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Introduction

'It's just a friendly letter, asking how you are.'
(BNC-Baby: FPB)
Metaphor in fiction: a preliminary example

In Yann Martel’s *Life of Pi* (2001), a sixteen-year-old Indian boy called Pi Patel finds himself stranded in a lifeboat together with a Bengal tiger after the boat carrying him and his family to Canada sinks. Pi manages to stay alive for 227 days before his lifeboat finally reaches land. During this time, he has to face many hardships and ordeals, posed not only by the slowly starving tiger and the changeable ocean and weather, but also by his own body and mind. He struggles with hunger, thirst, solitude, fear and despair. In Chapter 56, Pi reflects on the nature of fear. The first paragraph of this chapter is presented below (sentences have been numbered for ease of reference).

I must say a word about fear [1]. It is life’s only true opponent [2]. Only fear can defeat life [3]. It is a clever, treacherous adversary, how well I know [4]. It has no decency, respects no law or convention, shows no mercy [5]. It goes for your weakest spot, which it finds with unerring ease [6]. It begins in your mind, always [7]. One moment you are feeling calm, self-possessed, happy [8]. Then fear, disguised in the garb of mild-mannered doubt, slips into your mind like a spy [9]. Doubt meets disbelief and disbelief tries to push it out [10]. But disbelief is a poorly armed foot soldier [11]. Doubt does away with it with little trouble [12]. You become anxious [13]. Reason comes to do battle for you [14]. You are reassured [15]. Reason is fully equipped with the latest weapons technology [16]. But, to your amazement, despite superior tactics and a number of undeniable victories, reason is laid low [17]. You feel yourself weakening, wavering [18]. Your anxiety becomes dread [19]. (Martel 2001: 203)

In the next paragraph Pi moves on to describe how, after having defeated the mind, fear starts to attack the body. He notes how ‘your lungs have flown away like a bird and your guts have slithered away like a snake. Now you tongue drops dead like an opossum, while your jaw begins to gallop on the spot’ (p. 203). In the final two paragraphs of the chapter Pi considers how one should act in the face of fear, and what the consequences are of surrendering.

When reading the passage above, most people will immediately agree that this is an excerpt from a novel rather than from a face-to-face conversation, a speech, or a letter. Despite the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *you*, the present tenses, the short and simple sentences, and the relatively informal vocabulary, this passage will strike most readers as being clearly literary. One important factor in this sense of literariness is probably the presence of the particularly striking and original metaphorical expressions that people typically associate with novels and literary texts more generally. The entire passage compares the experience of struggling with your fears to being under physical attack from different adversaries. It
describes Pi’s emotions in terms of different types of people and their typical behaviour and characteristics. Our emotions are not people who live independently of us, but comparing their influence on us to the behaviour of adversaries fighting each other can help to better understand such complex emotions and how they affect us. It is particularly interesting that while the effect of fear on the mind is described in terms of a battle between different types of people, the effect of fear on the body is described in terms of animal metaphors. This subtly suggests that the mind is superior to the body as people are rational beings and therefore superior to instinct-driven animals; the conclusion to be drawn would then be that only the mind is strong enough to resist fear.

The comparison between the emotions and the different types of people begins in sentence (2), when fear is described as an _opponent_. As the opposed party is _life_, this personification of _fear_ also entails a personification of _life_. The personification of _fear_ as an opponent is repeated in sentence (3), where _fear_ proves to be the strongest of the two opponents and defeats life. Sentence (4) rephrases this personification by calling _fear_ an _adversary_. Like an opponent, an adversary is someone you compete or fight against. This adversary is now also assigned specific qualities, namely being _clever_ and _treacherous_. Sentences (5) and (6) further specify the behaviour of this adversary in terms of morality by referring to _decency, law, convention_ and _mercy_. The personification then becomes more complex, as _fear_ disguises itself as _doubt_ and this fear-disguised-as-doubt persona is then explicitly compared to a _spy_. This personification further specifies why _fear_ is such a treacherous adversary, namely because it disguises itself and spies on you. _Doubt_, on the other hand, is personified as being _mild-mannered_. In fact, the entire passage is devoted to the creation of one complex personification of Pi’s emotions. This personification metaphor is gradually developed and extended throughout the passage as a number of different abstract concepts – fear, doubt, disbelief, reason – are introduced and described in terms of characteristics, behaviour, or types of human beings.

At this point the personification of emotions is combined with a metaphor that presents the mind as a container, as the fear-spy slips into the mind-container. Inside this mind-container, _fear_ – disguised as _doubt_ – meets _disbelief_, which is first personified non-specifically as simply being an entity that tries to push doubt/fear out of the container. In sentence (11) this personification is then further specified when disbelief is described as a _poorly armed foot soldier_. This reference to being armed and being a soldier places the story within the frame of warfare. Fear is not a simple opponent or adversary in a competition, argument or fight, but in an actual war. Given this war frame the expression _do away with_ is likely to be interpreted as meaning _kill_ or _murder_. The opponent-personification is further developed within the warfare domain when _reason_ is also personified as being a
soldier that comes to do battle against doubt/fear. While disbelief was poorly armed, reason is equipped with the latest weapons technology, has superior tactics to doubt/fear, and has a track record of undeniable victories. Though reason is not explicitly identified as a specific type of person (such as an opponent, adversary, spy or foot soldier), the descriptions clearly refer to a soldier in the war scenario, and a superior one to disbelief. Yet despite reason’s superiority, it is still defeated by doubt/fear, and fear is now free to develop into dread and start attacking the body.

In everyday language use, it is in fact relatively common to say that people are ‘struggling with’ or ‘battling’ their emotions. We can also say that fear ‘makes’ you do or believe something or ‘tells’ you that something will happen, and doubts are often described as ‘nagging’, ‘lingering’ or ‘slipping in’. Yet the personifications in the excerpt above are so detailed, complex and well-structured that it is hard to imagine them occurring in a non-literary context. It is unlikely that anyone would spontaneously and unintentionally say or even think this stretch of discourse. And it is equally unlikely that anyone who reads or hears it would fail to notice the metaphors. This is primarily due to the fact that the metaphors themselves are the focus of the passage; these metaphors are what our attention is drawn to and understanding their meaning is essential to understanding this chapter. Understanding what these metaphors mean and what they say about Pi’s state of mind is what this whole chapter is about.

The attention of the reader is drawn to these metaphors in a number of ways, using different linguistic techniques. The first is the explicit A IS B format in sentences (2), (4) and (11): it is life’s only true opponent; it is a clever, treacherous adversary; disbelief is a poorly armed foot soldier. This explicit form focuses on the fact that one entity is being described in terms of another. A second feature is the syntactic parallelism in sentence (5): has no decency, respects no law or convention, shows no mercy. A third feature is the explicit signalling of the presence of a comparison in (9): like a spy. This type of explicit signalling is also strikingly present in the animal metaphors that follow in the second paragraph of the chapter (like a bird; like a snake; like an opossum). Finally, our attention is drawn to the metaphors by the use of elaborate, combined noun phrases, verb phrases and adjective phrases rather than single, isolated words: a clever, treacherous adversary; fully equipped with the latest weapons technology. Although describing emotions in human terms may be relatively common in everyday language use, this type of complex, extended and deliberate personification is clearly more unique and more obviously foregrounded, and therefore more likely to have been consciously constructed by the author and consciously interpreted by the reader.
This type of deliberate metaphor is generally regarded as a characteristic of literature. The same holds for the effect of such metaphors on the reader, namely the defamiliarization of our experiences by drawing attention to the language itself and making its aesthetic qualities more noticeable and memorable. Some readers may find such deliberately foregrounded uses of metaphor as the personifications of emotions as soldiers in the passage above too far-fetched or over-the-top while others may in fact feel that no one has ever expressed it so aptly or beautifully. This clearly belongs to the range of functions and effects literature is typically assumed to have. The kind of metaphors that are generally associated with literature are all present in the passage from *Life of Pi*, including personification metaphors, animal metaphors, similes, deliberate metaphors and extended metaphors (e.g., Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Leech and Short 2007; Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008; Steen and Gibbs 2004).

The metaphors also reflect the uses or functions that are commonly associated with metaphor in literature, namely the use of metaphor to express subjective experiences, the creative use of conventional metaphors, the use of novel metaphors to offer new and original perspectives, and the creation of complex textual patterns (e.g., Lakoff and Turner 1989; Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008). However, it remains an empirical question whether such metaphors are in fact frequent in fiction, and whether they are more typical of fiction than of other domains of discourse. These questions are the main focus of the present thesis, which aims to investigate the different forms and functions of metaphor in fiction.

**Aim and research questions**

This thesis is part of an encompassing research project called ‘Metaphor in Discourse: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures, cognitive representations’, which was funded by NWO-Vici grant 277-30-001. The project involved one principal investigator, Gerard Steen, and four PhD students: Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and myself.¹ In the *Metaphor in Discourse* project, a revised version of an explicit method for metaphor identification was developed and tested and a corpus of approximately 190,000 words of contemporary British English was annotated for linguistic metaphor. The corpus consisted of texts from

---

¹ Originally, the four PhD students involved in the project were Anna Kaal, Ewa Biernacka, Irene López-Rodriguez and myself, but after the initial year Ewa Biernacka and Irene López-Rodriguez left the project and were replaced by Berenike Herrmann and Tina Krennmayr.
four domains of discourse: academic prose, news texts, face-to-face conversations and fiction. Discourse was defined in the project as verbal communication in natural situations (cf. Schiffrin et al. 2001). The four domains included in the project were selected because they represent the four domains on which the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (Biber et al. 1999) is based, allowing for connections with a well-researched sample of four important varieties of English. After the corpus annotations had been completed, each PhD student analysed one register. This thesis will present the analyses for the forms and functions of metaphor in the register of fiction.

The Metaphor in Discourse project starts from the cognitive-linguistic standpoint that metaphor is not simply a matter of language and meaning but also of thought and knowledge. The basic assumption of the cognitive-linguistic study of metaphor is that the foundation of metaphor lies in people’s conceptual systems. The relation between metaphor in language and metaphor in thought can then be considered in two ways, going from language to thought or going from thought to language. Within this tradition, metaphor is defined as involving a set of correspondences between two conceptual domains (e.g., Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The resulting cross-domain mappings involve a transfer of knowledge between the two domains and can be either systematic or ad-hoc.

The Metaphor in Discourse project takes this conceptual definition of metaphor as its starting point for a novel cognitive approach to metaphor in discourse. As pointed out by Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b)², metaphor in discourse remains a neglected area of research within both cognitive linguistics and psycholinguistics. Researchers from both approaches tend to study metaphor either in isolation or in specially constructed contexts. Moreover, the materials that are used tend to be invented, elicited or manipulated for specific experimental purposes. Recent studies from corpus linguistics, applied linguistics and discourse analysis have begun to redress this situation (e.g., Cameron 2003; Cameron and Low 1999; Charteris-Black 2004; Deignan 2005; Goatly 1997; Semino 2008). However, the systematic, large-scale and exhaustive approach to metaphor in authentic discourse contexts remains an innovative aspect of the Metaphor in

² In the interest of economy and readability, in-text citations will use ‘Steen, Dorst et al. (2010a)’ to refer to Metaphor in usage by Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., and Krennmayr, T. (2010), and ‘Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b)’ to refer to A method for linguistic metaphor identification by Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., and Pasma, T. (2010). It is acknowledged that this is technically incorrect, as the references differ by one co-author (Pasma) but specifying all six names each time was considered too disruptive to the flow of the text. Dorst has been specified to distinguish these two references from Pragglejaz in practice by Steen, G. J., Biernacka, E., Dorst, A. G., Kaal, A. A., López-Rodríguez, I., and Pasma, T. (2010).
Discourse project, as discourse-analytical studies have typically focused on linguistic forms of metaphor in specific genres and registers.

The Metaphor in Discourse project is not only innovative in its consideration of metaphor use in four different discourse contexts, but also in defining metaphor as conceptual structure rather than linguistic form. Discourse-analytical studies of metaphor have typically concentrated on linguistic metaphor. That is, they concentrate on linguistic expressions that are used metaphorically, such as pig in a sentence like That pig fired me. However, cross-domain mappings are not necessarily expressed by metaphorically used language. In the case of a simile such as He eats like a pig, the linguistic expression like a pig is itself not used metaphorically even though it can be said to set up the same cross-domain mapping between a person and a pig as That pig fired me. This shows that cross-domain mappings can be realized by linguistic expressions that are not themselves linguistic metaphors, as is normally the case in similes and figurative comparisons and analogies.

It is the overall idea of the research project that metaphor defined as a cross-domain mapping in conceptual structure can be realized by different linguistic forms and that these different forms of metaphor may have different functions and effects in different genres and registers. Despite an increased interest among psycholinguists in comparing the metaphor and simile forms (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe 1999), there is at present no unified account of the relation between metaphor in conceptual structure and its expression in linguistic forms. Nor has sufficient attention been paid to the full range of possible linguistic forms and their uses in different discourse domains. This relationship between metaphor in conceptual structure and its expression in different linguistic forms in authentic discourse constitutes the main focus of the Metaphor in Discourse project.

One basic assumption of the project is that all cross-domain mappings involve some form of similarity between elements in the two domains. Although Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 126-7) list a number of arguments against the claim that metaphors involve similarity, Steen (2007: 61-4) has shown that all of their arguments can be refuted as long as similarity is not narrowed down to pre-existing similarity, not narrowed down to literal similarity, and not narrowed down to asymmetric similarity and opposed to symmetric literal similarity. Many studies of analogy have pointed out that the lack of literal similarity between domains is often simply ignored in both relational and proportional similarities (e.g., Coulson and Matlock 2001; Fauconnier 1997; Gentner 1983, 1989; Gentner and Clement 1988; Shen 1992). However, as Steen (ibid.: 62) points out, ‘analogy itself is a clear case
of similarity in the less restricted sense than literal similarity’, as shown by Gentner and Markman (1993, 1997), Markman and Gentner (1993) and Medin et al. (1993). Studies by Shen (1989, 2008) have shown that similarity can be symmetric and asymmetric, and that this holds true for both metaphorical and non-metaphorical comparisons. Steen (2007: 62) therefore proposes that asymmetric comparisons should be treated as belonging to one particular class of metaphor and that their irreversibility ‘should not be taken as a reason for rejecting the criterion of similarity as a basis for defining metaphor’. Similarity can be either pre-existing or created, objective or perceived, and can involve external resemblances or proportional analogies.

The assumption that metaphors involve some form of similarity does not entail that metaphors need to be formulated as comparisons, or even as metaphors. The position adopted in the Metaphor in Discourse project is that cross-domain mappings can be realized by a range of linguistic forms and that discourse factors determine the selection, function and effect of a particular linguistic form in a particular context. It also does not entail that metaphors are always cognitively represented as comparisons during comprehension. The processes involved in the understanding of metaphors are the subject of an ongoing debate in psycholinguistics (e.g., Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Giora 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008). These issues will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

The Metaphor in Discourse project follows the approach taken by Gentner and Bowdle (2001, 2008; Bowdle and Gentner 2005). Their Career of Metaphor hypothesis proposes that the processing of linguistic forms of metaphor by means of comparison or categorization is influenced by conventionality and grammatical form. Conventional linguistic metaphors tend to be processed by categorization while novel metaphors are processed by comparison; in addition, the metaphor form invites categorization processes while the simile form invites comparison processes. In the project, it was considered an empirical question how the full range of linguistic forms and conceptual structures of metaphor are cognitively represented (cf. Gibbs and Steen 1999). Metaphor form and conventionality appear to interact in different ways, resulting in different cognitive representations and representing different functions in different domains of discourse (e.g., Gentner 1982; Gentner and Jezioriski 1993; Steen 1994; Steen and Gibbs 2004).

Discourse analysts have emphasized the importance of discourse factors and the language user’s intentions in employing a specific form of metaphor. This type of discourse-analytical research has led to the distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate uses of metaphor, metaphor signalling, and the interaction between deliberateness and conventionality (e.g., Cameron 2003; Cameron and Deignan 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Charteris-Black and Musolff 2003; Goatly 1997).
Steen (1999a) discusses the role of rhetorical weight and the possibility of combining metaphor with other tropes, such as hyperbole, litotes, paradox, oxymoron, irony, sarcasm, and humour. It has also been pointed out that the rhetorical weight of metaphors is influenced by the nature of the register and the domain of discourse (e.g., Cameron 1999; Charteris-Black and Ennis 2001; Drew and Holt 1998; Low 1999; Steen 2002c), as well as by a linguistic metaphor’s structure, position and function in the discourse at the utterance, paragraph and text level (Steen 1999a). The Metaphor in Discourse project therefore examines the interaction between metaphor forms and conceptual structures and their use and function in four domains of discourse (academic discourse, conversations, fiction, and news).

The specially compiled and manually annotated corpus offers a detailed overview of the different linguistic forms of metaphor in authentic discourse, and provides the basis for a systematic investigation of the distribution and function of the linguistic forms and their conceptual structures. The identification and analysis of the linguistic forms of metaphor was based on MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b), a revised and extended version of the Metaphor Identification Procedure or MIP developed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007; cf. Steen 2002a, b, d; 2005). The identification and analysis of the underlying conceptual structures was based on Steen’s (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) five-step procedure. The project’s corpus-linguistic approach enabled an investigation of the patterns of usage of all linguistic forms of metaphor, so that the role and importance of frequently researched forms such as *A IS B* metaphors and *A IS LIKE B* similes could be compared with other forms that have received less or no attention. This approach also allowed for previously unnoticed phenomena to become noticed and examined a multitude of forms and functions in authentic contexts.

In addition, materials from the corpus were used to investigate the cognitive representations of metaphor. Psycholinguistic methods and techniques were used for the experimental study of cognitive representations of the linguistic forms and their conceptual structures. Materials for the experimental studies were selected on the basis of the relative importance of the various linguistic forms and conceptual structures of metaphor that were established in the corpus analyses. The overall goal of the Metaphor in Discourse project can then be summarized as follows: to describe and analyse which linguistic forms with which attending conceptual structures are used in which discourse situations, for which purpose and to which cognitive effect.

This thesis will focus on the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations of metaphor in fiction. It will describe their distribution, use, function and effect in authentic discourse contexts, and relate these findings to the encompassing framework. This means that
the findings for metaphor in fiction will also be compared to the forms and functions of metaphor in the other domains of discourse in the project, allowing for a corpus-based, cross-register metaphor profile of fiction. Metaphor in fiction has mostly been studied at a qualitative level, in which claims are often based on introspection or intuition and examples are drawn from personal reading experience. Moreover, corpus-based studies of metaphor in literature often use corpora only as their source of examples, without providing any quantitative information about the frequency, relevance and importance of such examples. The current study of metaphor in fiction therefore offers a unique view on the form and function of metaphor in fiction by offering corpus-based quantitative analyses and statistical evidence of the dominant patterns of metaphor. Qualitative analyses will provide insight into the different functions and effects of these metaphors by focusing on issues of deliberateness, conventionality, and creativity. This combination will provide an answer to the question what the main linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations of metaphor in fiction are and how these can be related to the particular characteristics of the register and domain of discourse.

Outline of the thesis

Chapter 1 offers a definition of what is considered to constitute a metaphor in this thesis. It explains how this thesis will systematically distinguish between linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of metaphor in discourse, as well as between semiotic and behavioural analysis. It also illustrates the insights from psychology and corpus linguistics that underlie these distinctions, and presents the theoretical framework and methodologies that form the backbone of the analyses presented in this thesis.

Chapter 2 then provides a definition of fiction and explains its relation to literature, narrative and the novel. The study of metaphor in fiction is placed within the larger framework of the distinction between literary and non-literary language and an overview of the different approaches to the study of metaphor in literature is given. This chapter also discusses the importance of linguistic approaches to the study of literature and provides an overview of corpus-based studies of genre and register by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001).

Chapter 3 presents the MIPVU procedure (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b) that was used in the Metaphor in Discourse project to annotate the corpus of 190,000 words of contemporary British English taken from the BNC-Baby corpus. It explains the
basic procedure and discusses the various refinements and extensions in MIPVU that were added to the original MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007).

Chapter 4 discusses some of the main issues relating to the application of MIPVU to the fiction sample of the corpus. It focuses on how features of MIPVU dealt with specific phenomena in fiction and the other three registers in order to achieve consistent analyses and classifications. It also gives a demonstration of the application of MIPVU to an excerpt from the fiction sample which illustrates most of these issues.

Chapter 5 presents the quantitative results of the linguistic metaphor analysis of the corpus. It focuses on how fiction differs from the other three discourse domains in terms of its general distribution of word classes, its distribution of metaphor across these word classes, its distribution of the different relations to metaphor that are distinguished in MIPVU, and its distribution of the different types of metaphor that are distinguished in MIPVU.

Chapter 6 further refines the quantitative findings presented for fiction in Chapter 5 by distinguishing between narrative and dialogue in fiction. Narrative and dialogue are compared in terms of their general distribution of word classes, their distribution of metaphor across these word classes, their distribution of the different relations to metaphor and their distribution of the different types of metaphor. This analysis focuses on which patterns of metaphor are typical of fiction as a whole, and which patterns are specifically attributable to either narrative or dialogue.

Chapter 7 provides a detailed study of the linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of personification in fiction. Personification proved to be one frequent and important type of metaphor in fiction and its analysis in authentic discourse posed different problems at each level of analysis.

Chapter 8 then focuses on the cognitive representations of personification in fiction. It presents the results of a psycholinguistic study that was carried out to investigate the recognition of different types of personification in fiction readers who were not experts in metaphor analysis.

Finally, Chapter 9 offers a general discussion of the main findings of this thesis. It presents a number of limitations to the research carried out and makes a number of suggestions for further research. It also discusses some of the implications of the present research for the study of metaphor in literature and discourse more generally.
Chapter 1

Contemporary Metaphor Theory

That girl is a dog!
(BNC-Baby: BMW)
1.1 From metaphor in language to metaphor in thought

As Ortony (1979: 3) once pointed out, ‘Any serious study of metaphor is almost obliged to start with the works of Aristotle’, for it was Aristotle who famously claimed in the *Poetics*:

> It is a great thing, indeed, to make a proper use of these poetical forms, as also of compounds and strange words. But the greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor. It is the one thing that cannot be learnt from others; and it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilars (*Poetics* 22; Bywater 1940: 62).

Aristotle defined metaphor as ‘giving the thing a name that belongs to something else’ (p. 56), a definition that reflects the origins of the word *metapherein*, which derives from the Greek prefix *meta*, meaning *with/after* (later extended to mean *over/across*), and *pherein*, meaning *to bear/carry*. Aristotle identified four types of metaphor, as the name assigning may take place ‘from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy’ (p. 56-57). The first three of Aristotle’s types all involve the substitution of one word for another. Of these three types, the type that has received most attention in contemporary metaphor studies is the genus-for-genus metaphor, such as *Man is a wolf*. Aristotle argued that in such nominal metaphors, one noun, *wolf*, substitutes for another noun, *man*, which belongs to the same genus, i.e. category or semantic domain. In the *Rhetoric* (Freese 1926), Aristotle argues that metaphors are implicit comparison statements, and he consequently regarded similes as having the same effect as metaphors as they differ from metaphors ‘only by the addition of a word’ (p. 397). Aristotle considered metaphors to be forms of “deviant” language use; metaphors and other deviant forms of language, such as strange words and abbreviations, were considered to have a primarily ornamental function, to ‘save the language from seeming mean and prosaic’ (Bywater 1940: 59), but they should be used sparingly and should be neither too obvious nor too obscure.

In response to Aristotle’s bold claim, Richards (1936: 89) notes that it contains ‘the evil presence of three of the assumptions which have ever since prevented the study of this “greatest thing by far” from taking the place it deserves among our studies and from advancing, as theory and practice, in the ways open to it’. Richards points out that the assumption that an ‘eye for resemblances’ is a special gift only some possess is a fallacy, since we all ‘live, and speak, only through our eye for resemblances’ (p. 89). While some may have better eyes than others, Richards believes that the difference is one of degree. He also refutes the claim that ‘This alone cannot be imparted to another’ by pointing out that people
learn to use metaphors ‘just as we learn whatever else makes us distinctively human’ (p. 90). But the worst assumption according to Richards is the assumption that metaphor is somehow exceptional or special, that metaphors deviate from normal language use rather than being omnipresent. Because of this assumption, metaphor was long considered a ‘sort of happy extra trick with words, an opportunity to exploit the accidents of their versatility, something in place occasionally but requiring unusual skill and caution’ (p. 90). That is, this assumption may have been the basis for the long-held belief that metaphors are ornamental, an ‘added power of language’ (p. 90), rather than being constitutive to the language. Or, as Ortony (1979: 3) succinctly put it, it led to the false belief that metaphors ‘are not necessary, they are just nice’.

However, Mahon (1999) argues that many of the assumptions about Aristotle’s views on metaphor are misplaced. In the Poetics, Aristotle was concerned with the creation or ‘coinage’ of new metaphors in Greek literature, particularly tragic and epic verse, not with the ‘usage’ of metaphor in everyday discourse (p. 73). In the Rhetoric, on the other hand, Aristotle acknowledges that metaphor is ubiquitous in everyday conversation and writing, and he encourages orators to produce better metaphors, explaining ‘what makes a metaphor successful, pleasing and informative’ (p. 75). Mahon emphasizes that Aristotle did consider these metaphors to have cognitive value as he argued that they are clear and reveal truths about the world. Moreover, he also considered metaphors to have pedagogical value since he argued that people learn new things about the world from metaphors, as metaphors make people see connections that they did not see before. According to Mahon, this shows that Aristotle did not maintain that metaphors are unusual per se – only the metaphors in tragic and epic poetry are unusual because they are new metaphors and capture new resemblances. While metaphors are used by everyone in everyday conversation and writing, tragedians and epic poets have a better eye for resemblances than others and a unique ability to create new metaphors. It is therefore only the new and creative metaphors in literature that should be considered exceptional.

Nevertheless, Aristotle’s claims about the exceptional nature of metaphors and their role in embellishing and enlivening language use led scholars like Richards (1936) to offer new definitions of metaphor that moved away from metaphor as a matter of substitution in language. Richards defined metaphor as follows: ‘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’ (p. 93). To distinguish between the ‘two thoughts of different things’ and the metaphor as a whole, two technical terms were introduced: tenor and vehicle. In a metaphorical expression such as Man is a wolf, man is the tenor, the thing being compared, and wolf is the vehicle, the thing that the tenor is being
compared with. In Richards’ view, the ‘co-presence of the vehicle and tenor results in a meaning (to be clearly distinguished from the tenor) which is not attainable without their interaction’ (p. 100). This entails that the vehicle is not merely ornamental or additional: the tenor influences the vehicle, and vice versa, and together they create a new meaning that cannot be ascribed to either term individually. The relative importance of particular tenors and vehicles in creating this interactive meaning of the metaphor may vary immensely depending on the context.

Richards also makes a broad distinction between two types of metaphor, namely those that are based on ‘some direct resemblance’ between the tenor and vehicle and those that are based on ‘some common attitude’ towards the tenor and vehicle (p. 118). As an example of the first, he discusses the nominal metaphor leg in the leg of a table. Unlike a horse, a table does not walk on its legs, but the legs of a table do serve to hold the table up. This common characteristic (i.e. holding up) is referred to as the ‘ground’ of the metaphor (p. 117). Richards notes that it may sometimes be impossible to determine the ground with certainty and stresses that this will not prevent the metaphor from being successful, as the fact that we cannot see how a metaphor works does not prove that it does not work, and vice versa, seeing how a metaphor should work does not mean that it does. As an example of the second type, he refers to common metaphorical terms of abuse and endearment, such as pig or duck. He argues that such metaphorical uses are not based on an actual resemblance between the animal and the person, but rather on some culturally-established feeling or attitude towards these animals which provides the ground for the comparison, such as disgust in the case of pigs. Such assumptions may be based on completely accidental or extraneous factors and may differ widely between cultures (cf. Deignan 2003).

In relation to the common assumption that metaphors involve comparisons, Richards notes that comparisons may take many different forms: they may involve simply putting two things together, they may involve an examination of how two things are alike and unlike, they may be used to draw attention to the likeness between two things, or they may be used to draw attention to aspects of the one through the presence of the other. The dissimilarities between the tenor and vehicle are often just as important as the similarity that provides the ground. For example, he points out that when Hamlet compares people to vermin by saying that they crawl, the force of the expression comes ‘at least equally from the differences that resist and control the influences of their resemblances. The implication there is that man should not so crawl’ (p. 127). The restrictions placed by the tenor on the meaning of the metaphor are just as important as the ground on which the comparison is based, and both similarities and dissimilarities play an important role in the meaning expressed by the metaphor.
This interactive view of metaphor was further developed by Black (1962) into the interaction theory of metaphor. Black contrasts the interaction theory of metaphor with the substitution theory, which treats metaphorical expressions as substitutes for literal expressions with the same meaning, as well as with the comparison theory, which treats metaphors as presentations of underlying comparisons based on similarities. A sentence such as Richard is a lion means the same as Richard is brave according to the substitution theory, and the same as Richard is like a lion (in being brave) according to the comparison theory (p. 35). Both views hold that the meaning of the metaphor could be expressed literally.

Black’s (1962) interaction theory follows Richards (1936: 93) in his argumentation that metaphor involves ‘two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction’. This single word or phrase is called the ‘focus’ by Black, the surrounding context the ‘frame’. Black argues that the interaction between a specific focus and a specific frame creates a new meaning that is not the same as the focus’s meaning in literal uses or the meaning of a literal substitute (p. 38).

Each specific frame extends the meaning of the focus, and the reader must remain aware of both the old and new meaning together.

In the interaction view, uttering the metaphor Man is a wolf evokes a ‘wolf-system of related commonplaces’ (p. 41), which are common assumptions that are not necessarily true but readily accepted in a specific culture. Based on these common assumptions about wolves, the reader will construct corresponding implications about man, implications that are not normally implied by literal uses of the word man. That is, the metaphor will act as a kind of filter and suppress some implications while emphasizing others: ‘it not only selects, it brings forward aspects [...] that might not be seen at all through another medium’ (p. 42). Black notes that these implications need not be ‘reach-me-downs’ (p. 43) but that writers of poetry and prose can create novel implication patterns; for example, though the common cultural assumption about wolves is that they are dangerous and hateful, a writer can refer literally to wolves in a very positive way, i.e. by describing them as brave and loyal, before using wolf as a metaphor vehicle. Such positive contextual uses will influence how the metaphor is interpreted. Moreover, Black points out that if we use the wolf vehicle to say something about the tenor man, then the metaphor will also make the wolf seem more human: because there is an interaction between the vehicle and tenor, the specific tenor will also influence the way the vehicle is interpreted.

Gibbs (1992, 1994) discusses the interaction view of metaphor as ‘perhaps the dominant theory in the multidisciplinary study of metaphor’ (1994: 234) and argues that the reason behind this lies in the fact that ‘interactionism not only accounts for metaphorical meaning as a late product of understanding, but it also
suggests an algorithm for the early unconscious process of metaphor comprehension’ (p. 234). However, several controversial issues regarding the interaction view have been the topic of debate among psychologists. For instance, some of the central notions in this view, such as ‘implicative complex’, ‘system of commonplaces’, ‘interactionism’ and ‘fit’ are inherently vague. Moreover, no criteria have been specified for deciding which features of the implicative complex of the vehicle domain (i.e. wolf) fit the implicative complex of the topic domain (i.e. man) or for determining which of the implications and predicates of the vehicle that apply literally to the topic are significant in the interpretation (see Gibbs 1994 for a detailed discussion).

Gibbs (1992, 1994) discusses four major models that have been proposed to account for how metaphors may create new meanings in line with the interactive view of metaphor, namely the salience imbalance model (Ortony 1979), the domains interaction model (Tourangeau and Sternberg 1981, 1982), the structure mapping model (Gentner 1983; Gentner and Clement 1988), and the class inclusion model (Glucksberg 2001; Gluckberg and Keysar 1990). Gibbs (1994) points out that each of these models places different constraints on the nature of the interaction between the vehicle and the topic and that each theory is limited to particular aspects of metaphor understanding as each model entails different assumptions. Nevertheless, all four of these models assume that ‘understanding each metaphorical utterance depends on some unique, novel act of mapping information from a source onto a target domain’ (p. 247). Gibbs argues that this need not be the case, as many metaphorical expressions may in fact be instantiations of pre-existing metaphorical conceptualizations of our experience. This claim is the main tenet of Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) well-known Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

This section has shown that while metaphor was historically regarded as a deviant and decorative “trick of language” belonging to poetic texts, the past few decades have seen a ‘cognitive turn in metaphor studies’ (Steen 2002b) resulting in a view of metaphor as a figure of thought rather than a figure of language. Simultaneously, attention has shifted from creative and novel uses in literature and rhetoric to the ubiquity of conventional metaphors in everyday language use. The next section will discuss the main tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the dominant paradigm in contemporary metaphor studies, while Sections 1.3 and 1.4 will present some of the critiques that have been raised against CMT from the fields of psychology and linguistics.
1.2 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Though Richards (1936) and Black (1962) already emphasized that metaphors are not deviant or rare and argued that metaphor is a matter of thought rather than a matter of language, it was Ortony’s edited volume of *Metaphor and thought* (1979) and Lakoff and Johnson’s ground-breaking publication *Metaphors we live by* (1980) that marked the beginning of the cognitive metaphor studies. Lakoff and his colleagues introduced the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor that is now commonly known as Conceptual Metaphor Theory, sometimes referred to as Cognitive Metaphor Theory (cf. Kövecses 2002; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999; Lakoff and Turner 1989). Lakoff and Johnson showed that metaphorical expressions are not restricted to poetic language and rhetoric but are pervasive in ordinary everyday language. Moreover, many of these metaphorical expressions form systematic patterns or groups, as is illustrated by the following examples:

(1)
Your claims are *indefensible*.
He *attacked* every weak point in my argument.
His criticisms were *right on target*.
I *demolished* his argument.
I’ve never *won* an argument with him.
You disagree? Okay, *shoot*!
If you use that *strategy*, he’ll *wipe you out*.
He *shot down* all of my arguments.
(1980: 4; italics in original)

(2)
You’re *wasting* my time.
This gadget will *save* you hours.
I don’t *have* the time to *give* you.
How do you *spend* your time these days.
That flat tire *cost* me an hour.
I’ve *invested* a lot of time in her.
I don’t *have enough* time to *spare* for that.
You’re *running out of* time.
(1980: 7-8; italics in original)

The italicized expressions in (1) all describe a verbal argument in terms of war. Lakoff and Johnson argue that such conventional metaphorical expressions show that we do not merely *talk* about arguments in terms of war but that we also *think* of arguments in terms of war. In Conceptual Metaphor Theory such systematic groups of expressions are considered to reflect conventional patterns of thought.
which Lakoff and Johnson call ‘conceptual metaphors’. The systematicity in the
language is merely a reflection of the underlying systematicity in our conceptual
system. That is, the italicized expressions are all linguistic realizations of an
underlying conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Conceptual metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR form systematic sets of
correspondences, also called ‘mappings’. These mappings allow us to conceive of
one domain, the target domain, in terms of another domain, the source domain. We
understand one concept, e.g., ARGUMENT, in terms of another concept, e.g., WAR.
This means that we use our knowledge about wars to understand arguments. We
think about arguments in terms of winning and losing, attacking and defending,
opponents and allies, and so on. In this sense, metaphors involve a transfer of
knowledge from a source domain to a target domain, or put differently, metaphor
involves a cross-domain mapping. Although there is a clear relation between
Lakoff and Johnson’s source and target domains on the one hand, and Richards’
(1936) vehicle and tenor on the other, it is important to note that the latter was
theorizing about metaphor at the level of language, while Lakoff and Johnson are
concerned with conceptual structures. As pointed out by Cameron (1999) and Steen
(1999a), among others, it is important that these levels and their corresponding
terminology are kept distinct.

Conceptual metaphors can themselves also form coherent systems, as is
illustrated by the examples in (2). These italicized expressions can be interpreted as
linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphors TIME IS MONEY (i.e. spend,
invest, cost), TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE (i.e. have enough of, running out of),
and TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY (i.e. have, give). These three conceptual
metaphors form a systematic hierarchical system since money is a type of limited
resource and limited resources are a type of valuable commodities; that is, TIME IS
MONEY entails that TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE and TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE
in turn entails that TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:
9). In addition to such structural metaphors, where one concept is structured in
terms of another, Lakoff and Johnson also discuss orientational metaphors, which
structure concepts in terms of spatial orientations such as down-up, in-out, front-
back, on-off, etc. Examples of such orientational conceptual metaphors are HAPPY
IS UP – SAD IS DOWN (e.g., ‘I’m feeling up.’; ‘My spirits rose.’; ‘I’m feeling down.’;
‘My spirits sank.’) and CONSCIOUS IS UP – UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN (e.g., ‘Wake
up.’; ‘Get up.’; ‘He fell asleep.’; ‘He’s under hypnosis.’) (p. 14).

Lakoff and Johnson argue that orientational metaphors are grounded in our
physical experience – our posture is erect when we are happy, we sleep lying
down, etc. – though they can vary to some degree between different cultures. In
fact, the experiential basis of conceptual metaphors and the notion of the
“embodiment” of meaning is, as emphasized by Kövecses (2002) ‘perhaps the
central idea of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor and indeed of the cognitive linguistic view of meaning’ (p. 16). Rather than being based on either pre-existing or newly created similarities, metaphorical meaning derives from our own bodily experiences and conceptual metaphors are grounded in physical, perceptual and cultural correlations in experience.

Related to this issue is the notion of the nature of conceptual metaphors. Grady (1997) re-analysed the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS and noted that it generates linguistic metaphorical expressions such as ‘Your facts are solid, but your argumentation is shaky’ and ‘That theory caved in under the weight of scrutiny’ but not ‘This theory has French windows’ (p. 269-270). Grady describes this phenomenon as the “poverty” of the mapping. He also points out that the same building-related terms (e.g., architect, foundation, cornerstone, collapse) can be used to talk about other target domains than theories, such as ‘social, political, financial, logical and other types of structures which are not primarily understood as physical objects’ (p. 271). Grady argues that these inconsistencies exist because THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS is an instance of a more general metaphor rather than a basic-level metaphor. THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS is a complex conceptual metaphor which is generated from the interaction between ORGANIZATION IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE and PERSISTING IS REMAINING ERECT. Because theories are a prototypical example of abstract organization and buildings are a prototypical example of physical structures, this generates the metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS and yields a large number of linguistic realizations. Grady calls ORGANIZATION IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE a “basic” or “primary” metaphor, while THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS is “complex”. He points out that decomposing complex metaphors into basic metaphors enables researchers to explain in a systematic way why particular elements in a complex scenario are mapped onto the target domain while others are not.

Lakoff and Turner (1989) discuss the internal structure of conceptual metaphors with regard to the LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor. First of all, the mapping involves ‘slots’ in the source domain (JOURNEY) that are mapped onto ‘slots’ in the target domain (LIFE). Some of the target-domain slots exist independently of the mapping, such as a ‘living person slot’, while others are created by the mapping: the ‘PATH slot’ in the JOURNEY domain requires a ‘COURSE OF LIFE slot’ to be created in the LIFE domain (p. 63). In addition to slots for entities, the metaphorical mapping also involves relations and properties. For example, the relation REACHING between TRAVELER and DESTINATION gets mapped onto the relation ACHIEVING between PERSON and PURPOSE. Lakoff and Turner argue that the mapping also transfers knowledge and inference patterns from the source domain to the target domain. For example, from the source domain of journeys we know that if you hit a dead end you cannot continue in the same direction; when life is
understood in terms of a journey, hitting a dead end in life therefore entails that you must change your behaviour (p. 64).

Lakoff (1993) explains this systematicity of the mapping between source and target domain elements by proposing the Invariance Principle. The Invariance Principle maintains that ‘metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive typology (that is, the image-schema structure) of the source domain, in a way consistent with the target domain’ (p. 215). According to the Invariance Principle, relationships between points in the target domain will be consistent with relationships between points in the source domain (for example, for the mapping LIFE IS A JOURNEY, the beginning of the journey will be mapped onto the beginning of life, i.e. birth, not a middle point or the end) and metaphorical mappings should only import those elements of the source domain that are consistent with the structure of the target domain. In the mapping, entities map onto entities, relations onto relations, and attributes onto attributes.

Within Conceptual Metaphor Theory, target domains such as TIME, LIFE and EMOTIONS are typically complex, abstract, unfamiliar and cannot be understood directly, though they may at times be experienced directly. Source domains, on the other hand, are typically concrete, simple and familiar and grounded in our bodily and perceptual experience. Furthermore, CMT holds that most metaphorical expressions in our everyday language use are conventional, and we use and understand them effortlessly and automatically. Because both production and reception are effortless, we are normally not aware of the metaphoricity of these expressions. Lakoff and Turner (1989) argue that when we employ or encounter novel metaphors or other creative uses of metaphor, for instance in literature, these novel and creative metaphors are normally extensions of or elaborations on conventional conceptual metaphors. Chapter 2 considers the nature of metaphor in literature and will provide a more detailed discussion of Lakoff and Turner’s model for poetic metaphor and its relation to conventional conceptual metaphors in everyday language.

This section has discussed the main tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which remains the dominant paradigm in metaphor studies to this day. The definition of metaphor as a mapping across conceptual domains is at present, as Steen (in press a) emphasizes, ‘the most productive and best embedded theoretical definition of metaphor’. Nevertheless, some of the claims of Conceptual Metaphor Theory have been challenged by scholars from varying disciplines, such as psychology, corpus linguistics and discourse analysis. Section 1.3 below will discuss some of the issues raised by psychologists and psycholinguists regarding metaphorical representation and metaphor processing. Section 1.4 will address questions raised by corpus linguists and discourse analysts concerning the use of isolated and invented examples, the identification of metaphors in authentic
discourse, and the relation between metaphor in language and metaphor in thought. Section 1.5 will then offer a proposal for a three-dimensional model of metaphor distinguishing between metaphor in language, thought and communication.

1.3 Critiques from psychology: conceptual metaphor, metaphoric representation and metaphor processing

1.3.1 Conceptual metaphor and metaphoric representation

With regard to the claim in CMT that our conceptual system is ‘fundamentally metaphorical in nature’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3), the notion of metaphoric representation has been questioned by scholars such as Murphy (1996, 1997) and McGlone (2001, 2007). The claim that our conceptual system is itself metaphorical entails that some mental representations of concepts are at least in part metaphorical. CMT assumes that some domains ‘cannot be clearly delineated in terms of the naturally emergent dimensions of our experience’ (1980: 177) and that although these domains can be experienced directly, they cannot be understood directly, that is, on their own terms. We can only understand these abstract and complex domains in terms of other, more concrete and simple domains. For example, abstract and complex domains such as emotions and life are understood in terms of more concrete, simple domains such as temperatures and journeys (Kövecses 1986; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1980). However, Murphy (1996: 176) points out that although Lakoff (1987, 1993) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) continually refer to metaphor in thought and understanding, they do not provide ‘a detailed psychological model of metaphoric representation, nor a process model for how such representations would be used in understanding and thought – at least, models of the sort expected in cognitive psychology’.

Murphy (1996) postulates two main interpretations of the claim for metaphoric representation, a strong interpretation and a weak interpretation. In the strong interpretation, some target domains, for example emotions, do not have their own conceptual representations but are understood through metaphor reference to a source domain, for example temperatures. In the weak interpretation people do have a separate representations of abstract and complex domains such as emotions, but the content of the representations is influenced by metaphors relating emotions to temperatures in such a way that the emotion concept takes on the same structure as the temperature concept (p. 176-177). The critical difference between the strong and weak versions is independence of representation. In the strong version, people
do not have a well-developed concept of argument independently of the concept of war – they can understand arguments only in terms of wars. In the weak version, people do have a complete, independent concept of argument which they can use to understand arguments, but the content and structure of this concept have been influenced by the content and structure of the concept of war (p. 179).

Murphy points out that in the strong view, for a metaphor such as argument is war our representation of the target domain arguments is a set of connections to the source domain war, relating the arguers to combatants, the arguments to weapons, arguments in favour to defences, and so on. This entails that people employ their knowledge of war to think about and understand arguments (p. 177). On the strong interpretation, concepts such as argument have little conceptual structure of their own but rather receive their structure via the source domain through which they are understood, such as war. This entails that people do not have independent knowledge about the components of an argument but only a set of pointers to the concept of war, and we use the components of war to understand the components of arguments. If concepts such as arguments have a metaphorical representation then they cannot be independently defined and represented. Murphy stresses that this entails that ‘one does not really understand an argument - one only understands war, and the understanding of arguments is parasitic on this concept’ (p. 178). Yet people know and believe a lot of things about arguments that they do not know or believe about wars, which would be impossible given the strong view.

Murphy points out that the strong view entails that concepts such as argument are represented and understood through a link to war and that this link would routinely attribute incorrect attributes of wars to arguments, which does not happen in practice. Moreover, the presence of multiple metaphors for the same target domain, such as love is a journey, love is madness and love is a business transaction (Kövecses 1986), poses a serious problem to the claim that concepts are structured metaphorically, and reference to the "inherent structure" of target domains cannot resolve this issue as this would require that this inherent structure is non-metaphorically represented. In relation to this point McGlone (2001: 94) has pointed out that people need ‘at least a minimal independent representation of theories’; otherwise people would ‘assume that theory terms are synonymous with building terms and would be conceptually incapable of distinguishing between them’.

The weak interpretation of the metaphorical representation claim entails that concepts such as argument do have independent representations but that these are influenced by the metaphors that are used to talk about this concept. That is, the metaphor influences the structure of the target domain concept, but the mental representation itself is not metaphorical. In this view the concepts argument and war both have their own mental representations and argument has its own
structure independent from the structure of WAR and defined in its own terms rather than in terms of the metaphor. However, because the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is so frequent in our language, the structure of the ARGUMENT concept has become similar to the structure of the WAR concept (p. 178).

Though Murphy acknowledges that a weak interpretation of the metaphoric representation claim is not impossible, he proposes an alternative hypothesis that does not require any metaphoric representation of concepts. In his *structural similarity view* all concepts are represented directly and the prevalence of metaphor in language does not generally reflect the influence of these metaphors on the mental representations. Instead, metaphors are the result of the similarity of pre-existing conceptual structures. Metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR are the result of a structural similarity between the concept of ARGUMENT and the concept of WAR. Murphy therefore argues that the relations of the components of ARGUMENT can be projected onto the relations of WAR in a coherent way, as is also argued by Gentner and Clement (1988). In his view it is this similarity in relational structure that enables people to construct understandable verbal metaphors, and those that are effective and pleasing become conventional ways of talking about a specific domain.

In Murphy’s *structural similarity view* concepts such as LOVE and JOURNEY have independent representations of their own. The existence of metaphorical expressions that relate love to journeys are the result of a structural similarity between these two domains. In this view, salient properties of LOVE correspond to salient properties of JOURNEY. Murphy argues that such correspondences could be explained by the structure-mapping theory of Gentner and colleagues (Gentner 1983; Markman and Gentner 1993). On the structural similarity view, the domain of LOVE and the domain of JOURNEY are each represented independently, and the domain of JOURNEY does not influence the content and structure of the domain of LOVE. Since this view does not propose any metaphoric links between source and target domains the problem of incorrect inferences does not occur. Multiple metaphors to describe one and the same target domain are also not problematic for the structural similarity view as different metaphors will map different structural similarities between domains. This ‘multiplicity of similarities’ (p. 196) between domains corresponds to findings by Medin et al. (1993) and Markman and Gentner (1993) that showed that a single stimulus could be viewed as similar to two different and incompatible stimuli. This showed that similarity comparisons can cause an item to be interpreted differently depending on the item it is being compared to.

McGlone (2001: 94-5) points out that the weak version of the metaphoric representation claim can be empirically tested, though this has rarely been done by CMT proponents. In most cases, the evidence for the presence of conceptual
metaphors has been circular: the evidence that people think about arguments in
terms of buildings is that they talk about arguments in terms of buildings, and the
reason that they talk about arguments in terms of buildings is because they think
about arguments in terms of buildings. To empirically test the presence of
conceptual metaphors, an abstract concept needs to be found for which a set of
metaphorical expressions can be determined that suggest a conceptual metaphor in
a given culture, such as THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS in Western culture. The
metaphorical expressions should then be compared to the way this concept is talked
about in a different culture, to determine whether this culture uses the same or a
different conceptual metaphor. After having determined whether the different
cultures use different linguistic expressions to talk about the same abstract concept,
it should then be demonstrated that these different cultures not only talk differently
about this concept but also think differently about it, as evidenced by non-linguistic
reasoning. This final step is crucial since it is the only non-linguistic evidence for
the presence of conceptual metaphors.

A number of experiments by Boroditsky (1998, 2000, 2001) specifically
address this issue. Boroditsky (2001) examined whether speakers of English and
Mandarin Chinese think differently about the abstract concept TIME. While both
Mandarin and English speakers use horizontal front/back terms to talk about time
(i.e. ‘the good times ahead of us’ or ‘the hardships behind us’), Mandarin speakers
also commonly use up/down vertical terms. The question is whether this difference
between English and Mandarin in the way speakers talk about time also leads to a
difference in the way speakers think about time.

Boroditsky (2001) specifically investigated whether using spatial language to
talk about time has both immediate, short-term implications for on-line processing
as well as long-term implications. Using reaction times as an implicit measure, the
experiments showed that language affected thought even in non-linguistic tasks.
The first experiment showed that ‘habits in language encourage habits in thought’
(p. 12): Mandarin speakers showed a vertical bias even when they were “thinking
for English”, indicating that ‘language-encouraged habits in thought can operate
regardless of the language that one is currently thinking for’ (p. 12). A second
experiment revealed that the bias of Mandarin speakers to think about time in
vertical terms was greater for speakers who started learning English later in life,
though the vertical bias appeared to be independent of the length of exposure to
English. That is, ‘[the] propensity to think about time vertically was related to the
length of pure Mandarin experience (before any English was learned), but not to
the length of English experience’ (p. 14). In a third experiment, native speakers of
English learned to use vertical spatial terms (i.e. above, below, etc.) to talk about
time, similar to the way these terms are used in Mandarin Chinese. The experiment
revealed that native speakers of English who had been trained briefly in using
vertical terms to talk about time produced similar results to the Mandarin speakers, confirming that the earlier differences between English and Mandarin speakers were driven by differences in language rather than culture. The results indicate that ‘learning a new way to talk about a familiar domain can change the way one thinks about that domain’ (p. 19).

In summary, Boroditsky’s experiments suggest that the way people think about an abstract concept such as TIME is strongly influenced by their language experience. The experiments revealed an effect of ‘first-language thinking on second-language understanding’ (p. 3) in such a way that speakers of English and speakers of Mandarin thought differently about the domain of time even when both groups were “thinking for English.” This result provides evidence in favour of the claim that the domain of TIME is partly structured in terms of language-encouraged spatial metaphors. The spatial metaphors that are used to talk about time encourage a structural alignment between the two domains. This alignment may then cause relational structures to be transferred from the concept SPACE to the concept TIME. When different cultures use different spatial metaphors to talk about time this therefore also causes them to think differently about time. Boroditsky argues that the mechanism behind this type of metaphoric structuring may be the same as the mechanism used in analogical inferencing (e.g., Gentner et al. 2001; Gentner and Wolff 1997).

This section addressed the claim in Conceptual Metaphor Theory that many abstract concepts are structured metaphorically. It discussed both a strong and weak interpretation of this claim for the metaphoric representation of concepts. Though the strong interpretation seems to be untenable, the experiments by Boroditsky (1998, 2000, 2001) provide evidence that supports the weak interpretation. Boroditsky’s findings and Murphy’s (1996, 1997) interpretation of the weak version of metaphoric representation were argued to be in line with Gentner’s (1983) structure-mapping theory. The next section will address this theory in more detail with regard to the issues raised against CMT in terms of its evidence for metaphor processing. That is, psychologists have emphasized that the existence of conceptual metaphors and the metaphoric representation of concepts cannot be taken as evidence for how metaphorical language is processed by individual language users during on-line comprehension.

1.3.2 Conceptual metaphor and metaphor processing

Though Murphy (1996, 1997) was primarily concerned with the problems relating to metaphoric representation, he also pointed out that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) do not provide a process model that explains how metaphors are used in thought
and understanding. Moreover, he stresses that ‘in order to escape linguistic circularity, Conceptual Metaphor Theory needs to provide evidence for metaphorical concepts from findings in, for example, induction, problem-solving, object recognition, conceptual development and memory’ (1996: 183-4). Other scholars have also pointed out that what is analysed as metaphorical in the linguistic and conceptual structures of discourse does not have to be a one-to-one reflection of the psychological processes of human verbal and cognitive behaviour in discourse (e.g., Cameron and Low 1999; Charteris-Black 2004; Gibbs 2006a; Steen 2007; Müller 2008).

The question remains what the relationship is between the on-line processes of metaphor understanding on the one hand, and the linguistic realizations and conceptual structures of metaphor on the other. Not all metaphor in language is necessarily the result of metaphor in on-line processing. Moreover, these processes only pertain to the short-term discourse processes of production, reception and interaction that characterize performance; how the relationship between metaphor and these discourse processes is connected with long-term psycholinguistic processes such as language acquisition, maintenance and attrition is an even more complex issue (Steen 2007).

Philosophers of language have traditionally been concerned with the semantics of metaphors in relation to truth conditions; it was assumed that people understood metaphorical language by recognizing that the utterance was literally false. Knowing what a metaphorical utterance meant entailed knowing under which conditions it would be true. Within pragmatic approaches to metaphor, a distinction is made not between true and false statements but between utterance meaning and speaker meaning. Following Grice’s cooperative principle (1975), by which speakers intend to be relevant, truthful, clear and informative in order to cooperate with each other during a conversation (see also Clark 1996), metaphorical language involves a violation of conversational norms. When people understand metaphorical language, or so the standard pragmatic argument goes, they begin by first analysing the literal meaning of an utterance and assessing its truthfulness and appropriateness in the given context. If this literal meaning is found to be false, inappropriate or in any other way “defective”, then – and only then – will people try to derive a metaphorical interpretation of the utterance by inferring what the speaker intended to convey. Searle (1993) continues this tradition and argues that metaphor – like irony, hyperbole and indirect speech acts – are instances of speaker meaning rather than utterance meaning.

Gibbs (1993) points out that the view that metaphorical language violates conversational maxims suggests three claims about how such expressions are understood. The first claim is that the literal meaning of an utterance has unconditional priority; the literal meaning is always derived and always derived
first. People understand a metaphorical expression by first retrieving the literal utterance and assessing its appropriateness in context. This literal meaning has to be found in some way defective before any attempt is made to retrieve a metaphorical meaning. The second claim is therefore that metaphorical interpretations are sought if, and only if, the literal meaning has been found to be defective. If the literal meaning makes sense in the given context then no attempt will be made to retrieve a metaphorical interpretation. The third claim is that additional cognitive work will have to be done to derive the metaphorical meaning. Glucksberg (2001: 10) points out that one underlying assumption of this approach to metaphor understanding is that literal meanings are unproblematic and context-free and that literal meanings will always require less time and effort than metaphorical meanings. Moreover, it assumes that literal meanings are derived automatically while metaphorical meanings are optional – they are only retrieved after the literal meaning has been rejected.

Psycholinguistic experiments have shown all of these claims to be false. Experiments by Gibbs (1982, 1984, 1989) and Gibbs and Gerrig (1989) revealed that the figurative interpretations of metaphors and idiomatic expressions such as ‘billboards are warts on the landscape’ and ‘John popped the question to Mary’ can be understood without any need to access and reject a literal interpretation if such metaphors are presented in a realistic context (Gibbs 1993: 254). Glucksberg et al. (1982) showed that subjects accessed the metaphorical interpretation of A is B statements such as ‘surgeons are butchers’ even when a literal interpretation was appropriate in the given context. This suggests that people simply cannot ignore metaphorical meanings even when there is no defective literal meaning. Finally, experiments by Gibbs (1986), Gildea and Glucksberg (1983), Keysar (1989) and Ortony et al. (1978) showed that metaphorical utterances require the same kind of contextual support as comparable literal expressions.

Psycholinguistic experiments have shown that understanding metaphorical expressions does take longer or requires additional mechanisms than understanding literal expressions as far as our immediate, automatic comprehension of utterances is concerned. Gibbs (1993) has stressed that one mistake that is commonly made is that the processes and products of understanding are confused. He distinguishes between four main stages in real-time language interpretation, namely comprehension, recognition, interpretation, and appreciation (p. 255-6):

Comprehension refers to the immediate moment-by-moment process of creating meanings for utterances. Recognition refers to the products of comprehension as types (i.e., determining whether an utterance conveys a particular type of meaning such as literal, metaphorical, ironic, and so forth). Interpretation refers to the products of comprehension as tokens (i.e.,
determining the specific content of the meaning type). Appreciation refers to some aesthetic judgment given to a product either as a type or token.

Gibbs warns that we cannot infer that people understand an expression such as *Juliet is the sun* metaphorically simply because we can identify the expression as metaphorical. That is, we cannot draw conclusions about the processes of understanding based on the products of understanding. Similarly, the findings that people find some metaphors better, more apt, appropriate or pleasing than others does not entail that good or appropriate metaphors are understood by employing different processes than bad or inappropriate metaphors (p. 256). Psycholinguistic evidence has demonstrated that judgments of metaphor aptness involve a different kind of psychological act than is used in comprehension (Gerrig and Healy 1983).

Though psycholinguistic experiments by Gibbs and colleagues (e.g., Gibbs and Nayak 1989; Gibbs et al. 1989; Gibbs and O’Brien 1990) have been taken as support for the cognitive-linguistic view of metaphor, Glucksberg and his colleagues (e.g., Glucksberg 2001; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Glucksberg and Keysar 1990) reject the view that metaphors are processed as cross-domain mappings (i.e. by comparison). They argue that metaphors are not implicit comparison statements but ‘exactly what they look like’, namely class-inclusion statements, which are processed by categorization, not comparison (Glucksberg 2001: 44). Metaphorical comparisons (*A is like B*) should therefore be considered implicit metaphorical class-inclusion statements (*A is B*), not the other way around. Moreover, metaphorical class-inclusion statements work exactly the same way as literal class-inclusion statements, except that in a metaphorical class-inclusion statement the vehicle term has ‘dual reference’ (2001: 41). That is, in a metaphorical statement such as *my lawyer is a shark*, the vehicle term *shark* refers to a marine predator with fins and gills at the basic, concrete level, while at the abstract, superordinate level *shark* refers to an abstract category of powerful and relentless predatory entities.

The abstract, superordinate category is exemplified by sharks, but also contains lions, eagles, wolves, and potentially lawyers. Such superordinate categories usually do not have conventional names of their own but carry the name of one typical subordinate category (i.e. the vehicle, in this case *shark*). When they are used in metaphoric statements to refer to a topic, they function as attributive categories, assigning properties of the vehicle category to the topic. Glucksberg (2001: 41) points out that with ‘extensive and repeated use, the attributive category that is exemplified by a vehicle may become part of a term’s conventional meaning’. In the case of the attributive category *shark*, the attributed properties include that these entities are ‘swift, powerful, relentless, voracious, and predatory, [that] they have neither conscience nor compassion, and [that] they strike fear into
the hearts of their intended victims’ (p. 41). Other features of the vehicle term that are not (necessarily) attributed to the topic are such properties as having fins, gills and leathery skin, being able to swim, and living in the ocean.

According to Glucksberg, treating metaphors as class-inclusion statements explains why they are non-reversible, as literal class-inclusion statements such as *apples are fruits* and *trees are plants* are also non-reversible, and why *my surgeon is a butcher* means something else than *my butcher is a surgeon*, since they exemplify different attributive categories that map different salient properties. Dual reference can also explain why nominal and predicative metaphors can be paraphrased as comparison statements, i.e. ‘My lawyer is a shark’ and ‘My lawyer is like a shark’. This is because the noun *shark* refers simultaneously to both the basic-level category and the attributive category. This is not possible for literal comparisons and literal uses of verbs. That is, ‘He woke up at 8:00 a.m. every morning’ cannot be paraphrased as ‘It was like/as if he woke up at 8:00 a.m. every morning’, while ‘After years of fruitless research, the professor woke up to face reality’ can be paraphrased as ‘It was as if / it was like the professor woke up to face reality’ (p. 49-50).

Dual reference also explains how people can still be aware of the metaphorical meaning of statements that are not false or semantically deviant and why hedging and specifying the ground of the metaphor reduces its perceived metaphoricity. For example, ‘John’s face was like a beet’ was judged more metaphorical than ‘John’s face was red like a beet’, in which the grounds of the comparison have been specified (Ortony 1979 cited in Glucksberg 2001: 46). Similarly, ‘Cigarettes are time bombs’ is stronger than ‘Cigarettes are like time bombs’ or ‘In certain respects, cigarettes are like time bombs’. This is because the topic is no longer unequivocally included in the specified category. The intensifier *literally*, on the other hand, increases the perceived metaphoricity, as in ‘Cigarettes are literally time bombs’, possibly because it emphasizes the speaker’s intention to categorize the topic as belonging to the category exemplified by the vehicle (p. 46-7). Categorization also explains varying degrees of aptness in metaphors, as these can be related to the fact that the most apt metaphors are those that use the most typical and clear examples of a category as the vehicle term (p. 48).

Glucksberg argues that metaphors are understood by a process of interactive property attribution (p. 51), in which there is an interaction between the vehicle and the topic, and both vehicle and topic help to interactively generate interpretations (p. 52). This entails that two kinds of semantic knowledge are required to understand a metaphor, namely knowledge about the topic that determines which kinds of properties will be relevant and meaningful, and knowledge about the vehicle that determines which kinds of properties it exemplifies. Glucksberg argues that people can readily understand metaphors with ambiguous vehicles as long as
the metaphor topic is high-constraining (i.e., has relatively few attributional dimensions). For example, the topic lawyer is high-constraining and is likely to be characterized on a limited number of dimensions, such as skill, ambition, reputation and cost; this topic therefore produces a limited range of expectations what the metaphor will be about. A topic like brother, on the other hand, is low-constraining and yields a relatively unlimited number of possible expectations about how the topic may be characterized. However, people can readily understand metaphors with low-constraining topics like brother as long as the metaphor vehicle is reasonably unambiguous, such as vehicles like shark. Since shark is the prototypical vehicle term for humans demonstrating predatory behaviour, the topic will constrain the interpretation of the metaphor in terms of vicious and ruthless behaviour despite the low-constraining topic (p. 55).

Experiments by Glucksberg (2001: 56) show that advance knowledge of high-constraining topics and unambiguous vehicles was useful for comprehension, while advance knowledge of low-constraining topics and ambiguous vehicles was not. These results indicate that the level of constraint of metaphor topics and the degree of ambiguity of metaphor vehicles play an important role during comprehension. This argues against the property matching model proposed by Wolff and Gentner (1992), in which matching does not begin until an exhaustive extraction of topic and vehicle properties has been completed. The sooner the property extraction process is completed, the sooner the property matching process can begin. This entails that advance presentation of any kind of topic or vehicle should speed up comprehension because the property extraction process is facilitated. However, the experiments by Glucksberg indicate that this is not the case, as only high-constraining topics and unambiguous vehicles facilitated comprehension.

Though Glucksberg originally claimed that all metaphors are processed by categorization, he has recently taken a more moderate position (Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Glucksberg 2008), in which he asks ‘when and under what circumstances are metaphors processed as categorizations, and when as comparisons?’ This question is also addressed by Gentner and colleagues (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Gentner et al. 2001; Gentner and Wolff 1997). Gentner and Bowdle (2001, 2008; Bowdle and Gentner 2005) have advanced their Career of Metaphor Theory to account for the fact that some metaphors are processed by comparison and some by categorization. The two main principles affecting metaphor processing according to the Career of Metaphor are degree of conventionality and grammatical (i.e. linguistic) form. Whether a metaphor is processed by comparison or categorization depends first of all on how conventional the metaphor is. According to the Career of Metaphor, novel metaphors are typically processed by comparison while conventional metaphors are processed by categorization. The crucial difference between novel and
conventional metaphors is the existence of an abstract superordinate category, Glucksberg’s (2001) attributive category. In the case of a novel metaphor, no abstract category exists yet, and the meaning of the metaphor has to be derived by comparing the vehicle and topic. When the vehicle term becomes conventionalized as the superordinate category, the metaphor no longer needs to be processed by comparison but the meaning of the attributive category can be accessed directly, i.e. by categorization.

The shift in processing from novel to conventional may eventually lead to the “death” of a metaphor, when the original basic-level category meaning is lost and only the abstract, superordinate category meaning is active in speakers’ vocabularies. In the first stage of a metaphor’s death the term is homonymous rather than polysemous, with the metaphorical and literal meanings seeming unrelated. For example, the sense of culture referring to a particular heritage in ‘a university is a culture of knowledge’ seems unrelated to the sense ‘a preparation for growth’ in bacteria culture (Bowdle and Gentner 2005: 209). The second stage of the death of a metaphor occurs when the word only refers to the derived metaphorical sense and the original literal sense of the word is lost. For instance, the word blockbuster now only refers to highly effective or successful things, such as movies, while the word originally referred to a large bomb that could demolish (i.e. ‘bust’) an entire block of buildings (p. 209). The Career of Metaphor follows a metaphor vehicle’s “career” from being novel to being conventional to dying to dead, and suggests a corresponding change in processing from comparison to categorization.

However, the Career of Metaphor Theory argues that whether a metaphor is processed by comparison or categorization is also influenced by its grammatical form: the simile form invites comparison (A mind is like a kitchen) while the metaphor form invites categorization (A mind is a kitchen). As novel metaphors are typically processed by comparison (since no abstract category exists yet), they are typically preferred in simile form, the linguistic form explicitly inviting comparison processes. Conventional metaphors, on the other hand, are typically processed by categorization, and are therefore preferred in regular metaphor form. However, when a conventional metaphor is presented in the form of a simile, it will be processed by comparison rather than categorization despite the existence of the abstract category. When a novel metaphor is not presented as a simile but as regular metaphor, readers will be garden-pathed by the grammatical form into trying to access a superordinate category. Since no such superordinate category exists, they will be forced to backtrack and compare the vehicle and topic to determine the meaning of the metaphor. Experiments revealed that these two factors, conceptual structure (conventional versus novel) and linguistic form (simile versus metaphor) did indeed interact in predictable ways: conventional
metaphors were processed more quickly when they were expressed as metaphors while novel metaphors were processed more quickly when expressed as similes. When novel metaphors were expressed as metaphors people took longer to process them since they were misled into processing them by categorization while no abstract superordinate category was available. Lastly, highly conventional metaphors usually remained “invisible” to readers since their meanings were accessed directly.

The distinction between linguistic form (metaphor versus simile) and conceptual structure (novel versus conventional) in Bowdle and Gentner’s (2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008) Career of Metaphor offers a promising two-dimensional model that accounts for the interaction between metaphor in language and thought. Steen (2008) points out that the Career of Metaphor can account for a number of important predictions about metaphor processing within Lakoff and Johnson’s Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Glucksberg’s Class-Inclusion Theory, such as the questions ‘whether metaphors operate at the level of individual concepts or entire conceptual domains’ (2008: 216). According to the Career of Metaphor, this will depend on both the metaphor’s degree of conventionality and its linguistic form. The findings of the Career of Metaphor provide a serious argument against the claim that all metaphor in language is processed by cross-domain mappings in thought, but also reveal that not all metaphor is necessarily understood via comparison either. The Career of Metaphor is in line with Steen’s (2007) argument to distinguish between metaphor as symbolic structure on the one hand, and metaphor as cognitive processes and cognitive representations on the other.

Glucksberg and colleagues (Keysar et al. 2000; McGlone 2007) have raised the question whether the metaphors discussed in cognitive linguistics can count as “genuine metaphors” if they are not processed by comparison but by categorization, and can therefore be seen as forms of polysemy. However, Steen (2008: 217) points out that a framework distinguishing between symbolic and behavioural approaches to metaphor can retain such metaphors as potentially metaphorical, and examine them as a particular class of linguistic metaphors, regardless of how they are processed in the end. The Career of Metaphor offers a useful distinction between symbolic and behavioural research within one encompassing framework. Conventional metaphors can still be retained as metaphorical expressions (in language) even if they are not processed metaphorically (by comparison). The description of linguistic forms and conceptual structures as cross-domain mappings is typically done at the level of symbolic analysis, but as Steen (2008) points out, these symbolic structures need not be realized during individual processing, nor should it be concluded that if such structures are not processed by cross-domain mappings they are not metaphorical.
1.4 Critiques from linguistics: from metaphor in thought back to metaphor in language

Although the psycholinguistic studies discussed in the previous section raise important questions about Conceptual Metaphor Theory with regard to how metaphors are processed and how they are structured in our conceptual system, linguists have in their turn raised important questions concerning the validity of such psycholinguistic experiments. For example, Deignan (2005) points out that the materials used in studies on metaphor processing often contain innovative rather than conventional metaphors, while innovative metaphors are rather rare in natural discourse. In addition, metaphors are usually offered in isolation rather than in context and in the traditional form of *A IS (LIKE) B* statements.

In naturally-occurring data, metaphors are never encountered without context and co-text, and the traditional *A IS (LIKE) B* form has been shown to be extremely rare (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a, b). Moreover, the context in which metaphors are encountered is normally rich, and provides information about the *field, tenor* and *mode* of the text (Halliday 1978). Cameron (2003) has shown that metaphors occur more frequently when speakers try to resolve interpersonal tensions, for example in negative evaluations. This suggests that when metaphors are presented in constructed texts which do not provide the appropriate clues about the tenor or mode, readers may not respond naturally to the stimuli. Deignan (2005) also emphasizes that the typical lexical and grammatical constructions in which literal and metaphorical uses of words are normally encountered should be taken into account when experimental passages are constructed as corpus studies have shown that literal and metaphorical senses of a word often have different syntactic and grammatical patterns (Deignan 1998, 1999, 2003, 2005). As such, processing speed may not be affected by differences between the processing of literal and metaphorical senses, but by encountering these senses in unexpected constructions or combinations with unexpected collocates.

Another problem relates to the fact that many experiments are based on an ambiguity between literal and metaphorical interpretations of specific words. For example, Frisson and Pickering (2001) used eye movement tracking to determine how readers resolved ambiguities in order to arrive at the correct meaning of a word. Taking their discussion of *disarmed* as a starting point, Deignan (2005: 115) shows how corpus citations reveal that words are hardly ever ambiguous between literal and metaphorical senses when they are used in context, as in almost all cases ‘the reader is able to see immediately which sense is intended from the part of the sentence leading up to the supposedly ambiguous *disarmed*, before the second part of the sentence is read’. The evidence from authentic discourse therefore strongly undermines the assumption behind experiments based on ambiguous interpretations.
between literal and metaphorical. Deignan emphasizes that if words ‘are rarely ambiguous in their natural contexts, experiments may be forcing participants to tackle problems that are not faced in normal discourse’ (p. 117). As such, the strategies that people adopt in these experiments to solve the ambiguity may be very interesting in themselves but do not necessarily provide evidence for how metaphor is processed under natural conditions. Both Conceptual Metaphor Theory and theories of metaphor processing have tended to disregard the textual manifestations of metaphor and have ignored the different forms and functions of linguistic metaphor in authentic discourse.

As CMT is concerned with metaphors in thought rather than metaphors in language, the linguistic realizations of metaphor are usually treated as being of secondary interest, and they are usually only employed as evidence for the existence of certain conceptual metaphors. For a long time the different manifestations of metaphor in discourse did not receive much attention. However, an increasing number of scholars from linguistic disciplines have stressed that the examples used by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and other researchers working in the CMT tradition are artificially constructed or elicited. The examples were collected from personal intuition and experience rather than from authentic discourse. Moreover, they are usually presented in isolated sentences rather than connected text. Many scholars have therefore pointed out that the claims made by CMT do not necessarily accurately reflect how metaphor works in authentic language use and the evidence provided for the existence of conceptual metaphors may not be representative of how metaphor really works in practice.

Since Lakoff and Johnson (1980) based their claims for the existence of conceptual metaphors on isolated examples that they invented or elicited, they had no need to develop an explicit and reliable method to identify metaphorical expressions in discourse. This raises serious questions about the reliability of the presented evidence (Deignan 2005; Low 2003; Semino et al. 2004; Steen 1999a, 2002c). In addition to problems concerning the identification of linguistic metaphor – i.e. how to decide which words are used metaphorically – there is also the additional problem of relating linguistic metaphorical expressions to their underlying conceptual metaphors. Most metaphor scholars maintain a top-down approach, starting from conceptual metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR or THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS and then looking for linguistic expressions that can be considered realizations of these conceptual metaphors. But this is not self-evident at all, as regardless of whether a top-down approach (from conceptual to linguistic) or a bottom-up approach (from linguistic to conceptual) is maintained, the problem remains how analysts can reliably relate one to the other and demonstrate that the linguistic expressions are indeed relations of the claimed conceptual metaphor.
Such shortcomings are being addressed by corpus linguists, critical discourse analysts, and other linguists working with authentic discourse (e.g., Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Deignan 2005; Musolff 2004). As Swan (2002: 450-1) points out: the ‘disciplinary commitment’ of CMT to describe what is ‘regular, invariant, and generalizable’ does not have to prevent the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor from ‘joining a description of its systematic structure with accounts of particular, situated, acts of meaning’. The sections below deal with the three main issues raised from linguistics, namely the authenticity of the linguistic evidence, the validity of linguistic metaphor identification, and the transition from linguistic metaphor to conceptual metaphor.

1.4.1 CMT and authentic language

As pointed out above, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) were primarily concerned with conceptual metaphors in developing their Conceptual Metaphor Theory and the linguistic examples they provided as evidence for the presence of conceptual metaphors were constructed examples from intuition and personal experience. Moreover, as the linguistic metaphorical expressions were considered to be of secondary importance to the conceptual metaphors, they did not try to account for the many different manifestations of metaphor in discourse, casting serious doubt on the ability of CMT to account for the diversity of metaphor in language (Deignan 2005; Low 2003; Semino 2008; Semino et al. 2004; Steen 1999a, 2002c, 2007).

The most systematic investigation of the tenets of CMT in relation to authentic language use has been carried out by Deignan (1998, 1999, 2003, 2005). She examined to what extent the implications of CMT are borne out in linguistic evidence using techniques from corpus linguistics and data drawn from a large computerized corpus consisting of naturally-occurring citations of the metaphors being studied. Deignan employed a cross-section of 56 million words from the Bank of English, one of the largest corpora in the world, with over 400 million words of British English (approx. 70%), North-American English (approx. 20%) and Australian English (approx. 10%). She tested several of the basic tenets of CMT by running concordances of particular linguistic metaphors and their inflections, and analysing their collocational, syntactic and grammatical patterns. As Deignan (2005: 2) puts it herself: ‘My ultimate goal is to find out how far a theory of metaphor as thought can account for the patterns found in natural language’. As her concern was with testing the validity of CMT’s claims, she
investigated typical conventional language patterns rather than innovative, original or poetic uses of metaphor.

Deignan warns that corpus findings are often dismissed because they strike people as familiar or trivial but that a ‘linguistic theory developed without reference to naturally-occurring language data may be elegant and internally consistent, but is simply irrelevant to the task of finding out how language works, because it ignores factual evidence’ (p. 88). For example, Deignan (1998) ran concordances on a number of lexical items identified by Yu (1995) as being realizations of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT: ‘These are inflammatory remarks’; ‘She was doing a slow burn’; ‘He was breathing fire’; ‘Your insincere apology has added fuel to the fire’; ‘After the argument, Dave was smoldering for days’; ‘Boy, am I burned up’; and ‘Smoke was pouring out of his ears’. Deignan’s study showed that some of Yu’s linguistic metaphors were frequent in the corpus while others did not occur at all. For example, inflammatory and smoldering both occurred regularly in expressions indicating anger but there was only one metaphorical use of breathe/ed/es/ing fire in 1,000 citations of fire.

The metaphorical use of fuel and its inflections collocated with fire as a linguistic metaphor only three times in 10,000 citations of fire. The other examples were either very rare or completely absent. Of 1,000 citations of burn and its inflections there was no use that resembled the expression ‘doing a slow burn’. There were also no instances of burned + up expressing anger. There were two instances in which smoke appeared within eight words of ears but both uses were literal. Deignan emphasizes that these findings do not entail that ANGER IS HEAT is not an important conceptual metaphor. On the contrary, she found that the metaphor had a number of linguistic realizations that were not mentioned by Yu (1995), several of which were much more frequent in the corpus than any of Yu’s examples. For instance, ignite/e/s/ing/ed occurred 332 times, 228 of which were used metaphorically to express anger. This study showed how corpus data are essential if researchers wish to make reliable claims about the existence and frequency of linguistic metaphors. Moreover, the corpus data reveal interesting regularities in the collocations and syntactic behaviour of metaphorical expressions.

Deignan (2005: 86) points out that corpus researchers regularly find uses of words that they would not have predicted in terms of observed frequencies, word combinations and fixed expressions, as well as word meanings. For example, she found that the main metaphorical use of the verb rock, in the sense of ‘disturb’, occurred almost always in the passive voice or simple past tense. The most frequent idiomatic use of rock was rock the boat, meaning ‘disturb or criticize accepted ways of doing things’. The expression rock the boat was almost always used after phrases that expressed negativity, rarely occurred in the simple past
tense, and occurred most frequently in the “-ing” form. When the noun rock was used metaphorically, it usually occurred in the plural form when used to describe dangers (e.g., on the rocks), but in the singular form when used to describe stability (e.g., the rock on which our society is built). Such grammatical and syntactic regularities in metaphor use can only be determined by examining a large number of citations from natural language use. Another advantage of using corpus data is that analysts will not know all the words of their language and all of their meanings in usage. For example, Deignan (2005: 87) found that the expression rocked was relatively frequently used to refer to a sporting defeat (i.e. ‘Relegated Drogheda United rocked Dundalk to claim only their second Premier Division win of the season’), a usage that she had not been aware of.

In relation to Lakoff’s (1993) claim about the systematicity of mappings and his proposed Invariance Principle (see Section 1.2), Deignan (2005) discusses how corpus data reveal interesting results. The Invariance Principle suggests that the relationships between the target domain points will be consistent with relationships between the source domain points and that metaphorical mappings should only import those elements of the source domain that are consistent with the structure of the target domain, i.e. entities should map onto entities, relations onto relations and attributes onto attributes. She used the source domain of animals to show that the corpus evidence reveals interesting inconsistencies with this claim. The source domain of animals includes as its most central elements a large number of nouns denoting animals (i.e. dog, cow, etc.). There are also verbs and adjectives denoting behaviour and characteristics typical of animals, such as bark, growl and vicious, but Deignan argues that these would probably be regarded as secondary to the animal nouns and points out that they are less frequent in the corpus. The target domain of humans, on the other hand, appears to have a different structure, with attributes and behaviour being more prominent than entities. As such, the Invariance Principle would suggest that entities expressed as nouns in the source domain of animals should be largely absent from the mapping.

However, the corpus study revealed that animal nouns are not absent from the mapping but instead seem to undergo a process of grammatical transformation (from noun into verb or adjective, i.e. from dog into to dog and dogged). Due to this grammatical transformation the original animal noun (which refers to an entity) can now be used to describe behaviour and attributes. Deignan (2005: 164) points out that this process ‘can distort some of the relations that hold between source domain points’. For example, in the source domain of animals, the word dog usually refers to an entity. When it co-occurs with hunt, the relationship between dog and hunt is usually that of subject and verb. However, in the target domain of humans dog and hunt were shown to be near synonyms. The correspondences between elements in the source and target domains as predicted by the Invariance
Principle were absent. Instead, the ‘corpus evidence suggests that the nature of the target domain does not just constrain the extent of the mapping, as argued by the Invariance Principle, it also shapes it’ (p. 164). That is, the structure of the target domain exerts a much stronger influence on linguistic metaphors than is suggested by Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

Deignan (2005) also discussed a number of cross-linguistic studies which have revealed interesting findings in relation to the claim by CMT that some conceptual metaphors are universal. Deignan et al. (1997) compared linguistic metaphors in English and Polish and found that some conceptual mappings seemed to have similar linguistic realizations, other mappings were shared but had different linguistic realizations, and in some cases there was no shared conceptual metaphor at all. Boers and Demecheleer (1997) analysed English, French and Flemish economics discourse and found that, on the whole, the same source domains were used but with different levels of frequency. The most popular source domains corresponded to national stereotypes, such as gardening metaphors in British texts and cookery metaphors in French texts. Similarly, Charteris-Black (2003) investigated the influence of culture on metaphor use by means of a comparison between English and Malay and found that where English tended to use metaphors referring to the heart as the centre of feeling, Malay tended to use metaphors referring to the liver, reflecting the relative importance of the organs in each culture.

A study by Semino (2002a) comparing English and Italian news texts discussing the introduction of the Euro revealed that the different languages preferred different metaphors that seemed to reflect different attitudes towards the topic rather than cultural differences. Using frequency counts as well as detailed text analyses, Semino showed how the metaphors in the Italian texts were consistent with a positive but apprehensive attitude towards the euro, while the English texts revealed a negative and sceptical attitude. This study and the other cross-cultural studies discussed above challenge the claim that conceptual metaphors are universal and support Gibbs’s (1999) claim that even “universal” metaphors are filtered culturally. Deignan (2005: 101) emphasizes that such studies show that ‘the choice of vehicle or source domain used to talk about a particular topic can vary considerably, according to the speakers’ language, culture, attitudes to the topic, and current preoccupations’. She therefore warns against an over-rigid interpretation of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, and the assumption that many conceptual metaphors are universal and constrain speakers to talk and think in particular fixed ways.

Deignan’s (2005: 31) study of the metaphor AN ELECTION IS A HORSE-RACE demonstrated that the distribution of linguistic metaphors across different semantic sub-domains is not consistent, and does not seem to be predictable from any single
underlying conceptual metaphor, though there is clearly a loose overarching semantic theme. Deignan ran concordances for six linguistic metaphors: in/out of the running, neck and neck, also-ran, favourite, outsider and odds, and showed that they are unpredictable in their range of reference. The phrase in the running was not only used to talk metaphorically about politics but also about many other competitive areas of life, such as business and careers. This suggests that the conceptual metaphor should be rephrased as COMPETITION IS A HORSE-RACE. However, she points out that this general metaphor also cannot explain the linguistic uses adequately, since the linguistic metaphors are distributed unevenly across different semantic fields within the general target domain of competition. For example, neck and neck, was largely restricted to the domain of politics, while in the running was often used for commercial contracts as well. The metaphorical use of odds was used mainly in relation to personal struggles rather than public or commercial struggles.

The study of AN ELECTION IS A HORSE-RACE also revealed that the meanings of linguistic metaphors cannot always be predicted from the conceptual metaphor. One linguistic realization Deignan studied was first past the post. She showed that this expression has developed a specialized meaning in the domain of politics and is usually used to modify noun phrases such as electoral system. There were no corpus citations in which the expression was used in sentences such as ‘Clinton was first past the post in 1996’ (2005: 31). Deignan points out that such sentences should have occurred in the data if the ‘metaphorical system was a one-to-one mapping of race onto election, horse onto politician and so on’ (p. 31). The fixedness of the expression’s metaphorical meaning results in a fixedness in its linguistic patterns in usage. Similarly, the metaphorical meaning of odds only occurred in the expressions the odds are, against all odds and to face [impossible/overwhelming/enormous] odds (p. 31).

The studies by Deignan (1998, 1999, 2003, 2005) show that naturally-occurring language data provide challenges to some of the claims of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Firstly, the corpus data reveal that some of the linguistic expressions used by cognitive linguists to explain the existence of conceptual metaphors are infrequent in the corpus or do not even occur at all. Although this does not entail that such conceptual metaphors do not exist or are unimportant, it does indicate that reference to corpus data is essential if researchers wish to make reliable claims about the existence and frequency of linguistic metaphors. The data also reveal interesting regularities in the collocations and syntactic behaviour of metaphorical expressions; for example, some metaphorical expressions almost always occur in a particular tense form or voice, or only occur in fixed expressions. Moreover, the meanings of linguistic metaphors cannot always be predicted from the conceptual metaphor. In relation to the Invariance Principle (Lakoff 1993), the
corpus data reveal that the predicted correspondences between elements in the source and target domains were absent and the corpus evidence suggests that the nature of the target domains does not merely constrain the mapping but also shapes it and influences the realization of linguistic metaphors. Finally, the cross-linguistic corpus studies (e.g., Boers and Demecheleer 1997; Charteris-Black 2003; Deignan et al. 1997; Semino 2002a) show that the choice of a particular vehicle or source domain to describe a particular topic or target domain varies considerably according to the languages, cultures and attitudes involved, which argues against the claim that such metaphors are universal and constrain how people talk and think.

1.4.2 Metaphor and domains of discourse

The studies by Deignan discussed in the previous section were primarily concerned with conventional metaphorical uses of words in general language patterns. Other researchers have focused more on the different forms and functions of linguistic metaphor in different registers, such as business (Koller 2004a, b), education (Cameron 2003, 2008; Low 2008a, b; Low et al. 2008), literature (Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008; Steen and Gibbs 2004), politics (Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2002a), mathematics (Núñez 2008), architecture (Caballero 2006), advertising (Forceville 2008), and so on. Many of these studies emphasize the importance of the patterning of linguistic metaphor in discourse, as well as its dynamics in spoken discourse (e.g., Cameron et al. 2009) and its potential for creativity and originality (e.g., Semino 2008). Similar to Deignan (2005), Semino (2008) bases her claims about conventional linguistic metaphors and their underlying conceptual metaphors on quantitative evidence from large general language corpora such as the British National Corpus and the Bank of English. She emphasizes that we should ‘give detailed attention to the formal characteristics of metaphorical expressions, and to the textual and intertextual patterns they are part of’ (p. 10).

Semino demonstrates how metaphor plays a central role in various discourse domains, namely literature, politics, science, education, advertising, and the discourse of mental illness. She analyses the different forms and functions of linguistic metaphor in each domain, paying particular attention to the relationship between individual uses of metaphor in specific contexts and conventional metaphorical patterns in the language as a whole. She emphasizes the tendency towards an interaction between conventionality and creativity in metaphor use and reflects on the relation between metaphor in language on the one hand and
metaphor in mental representations and thought on the other. She points out that analysts should ‘combine an awareness of the conventional status of many uses of metaphor with a consideration of the uniqueness and specificity of individual occurrences’ (p. 10). She therefore pays special attention to the issue of deliberateness (cf. Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Steen 2008) and of a range of textual phenomena in relation to linguistic metaphor: repetition, recurrence, clustering, extension, combination and mixing, literal-metaphorical oppositions, signalling and intertextual relations. The importance of such textual patterns in relation to metaphor in literature has also been noted by Goatly (1997), who discusses similar phenomena in relation to his corpus of novels. These patterns will therefore be discussed in more detail in the following chapter in relation to metaphor in literature.

With regard to the function of metaphor in discourse, Semino (2008: 31) points out that while Conceptual Metaphor Theory is concerned with broad questions such as ‘Why do particular metaphorical patterns occur in a particular language or languages?’, the study of metaphor in discourse also involves more specific questions such as ‘Why do particular metaphorical choices and patterns occur in particular texts, genres or discourses?’ Semino emphasizes that while the first kind of question can be answered with reference to embodied and physical experience, for example when space is used to understand time or journeys to understand life or love, the questions asked by the study of metaphor in discourse need to be answered with reference to ‘the role, identities and goals of the addressers and addressees, their mutual relationships, and the relevant co-text and context, broadly conceived (i.e. including situational, social, political, historical and cultural aspects)’ (p. 31). This means that analysts need to take into account whether metaphors are used to persuade, reason, evaluate, explain, theorize, (re-)conceptualise knowledge, entertain, divert, and so on.

The different functions of metaphor in discourse can be related to Halliday’s (1978, 1994a) theory of the ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language (see also Koller 2003). The representational function of metaphor can be related to Halliday’s ideational function of language, which is concerned with the role of language in the understanding and construction of reality. The interpersonal function of language is reflected in the role of metaphor in constructing identities and relations between producers and recipients. For example, speakers can distance themselves from their interlocutors by explicitly negotiating their metaphors or disagreeing with their metaphors. The textual function of language, its role in providing cohesion in texts, manifests itself in the textual patterning of linguistic metaphors and how these patterns of metaphor can provide the organizational structure of a text, especially by repetition, recurrence and clustering. Careful
attention to textual phenomena and the different functions of metaphors in discourse is therefore essential according to Semino (2008).

This point is also emphasized by Charteris-Black (2004) with special reference to the ideological function of metaphor. He examines the use of metaphor in political discourse (party manifestos and presidential speeches), press reporting (sports and finance reporting), and religious discourse (the Bible and the Koran) in order to investigate what metaphor is and does in language. Charteris-Black sees metaphor as ‘a prime example of how pragmatics – context-specific linguistic choices by speakers – impinges on semantics – the linguistic system for the realisation of meaning’ (p. 1) and argues that metaphor can only be explained when the interdependency between its semantic, pragmatic and cognitive dimensions is taken into consideration. He describes how metaphor has different roles in language, namely ‘a semantic role in creating new meanings for words, a cognitive role in developing our understanding on the basis of analogy and a pragmatic role that aims to provide evaluations’ (p. 23-4). The pragmatic role of metaphor lies in realizing particular rhetorical goals in particular communicative contexts and although metaphor, like language, is to a large degree shared and social, it is also original and individual and can be used for ‘experimentation and innovation in the boundaries of word meaning’ (p. 3).

The persuasive function of metaphor and the way in which it can offer new perspectives and new insights are the main focus of the analyses carried out by Charteris-Black. He argues that Conceptual Metaphor Theory needs to be complemented by analyses of the pragmatic role of metaphor, since metaphors are always used in a particular communicative setting to achieve a particular goal, and both the communicative setting and the communicative goal will influence which particular metaphorical expression is used. He emphasizes that although the cognitive importance of metaphor cannot be denied, it cannot be analysed independently of its particular function in a particular discourse setting. While CMT can provide insight into why we have the conceptual metaphors that we do, it cannot explain the specific selections speakers make when they talk or write; that is, CMT cannot explain why speakers choose to express conceptual metaphors in one specific way and not another when both options are equally suitable from a conceptual point of view.

Charteris-Black argues that explaining metaphor only by referring to its underlying experiential basis turns the use of metaphor into an unconscious reflex, while speakers use metaphor ‘to persuade by combining the cognitive and linguistic resources at their disposal’ (P. 11). This deliberate and conscious persuasive goal of metaphors in discourse should be integrated within the larger cognitive framework. Charteris-Black is primarily interested in such persuasive uses of metaphors and how they ‘provide insight into the beliefs, attitudes and
feelings of the discourse community in which they occur’ (p. 13). This does, however, mean that he is mostly concerned with deliberate metaphor, as he argues that when speakers or writers use metaphors, they invite their addressee to ‘participate in an interpretive act’ in which the addressee needs to ‘overcome the tension between what is said and what is meant’ (p. 12). If the tension is overcome and the metaphor is successfully understood, it ‘bonds people in a joint act of meaning creation’ (p. 12). However, psycholinguistic evidence suggests that for the bulk of conventional metaphorical expressions this tension is not experienced. Nevertheless, the importance of the textual manifestations and their function in discourse cannot be denied. The question remains why a speaker or writer uses – consciously or unconsciously – one particular metaphorical expression out of all the metaphorical and non-metaphorical options that were available.

The approach to metaphor analysis taken by Charteris-Black (2004: 30) follows one of the main tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis, namely that ‘every discourse act is assumed to have a potentially conscious intention that reflects the relative social positions of the text producer and recipient’. He proposes Critical Metaphor Analysis as an approach to metaphor analysis that ‘aims to reveal the covert (and possibly unconscious) intentions of language users’ (p. 34). In addition to identifying linguistic metaphorical expressions and relating them to underlying conceptual metaphors, he also tries to explain the use of metaphors in discourse in terms of ‘the social agency that is involved in their production and their social role in persuasion’ (p. 39), that is in establishing the ideological and rhetorical motivation behind the identified metaphors. Charteris-Black describes Critical Metaphor Analysis as an approach that integrates corpus linguistics with cognitive linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. This combination can be used to explain the important persuasive role that metaphors have and the way they can be used to evoke emotional responses in readers and that will influence how they interpret a text. His corpus studies revealed that domains such as conflict, nature, buildings, journeys, fire and light, the human body, the physical environment and the weather were common in all three types of discourse – political discourse, press reporting and religious discourse – but were employed in different ways (p. 246).

Charteris-Black therefore argues that although there is an experiential basis for the use of these domains, our bodily experience of for instance journeys, conflicts and nature cannot in itself account for the choice of particular metaphors; this choice is constrained and determined by the rhetorical goals of the discourse. The same point can often be communicated by different metaphors, and the ideologies, assumptions and beliefs that lie behind the discourse will determine which metaphor is selected. In addition, different ideologies or belief systems can employ the same metaphor in different ways. The analyses demonstrate that metaphors are selected to achieve particular goals in a particular text, rather than being
predetermined by embodied experience. Charteris-Black therefore claims that ‘a complete theory of metaphor must also incorporate a pragmatic perspective that interprets metaphor choice with reference to the purposes of use within specific discourse contexts’ (p. 247). He points out that while much cognitive and linguistic research on metaphor is primarily aimed at metaphor interpretation, or decoding, Critical Metaphor Analysis emphasizes the importance of explaining metaphor choice or encoding (p. 249). The choice of a particular metaphor in context can then be analysed as a conscious selection of particular linguistic forms which help to make a particular rhetorical point, and this choice can be related to social and individual beliefs and goals.

As mentioned above, the communicative function of metaphor in discourse has been a neglected area of cognitive metaphor studies, which have focused more on its conceptual nature and linguistic manifestations. This issue will be further discussed in Section 1.5 below. First, however, one important question raised by both quantitative and qualitative corpus studies of metaphor in natural discourse needs to be addressed, namely ‘How do we reliably identify linguistic metaphor in the first place?’

1.4.3 CMT and linguistic metaphor identification

The recent focus in metaphor studies on employing authentic data rather than constructed examples and dealing with linguistic metaphor in its natural context rather than in isolation or artificially manipulated contexts provides important insights into the different forms and functions of metaphor in discourse. Nevertheless, the use of real discourse data raises one important problem: how do we define what counts as a metaphor in a reliable and explicit way? Deignan (2005) and Semino (2008) both note that it is rare for metaphor analysts to make explicit how they defined linguistic metaphor and its relation to conceptual metaphor, though some exceptions exist (Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Deignan 2005; Goatly 1997). Nevertheless, even when analysts explicitly mention their approach, the primary difficulty lies in the fact that researchers often differ in their intuitions about what counts as a metaphoric word or phrase, and these intuitions vary not only from individual to individual and from text to text (possibly even from day to day) but even more so between disciplines, theoretical orientations and research purposes.

For example, Goatly’s (1997: 32) classification of linguistic metaphor, which distinguishes between Active, Tired, Sleeping, Buried and Dead metaphors, sometimes includes cases as metaphorical on the basis of etymology (e.g., pupil)
while in other cases etymology is ignored (e.g., *vice*). Moreover, as pointed out by Deignan (2005: 39), his classification ‘relies largely on beliefs about how speakers process metaphors as his main way of distinguishing between different types of metaphor’. This is problematic as experiments have shown that people make different judgments about the same words at different moments (Lehrer 1974) and people have different opinions about the metaphoricity of words depending on context (Cameron and Deignan 2003). Traditional approaches of metaphor in literature almost exclusively focus on innovative, creative and explicit uses of metaphor, with highly conventional or “dead” metaphors being disregarded. Moreover, descriptions of the role of metaphor in creating a literary masterpiece normally do not refer to frequencies or statistics.

The lack of a precise definition of metaphor and the variability between identification approaches make it almost impossible to compare analyses or statistics, for example on the frequency or density of metaphorical expressions in particular texts or genres (cf. Deignan 2005: 33). It also makes it difficult to evaluate claims about the ubiquity of metaphor in language or about the relation between metaphoric language and metaphoric thought (see Cameron 2003; Semino et al. 2004). This situation prompted a group of ten metaphor scholars, from different academic disciplines, to formulate an explicit, reliable and flexible method for the identification of metaphorically used words in spoken and written language, the Metaphor Identification Procedure or MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007). The name Pragglejaz Group was coined after the initials of the first names of the ten scholars involved: Peter Crisp, Ray Gibbs, Alan Cienki, Gerard Steen, Graham Low, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joseph Grady, Alice Deignan, and Zoltán Kövecses.

The Metaphor Identification Procedure (hereafter MIP) ‘aims to establish, for each lexical unit in a stretch of discourse, whether its use in the particular context can be described as metaphorical’ (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 2). In MIP, metaphorically used words are identified on the basis of referential incongruity – that is, indirect meaning. The procedure involves the decision whether a lexical unit is or is not used metaphorically without making any claims about whether the writer or speaker intended the lexical item to express metaphorical meaning and whether the reader or listener understood it as such. MIP involves a binary distinction rather than allowing for varying degrees of metaphoricity, though it acknowledges that words, and language in general, differ in the degree to which they express metaphoricity. Moreover, MIP is not concerned with relating the identified metaphorically used words to underlying conceptual metaphors, or with establishing the exact nature of the underlying mappings. MIP should be viewed as ‘providing a reliable research method for determining whether words in contexts convey metaphorical meaning’ (p. 2). A procedure such as the MIP can help
researchers deal with the identification of individual cases in a consistent and systematic manner.

The basic steps of the MIP are as follows (p. 3):

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
(b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
   —More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
   —Related to bodily action;
   —More precise (as opposed to vague);
   —Historically older;
Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

Taking one of Lakoff and Johnson’s well-known examples cited in Section 1.2, ‘Your claims are indefensible.’, the application of MIP would be as follows. Step 1 becomes irrelevant as Lakoff and Johnson used isolated, constructed examples. Nevertheless, the meaning of the sentence is clear, and concerns a verbal argument. The result of step 2 would be the following segmentation into lexical units: Your / claims / are / indefensible/. If we apply step 3 to indefensible, to check whether MIP agrees with CMT that this is a linguistic metaphor, the result is as follows. The contextual meaning of indefensible (step 3a) is ‘impossible to defend from criticism’ (sense 1 in the Macmillan dictionary). The basic meaning of indefensible (step 3b) is ‘impossible to protect against military attack’ (sense 2 in the Macmillan dictionary). This contextual meaning and basic meaning can be contrasted – the basic meaning is concrete and physical while the contextual meaning is abstract and verbal – and the contextual meaning can be understood in comparison with the basic meaning as we can understand a verbal disagreement in
terms of a physical attack. Therefore, the result in step 4 is that the lexical unit *indefensible* has indeed been metaphorically used.

As noted above, the conclusion that a specific lexical unit has been used metaphorically does not entail that the writer intended it to be metaphorical or that the reader recognized it as metaphorical or understood it metaphorically (i.e. via cross-domain comparison). The conclusion that a word is metaphorically used simply means that the particular linguistic use can be analysed as metaphorical in relation to other uses, and that it therefore has the linguistic potential to be recognized and processed as metaphorical. In Cameron’s (1999) terms, it is concerned with metaphor in language at the ‘theory’ level, rather than the ‘processing level’ or ‘neural level’. MIP also does not assume that metaphorical expressions have equivalent non-metaphorical paraphrases (in step 3a). In many cases, the contextual meaning of lexical units may be vague or even inexpressible.

The Pragglejaz Group report that the results of the application of MIP to various kinds of texts have been promising but also revealed a number of specific problem areas. For example, in relation to the analysis of spoken discourse, they point out that the segmentation of the discourse into lexical units (step 2 of MIP) can become problematic as speakers sometimes make false starts or speak certain words only partially. This raises the question whether such false starts and partial words should count as lexical units for analysis. The establishment of contextual meanings (step 3a) may become problematic when non-standard or non-contemporary texts are analysed or when texts vary considerably in terms of stylistic, dialectal, historical or geographical features. Especially in literary discourse this may require an increased awareness of historical meanings of words. Literary texts, as well as other allegorical and symbolic genres (e.g., religious discourse) may also contain words that relate both literally and metaphorically to the scenes described. That is, though the language is used non-metaphorically within the text, it has further metaphorical significance outside the text (see Crisp 2001, 2005, 2008). In such cases of allegory or symbolism, there is no contrast between a contextual meaning and a basic meaning for the lexical unit as it relates directly and non-metaphorically to the referents in the text.

Other, more general issues concern the analysis of multiword expressions such as idioms, phrasal verbs and compounds, as well as issues relating to word class. Content words such as nouns, verbs and adjectives will usually be relatively easy to analyse as they are normally rich in semantic content, but this is less so for adverbs and prepositions. Grammatical words such as articles, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, pronouns and determiners have virtually no semantic content and their basic meaning cannot easily be established as their meaning is highly abstract and schematic. However, many prepositions have spatial and concrete basic meanings and can be related to systematic conceptual metaphors such as *TIME IS SPACE* and
DISCOURSE IS SPACE (Lindstromberg 1998; Tyler and Evans 2003). Within the word class of verbs, delexicalized verbs such as make, take, have, get, give, etc. have very little semantic content and it may therefore be more difficult to establish a basic meaning that can be contrasted and compared to a contextual meaning (cf. Deignan 2005; Heywood et al. 2002). In MIP, the physical meanings of such verbs were taken as their basic meanings, though this is another area where researchers may make different decisions depending on their research goals and theoretical framework.

As the studies by Deignan (1998, 1999, 2003, 2005) revealed that metaphorical senses of words often have different collocational, grammatical and syntactic patterns from literal senses of the same word, one question for an identification method such as MIP is whether metaphorically derived verbal forms (i.e. to dog) should be examined in relation to the noun (i.e. dog) when contextual and basic meanings are established. If the different parts of speech are treated as different lexemes (that is, essentially different words) then identical verb-noun pairs such as dog-dog would be considered homonyms and they cannot be compared for metaphorical use. MIP considers the link between such forms to be clear for contemporary language users and therefore ‘decided that word class may be ignored in MIP’ (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 28). Historical or etymological metaphor, on the other hand, is disregarded in MIP, so that words such as comprehend and fervent are not considered in relation to their original Latinate senses relating to physically handing objects and temperature respectively. MIP only considers words that have an active metaphorical basis in contemporary usage, ‘in the sense of there being a widespread, knowable, comparison, and contrast between that word’s contextual and basic meanings’ (p. 30). However, researchers with a particular interest in etymology may take a different stance on this decisions.

In summary, the Pragglejaz Group (2007) report how these problems were dealt with, though they point out that their aim is not to provide solutions to these issues but to discuss them ‘as practical matters to be addressed whenever one tries to do systematic metaphor identification, and as broader theoretical questions that surely shape our complex intuitions about what constitutes metaphor’ (p. 23). Various decisions still need to be made and researchers need to determine how they wish to deal with such issues as etymology, word class, multiword units, etc. This is exactly what has been done in the Metaphor in Discourse project. In this project, the original MIP was extended and refined to deal with the problem areas discussed by the Pragglejaz Group. This extended and refined version, called MIPVU – after MIP + the initials of the Vrije Universiteit – will be presented in Chapter 3 together with a discussion of how specific problems were solved. However, reliably identifying metaphorically used words is only the first step, as these linguistic
metaphors also need to be related to underlying cross-domain mappings and conceptual metaphors in a systematic and reliable way. The next section addresses this issue.

1.4.4 From linguistic to conceptual metaphor

Steen (2007) emphasizes the need to distinguish between different levels of metaphor analysis, focusing on the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, or communicative functions of metaphor in discourse, in addition to their cognitive representations in behavioural analyses. He also points out that one issue that has received little methodological attention in the study of metaphor is how researchers actually relate specific linguistic forms of metaphor in discourse to the underlying conceptual structures that are believed to represent cross-domain mappings, and how we decide which elements and correspondences are involved. To tackle this problem, Steen (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) developed a five-step procedure that offers a formal analytical technique for the identification of conceptual structures of metaphor in discourse.

This procedure can be used to determine what the nature and content of the metaphorical mapping between two conceptual structures is, regardless of whether we label these two conceptual structures as domains, as in Lakoff and Johnson’s Conceptual Metaphor Theory (1980; Lakoff 1993), or as mental spaces, as in Fauconnier and Turner’s Blending Theory (1998, 2002, 2008). What is more important is the fact that the two conceptual structures are aligned in such a way that correspondences between individual elements can be established. This is in line with research by Gentner (1983) and Gentner and Markman (1993, 1997), which treats metaphor as analogy. As Steen (2009) points out, the two conceptual structures involved are ‘the abstract or symbolic structures which may be discerned by linguists and discourse analysts without necessarily having to make assumptions about their cognitive representation in the process of writing and reading of individual people’ (p. 198).

The procedure involves five discrete steps that allow the researcher to move from the linguistic forms on the page to the underlying conceptual structures. The first step involves the identification of the linguistic expressions of metaphor, that is, the metaphor-related words. Metaphor-related words express the source domain of the metaphor, either indirectly or directly. That is, they express the focus (Black 1962) or vehicle (Richards 1936) of the metaphor. This step can be carried out using a reliable and explicit tool such as the Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007) or MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b). As noted in
Section 1.4.3, MIP identifies metaphorically used words on the basis of indirectness of meaning (Gibbs 1993, 1994; Lakoff 1986, 1993). The MIPVU procedure, which will be presented in Chapter 3, can also handle linguistic forms that directly express the source domain of a metaphorical mapping, such as similes and analogies; this can even be done if the target domain is only present in the underlying conceptual structure, as is typical of allegory (e.g., Crisp 2001, 2005, 2008).

Step 1 is aimed at the identification of referential or topical incongruity based on similarity. Steen points out that since this analysis is aimed at the semantic structure of the text, it is ‘immaterial that such indirect metaphorical meaning may be more or less conventional and salient (Giora 2003)’ and the identified referential or topical incongruity need not be consciously experienced as a disruption in the reading process of the reader (2009: 203). Rather, this incongruity and the potential “threat” it poses to the coherence of the text are, in this case, relevant to ‘the discourse analyst who wishes to capture all metaphor as part of the symbolic structure of the text’ (p. 203).

Once the metaphor focus expressing the source domain has been identified, the linguistic form needs to be related to the corresponding concept in conceptual structure. Within Steen’s framework, propositionalization in the tradition of Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) is employed as a general technique for the transition from linguistic forms in the surface text to conceptual structures in the text base. Steen (2009: 200) stresses that ‘Lakoff’s (1993) denial that metaphors are propositions pertains to the general conceptual structure of conventional conceptual metaphors, not to the local conceptual structure of individual metaphors in unique usage events’. Step 2 of the five-step procedure involves the transformation of linguistic forms into conceptual structures in the form of propositions. As Steen points out, this step ‘makes explicit the assumption that metaphor is a matter of thought, not language’ (p. 203).

To move from the established propositional structures to the final cross-domain mapping, Steen refers to Miller’s (1979/1993) work on comparison statements, which offers a uniform approach for turning propositions into analogical structures. In step 3 of the procedure, the propositions containing metaphor-related concepts are turned into an open comparison between two incomplete propositions, one belonging to the source domain and one belonging to the target domain. This step makes explicit that there is some form of similarity between the two conceptual domains by introducing the operator “SIM” for similarity. This step also makes explicit that corresponding elements are needed on both sides of the equation; this is signalled by the open function and argument variables. Steen emphasizes that these open slots are filled in naturally as we try to reconstruct the correspondences between elements in the source and target domain.
Moreover, ‘no new conceptual elements are added to the comparison except the ones that are implied by the original proposition’ (2009: 204).

In step 4 of the procedure the open slots in the equation are filled in and the open comparison becomes a closed comparison with the formal structure of an analogy (though it may not need analogical interpretation). Steen (2009: 204) points out that this step makes explicit ‘that analysts sometimes have to add new conceptual substance to the mapping between the two domains in order to make the mapping complete’. One decision that analysts need to make here is at which level of generality they select the relevant concepts to fill in. The selection of the appropriate concepts involves two complementary processes, in line with Reinhart’s (1976) claims about the two procedures involved in understanding poetic metaphor, namely focus interpretation and vehicle interpretation. In the case of focus interpretation, a target-domain equivalent is selected to replace the metaphorical focus and complete the target domain. In the case of vehicle interpretation, source-domain elements evoked by the focus are selected to complete the source domain.

Steen points out that the interpretation of the topic to find the relevant target-domain concepts is constrained by the context of the utterance and the overall topic of the discourse. The interpretation of the vehicle to find relevant source-domain concepts, on the other hand, will draw more on encyclopaedic knowledge about meaning and typical referents. A useful discussion of the difficulties involved in this step is offered by Semino et al. (2004). Using examples of metaphorical expressions to talk about cancer, such as *erupt* and *dormant* (2004: 1281), they show how such expressions not only conventionally relate to default literal associates but also to a range of entities to which they apply metaphorically, which suggests that there will often not be ‘just one default literal associate for each metaphorical focus’ (p. 1289). Semino et al. point out that different decisions in step 4 can lead to ‘quite dramatic differences in conclusions about how cancer is conventionally conceptualised’ (p. 1292). Nevertheless, they point out that Steen’s procedure ‘has the undoubted merit of making a positive contribution to the beginning of a methodological debate within metaphor studies that […] is long overdue’ (p. 1293).

In the fifth and last step of the procedure, the analogical structure derived in step 4 is turned into a mapping structure between the source and target domains. This step makes explicit what the correspondences between the elements in both domains are and what the inferences are that we draw from the mapping. Steen points out that in this step new correspondences can be added that were implicit or backgrounded in the analogy; these additional inferences can be used to enrich the information that is derived from the mapping.
Steen (2009: 201-5) illustrates the application of these five steps using the line ‘Now sleeps the crimson petal’ from the poem ‘Now Sleeps the Crimson Petal’ by Lord Alfred Tennyson. For this expression, step 1 would determine that it contains one metaphorically used word, namely the verb *sleeps*. Step 2 transforms the linguistic expression into the following underlying propositions:

\[
P1 (\text{SLEEP}_s \text{ PETAL}_t) \\
P2 (\text{MOD} \ P1 \ \text{NOW}_t) \\
P3 (\text{MOD} \ \text{PETAL}_t \ \text{CRIMSON}_t)
\]

Underlining is used to indicate the metaphor focus that was identified in step 1. The indices “s” and “t” are used to signal which concepts belong to the source domain (“s”) and which to the target domain (“t”). Numberings can be added to these indices if multiple source and/or target domains need to be distinguished. In step 3, these propositions are transformed into the following open comparison:

\[
\text{SIM} \ \{ \exists F, \exists a, \ \ [F (\text{CRIMSON PETAL})]_t, \ [\text{SLEEP} \ a]_s \} 
\]

This should be read as saying that there is some form of similarity (SIM) between an unknown activity *F* performed by the crimson petal in the target domain and the sleeping of some unknown entity in the source domain.

In step 4, the appropriate concepts are filled in for the unknown activity *F* and the unknown entity *a*. The most likely candidate for the source-domain concept is either a person or an animal. Given that people are most likely to regard the world from a human perspective, this would lead to the choice of HUMAN as the relevant concept. This decision is supported by further examples of personification in the poem. The relevant target-domain activity can be formulated as BE-INACTIVE. This yields the following closed comparison:

\[
\text{SIM} \ \{ \ [\text{BE-INACTIVE (CRIMSON PETAL)}]_t, \ [\text{SLEEP (HUMAN)}]_s \} 
\]

In step 5 this closed comparison is turned into a mapping structure between the two domains and the correspondences between the source and target are now made explicit. Steen points out that further correspondences can also be added in this step. Implicit elements of the source can be projected onto the target, such as the goal of sleeping, which may infer that the petal is tired, or the typical time of
sleeping, which may suggest the time that the actions described in the poem take place.

Steen (2009: 205) discusses how such additional inferences ‘add minimal assumptions about the cross-domain mapping’, and can therefore potentially ‘enrich the information that may be derived from it for the overall meaning of the text’. By applying these five steps, metaphor researchers can move from the identification of linguistic forms of metaphor (step 1) through their propositionalization (step 2) to their transformation into an open comparison (step 3), which can then be interpreted as an analogical structure (step 4) and fleshed out into a cross-domain mapping (step 5).

In this thesis, the five-step procedure will be used to address the issue of identifying personifications in fiction (Chapter 7), which turned out to be an extremely complicated issue involving different interactions between linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions. These findings will be related to a discussion of the cognitive representations of personifications in fiction in Chapter 8. With MIP/MIPVU providing a tool for linguistic metaphor analysis and the five-step procedure providing a tool for the transition from linguistic to conceptual metaphor, the groundwork has been laid for a three-dimensional model of metaphor that considers metaphor in language, thought and communication. This model, proposed in Steen (2008), forms the backbone of this thesis, and will be discussed in the following section.

1.5 A three-dimensional model of metaphor

The finding that many metaphorical expressions remain “invisible” to readers and are processed by categorization rather than cross-domain comparison leads to what Steen (2008: 220) has called “the Paradox of Metaphor”: ‘a lot of metaphor may not be processed metaphorically, that is, with language users activating two comparable or parallel domains and retrieving or (re)constructing a mapping between them’. According to Steen, this paradox arises when researchers take metaphor’s conceptual structure as a model for processing. The paradox disappears when a three-dimensional model is employed that systematically distinguishes between language, thought and communication, including the communicative functions of metaphor in addition to its linguistic forms and conceptual structures. Steen stresses that metaphor research has been primarily concerned with the linguistic and conceptual properties of metaphor at the expense of metaphor’s communicative properties, which relate to a metaphor’s specific communicative purpose (i.e. divertive, informative, persuasive, etc.) in a particular discourse event.
and, more importantly, to whether the metaphors are used deliberately or non-deliberately. Especially the notion of deliberateness has received little systematic attention, though there are exceptions (Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2002a).

Within Steen’s three-dimensional framework, conventional metaphors in language and thought may still be processed by comparison (i.e. metaphorically) rather than by categorization as long as they are used deliberately. Steen (2008: 222) argues that a metaphor is used deliberately ‘when it is expressly meant to change the addressee’s perspective on the referent or topic that is the target of the metaphor, by making the addressee look at it from a different conceptual domain or space, which functions as a conceptual source’. Within this framework, an utterance such as *Juliet is the sun* deliberately introduces a ‘truly alien domain’ (p. 222) into the discourse and invites addressees to review their perspective of Juliet in light of this source domain. An expression such as *we have come a long way*, on the other hand, does not clearly invite addressees to change their perspective of the topic, a relationship, in terms of the source domain of journeys. Nor is it clearly intended by the speaker to offer a new or different view on relationships. The metaphorical nature of this utterance is therefore more likely non-deliberate, and may be expected to be processed by categorization, as proposed by Glucksberg (2001), or lexical disambiguation (Giora 2003; Katz and Ferretti 2001).

According to Steen (2008: 22), deliberate metaphor differs from non-deliberate metaphor in being ‘a relatively conscious discourse strategy’ involving the conscious re-evaluation (in production and/or reception) of the target domain in terms of the source domain. Deliberate metaphors can be signalled in various ways, including word play, extension and elaboration, or explicit signalling using an *A is B* or *A is like B* format. It is important to note that conventional metaphors in language and thought are not necessarily used non-deliberately in communication. Even highly conventional metaphors can be produced and received as deliberate metaphors for various discourse purposes, and their deliberate use can be signalled in various ways. Steen illustrates this issue with regard to the verb *hit* in the following two sentences (p. 229):

1. We hit Amsterdam in the early evening.
2. We hit Amsterdam like a bulldozer.

In the three-dimensional model, the verb *hit* can be analysed at the level of metaphor in language as a conventional linguistic metaphor in both (1) and (2). At the level of metaphor in thought, the verb *hit* is potentially related to a conceptual mapping between motion and physical force in both (1) and (2). Finally, at the level of metaphor in communication, the use of *hit* is potentially deliberate in (2),
as long as it is connected with the explicitly signaled metaphorical comparison like a bulldozer. Sentence (2), Steen notes, ‘instructs the addressee to set up a comparison between the action of a bulldozer hitting something and the target domain of the local discourse referent and topic, us hitting Amsterdam’ (p. 229). In sentence (1), on the other hand, hit is most likely not used deliberately, as this sentence does not instruct the addressee to set up a similar comparison.

Steen acknowledges that addressees may in fact set up a cross-domain mapping between hitting and arriving for sentence (1), but the sentence itself and the use of the verb hit can also be adequately understood via categorization or lexical disambiguation. This is not the case for sentence (2), as this sentence explicitly demands that a comparison is made. Introducing deliberateness and the communicative function of metaphor into the model resolves the observed paradox by putting forward that ‘it is likely that most deliberate metaphor is processed metaphorically’ (p. 227). The same metaphorical expressions in language and metaphorical ideas in thought may be used either deliberately or non-deliberately in communication. It should be pointed out that introducing the notion of deliberateness in communication is particularly useful for the analysis of conventional metaphors in language and thought. As Cienki (2008) shows, conventional metaphors in thought, such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, can be expressed by either conventional or novel metaphors in language, i.e. ‘I feel like my life is going nowhere’ versus ‘He skateboarded his way through life’ (p. 9-10). Novel conceptual metaphors, on the other hand, such as LIFE IS A BANANA, necessarily require novel metaphorical expressions, i.e. ‘Life is a banana: you should peel it carefully and enjoy every bite’ (p. 9). Since novel metaphors in language and thought are by default examples of deliberate metaphors in communication, this explains why novel metaphors are processed by comparison rather than categorization (Bowdle and Gentner 2005).

Steen (2008: 231) proposes three separate functions of metaphor corresponding to the three levels of analysis in the three-dimensional model:

- Naming: the linguistic function of metaphor in language is to fill lexical (and other formal) gaps in the language system (an illustration of this function is metaphorically motivated polysemy);
- Framing: the conceptual function of metaphor in thought is to offer conceptual frameworks for concepts that require at least partial indirect understanding (this function can be illustrated by metaphorically motivated conceptual systems);
- Changing, or perspective changing: the communicative function of metaphor in communication is to produce an alternative perspective on a
particular referent or topic in a message (this can be done to achieve a variety of rhetorical functions in specific discourse settings).

The advantage of adopting a three-way model that includes metaphor in communication as an independent level of analysis is that the traditional distinction between metaphor as a deliberate rhetorical tool and metaphor as a general tool in language and thought is reinstated, while acknowledging the independence of metaphor in language and metaphor in thought (p. 238). The opposition between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphors in communication can help explain why many conventional metaphors in language and thought are not processed as metaphors, that is, by comparison.

1.6 Summary

For a long time metaphor was regarded as a deviant and decorative “trick of language” but since the 1980s metaphor has firmly been established as an indispensable tool in both language and thought. Theoretical approaches to metaphor also shifted from focussing on creative and novel uses in literature and rhetoric to an examination of the ubiquity of metaphor in everyday language use. The dominant paradigm in contemporary metaphor studies is Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Though several claims made by CMT have been challenged by psychologists, corpus linguists and discourse analysts, the definition of metaphor as a mapping between conceptual domains is at present the most useful and well-supported definition. As such, this thesis starts from the definition of metaphor as a cross-domain mapping and the distinction between metaphor in thought and metaphor in language. However, metaphor in communication is considered to be a third independent level of analysis. Other models of metaphor, such as Blending Theory and Relevance Theory, will not be discussed in this thesis, but see, for example, Fauconnier and Turner (2002), Giora (1993), Kittay (1987), MacCormac (1985), Sperber and Wilson (1995), and Stern (2000).

Despite this grounding in CMT’s definition of metaphor, not all of its main tenets are adopted in this thesis. Some of the issues concerning CMT raised from psychology are related to the notion of metaphoric representation. Murphy’s (1996, 1997) weak and strong interpretation of this claim were discussed, and in light of his discussion and the evidence provided by Boroditsky’s (1998, 2000, 2001) studies it appears to be a valid assumption that some abstract concepts are to some degree structured metaphorically. It is emphasized, however, that this does not
provide any evidence for the on-line processing of metaphorical language, an issue which can only adequately be addressed by behavioural research. Psycholinguistic experiments have provided valuable insights into the nature of metaphor processing, and Gibbs (1994) has emphasized that different stages should be distinguished. With regard to the different models of metaphor processing, the Career of Metaphor proposed by Bowdle and Gentner (2005) seems at present the most promising and encompassing model, especially in terms of its systematic distinction between conventional and novel metaphor and the interaction between conventionality and grammatical form.

The main issues raised from linguistics relate to the use of invented and isolated examples to support the claims of CMT. Corpus linguists and discourse analysts have demonstrated the need to use authentic language data to test the claims of CMT regarding the ubiquity of metaphor in everyday discourse, and have shown that the analysis of authentic discourse often reveals unexpected patterns in the collocational, grammatical and syntactic behaviour of linguistic metaphors. Linguists have also emphasized the need to consider metaphors in their rich linguistic contexts, as this context greatly determines the form and function of linguistic metaphors (Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2008). This is also an important issue with respect to the many psycholinguistic experiments that aim to support CMT, as these experiments usually present metaphors in isolation or scant contexts, and these metaphors are often presented in collocations or grammatical patterns that are not normally encountered in natural language use (Deignan 2005). This puts a serious strain on the explanatory power and the validity of these experiments with respect to what language users normally do when they encounter metaphors “in the real world”.

The work by discourse analysts has also reclaimed the importance of metaphor in language, especially with regard to the reliable identification of metaphor in various forms of discourse and the way in which individual metaphorical expressions are related to underlying conceptual mappings and conventional conceptual metaphors. The role of explicit and reliable identification methods and the quantification and validity of the results are central to the aims of this thesis, which intends to systematically investigate the different linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations of metaphor in fiction. However, before the specific methods and their results can be discussed, Chapter 2 will first address the issue of metaphor in fiction and the specific relation of metaphor to the language of fiction.
Chapter 2

Metaphor in fiction

Leaves and yellow blossoms obscured the top of the window, while the bottom was covered by aggressive pink hollyhocks, seemingly determined to fight their way inside.

(BNC-Baby: FPB)
2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed various definitions of and approaches to metaphor, and proposed a three-dimensional framework for the analysis of metaphor in discourse that distinguishes between metaphor in language, cognition and communication. This chapter will narrow the scope of metaphor in discourse by focusing on metaphor in literature, particularly fiction. Using the term ‘fiction’ immediately raises issues concerning its scope and how it relates to ‘literature’, ‘the novel’ and ‘narrative’, as not all fictional texts are necessarily literary texts, or novels, or narratives. Nevertheless, the terms ‘narrative’, ‘fiction’, ‘novel’ and ‘literature’ are often conflated or used interchangeably in both literary and linguistic research, and their definition remains problematic. Moreover, as Scholes and Kellogg (1966: 8) have emphasized, ‘our view of narrative literature is almost hopelessly novel-centred’; as a result, people generally associate narrative literature with the novel and their expectations and assumptions about both narratives and literature are primarily based on their experience with reading novels. As novels tend to be works of fiction, ‘fiction’ is subsequently used to cover ‘literature’, ‘narrative’ and ‘novel’ all at once.

Section 2.2 will first offer a multi-dimensional approach to the definition of fiction. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 will then provide an overview of the study of metaphor in literary discourse. These sections will discuss different approaches to the study of metaphor in literature and consider the various forms, functions and effects of metaphor in literary fiction. In Sections 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 various issues concerning linguistic approaches to the study of literature will be raised and a corpus-based multi-dimensional analysis of the language of fiction will be discussed. These linguistic approaches to literature provide the background for Chapters 3 through 6, which will demonstrate the identification and analysis of different linguistic forms of metaphor in the language of fiction.

2.2 A multi-dimensional definition of ‘fiction’

Based on Steen’s (1999d; 2002c, e; in press b) discussion of the relation between genre, literature and language, the current thesis assumes that ‘literature is an abstraction across genres according to one value of one dimension, “literary” for domain’ (2002e: 47). The basic genres of literature are the novel, the poem and the play. Steen (in press b) emphasizes that although the area of ‘genre analysis’ has been emerging since the 1990s, there is at present no generally accepted integrated
and interdisciplinary framework for the study of genre in the humanities and sciences. Moreover, the importance of genre in the study of discourse has not always been sufficiently recognized and the notion of genre has been conceptualized and researched in different ways in different disciplines. As such, features like ‘narrative’ are regarded as genres by some researchers but are treated as aspects of genres by others. Additionally, the same variables and categories often receive different names, functions, and weights in different models. Steen therefore proposes a new ‘unified, consistent, and explicit theoretical framework for genre that is based in cognitive psychology’ (in press b).

Steen introduces the notion of the ‘genre event’, which reflects the fact that language users employ their knowledge of genres within situated events of genre use (e.g., reading a novel, watching the news, having a conversation, sending an email, and so on). In such genre events language users have to construct, maintain, update, align, and monitor aspects of four mental models: the context model, the situation model, the text base, and the surface text (Kintsch 1998; Van Dijk 2008; Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983). The notion of the genre event moves away from the conceptualization of genres as being either document-related (e.g., novel, film, letter) or genre being interaction-related (e.g., conversation, meeting, interview). The cognitive-psychological standpoint behind this approach is that the notion of genre is intimately connected to both long-term and short-term knowledge schemas for genre. The encompassing model is based on a multi-dimensional approach to genre as involving a text (i.e. ‘the message that is being exchanged or co-constructed between the participants’), a code (i.e. ‘the semiotic means comprising the text’), and a context (i.e. ‘all relevant structures and entities outside the text which are involved in the genre event’) (in press b).

Within this framework, the context model represents the interaction between language users in discourse and includes the following variables: participants and their relations and roles; goals and functions of discourse; situations and settings and their properties; domains and their norms and values; and medium, including devices and channels of communication. The text model represents various aspects of the text (i.e. the text base and situation model). These aspects include the content of the text, the type of the text, the form of the text, and the structure of the text. Finally, the code model represents various aspects of the means of expressions of messages (i.e. the surface text); these aspects include: modality, language, register, style, and rhetoric. Based on Steen’s genre model, ‘fiction’ is a content category in the text model, and this category includes all texts that have a fictional content. In practice, however, ‘fiction’ is normally used to represent literary narrative texts with a fictional content, and as such, ‘fiction’ overlaps almost entirely with the genre of the novel. This trend is reflected in the fact that many bookshops and libraries use ‘fiction’ as a functional label (Fishelov 1995). In many studies of
fiction, such as Lodge’s (1966) *Language of fiction* and Leech and Short’s (1981/2007) *Style in fiction*, the texts being studied are in fact all novels, not non-literary texts relating fictional events. Fiction can therefore be treated as a quasi-genre overlapping with the novel. This quasi-genre of fiction can be defined in the following way in terms of its characteristics in the context model, the text model and the code model.

In terms of the context model, the participants in the genre event are typically a single author and a mass readership. These participants do not interact and are usually separated geographically and temporally. The medium is printed text and the goal of the discourse is primarily divertive as the text belongs to the domain of arts and entertainment. In terms of the text model, the content is fictional events and characters, and the type of text is narrative. The events are normally presented in a temporally ordered form, though not necessarily chronologically, and the text is normally divided into chapters. In terms of the code model, fiction is characterized by its own register as well as the individual styles and rhetoric of the authors. In this case style can be considered the relatively unconscious personal style of the author in relation to more general register patterns, whereas rhetoric refers to the author’s deliberate linguistic design of the text to achieve particular communicative effects. This shows that fiction, like metaphor, can be analysed in terms of the dimensions of language (code model), cognition (text model) and communication (context model). In the following chapters the code model will play a central role, as these analyses will focus on the linguistic manifestations of metaphor in the register of fiction.

Steen emphasizes that his multi-dimensional genre model involves an approach that is comparable to Biber’s (1988, 1989) multi-dimensional model for the study of textual dimensions in register variation. Following Lodge (1966) and Leech and Short (1981/2007), the title *Metaphor in fiction* indicates that the analyses to be presented in this thesis will focus on the language of fiction, specifically, the role of metaphor in the language of fiction. This approach will ensure that the findings of this thesis can be aligned with the work done on fiction by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001) as discussed in Section 2.7 below. The title also emphasizes that this thesis will not be concerned with analysing metaphor use in specific novels or by specific authors. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the analyses to be presented in this thesis will be restricted to excerpts from contemporary British-English novels belonging to the literary domain, which can be classified as being narratives in terms of their text type and fictional in terms of content. Additionally, the included texts can be said to be “realistic” in style, with “realistic” being used here in the way it is used by Lodge (1977) and Leech and
Short (2007), namely as a descriptive label of literature that aims to mimic reality, and not as an evaluative label (i.e. “convincing”).

These specifications and the issues discussed in this section concerning the notion of genre and register should be kept in mind when generalizations about the forms, functions and patterns of “metaphor in fiction” are presented in the remainder of this thesis. Despite the restriction in this thesis on analysing metaphor in narrative fiction taken from novels, the analyses are to be considered in light of the linguistic, conceptual and communicative dimensions of literary metaphor more generally, which is the topic of Section 2.3 below.

2.3 Approaches to analysing metaphor in literary discourse

With regard to metaphor in literature, Semino and Steen (2008) point out that most scholars still maintain that the metaphors found in literature are more novel, creative, original, inspiring, interesting, complex and rich than those found outside literature: ‘The single major assumption that appears to be shared, implicitly or explicitly, by the vast majority of studies of metaphor in literature is that there is a difference between metaphor in literature and metaphor elsewhere’ (p. 233). Empirical evidence for this view was collected by Steen (1994: 202), whose studies on journalistic versus literary metaphors revealed that the literary metaphors were considered more difficult, positively valued, impolite and unbiased. Similarly, Zwaan (1994) found that participants who were reading a text ‘under a literary perspective had longer reading times, better memory for surface information, and a poorer memory for situational information than those reading under a news perspective’ (1994: 920). Both studies show that expectations about the genre of a text influence how readers read and process the text. As Zwaan (1994: 931) points out: ‘[i]n most naturalistic situations, people read texts belonging to a particular genre, and they adhere (consciously or subconsciously) to the constraints of that genre’.

Yet although most studies on literary metaphor share a belief that the metaphors in literary works are different from the metaphors in non-literary works, they do differ in their opinion on what the relation between metaphor in literature and in ordinary language use is. Semino and Steen (2008) propose a broad distinction between approaches that emphasize the discontinuity between metaphor in literary works and metaphor in non-literary works, and approaches that emphasize the continuity between the two.

The discontinuity approach follows from traditional Formalist approaches to the difference between poetic and ordinary language on the basis of foregrounding
Mukařovský discusses metaphor as a deviation by which the semantic relationship between words is distorted, and the relationship between the meanings of the words is foregrounded: ‘the words here do not succeed each other naturally and inconspicuously, but within the sentence there occur semantic jumps, breaks, which are not conditioned by the requirements of communication, but given in the language itself’ (1970: 55). The emphasis on linguistic deviation and foregrounding effects indicates that scholars working in this tradition are primarily concerned with analysing linguistic manifestations of metaphor (the language dimension) and that they focus on metaphors that are likely to have been used deliberately and consciously perceived by readers (the communicative dimension), as illustrated by Mukařovský’s (1970: 55) claim that ‘the determining force can be felt with which every word affects every other’ and the suggestion that the sentence ‘comes alive before the eyes of the speech community: the structure is revealed as a concert of forces’.

This is also the case for Nowottny (1962: 52-53), who proposes that figurative language use can be identified 'by reference to our own impression of it', and argues that if a usage ‘strikes us as “normal” (another shifty word, but meaningful enough for our purposes) we can call it “literal”’. This notion of the identification of metaphor via our awareness of the deviation appears to be a central element in discontinuity approaches: Ullman (1957: 214) refers to metaphors evoking ‘a feeling of disparity’ and Leech (2008: 25) argues that metaphors only become meaningful when ‘some kind of psychological, emotional or perceptual relation’ between the literal and figurative meaning of a word is found; that is, the deviant terms only become significant when an appropriate analogy is recognized. In fact, most scholars in the discontinuity approach equate literary metaphor with deliberate metaphor. Nowottny’s (1962: 52-53) claim that ‘much of the impact and interest of metaphor in poetry depends on our sense of a gap between the [tenor and vehicle]’ relates directly to the assumption that the metaphors in literature are intended to create foregrounding effects and defamiliarize the reading process. As Steen and Gibbs (2004) point out, this in turn leads to the assumption that particular forms of metaphor, such as novel and extended metaphor, are typical of literature.

Leech (2008: 16) stresses that the deviations in literature are unique and meaningful rather than ‘unmotivated aberrations’. He argues that ‘by the standards of the accepted code (i.e. “literal meaning”) a literary metaphor is a semantic absurdity’ (p. 21). This point is also made by Short (1996), who claims that metaphors become nonsensical and illogical when taken literally. Although such deviations may also occur in non-literary language, Leech (2008) argues that it is primarily the number and importance of the deviant features that characterize
literature, while Mukařovský (1970) stressed that it is not the quantity of foregrounding effects that characterizes literature but their systematicity and consistency. In general, the scholars in the discontinuity approach consider literary writers, and poets in particular, to be the creators of metaphor. These literary metaphors then gradually lose their metaphoricity as they are absorbed into ordinary language use. When they have completely lost their deviant character over time, i.e. when they are no longer violations of the norms of the standard, they have become dead metaphors.

The scholars in this tradition consider literary metaphor to be primary, and the metaphors found in ordinary language are deemed to be lesser derivations of the unique and creative metaphors in poetic language. They believe, in the words of Leech (2008: 30), that in ‘making choices which are not permissible in terms of the accepted code, the poet extends, or transcends, the normal communicative resources of the tongue’. By contrast, scholars in the continuity approach take the opposite view and consider metaphor in everyday language to be primary and literary metaphor secondary, though these scholars also believe that the metaphors found in literature are superior in quality and significance to the metaphors outside literature. This continuity approach is closely related to the paradigm of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (as discussed in Chapter 1), and emphasizes the conceptual nature of metaphor.

Within the framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Lakoff and Turner (1989) argue that poets create novel and original metaphorical expressions from the same conceptual metaphors that underlie conventional metaphorical expressions found in everyday language. They discuss four techniques – extending, elaborating, questioning, and composing – that are frequently employed by poets and to ‘lead us beyond the bounds of ordinary modes of thought and guide us beyond the automatic and unconscious everyday use of metaphor’ (p. 72). For example, in Hamlet’s soliloquy the conventional conceptual metaphor DEATH IS SLEEP is creatively extended by Shakespeare to include the possibility of dreaming:

To sleep? Perchance to dream! Ay, there’s the rub;
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come?
(William Shakespeare, Hamlet, quoted in Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 67)

Similarly, in Horace’s description of death as ‘the eternal exile of the raft’ (1989: 67), the conventional conceptual metaphor DEATH IS DEPARTURE is creatively elaborated upon by making the notion of departure more specific via the notion of exile, and specifying the vehicle of departure in terms of a raft. The reference to exile brings in associations of unwanted banishment and a desire to return, and the image of the drifting raft also suggests that this is a departure without a destination.
Via this elaboration, the target concept DEATH is understood in a different and more original way than by conventional linguistic expressions such as ‘She’s passed away’ or ‘She’s no longer with us’.

However, contrary to the scholars in the discontinuity approach, Lakoff and Turner (ibid.) do not consider such metaphors to be deviant, and they focus on the conceptual dimension of metaphor rather than its linguistic manifestation. These creative exploitations of conventional metaphors follow naturally from the fact that conceptual metaphors are indispensible cognitive tools. Though at times such linguistic expressions may be highly novel and original, these literary metaphors still rely on the same conventional conceptual metaphors that pervade everyday language use and thought. That is, rather than focusing on the uniqueness of linguistic manifestations of literary metaphor, scholars in this tradition aim to reveal how novel and original linguistic expressions can be related to conventional conceptual metaphors. For example, Donald Freeman (1993, 1995, 1999) showed how metaphorical patterns in Shakespeare’s King Lear, Macbeth and Anthony and Cleopatra can be related to conventional conceptual metaphors that have been identified in cognitive linguistics. The metaphorical expressions in the opening scene of Shakespeare’s plays King Lear can thus be described in terms of the conventional metaphorical schemata BALANCE and LINK while Macbeth is dominated by CONTAINER and PATH metaphors. Similarly, Gibbs (1994) showed how the linguistic metaphors in the poem ‘I taste a liquor never brewed’ by Emily Dickinson are based on familiar conceptual metaphors for love, but are fused into a rich semantic pattern that supports the thematic structure of the poem.

Semino (2008) acknowledges that Lakoff and Turner’s (1989) study has made a valuable contribution to the understanding of literary metaphor, but points out that their emphasis is on creativity in terms of the elaboration and extension of existing conceptual metaphors rather than in terms of the creation of novel conceptual metaphors. As such, they have not paid enough attention to the issue of novelty in the choice of source and target domain combinations and to the linguistic and textual dimensions of metaphorical creativity. Semino shows how in the novel Atonement, Ian McEwan describes a character’s migraine attacks in terms of an animal that lives inside her head. In relation to this ANIMAL metaphor for migraine Semino (2008: 50) points out that although ‘it is possible to establish a connection with conventional metaphorizations of pain in terms of external invasion into the body, it would be reductive to simply categorize McEwan’s ANIMAL metaphor as a case of elaboration of a conventional conceptual metaphor’.

Semino stresses that this metaphor is far too distinctive and idiosyncratic to be considered a creative elaboration on an existing metaphor. Moreover, the relationship between this metaphor in which migraine is described in terms of an animal that lives inside the head and conventional (conceptual and linguistic)
metaphors that describe migraine as physical invasions of the body (i.e. a *stabbing* pain, a *knifing* pain) is highly tenuous (p. 50). Instead, Semino proposes to treat this example as a highly novel and original conceptual metaphor which does not extend or elaborate any existing conventional conceptual metaphor but may still be consistent with it. Novel metaphors often provide radically different ways of thinking about a topic. Such metaphors may be used to express otherwise inexpressible feelings and emotions in a way that is both original and creative but also strikes the reader as realistic and true. Highly novel metaphors may on the one hand be rejected by some readers for being too far-fetched, unintelligible or disturbing. On the other hand, other readers may feel that no one has ever been able to express something that aptly.

Semino (2008: 53) points out that ‘a consideration of the conceptual dimension of metaphor allows us to distinguish between different kinds or degrees of creativity in the use of metaphor in language’. Linguistic metaphorical expressions are novel if the words have no conventional metaphorical senses related to the source domain, but these novel linguistic expressions can realize extensions or elaborations of existing conceptual metaphors or they can express entirely novel conceptual metaphors. That is, creativity and novelty at the linguistic level and at the conceptual level are related but independent. Metaphorical creativity should therefore not only be considered in terms of conceptual mappings, but also in terms of ‘the salience and originality of individual metaphorical choices and patterns’ (p. 54). Although studies by Carter (2004) and Carter and Nash (1990) have shown that creativity does not occur exclusively in literature, the role of creativity in metaphor use may still play an important role in literature, and the creative uses of metaphor may be more frequent or different in works of literature.

Semino and Steen (2008) stress that even though the *discontinuity* and the *continuity* approach may be hard to reconcile, each of them provides useful insights into our understanding of metaphor in literature, and we need to take into account ‘both the unique characteristics of particular uses in context, and the way in which particular uses relate to conventional patterns, that may reflect shared cognitive structures and processes’ (p. 244). Metaphors in literature may be different from those outside literature because of their properties and distribution, because of the way they are treated by authors and/or readers, or because of an interaction between these two parameters (p. 243). People may expect literature to contain more metaphors due to its aesthetic function, but this expectation need not correspond to actual usage. It may be that people are more aware of the metaphors in literature, or that the metaphors found in literature are more prominent or noticeable than those in other genres and registers.

This section has focused on different approaches to metaphor in literature, showing that there are basically two opposing approaches to the relation between
metaphor in literary and non-literary works, though both maintain that the metaphors found in literature are different from the metaphors found outside literature. On the one hand, there is the discontinuity approach, which is closely related to the study of foregrounding and defamiliarization; it sees metaphor in literature as primary and metaphors in ordinary language use as lesser derivations that are absorbed into the standard language and become dead metaphors. The continuity approach, on the other hand, which is closely related to Conceptual Metaphor Theory, sees metaphors in ordinary language as primary and considers metaphors in literature to be creative elaborations and extensions. It was shown that while the discontinuity approach focuses mainly on analysing deliberate uses of linguistic metaphor, the continuity approach focuses mainly on establishing the underlying conventional conceptual metaphors.

This thesis will follow Semino (2008) and Semino and Steen (2008) in paying attention to both unique and creative uses as well as conventional patterns, and determining in both qualitative and quantitative terms if and how the metaphors in literature differ from those outside literature in terms of their properties and distribution, as well as their treatment by readers. The distinctions between linguistic and conceptual metaphor, between novel and conventional metaphor, and between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor are all central to this objective.

2.4 Forms and functions of metaphor in literature

Discussions of metaphor in literature such as Semino (2008), Semino and Steen (2008), Steen (1994) and Steen and Gibbs (2004) have stressed the fact that most work on metaphor in literature has focused on the distinctive uses of metaphor in specific genres, in specific texts, and by specific authors. In addition to being highly idiosyncratic, most studies also tend to focus on novel and unique uses of metaphor and aim to show how particular uses or patterns of metaphor are part of the particular style of a literary work, author or genre. As many literary critics wish to demonstrate why a particular work is worthy of attention, and why it deserves a place in the literary canon, generalization about metaphor use across texts, authors, periods, schools and genres is rare. Moreover, literary scholars have argued that cognitive-linguistic studies that relate specific literary metaphors to general conceptual mappings, such as the studies by Donald Freeman (1993, 1995, 1999) and Gibbs (1994) do not do justice to the metaphors’ uniqueness, artistic value and significance. As pointed out by Steen and Gibbs (2004: 340): ‘[l]iterary criticism typically resists generalization and aims at capturing and reifying a unique relationship between one text and one reader’.
A rare quantitative study of metaphor in literature is provided in Goatly (1997), which compared the use of active metaphors in various literary and non-literary genres, namely conversation, national news reports, popular science, magazine advertising, modern novels and modern English lyric poetry. Goatly found that modern lyric poetry had the highest proportion of active metaphor (58%), while novels had only 28% active metaphors and magazine advertising 22%. Lyric poetry was also characterized by a high number of nominal metaphors and contained relatively more verbal metaphors than the other genres. Metaphor signalling and the use of similes occurred more often in the novels than in poetry and the non-literary genres. Metaphor extension was most frequent in poetry and magazine advertising. Steen and Gibbs (2004) point out that although these findings are important, the problem with Goatly’s study lies in the reliability of its metaphor identification. As pointed out in the previous chapter, reliable metaphor identification remains a problem for all linguistic research on the distribution and function of metaphor in natural discourse (see Steen 2002a, b, d; Pragglejaz Group 2007; Steen, Biernacka, et al. 2010; Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a, b).

The study by Goatly (1997) provided quantitative support for some of the claims made in the famous study by Lodge (1977) on the *Modes of modern writing*. Lodge further developed the distinction made by Jakobson (1956) between the metaphoric and the metonymic poles. Jakobson (ibid.) proposed that different ways of speaking and writing could be distinguished on the basis of metaphor and metonymy (1956: 90):

> The development of a discourse may take place along two different semantic lines: one topic may lead to another either through their similarity or through their contiguity. The METAPHORIC way would be the most appropriate term for the first case and the METONYMIC way for the second, since they find their most condensed expression in metaphor and metonymy respectively.

Jakobson argued that although both processes are active in verbal behaviour, one or the other will be preferred under specific circumstances. With regard to different literary schools, he argued that Romanticism and Symbolism privilege metaphor while Realism prefers metonymy (p. 91-92).

This distinction was further differentiated by Lodge (1977: 104), who discusses different literary schools, genres and authors on the basis of the cline from metaphoric to metonymic writing. In comparison with non-literary language, literary writing is essentially metaphoric according to Lodge, while non-literary writing is essentially metonymic. Within the literary genre, poetry can be placed at the metaphoric end of the cline while prose fiction is situated at the metonymic end. Within poetry, a metaphoric style is preferred in lyric poetry while epic poetry prefers a metonymic style. And within prose fiction, Modernist novels prefer a
metaphoric style while Realistic novels are typically metonymic in style. Lodge also distinguishes between metaphoric and metonymic writers. Examples of metaphoric writers are Dylan Thomas, T.S. Eliot and James Joyce, while William Wordsworth, Ernest Hemingway and Philip Larkin are examples of writers with a metonymic style. According to Lodge, the metaphoric writers frequently employ metaphor and use metaphor creatively and innovatively while the metonymic writers use fewer metaphors and rely much more heavily on metonymic relations. When metonymic writers or texts employ metaphor it is often much more locally and the metaphors are more likely to be expressed in simile form than in metaphor form.

Steen and Gibbs (2004) point out that the study by Lodge (1977), though providing valuable insights and making intuitive sense, is highly anecdotal and does not provide exhaustive analyses or systematic and representative comparisons of metaphor in different classes of literary and non-literary discourse. Such findings are therefore hard to generalize to other works of literature, authors or genres. Moreover, as emphasized by Semino (2008), Lodge’s work is limited due to the fact that metaphor and metonymy are not clearly and operationally defined, no systematic attention is paid to the distinction between novel and conventional metaphor, no quantitative evidence is provided, and certain generalizations, such as the findings concerning the differences between literary and non-literary language, are at times too simplistic (2008: 56). However, Lodge’s way of argumentation through an extensive discussion of examples from varying texts and authors remains the dominant way in which metaphor in literature is analysed.

Most studies of metaphor in literature are not concerned with the actual frequencies or distributions of metaphorical expressions, whether novel or conventional or both, and focus on particular kinds of metaphors. For example, Tsur (1987: 7) distinguishes between metaphors with a ‘split’ or ‘integrated’ focus: a split focus occurs when ‘attention is focussed on the incongruence between meanings or relationships’, an integrated focus when ‘attention is focussed on their concordant aspects’. That is, split-focus metaphors emphasize the distance between the source and target domain, while integrated-focus metaphors background the differences between source and target. Tsur claims that metaphors with a split focus are typically perceived as more ironic, witty and paradoxical while metaphors with an integrated focus tend to be perceived as more emotional, elevated or sublime. With regard to literary schools, Tsur (1992) argues that Metaphysical and Modern poetry are characterized by split-focus metaphors while Renaissance and Romantic poetry are characterized by integrated-focus metaphors.

In addition to specific types of metaphor, studies on metaphor in literature are predominantly concerned with one specific genre, author or literary work. For example, Crisp (1996) focuses on image metaphors in Imagist poetry, while Hiraga
(1999) focuses on the genre of haiku. Studies that focus on individual authors’ ability to use metaphor in original ways are exemplified by Margaret Freeman’s (1995) study of metaphors for life and death in Emily Dickinson’s poetry, and Hamilton’s (2002) study of personifications in the poetry of W.H. Auden. Other studies focus on how particular texts are characterized by systematic patterns of metaphor, such as Simon-Vandenbergen’s (1993) study of George Orwell’s Nineteen eighty-four, Popova’s (2002, 2003) studies of Henry James’s short story ‘The Figure in the Carpet’ and Patrick Süskind’s novel PERFUME, and Werth’s (1999) study of E.M. Forster’s novel A passage to India. Werth (1994, 1999) introduces the term ‘megametaphor’ to describe the ‘sustained metaphorical undercurrents’ underlying the entire novel (1999: 323). Studies that focus on how patterns of metaphor can be used in a novel to create different mind styles for different characters include Semino’s (2002b) study of The collector, Semino and Swindlehurst’s (1996) study on One flew over the cuckoo’s nest and Black (1993) on William Golding’s The Inheritors.

Semino and Swindlehurst (1996) discuss how in Ken Kesey’s novel One flew over the cuckoo’s nest the metaphor patterns help to establish the mental habits of individual characters. One of the main characters, Bromden, uses a large number of machinery metaphors that are extensions and elaborations of the conceptual metaphors PEOPLE ARE MACHINES and SOCIETY IS A MACHINE. Semino and Swindlehurst point out that these machinery metaphors are used more frequently and much more creatively than conventional expressions such as ‘he is running out of steam’ or ‘he has a screw loose’. As a former mechanic, Bromden’s familiarity with machines allows him to make sense of the world around him, and conceptualize his experiences and emotions. These metaphors are part of his individual world view, and as his world view changes over the course of the novel, so do his metaphors. Similarly, Semino (2002b) showed that in Fowles’ The collector main character Clegg conceptualizes women in terms of insects, specifically butterflies, resulting in an unconventional worldview which he is unable to adjust.

The studies discussed in this section suggest ways in which the metaphors and patterns of metaphor found in literature may be special. Manifestations of metaphorical mappings through allegory (Crisp 2001), parable (Turner 1996), extended metaphor (Werth 1994, 1999) or multiplied simile (Ben-Porat 1992) may be typical of literature, though they are not necessarily exclusive to literary texts. Steen and Gibbs (2004) ask how such forms can be said to be typical of literature if they are not restricted to literary genres, and postulate a number of possible solutions. One is that the metaphors in literature ‘exhibit subtle structural or semantic particularities’ (p. 348), which is suggested by Tsur (1987) and Lakoff and Turner (1989). Alternatively, as mentioned above, it could be the case that we
pay more attention to literary metaphors due to a special literary reading attitude, as has been suggested by several empirical studies of metaphor in literary text processing (e.g., Gibbs et al. 1991; Steen 1994; Zwaan 1994).

Steen and Gibbs (2004: 348) argue that in addition to the possibility that literary metaphors are rhetorically more prominent or deliberately exploited by readers, it is also possible that literature contains a higher density of metaphor; it may also be that literary metaphor is more prone to be frequently or prominently combined with other figures of speech. They emphasize (p. 341) that contributions to the general view of literary metaphor have mostly concentrated on what is specific to literature without paying sufficient attention to patterns of metaphor in general language use and cognition. Moreover, most of the studies on metaphor in literature do not provide the necessary empirical support and often do not systematically distinguish between the use, function and effect of metaphor (e.g., Gibbs and Steen 1999; Steen 1994; Steen 2007). Only large-scale corpus work between literary and non-literary discourse will be able to provide an accurate description of the extent to which the specific properties of literary metaphors, their distribution, and their combination with other tropes and aspects of language use play a role in the specific nature of metaphor in literature (Steen and Gibbs 2004: 350).

The main objective of this thesis will be to provide such quantitative, empirical evidence for the forms, frequencies and distribution of metaphor in the language of fiction based on explicit linguistic definitions and reliable corpus analyses, thereby bridging the gap between literary and linguistic approaches to metaphor. As long as literary critics aim to provide attractive and original interpretations of literary metaphors while linguists aim to produce reliable analyses and generalizable explanations, literary criticism and linguistic metaphor analysis will be hard to reconcile. This tension between traditional literary and linguistic approaches is considered in more detail in the section below.

2.5 Characteristics of literary and non-literary language

The traditional view of metaphor as “deviant” and “decorative” described in the previous chapter and the emphasis on the originality, creativity and superiority of metaphor in literature are closely related to dominant views of literary language. Literary texts and literary language are traditionally considered to be different from non-literary texts and ordinary language use (i.e. deviant), and literary texts and language are considered to be essentially autotelic in nature and aesthetic in
function (i.e. decorative). This view can be illustrated by the following quote from Spitzer (1970: 21):

Since the best document of the soul of a nation is its literature, and since the latter is nothing but its language as this is written down by elect speakers, can we perhaps not hope to grasp the spirit of a nation in the language of its outstanding works of literature?

The references to ‘the soul of a nation’, ‘elect speakers’ and ‘outstanding works of literature’ reflect the common assumption that literary works are somehow more special and meaningful than non-literary works, that they capture something “spiritual” and are written by people with a special gift. In this respect, Aristotle’s notion of the creative genius is still very much alive and it is not uncommon for literary critics or linguists to refer to a literary work as “a literary masterpiece” or “a masterful display of literary genius”.

Though linguists and literary scholars alike have questioned the existence of a literary variety of language that can be clearly and objectively distinguished from non-literary varieties, there is some intuitive sense to the claim that readers can immediately tell whether a verbal structure belongs to a literary work or not. The distinction between literary and non-literary language may not be a clear-cut dichotomy, but there is still some sense of “literariness”. Leech (2008) proposes to treat both ‘literature’ and ‘literariness’ as prototype concepts in the sense of Rosch (1975), with ‘literature’ having a core of clear cases – such as Shakespeare, Donne and Hemingway – and a periphery of unclear or borderline cases, including the works of individual authors but also entire genres, such as crime novels, chicklit and fan fiction. He emphasizes the role of socio-cultural, aesthetic and linguistic criteria as indicators of literariness. Empirical studies of literature have shown that literature functions as a social system, on a par with law, religion, science, and so on (e.g., Schram and Steen 2001).

Although many linguists now argue that there are no defining formal features of literature, it is still assumed by many analysts of literature that the main characteristic of literary or poetic texts is foregrounding (Mukařovský 1970), a notion that remains central to literary studies (see Douthwaite 2000; special issue of Language and Literature 2007: 16 (2)). Empirical studies of literature have attempted to offer support for the claim that foregrounding leads to the defamiliarization of the reader’s perception and cognition (e.g., Van Peer 1986a; Steen 1994). Mukařovský (1970) points out that poetic language and the standard language are closely connected, since poetic language employs the same linguistic resources – lexis, syntax, phonology, etc. – as the standard language. Moreover, the standard language provides the norm that poetic language deviates from: ‘for poetry, the standard language is the background against which is reflected the
esthetically [sic] intentional distortion of the linguistic components of the work, in other words, the intentional violation of the norm of the standard’ (p. 42).

Mukařovský emphasizes that foregrounding in poetic language occurs for the sake of foregrounding, not communication, and the linguistic expression itself becomes the centre of attention. Metaphors are considered to be one such type of linguistic deviation that leads to foregrounding and defamiliarization. However, the assumption that these violations are deliberately used for the sake of drawing attention to their status as being violations becomes problematic when considered in light of the findings of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. It is unlikely that highly conventional, non-deliberate metaphors will have a foregrounding effect, and as psycholinguistic studies have revealed that they often go unnoticed they do not defamiliarize our experience. It is more likely that only deliberate metaphors have this function. Given the association between literature and foregrounding, this then suggests that literary works may contain more deliberate metaphors than non-literary works, as literary works typically seek to defamiliarize our experience and deliberately offering novel or creative metaphors may be one way to achieve this effect.

Mukařovský (1970: 44) argues that foregrounding in poetic language is characterized by its consistency and systematicity, which can be related to the findings of Goatly (1997), Semino (2008) and Steen and Gibbs (2004) that metaphor in literature often involves systematic forms of patterning, repetition, clustering, extension, and so on. According to Mukařovský there is always a tension between foregrounded and unforegrounded components in literary texts, even in genres in which the subject matter is the dominant element, such as in novels. Novelists may choose not to violate the norms of the standard, they may subordinate the linguistic violations to the subject matter, they may subordinate the subject matter to the linguistic violations, or they may emphasize the contrast between the subject matter and its linguistic expression (p. 54). As this thesis is concerned with excerpts from realistic novels, this suggests that in these texts the use of deliberate metaphors to create foregrounding effects will most likely be subordinate to the subject matter of the novel, or that the contrast between target-domain language and source-domain language may be emphasized. This may be why the explicit signalling of metaphor appears to be typical of literature (cf. Goatly 1997).

Nowottny (1962: 41) argues that deviations are acceptable in poetic language and not strike the reader as inappropriate or off-putting because poets and other creative writers are expected to use language in unusual ways and are therefore by convention allowed ‘poetic licence’. In Nowottny’s view writers of literature are ‘both free of context and bound to create it’ (p. 43). They are on the one hand not bound by any “real” context in terms of their personal background or the
conversational situation. On the other hand, they are bound to create a verbal context for their poetic creation that allows readers to interpret the entities and objects described in terms of attributes, scale, setting and significance. Metaphor plays an important role in this creation of context as one of the functions of metaphor is to determine the reader’s point of view and add evaluative value. This suggests that writers of literary works such as novels may be more free to employ metaphor to refer to entities than a journalist would be, as readers of novels are not expected to “test” these metaphorical descriptions against a “real context”. Nevertheless, in realistic fiction, novelists could again be less free to use metaphorical descriptions than poets as the created contexts need to be realistic.

According to Nowottny (1962: 59), metaphors help the reader to construct the target but do not ‘contaminate the mental image of the target by using any one of the literal terms available in ordinary language for referring to such a target’. This means that metaphor allows readers to fill in part of the target image from their own experience and imagination. The metaphor suggests a likeness between two elements, but does not specify this likeness in the way a literal equivalent would, so that in the metaphorical expression *Afternoon burns upon the wires of the sea* (p. 58), the use of *wires* leads us to a sense, but not an exact term such as *ridges, swells, humps or crests*. This allows us to fill in our own visualization of the physical appearance of these *wires*, and they do not have to be ‘hard like ridges or white like crests or humpy like humps’ (p. 59). The same principle applies to similes, as similes explicitly indicate that one thing is similar to another but do not necessarily specify how, and things may often be alike in many different ways. Nowottny (1962: 67) therefore concludes that ‘the vast power of metaphor in poetry’ and the ‘fashionable belief that metaphor is the language of poetry’ should be considered in relation to the fact that metaphor ‘vastly extends the language at the poet’s disposal’ and offers the poet ‘a magnificent array of solutions to major problems of diction’.

Nowottny’s view of the function of poetic language and poetic metaphor neatly summarizes the long-held beliefs about the difference between literary and non-literary language discussed in this section. Traditionally, literary works and literary language have been considered to be characterized by violations of the norms of standard language use and by a deliberate defamiliarization of our experience. Metaphor is considered to be one important type of violation of the norms of the standard that leads to foregrounding effects for the sake of foregrounding. This view of literary language as characterized by linguistic deviations still plays an important role in literary studies, and many contemporary studies of metaphor in literature display an emphasis on deliberateness, creativity and novelty. The following section will discuss the need for systematic linguistic
approaches to the analysis of literary language to determine its linguistic characteristics and how it differs from non-literary language.

2.6 Linguistic approaches to the study of literature

Though many linguists and literary critics have argued that linguistic approaches to literature, also referred to as stylistics or linguistic stylistics, can help to bridge the gap between the two disciplines, Leech (2008: 37) points out that ‘the literary critic is still typically cast in the role of the coy bride-to-be, who rejects the advances of the linguistic bridegroom, and his promise of a fruitful union between the two disciplines’. Leech argues that the deviations in literary language can be considered unique to the specific text in which they occur, and as such ‘any corpus of material, however large, would be inadequate for a complete description of literary language: every new metaphor, for instance, would require an alteration of the existing description’ (p. 15). According to Leech, linguistics cannot appropriately describe those aspects of literature that are most interesting and illuminating as literary texts are by default intended to ‘transcend the limitations of ordinary language’ (p. 15).

Donald Freeman (1970: 3) points out that linguistics is not intended to replace literary criticism but can contribute to literary analysis by providing literary criticism with ‘a theoretical underpinning as necessary to that undertaking as mathematics is to physics’. This point is also made by Halliday (1970: 70), who argues that linguistics ‘is not and will never be the whole of literary analysis’ and points out that only literary analysts can determine the role of linguistics in literary studies. Nevertheless, in order to describe texts accurately and properly, it is necessary to employ the theories and methods developed in linguistics, ‘the subject whose task is precisely to show how language works’. Halliday warns that since many literary critics invent their own ad-hoc categories to describe particular phenomena in texts, and since these categories differ per critic and per text, the analyses and findings presented in these studies, however insightful and valuable, cannot be compared to studies of other texts or authors, and even less to descriptions of general language use. Linguistic analyses of literary works can only be valuable and yield significant comparisons if the analyses are carried out against the background of a general description of the language, and employ the same theories, methods and categories.

Halliday (1970: 69) emphasizes the need to accurately and explicitly state ‘the role of a particular pattern or item in the language, what it contrasts with, what it may and may not combine with and so on’. Moreover, we need to establish the
probability of occurrence for each pattern or item under specified conditions: ‘It is of no interest to show that nine-tenths of all clauses in a certain poem are, say, of the class “interrogative” unless we know how this relates to the probabilities of occurrence of this and the other terms in the mood system’ (p. 69). Similarly, it is of no use to state that a particular literary work contains a certain number of similes, or more verbal than nominal metaphors, if we do not know how similes and verbal versus nominal metaphors are distributed in other texts of the same or different genres and in the language as a whole. According to Halliday, originality does not lie in selecting features that are impossible or have never been used before, but in selecting from a number of equally possible candidates the less probable feature, and in balancing the combination of probable and improbable choices.

In fact, traditional studies of fiction and the novel have primarily focused on novelists and novels that stand out due to their excellence. Priestley (1927: 5) defines the term ‘novel’ as ‘a narrative in prose treating chiefly of imaginary characters and events’ and claims that his definition ‘tells us very little about prose fiction, but then prose fiction itself, as a whole, tells us so much. It is a large mirror of life, and has a far greater range than any other form of literature’. According to Priestley, great writers of fiction can be very different from each other, but their greatness always lies essentially in their ability to create interesting and believable characters, ‘in whose existence, no matter how wild and strange they may be, we are compelled to believe while we are reading’ (p. 6). Other studies of fiction and the novel (e.g., Raleigh 1894; Rimmon-Kenan 1983; Van Ghent 1953; Watt 1957) have also been predominantly interested in analysing novels in terms of the story and plot, characterization, focalization and narration. That is, great works of fiction have usually been defined in terms of content rather than form, although references are frequently made to an author’s skill in crafting beautiful sentences or his mastery of the use of metaphors and other tropes.

In Language of fiction, Lodge (1966: 29-30) argued that scholars analysing the language of prose fiction should not only refer to the great novelists to support and illustrate their discussions since literary criticism should be able to deal with the language of all novels: ‘We do not want a normative concept of the language of prose fiction which will predictably give the first prize to Flaubert and the wooden spoon to George Eliot’. The verbal artistry of novelists should be shown with respect to all the available materials. Lodge therefore discusses a number of novels that are not necessarily the best or most representative works of their respective authors, but which offer interesting and important critical problems of interpretation and evaluation. His discussion of the language of fiction concludes that ‘ultimately language is the only tangible evidence we have for those vast,

With *Style in fiction* Leech and Short (1981/2007) offered an even more systematic study of the linguistic characteristics of prose fiction. They demonstrated how methods and techniques from linguistics could be used to analyse literature, in this case narrative fiction, in a way that explicates how particular stylistic effects are achieved, which leads to a greater understanding and appreciation of what authors create in great works of novels. They point out that such linguistic analysis still requires interpretation and an evaluation of the literary effects and quality of such features. They aim to demonstrate which linguistic features are responsible for creating the verbal mastery of the great novels. In their analyses of style they ‘attempt to find the artistic principles underlying a writer’s choice of language’ (2007: 60), as all novelists and novels have individual qualities and these qualities will play an important role in some texts but not others. It is therefore vital to determine for each individual text which linguistic features are significant, how these linguistic features fit within the creative whole of the text, and what their literary effect is.

Leech and Short proposed a checklist of linguistic features that can be used to determine the literary effect of a passage, categories likely to yield stylistically relevant information (2007: 61). This checklist involves lexical categories (such as the nature of the employed vocabulary, i.e. concrete or abstract, formal or informal, etc.), grammatical categories (such as sentence types and complexity, clause types and structures, and the different phrase types), figures of speech (i.e. grammatical and lexical patterns, phonological patterns, and tropes), and context and cohesion. Leech and Short demonstrate the application of this checklist to passages from Joseph Conrad, D.H. Lawrence and Henry James, showing that it can be used to identify the most significant style markers in a literary passage, which can then be used to determine their literary function in context (p. 66). Many of these features can easily be quantified and the quantitative differences between the passages tested statistically. Leech and Short demonstrate how such statistically significant linguistic features seem to converge to create specific aesthetic effects and reveal individual literary styles in fiction.

This section has addressed the importance of linguistic approaches to the analysis of literature based on existing, generally-accepted descriptions of language use. The dichotomy between literary and non-literary language may not be clearly delineated but it is essential that notions such as ‘literature’ and ‘metaphor’ are defined in generally accepted linguistic terms, since the analyses would otherwise be meaningless and would have little use for further application. Moreover, the studies by Lodge (1966) and Leech and Short (2007) have emphasized the importance of not limiting support and illustrations of the language of fiction by
looking only at the great novels and great novelists. Although the studies by Lodge (1966) and Leech and Short (2007) already demonstrate an important step towards more systematic, linguistic approaches to literature, the most comprehensive studies on the linguistic characterization of the language of fiction were carried out by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001). These studies, which form the background against which the analyses in Chapters 5 and 6 should be considered, will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

### 2.7 Corpus-based studies of the language of fiction

The corpus-based studies of register variation by Biber (1988, 1989), Conrad and Biber (2001), and Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992, 2001) have demonstrated that linguistic features interact significantly with certain text types, registers and genres. Biber (1988, 1989) provides a multi-feature/multi-dimensional approach to textual variation using a factor analysis. In this factor analysis, the frequencies of linguistic features were reduced to a small set of ‘factors’, with each factor representing ‘a grouping of linguistic features that co-occur with a high frequency’ (1988: 79). The interpretation of the factors is based on the theoretical assumption that linguistic features co-occur frequently in texts because they share the same underlying communicative function. Thus, the interpretation of a factor involves determining the communicative function that the co-occurring linguistic features represent; these communicative functions form the basis of Biber’s formulation of six dimensions of variation in speech and writing.

The six dimensions identified by Biber (1988: 104-115) are: ‘Informational versus Involved Production’ (Dimension 1); ‘Narrative versus Non-narrative Concerns’ (Dimension 2); ‘Explicit versus Situation-Dependent Reference’ (Dimension 3); ‘Overt Expression of Persuasion’ (Dimension 4); ‘Abstract versus Non-Abstract Information’ (Dimension 5); and ‘On-line Informational Elaboration’ (Dimension 6). Dimension 1 distinguishes between discourse with an interactional, affective, and involved purpose, typically associated with real-time production and comprehension, and discourse with an informational purpose, which is typically constructed and edited carefully. Dimension 2 distinguishes between discourse with narrative concerns and discourse with non-narrative concerns (e.g., expository, descriptive, persuasive, etc.). Dimension 3 distinguishes between discourse that identifies referents fully and explicitly and discourse that relies on external reference and non-specific deictics. Dimension 4 identifies texts that are characterized by an argumentative style intended to persuade the addressee or
express the speaker’s point of view. Dimension 5 distinguishes between discourse which is highly technical and abstract and discourse with a non-technical, non-abstract focus. Finally, Dimension 6 distinguishes between informational discourse produced under highly constrained conditions and therefore presented in a fragmented manner on the one hand and informational discourse which is highly integrated or discourse that is not informational on the other.

Each of these dimensions is characterized by a group of co-occurring linguistic features, some of which have positive weights and some of which have negative weights. Texts that have many positive features will have few negative features and vice versa. These six textual dimensions were used as parameters of variation to specify the linguistic similarities and differences between spoken and written texts in English. The distributions of sixty-seven linguistic features was considered among twenty-three spoken and written text genres. The fiction genres included in Biber’s study were all taken from the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen corpus and consisted of general fiction (all texts from LOB corpus category K), mystery fiction (texts 1-14 from LOB corpus category L), science fiction (all texts in LOB corpus category M), adventure fiction (texts 1 – 14 from LOB corpus category N), and romance fiction (texts 1 – 14 from LOB corpus category P).

The fiction genres included in Biber’s analysis had moderate scores on all dimensions except Dimension 2, ‘Narrative versus Non-narrative Concerns’. The fiction genres had by far the highest mean scores on this dimension, which is characterized by frequent occurrences of past-tense and perfect-aspect verbs, third-person pronouns, public verbs, present-participle clauses, and synthetic negation, together with markedly infrequent occurrences of present-tense verbs and attributive adjectives. Biber (1989: 136-7) notes that ‘[t]he large separation of the fiction genres from all other genres […] indicates that the proposed interpretation of a narrative versus non-narrative dimension is an accurate description of the underlying function [of these features]’. The past-tense and perfect-aspect verbs can be related to fiction’s reporting of past events and their continuing results; verbs of speaking can be used to introduce direct or indirect speech. The high frequency of third-person pronouns is caused by constant referring to the characters in the story, while the present participles are used for ‘depictive imagery’ (p. 137).

Non-narrative concerns on Dimension 2 include the presentation of expository information, which has few verbs and few animate referents, the presentation of procedural information, which uses many imperative and infinitival verb forms to give a step-by-step description of what to do (rather than what somebody else has done), and the description of actions actually in progress, that is, action in the present tense (p. 137-138). Biber observes that the imaginative fiction genres in his

---

study were the only texts with an extreme narrative concern. Moreover, he notes that the dialogues in fiction ‘are subordinate to the narrative purpose rather than marking a separate interactional purpose’ (p. 142).

Biber’s (1988) analysis of textual dimensions showed that there were significant and important differences among the twenty-three genres. However, he points out that genre distinctions by themselves do not fully represent the underlying text distinctions as texts within a single genre can be markedly different in their linguistic characteristics, and conversely, different genres can be linguistically similar. Biber (1989) therefore uses two complementary perspectives to analyse the main text categories of English, namely a typology of genres and a typology of text types. Text types represent linguistically well-defined text categories. Linguistically distinct texts within the same genre can then be said to represent different text types while linguistically similar texts from different genres can be said to represent the same text type.

Biber (1989) used multivariate statistical techniques including a cluster analysis to analyse 481 texts taken from the 23 genre categories mentioned above in terms of their scores on the six dimensions of textual variation. He identified eight main text types, each text type representing a grouping of texts which were markedly similar in their linguistic characteristics. Those texts with the most similar dimension scores were grouped into clusters, with the texts within each cluster being ‘maximally similar to each other in their exploitation of the textual dimensions, while each cluster is maximally distinct from the others’ (p. 13). This leads to each cluster containing both ‘core’ and ‘peripheral’ texts, with core texts being ‘very similar to the central linguistic characterization of a cluster’ and peripheral texts being ‘relatively dissimilar to the central cluster characterization, but even more dissimilar to other clusters’ (p. 16).

Most of the fiction genres in Biber’s analysis were grouped into cluster 5, ‘Imaginative narrative’. This cluster is situated in reference (Dimension 3), non-abstract in style (Dimension 5), and slightly involved (Dimension 1), though the most defining feature of this cluster is its extreme narrative emphasis (Dimension 2). This cluster contains 92% romance fiction (12 core texts), 51% general fiction (12 core texts + 3 peripheral texts), 70% mystery fiction (7 core texts + 2 peripheral texts), 70% adventure fiction (7 core texts + 2 peripheral texts), and 33% science fiction (1 core text + 1 peripheral text). Non-fiction texts in this cluster include prepared speeches, interviews and personal letters. Linguistic features that are typical of the high score on Dimension 2 (narrative goals) are past-tense and perfect-aspect verbs and third-person pronouns; typical of an involved style (Dimension 1) are first-person pronouns and contractions. Biber (1989: 31) also points out that the more direct dialogue between participants (that is, characters) a text contains, the higher its score for involved features on Dimension 1 will be.
Cluster 6 consists of ‘General narrative exposition’ and is characterized by a marked informational focus (Dimension 1) and a moderate narrative concern (Dimension 2). This cluster is similar to cluster 5 in that it has a moderately high narrative concern. However, it is also markedly informational and non-involved (Dimension 1), and unmarked for Dimensions 3 and 5, whereas cluster 5 was situated and non-abstract. Typical features of Dimension 1 in this cluster are frequent uses of nouns, prepositional phrases and attributive adjectives (bottom features) and infrequent uses of private verbs and contractions (upper features). Biber (1989: 31) points out that ‘the narrative portions in these texts are not imaginary or for entertainment; they are rather an integral part of the expository information conveyed’. Nevertheless, this cluster contains 41% general fiction (12 core texts), 50% science fiction (3 core texts), 31% adventure fiction (3 core texts + 1 peripheral text), 23% mystery fiction (3 core texts) and 8% romance fiction (1 core texts). This shows that there is variation between different fiction genres, with some fiction texts being more extreme in their narrative features than others and some being closer to general narrative exposition, which also includes 73% of the press reportage files and 86% of the press editorials.

Moreover, Biber and Finegan (1989: 487) showed how between the seventeenth and twentieth century, three English genres – letters, essays and fiction – “drifted” towards a more oral style, that is, ‘more involved, less elaborated, and less abstract’. They point out that although fiction is in essence a “literate”4 genre, since it is carefully planned and produced, has a large audience and does not involve direct interaction between participants, it differs from other literate genres with a clear informational, argumentative or persuasive function in that the events and situations described in fiction serve an aesthetic purpose. Fiction has intermediate values on Dimension 1, ‘Informational versus Involved Production’; these scores are neither oral nor literate. It also has a moderately low – and therefore more oral – score on Dimension 3, ‘Explicit versus Situation-Dependent Reference’, and a non-abstract – and thus oral – score on Dimension 5, ‘Abstract versus Non-Abstract Information’.5

Biber and Finegan (1992) extended the abovementioned diachronic investigation by including two speech-based genres, namely dialogue in drama and dialogue in fiction. Though these genres are essentially written, they originate in speech, which may affect their linguistic characteristics. As Biber and Finegan (1992: 691) remark, although literary dialogue ‘is carefully produced, it represents

---

4 Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992) distinguish between “oral” and “literate” genres rather than between “speech” and “writing”.
5 Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992) use slightly different domain labels from Biber (1988). However, as the content of these domains is the same, the original domain labels as presented in Biber (1988) are used here for the sake of consistency.
face-to-face conversation and thus is characterized by linguistic features of interaction and involvement. Such linguistic features include the frequent use of, for example, first-person and second-person pronouns, indefinite and demonstrative pronouns, contractions, discourse particles, hedges and amplifiers, private verbs, and possibility modals. Involved texts are also characterized by a lack of nouns, prepositions and attributive adjectives and a low type-token ratio.

Using a multi-dimensional approach, Biber and Finegan showed that the literary dialogue genres are remarkably similar to the actual conversations with respect to both ‘Explicit versus Situation-Dependent Reference’ (Dimension 3) and ‘Abstract versus Non-Abstract Information’ (Dimension 5). That is, the literary dialogues are situated and non-abstract. Linguistic characteristics associated with situated reference are a high frequency of time, place and other adverbials, and a lack of WH-relative clauses on object and subject positions, pied-piping constructions, phrasal coordination and nominalizations. A non-abstract style is characterized by a lack of conjuncts, passives, past participial adverbial clauses and other adverbial subordinators. With respect to Dimension 1, ‘Informational versus Involved Production’, however, Biber and Finegan found that both dialogue in fiction and dialogue in drama are considerably more informational – thus ‘literate’ – than face-to-face conversations are. They postulate that this informational focus of dialogue in drama and fiction may be due to their specific literary functions, namely to ‘carry the story line’ in drama and ‘advance the story line’ in fiction (p. 701-2).

The studies by Biber (1988, 1989) reveal that fiction can be distinguished from other registers on the basis of its linguistic features, and that fiction is mainly characterized by an extreme narrative emphasis on Dimension 2. In terms of text types, most of the fiction texts belong to either the imaginative narrative cluster or the general narrative exposition cluster. The studies by Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992) indicate that as a register, fiction has become more oral over the past few centuries. The relation between fiction and other narrative text types and the relation between fiction and oral text types will both be taken into consideration in the cross-register analysis to be presented in Chapter 5, in which the distribution of metaphor in fiction is compared to the distribution of metaphor in academic texts, news texts and conversation. The potential influence of the presence of both narrative and dialogue in fiction will be given special attention in Chapter 6, which will distinguish between metaphor in narrative and dialogue in fiction.

---

6 A low type-token ratio results from the use of relatively few different lexical items, indicating that there is little lexical variation in the text.
2.8 Summary

This chapter addressed the nature of literature, literary language and metaphor in literary discourse. It was emphasized that the terms ‘narrative’, ‘fiction’, ‘novel’ and ‘literature’ are often conflated or used interchangeably and that there is at present no generally accepted integrated and interdisciplinary framework for the study of genre in the humanities and sciences. Based on Steen’s genre classification (1999d, 2002e, in press b) it was specified that this thesis is restricted to excerpts taken from contemporary British-English novels belonging to the literary domain, which can be classified as being narratives in terms of their text type and fictional in terms of their content. The identification and analyses of the different linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of metaphor in this thesis will determine the role metaphor plays in the language of fiction, aligning the analysis of metaphor in discourse with the corpus-based multidimensional framework for register variation proposed by Biber (1988).

The issue of literariness and literary language was discussed from the point of view of foregrounding and defamiliarization. The traditional view of metaphor as “deviant” and “decorative” and even the contemporary view of literary metaphor as more creative and original than non-literary metaphor are closely related to the view that literature itself and literary language are special. Though foregrounding and defamiliarization may only be typical for deliberate metaphor, and not highly conventional and non-deliberate metaphors that tend to go unnoticed during production and reception, the association between literature and foregrounding suggests that literary works may contain more deliberate metaphors than non-literary works, and that literary works may seek to defamiliarize our experience by deliberately offering novel or creative metaphors. The view that foregrounding in literary works is characterized by consistency and systematicity could be related to findings by for instance Goatly (1997) and Semino (2008) that metaphor in literature is characterized by systematic patterning in the form of repetition, clustering, literalization, and so on. Deliberate uses of metaphor and patterns of metaphor both play a central role in this thesis, especially in terms of their frequency and relative importance in fiction in comparison to other registers.

This chapter identified two dominant approaches to metaphor in literature in contemporary metaphor studies, namely the discontinuity approach, which follows the traditional view of literary language and sees creative and novel metaphor in literature as primary and metaphor in ordinary language as derived and therefore secondary, and the continuity approach, which sees conventional conceptual metaphors in ordinary language as primary and considers literary metaphors to be creative and novel extensions and elaborations of these conventional metaphors. Following Semino (2008) and Semino and Steen (2008) this thesis will take into
account both what is common and what is creative, what is typical of metaphor in fiction and what is typical of metaphor in authentic discourse in general. The cross-register comparison between fiction, academic discourse, news and conversation to be presented in Chapter 5 will ensure that the forms and functions of metaphor in the language of fiction are considered in light of both what is special and what is shared.

The studies by Biber (1988, 1989) show that fiction can be distinguished from other registers in terms of its linguistic characteristics. The most distinguishing dimension of textual variation was fiction’s extreme narrative focus (Dimension 2). The present thesis aims to complement Biber’s lexico-grammatical analysis of fiction by adding the lexico-semantic dimension of metaphor use to the multi-dimensional model. This will show if and how fiction can be distinguished from the other registers in terms of the frequencies and distributions of linguistic metaphor. As the studies by Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992, 2001) showed that narrative and dialogue within fiction differ significantly in terms of their linguistic characteristics, this thesis will analyse if and how the use of metaphor in fiction differs from the use of metaphor in other registers (Chapter 5) as well as if and how the use of metaphor differs between narrative and dialogue within fiction (Chapter 6). Relating the analysis of metaphor to Biber’s multi-dimensional model ensures that the comparisons are performed against a consistent, accurate and explicit baseline. The established patterns will be tested statistically for their significance and their occurrence will be compared to patterns in other registers and general language use.

As the texts included in this study were not selected because they represent great novels, great authors or great examples of metaphor, this thesis will provide a unique view of what kinds of metaphors are found in fiction when texts are selected randomly and without prior knowledge of its origin or content. Unlike many studies on metaphor in literature, this thesis will not focus on texts that have been selected because they contain interesting uses, forms or functions of metaphor. As many claims about metaphor in literature have been based on the use of metaphor in exceptional literary works or by exceptional authors, the common view of literary metaphor may in fact be skewed, and the role of creativity originality and novelty overestimated, as such “mastery of metaphor” may not be typical of “ordinary” novels or popular fiction. The objective of this thesis will not be to provide attractive, challenging or original interpretations of metaphor in fiction but rather to empirically asses the frequency and distribution of metaphor in fiction as opposed to other classes of discourse based on tested, reliable and explicit methods and accepted linguistic definitions.

The present thesis therefore provides an unconventional approach, venturing into the analysis of metaphor without knowing beforehand that any interesting
examples of metaphor use will be found. This unconventional approach will provide an exciting test to common claims about metaphor in literature, as it will demonstrate whether twelve randomly selected fragments of contemporary fiction yield the same kind of innovative and creative uses, patterns, repetitions, extensions and elaborations of metaphor that have generally been assumed to be typical of metaphor in literature. Now that the notions of both ‘metaphor’ and ‘fiction’ have been defined and contextualized, we can proceed to systematically address the issue of the linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of metaphor in fiction. Chapters 3 and 4 will first demonstrate the method on which the identification and analysis of metaphor in this thesis were based. Chapters 5 and 6 will then discuss the quantitative findings concerning the forms, frequencies and distribution of metaphor in fiction. Finally, Chapters 7 and 8 will present a detailed case study of the different forms, functions and effects of personifications in fiction.
Chapter 3

MIPVU: A manual for identifying metaphor-related words

The appearance of a famous face in the show rooms always caused a stir amongst the girls, who all longed to hook a wealthy husband.

(BNC-Baby: BMW)

The MIPVU manual has previously been published as Chapter 2 in Steen, Dorst, Herrmann, Kaal, Krennmayr and Pasma (2010), but has been adjusted here to fit the present thesis.
3.1 Introduction

The previous chapters have stressed the need for an explicit and reliable method for metaphor identification in authentic discourse. Chapter 1 discussed the Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007; cf. Steen 2002a, b, d; 2005), which provides a tool for linguistic metaphor identification, as well as the five-step procedure (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009), which offers a tool for relating linguistic manifestations of metaphor to underlying conceptual structures and mappings. The current chapter will present the complete MIPVU procedure, the revised and extended version of MIP that was developed in the Metaphor in Discourse project. The MIPVU procedure formed the basis for the studies of the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction to be reported in Chapters 5 and 6, as well as for the empirical investigation of the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations of personification in fiction to be presented in Chapters 7 and 8. Chapter 4 will demonstrate the application of MIPVU to fiction and discuss a number of additions and specifications in MIPVU that proved central to the analysis of metaphor in naturally-occurring discourse. Reliability figures for the annotation of fiction on the basis of MIPVU will also be provided in Chapter 4.

In the sections below, the complete MIPVU procedure will be presented. It should be noted that the original wording and layout as used in Chapter 2 of Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b) has been retained as much as possible, though the numbering of the sections and references to sections and chapters have been adjusted to fit this thesis for the sake of consistency and cross-referencing. The manual’s set-up as a set of instructions has been retained, which means that ‘we’ refers to the authors of the MIPVU manual (Gerard Steen, Aletta Dorst, Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal, Tina Krennmayr and Trijntje Pasma) and that ‘you’ refers to the metaphor researcher or student using the manual as a set of instructions to find metaphor-related words in discourse. It should be noted that the term ‘metaphor-related words’ is used to reflect the fact that MIPVU aims to identify all lexical units in the discourse that can be related to cross-domain mappings in conceptual structure rather than only metaphorically used words, as is the case in MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007). The Metaphor in Discourse project also formulated an explicit annotation protocol and additional guidelines on the use of the dictionaries (see Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b).

Similar to the Pragglejaz Group, the corpus-based learner’s dictionary Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners (Rundell and Fox 2002) was used as a primary source of reference. In cases where analysts suspected that the sense descriptions in Macmillan might be conflated (see Steen, Biernacka, et al. 2010), the Longman dictionary of contemporary English was used as a second
opinion. As both Macmillan and Longman have publicly accessible online versions, it was decided early on in the project to use the online dictionaries for reasons of speed and efficiency. As such, no page references have been added to the sense descriptions cited in this thesis.

3.2 The basic procedure

The goal of finding metaphor in discourse can be achieved in a systematic and exhaustive fashion by adhering to the following set of guidelines.

1. Find metaphor-related words (MRWs) by examining the text on a word-by-word basis.
   ⇒ For information about whether an expression counts as a word, consult Section 3.3.
2. When a word is used indirectly and that use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning of that word, mark the word as metaphorically used (MRW: indirect).
   ⇒ For information about indirect word use that is potentially explained by cross-domain mapping, consult Section 3.4.
3. When a word is used directly and its use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping to a more basic referent or topic in the text, mark the word as direct metaphor (MRW: direct).
   ⇒ For more information about direct word use that is potentially explained by cross-domain mapping, consult Section 3.5.
4. When words are used for the purpose of lexico-grammatical substitution, such as third person personal pronouns, or when ellipsis occurs where words may be seen as missing, as in some forms of co-ordination, and when a direct or indirect meaning is conveyed by those substitutions or ellipses that may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or topic, insert a code for implicit metaphor (MRW: implicit).
   ⇒ For more information about implicit meaning by substitution or ellipsis that is potentially explained by cross-domain mapping, consult Section 3.6.
5. When a word functions as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, mark it as a metaphor flag (MFlag).

---

For more information about signals of cross-domain mappings, consult Section 3.7.

6. When a word is a new-formation coined by the author, examine the distinct words that are its independent parts according to steps 2 through 5.

⇒ For more information about new-formations, consult Section 3.8.

The use of the phrase ‘potentially explained by a cross-domain mapping’ is intentional. It should be read with an emphasis on ‘potentially’. This links up with the tenuous connection between linguistic and conceptual metaphor identification as discussed in Chapter 1.

As for the relation with MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), points 1 and 2 are essentially the same as MIP. Points 3 and 4 deal with two additions to MIP in the area of other forms of metaphor. Point 5 is a different kind of addition to MIP and includes the identification of signals of metaphor. And point 6 takes one assumption of MIP to its linguistic conclusion by including instructions for handling new lexical units.

### 3.3 Deciding about words: lexical units

The word is the unit of analysis which is examined for metaphorical use. There are other possibilities, such as the morpheme or the phrase, and these can account for additional metaphor in usage. However, we do not mark these other possibilities, because we can only do one thing at a time. Focusing on the word as the unit of analysis is already a most challenging and complex operation. It is motivated by the functional relation between words, concepts and referents in discourse analysis, as was discussed in Chapter 1.

A systematic and explicit approach to the relevant unit of analysis is crucial for a consistent and correct quantitative analysis of the data. Lack of clear guidelines may introduce a substantial degree of error and therefore noise into the numbers and patterns obtained. It would undermine detailed quantitative comparison between distinct studies.

For theoretical reasons, we will call the word a ‘lexical unit’. In adopting this terminology, we follow the Pragglejaz Group (2007). When you decide about the boundaries of lexical units, the following guidelines should be adopted.
3.3.1 General guideline

In our project, the data come from the British National Corpus, and we therefore follow most of BNC practice in deciding what counts as a lexical unit. In other projects with other materials, these guidelines may or may not have to be adjusted to the other source, as was done by Pasma (in prep.; Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b) for the analysis of a corpus of Dutch news texts and conversations. For the present research, the dependence on the BNC materials means two things:

1. All words provided with an independent Part-Of-Speech (POS) tag in the corpus are taken as separate lexical units. For instance, prepositions are coded as PRP, nouns are coded as NN, and so on. A full list of tags is available from the BNC website: www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk.

2. All so-called polywords in the corpus are taken as single lexical units. There are a number of fixed multi-word expressions that are analysed as one lexical unit in the BNC, on the grounds that they are grammatical units which designate one specific referent in the discourse. Examples include a good deal, by means of, and of course. These multi-word expressions are called polywords. They have special tags and are available in a finite list from the BNC website: www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk. You should follow this practice and, in particular, not examine the parts of these polywords for potential metaphorical meaning.

3.3.2 Exceptions

There are three exceptions to our overall acceptance of BNC practice: phrasal verbs, some compounds, and some proper names.

Phrasal verbs are verbal expressions consisting of more than one word, such as look up or turn on. These are not taken as single lexical units in the BNC, but as independent verbs followed by autonomous adverbial particles. We will not follow this practice, for phrasal verbs function as linguistic units designating one action, process, state or relation in the referential dimension of the discourse. In that respect, they are similar to polywords.

You should therefore treat all phrasal verbs as single lexical units: their individual parts do not require independent analysis for potential metaphorical meaning. The phrasal verb as a whole, however, can still be used metaphorically. For instance, setting up an organization is a metaphorical variant of setting up a
roadblock. The classification of two or more words as part of one phrasal verb should be marked as such in the data.

The problem with phrasal verbs is their superficial resemblance to prepositional verbs (i.e. a frequent verb-preposition combination) and to verbs followed by free adverbs. The latter two cases should be analysed as free combinations consisting of two independent lexical units, as opposed to phrasal verbs which should be taken as only one. Again, the motivation for this approach is the assumption of a functional and global correspondence between words, concepts, and referents.

One way to tell these three groups apart is by examining their POS tags in the BNC. Particles of phrasal verbs have received an AVP code, prepositions of prepositional verbs a PRP code, and freely occurring adverbs an AV0 code. These are classifications which have been made independently of any questions about metaphorical use; they are based on a general approach to data analysis, which is a bonus.

However, the matter is further complicated in three ways. Firstly, when we go to the dictionaries used in our research for examining contextual and basic meanings, it appears that they do not distinguish between phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs. They in fact call both types phrasal verbs. An example is look at in a sentence like “it was only when you looked at their faces that you saw the difference”. According to Macmillan this is a phrasal verb, but the BNC code for at is PRP, indicating that it is a prepositional verb. We follow the BNC’s decision, which means that you have to analyse look and at as two lexical units and independently examine their main senses in the dictionary to find their respective basic meanings; the contextual meaning of each of them in their combined use, even as a prepositional verb, however, will be found under the phrasal meaning of the combination.

Secondly, some of the verb+particle combinations marked as such in the BNC are in fact not conventionalized phrasal verbs. That is, they are not phrasal verbs according to the dictionary. An example is look up in a sentence like “she looked up into the sky”. Here up is coded as AVP in the BNC, suggesting that this is a proper phrasal verb. However, the Macmillan dictionary tells us that the contextual meaning – “to direct your eyes towards someone or something so that you can see them” – is not one of the meanings of the phrasal verb (unlike, for instance “to try to find a particular piece of information”). The contextual meaning, instead, is the result of a free combination of a verb plus an adverb. BNC has probably made a mistake here; the words consequently have to be analysed as two separate lexical units.

Thirdly, there is the matter of complex phrasal verbs, such as make up for or do away with. These may be easily confused with combinations of simple phrasal
verbs with a preposition (*make up* + *for* or *do away* + *with*). However, they are typically listed as complete, complex phrasal verbs in the *Macmillan* dictionary, as run-ons after the main verb, and they can be replaced by a synonym (*compensate* and *get rid of*). Because of this referential unity, we follow the dictionary for complex phrasal verbs and take the dictionary classification of these complex verbs as single units as our guideline.

Taking all of this into consideration, we have established the following rules for simple phrasal verbs (complex phrasal verbs being recognizable by the criteria above):

a. If the POS tag is PRP then we are dealing with a prepositional verb → analyse the verb and the preposition separately (i.e. two lexical units).

b. If the POS tag is AVP then check in the dictionary whether the combination of verb+particle has been listed as a phrasal verb meaning in the relevant contextual meaning

   • → if this is the case, then we accept it is a phrasal verb and analyse the combination as one lexical unit;
   • → if this is not the case, then we do not take the combination to be a conventionalized phrasal verb and therefore we analyse the verb and the particle separately (i.e. two lexical units).

c. If the POS tag is AV0 then we are dealing with a verb followed by a free adverb → analyse as two lexical units.

d. If the POS tag is PRP/AVP then apply the tests below to determine whether we are dealing with a phrasal or a prepositional verb.

e. If the BNC code is clearly wrong (supported by the above criteria or the tests below) then apply the proper analysis and add a comment in the materials stating “incorrect POS tag: PRP not AVP”.

Tests for deciding between phrasal/prepositional verbs

In prepositional verbs:

- The preposition and following noun can be moved to the front of the sentence, which is not possible with phrasal verb particles (e.g., *Up into the sky she looked* but not *Up the information she looked*).
- An adverb can be inserted before the preposition (e.g., *She ran quickly down the hill* but not *She ran viciously down her best friends*).
- The preposition can be moved to the front of a wh-word (e.g., *Up which hill did he run?* but not *Up which bill did he run*).
In **phrasal** verbs:

- The adverbial particle can be placed before or after the noun phrase acting as object of the verb, which is not possible for the prepositional verbs (e.g., *She looked the information up* but not *She looked his face at*).
- If the noun phrase is replaced by a pronoun, the pronoun has to be placed in front of the particle (e.g., *The dentist took all my teeth out* > *The dentist took them out* but not *She went through the gate* > *She went it through*).

**Compounds** are single lexical units consisting of two distinct parts, which may cause orthographical problems. They can be spelt in three ways: as one word, as two hyphenated words, and as two separate words.

a. When a compound noun is spelt as one word, such as *underpass*, and can be found as such in the dictionary we treat it as one lexical unit designating one referent in the discourse.

b. When a compound noun is spelt as two hyphenated words and can be found as such in the dictionary, such as *pitter-patter*, we similarly treat it as one lexical unit. However, if we are dealing with a novel formation unknown to the dictionary, the compound noun is analysed as two separate units, even though it may have one POS tag in the corpus. Our reason for this practice is that the language user is forced to parse the compound into its two component parts in order to establish the relation between the two related concepts and referents. This also applies to hyphenated compound nouns created through a productive morphological rule but that are not listed as a conventionalized compound in the dictionary (such as *under-five*).

c. In the BNC, compound nouns that have been spelt as two separate words are not taken as single lexical units, but analysed as combinations of two independent words which each receive their own POS tags. When such compounds are conventionalized and, again, function as lexical units designating one referent in the discourse, we will not follow the BNC solution. For then they are like polywords, and should be treated as single lexical units, whose parts do not require analysis for potential metaphorical meaning.

The *Macmillan* dictionary has a tell-tale signal for identifying conventionalized compounds that are spelt as two distinct words: when a fixed expression is taken to be a compound noun, there is primary stress on the first word and secondary stress on the second word (e.g., *power plant*). In cases where the *Macmillan* dictionary treats a multi-word combination as having one meaning, but displays a reversed stress pattern
(such as *nuclear power*), we do not treat the multi-word expression as a compound noun, and analyse it as consisting of two separate lexical units.

- Rules (a) and (b) also apply to compound adverbs and adjectives, such as *honey-hunting*. This example is a novel formation unknown to *Macmillan*. Therefore, following rule (b), the adjective is analysed as comprising two separate lexical units, even though BNC has given it one POS tag.

- Words may be spelt in more than one way, which may cause problems about the independent status of their components in some cases. An example is when the preposition *onto* is spelt as two words instead of one. When this happens, we will adhere to the spelling of the dictionary instead of the spelling of the document under analysis, because the dictionary is the more general reference work and related to accepted norms for language users. You should therefore analyse words according to their spelling in the dictionary, not according to their spelling and POS tagging in the corpus.

Proper names appear to form a special group in our analyses. There are several subclasses which we have encountered, which may not all technically qualify as genuine proper names. They will be discussed one by one. In general, however, proper names do not require any specific additional coding. The special nature of proper names in fiction will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Our general strategy is to reduce the number of exceptions to POS tagging as provided by the BNC corpus. The solution to annotation problems proposed below is maximally simple: every separate word will be treated as a separate lexical unit, except for the underlined cases.

a. Proper names: all parts of genuine proper names are to be treated in the way of regular POS tagging. That is, *Roy Wood* and *Madame Mattli* are coded as two separate words and taken as two lexical units. This can be extended to addresses, with house numbers as well as road names all being cut up into separate lexical units. As a result, *New York* (*in New York Herald Tribune*) is also two units.

b. Some proper names have been bestowed on public entities and may appear in the dictionary. If they do, they are to be treated as all other expressions in the dictionary: thus, *Labour Party* becomes one lexical unit because it has the stress pattern of a compound.

The same holds for some titles that appear in the dictionary, such as *Pulitzer Prize*, which is also treated as one lexical unit on the basis of the stress pattern.
In our annotations, these expressions should be treated as similar to phrasal verbs, compounds, and polywords and should therefore receive a code to indicate that the words form single lexical units.

Green Paper and White Paper, by contrast, are to be treated as containing two lexical units, because they have rising stress (Green and White would always be marked as related to metaphor).

The elements of names of countries (e.g., United Kingdom) and organizations (e.g., United Nations) that have rising stress in the dictionary should also be treated as separate units.

c. Other names and titles do not appear in the dictionary. They are also treated as composites of their independent words, both by the BNC and by us. This accounts for two lexical units in Labour Law, Executive Committee, European Plan, Scarman Report, and even more lexical units in the Student Winter Games, the Henley Royal Regatta, the Criminal Law Revision Committee, House of Oliver, and so on.

d. A separate problem is constituted by genuine titles, that is, titles of texts:
   - If titles are used as titles, that is, as headings of newspaper articles or chapters and sections of novels and academic writing, they need to be taken on a word-by-word basis. This is because they summarize or indicate content by means of words, concepts, and referents. They are regular cases, if linguistically sometimes odd.
   - If titles are mentioned, however, to refer to for example a text or a TV program, they function as names, like proper names. If they are in the dictionary, check their stress pattern; if they are not, use BNC-Baby as a guide.

### 3.4 Indirect use potentially explained by cross-domain mapping

Indirect use of lexical units which may be explained by a cross-domain mapping is basically identified by means of MIP, with some adjustments. This means that the following guidelines should be adopted.

1. Identify the contextual meaning of the lexical unit.
   ⇒ For more information, see Section 3.4.1.
2. Check if there is a more basic meaning of the lexical unit. If there is, establish its identity.
   ⇒ For more information, consult Section 3.4.2.
3. Determine whether the more basic meaning of the lexical unit is sufficiently distinct from the contextual meaning.
⇒ For more information, see Section 3.4.3.
4. Examine whether the contextual meaning of the lexical unit can be related to the more basic meaning by some form of similarity.
⇒ For more information, consult Section 3.4.5.

If the results of instructions (2), (3), and (4) are positive, then a lexical unit should be marked as a metaphor related word (‘MRW’), which may be made more precise by adding the information that it is ‘indirect’ (as opposed to ‘direct’ or ‘implicit’, see below).

### 3.4.1 Identifying contextual meanings

The contextual meaning of a lexical unit is the meaning it has in the situation in which it is used. It may be conventionalized and attested, and will then be found in a general users’ dictionary; but it may also be novel, specialized, or highly specific, in which case it cannot be found in a general users’ dictionary.

When you identify the contextual meaning of a lexical unit, several problems may arise.

1. When utterances are not finished, there is not enough contextual knowledge to determine the precise intended meaning of a lexical unit in context. In such cases, it may be that the lexical unit has been used indirectly on the basis of a metaphorical mapping, but this is impossible to decide. In such cases, we will discard for metaphor analysis all relevant lexical units in aborted utterances.

   An example is ‘Yeah I had somebody come round and stuck their bloody …’ The lexical units in the incomplete utterance in question (beginning with stuck) that could or could not have been related to metaphor should be marked as Discarded For Metaphor Analysis (add code ‘DFMA’ to each of them).

2. When there is not enough contextual knowledge to determine the precise intended meaning of a lexical unit in context, it may be that it has been used indirectly on the basis of a metaphorical mapping, but this may be impossible to decide.

   a. An example is the use of up to indicate movement towards, where it is possible that the target is either higher (not metaphorical) or not higher (metaphorical) than the speaker.

   b. Another example is the use of idioms such as gasp for breath or turn your shoulder, approached as three lexical units, where it is
possible that the designated action in fact takes place and thereby stands for the emotion (metonymy), or the designated action in fact does not take place so that the phrase is used metaphorically to indicate the concomitant emotion.

c. A third example involves anaphora which may be interpreted in more than one way, as in *all that* in the following example, where a possible metaphorical interpretation is applicable: ‘he said I come to sup be supervisor he said, I don’t know, I don’t wish to learn *all that!*’

In such cases of lack of situational knowledge but with a potential for metaphorical meaning, you have to treat the word as if it was used indirectly and metaphorically, on the basis of the general rule ‘When In Doubt, Leave It In’ and add the special code ‘WIDLII’.

3. Specialist terminology may constitute a specific case of insufficient contextual knowledge to determine the precise intended meaning of a lexical unit in context. When there is not enough contextual knowledge to determine the specific technical and/or scientific meaning of a word in context, regular dictionaries cannot help. In such cases, it would of course be possible to use other, preferably specialized dictionaries to find out the specific contextual meaning of a term. However, in our project we assume that metaphor is ‘metaphor to the general language user’: if we as general language users cannot establish the meaning of the lexical unit with the contemporary dictionaries alone but the lexical unit could be metaphorical on the basis of some contextual meaning projected from the basic—non-technical—meaning, we also mark the word as metaphor-related based on ‘WIDLII’.

4. Sometimes the contextual meaning of a lexical unit may be taken as either metaphorical or as not metaphorical. This seems to be the case for many personifications, such as *furious debate* or *this essay thinks*. These examples may be analysed as involving a metaphorical use of *furious* and *thinks*, respectively, but they may also be resolved by a metonymic interpretation of the other terms, i.e. *debate* and *essay*, in which case *furious* and *thinks* automatically turn non-metaphorical. In such cases, the possibility of the metaphorical interpretation should not be lost, and you should mark the relevant ambiguous words *furious* and *thinks* as metaphor related words, and add a comment that this is due to a possible personification (coded ‘PP’). The issue of personifications in fiction will be dealt with in more detail in Chapters 4, 7 and 8.
3.4.2 Deciding about more basic meanings

A more basic meaning of a lexical unit is defined as a more concrete, specific, and human-oriented sense in contemporary language use. Since these meanings are basic, they are always to be found in a general users’ dictionary. A meaning cannot be more basic if it is not included in a contemporary users’ dictionary.

From a linguistic point of view, a more basic meaning of a word is its historically older meaning. However, from a behavioural point of view, this definition may not be optimal. Most language users are not aware of the relative ages of the various meanings of most words in the contemporary language. This means that the linguistic notion of basic sense as the historically prior sense has little relevance to the behavioural, in particular cognitive notion of basic sense.

However, it is one of the fundamental claims of contemporary metaphor theory that most of the historically older meanings of words are also more concrete, specific, and human-oriented. This is explained by the cognitive-linguistic assumption of experientialism (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). As a result, concrete meanings are typically also basic meanings from a historical perspective.

The still largely programmatic assumption of a connection between historically prior meanings and concrete, specific, and human-oriented meanings makes it possible for us to adopt one practical and consistent general starting point about basic meanings: they can be operationalized in terms of concrete, specific, and human-oriented meanings. This is our general definition for basic meanings.

As a result, we will not check the history of each lexical unit as an integral part of our procedure. This is a huge practical advantage, which is based in general cognitive linguistic practice. Diachronic considerations of basic meanings may only come in when specific problems arise.

When attempting to find basic meanings in the dictionary, the following guidelines should be adopted.

1. A more basic sense has to be present for the relevant grammatical category of the word-form as it is used in context. This is because a grammatical category in a text specifies a particular class of concept and referent, which may not be altered when looking for basic meanings, for otherwise the basis of comparison is shifted. When the dictionary shows that a word may be used in more than one grammatical category, you hence have to examine the various meanings of the word within its grammatical category.

   Contextual and basic meanings are therefore contrasted as two alternative uses for the same word form in the particular grammatical role that it has in the text. As a result,

   a. the contextual meaning of nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and interjections cannot be compared with the
meaning of other word classes for the same lemma (conversions); for instance, the meaning of *shift* as a noun should be analysed irrespective of the meaning of *shift* as a verb.

b. the contextual meaning of verbs used as linking verbs, primary verbs, modal verbs, verbs initiating complex verb constructions such as *start, stop, continue, quit, keep,* and so on, causative verbs (*have, get,* and so on), and full verbs cannot be compared with the meaning of the same verbs used in other roles.

c. the contextual meaning of verbs used transitively can as a rule not be compared with the meaning of the same verbs used intransitively.

d. the contextual meaning of nouns used to designate countable entities can as a rule not be compared with the meaning of the same nouns used to designate uncountable entities.

However, there are a number of complications:

2. When a word may be used in more than one grammatical category, but its description in the dictionary is limited to one of those categories only, you inevitably have to compare the various meanings of the word in the other grammatical categories with reference to that one grammatical category. Example: the contextual and basic meanings of *suppression* have to be examined with reference to the description of *suppress.*

3. When verbs are described under a single sense description in the dictionary as both transitive and intransitive, then you may compare these transitive and intransitive meanings with each other in order to determine whether the contextual meaning may be differentiated from a more basic meaning in the same sense description.

4. Sometimes lexical units have an abstract contextual meaning that is general which has to be contrasted with a concrete meaning that is specialized, for instance because it is limited to a style (e.g., very [in]formal), a subject (business, computing, journalism, law, linguistics, medicine, science, and so on), or period (literary, old-fashioned). In that case, we abide by our general rule for finding basic senses and take the most concrete sense as basic, even if it is specialized. Example: the concrete medical sense of *palliate* is basic and the general abstract sense of *palliate* is therefore metaphorical.

5. The reverse of (4) also applies: when a lexical unit with an abstract but specialized contextual meaning has to be contrasted with a concrete but general meaning, we also take the concrete sense as basic. Example: the abstract religious sense of *father, mother,* and so on is not basic, whereas
the concrete general sense is. Therefore the religious senses are metaphorical.

6. When the contextual meaning of a lexical unit is just as abstract/concrete as some of its alternative meanings, we have to check whether there is any indication of the (original) domain from which the word derives. For instance, there are verbs such as trot and roar which may be applied with equal ease to a range of concrete entities, but the nonhuman, animal origin (basic sense) of the lexical units decides which applications are metaphorical and which are not.

7. However, other lexical units may have a less clear domain of origin, such as the verb ride. It is presented in the Macmillan dictionary as monosemous between animal and artefact. If we suspect that there is a problem with the dictionary description because of its function as an advanced learners’ dictionary, we check the evidence in a second advanced learners’ dictionary, Longman. For instance, the verb to groom does not have distinct senses for people and animals in Macmillan, but it does in Longman; as a result, we rely on Longman to conclude that the two senses are sufficiently distinct. By contrast, transform has one general sense in Macmillan, which is corroborated by the Longman dictionary.

3.4.3 Deciding about sufficient distinctness

Metaphorical meanings depend on a contrast between a contextual meaning and a more basic meaning. This suggests that the more basic meaning has to be sufficiently distinct from the contextual meaning for the latter to be seen as potentially participating in another semantic or conceptual domain. The following practical guideline should be followed: When a lexical unit has more than one separate, numbered sense description within its grammatical category, these senses are regarded as sufficiently distinct. When a lexical unit has only one numbered sense description within its grammatical category, this counts as the basic sense and any difference with the contextual sense of the item under investigation will count as sufficient distinctness (cf. Steen, Biernacka et al. 2010).

3.4.4 Deciding about the role of similarity

When you have two sufficiently distinct meanings of a lexical unit and one seems more basic than the other, these senses are potentially metaphorically related to each other when they display some form of similarity. This typically happens
because they capitalize on external or functional resemblances (attributes and relations) between the concepts they designate. It is immaterial whether these resemblances are highly schematic or fairly rich.

In deciding about a relation of similarity between the contextual and the basic sense of a lexical unit, the following practical guidelines should be followed:

1. When a lexical unit has a general and vague contextual sense which looks like a bleached, abstracted relation of a rather specific and concrete sense, you should mark the word as metaphorically used when the two senses are distinct enough and can be related via similarity. This is typically the case for senses that may be distinguished as concrete versus abstract. It should be noted that similarity is not the same as class-inclusion, as in the case of synecdoche. Thus, for *appeal* we have an abstract general sense and a more concrete but also specialized legal sense. If we decide that the latter is basic because it is more concrete, then the general sense of *appeal* is a case of generalization instead of similarity, and it can therefore be treated as a case of synecdoche instead of metaphor. This should be contrasted with a case like *palliate*, where we see both generalization and similarity based on metaphorical mapping from concrete (relieve physical pain) to abstract (relieve generally bad situations of their most serious aspects).

2. When a lexical unit has an abstract contextual sense and a sufficiently distinct, concrete more basic sense, but there does not seem to be a relation of similarity between the two even though there does seem to be *some* sort of relation, check the *Oxford English Dictionary* to deepen your understanding of the word. In such a case, the two senses may be historically related via a common source which may have disappeared from the language. Checking the *OED* may explain the strange relation between the current abstract and concrete senses and support the decision *not* to take the concrete sense as basic for the abstract sense, but instead to take both senses as equally basic because there is no transparent relation of similarity for the contemporary language user. We have seen this for a word like *order* (‘arrangement’ and ‘bringing about of order by speech act’).

3. When two senses appear to be metonymically related, this does not mean that you should not also consider the possibility that they are metaphorically related at the same time. Sense relations may have more than one motivation.
3.5 Direct use potentially explained by cross-domain mapping

Directly used lexical units that are related to metaphor are identified as follows:

1. Find local referent and topic shifts.
   ⇒ Good clues are provided by lexis which is “incongruous” (Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004) with the rest of the text.

2. Test whether the incongruous lexical units are to be integrated within the overall referential and/or topical framework by means of some form of comparison.
   ⇒ Good clues are provided by lexis which flags the need for some form of similarity or projection (Goatly 1997).

3. Test whether the comparison is nonliteral or cross-domain.
   ⇒ Cameron (2003: 74) suggests that we should include any comparison that is not obviously non-metaphorical, such as the campsite was like a holiday village. Consequently, whenever two concepts are compared and they can be constructed, in context, as somehow belonging to two distinct and contrasted domains, the comparison should be seen as expressing a cross-domain mapping. Cameron refers to these as two incongruous domains.

4. Test whether the comparison can be seen as some form of indirect discourse about the local or main referent or topic of the text.
   ⇒ A provisional sketch of a mapping between the incongruous material functioning as source domain on the one hand and elements from the co-text functioning as target domain on the other should be possible.

If the findings of tests 2, 3, and 4 are positive, then a word should be marked for direct metaphor (‘MRW: direct’).

3.6 Implicit meaning potentially explained by cross-domain mapping

The previous forms of metaphor were explicit in that there is at least one word in the discourse which comes from another semantic or conceptual domain. Implicit metaphor is different and does not have words that clearly stand out as coming from an alien domain. It comes in two forms, implicit metaphor by substitution and implicit metaphor by ellipsis. Following Halliday and Hasan (1976), metaphor by substitution works through pro-forms such as pronouns, and metaphor by ellipsis works through non-existent words which may be inserted into grammatical gaps.
Both types therefore do not exhibit ostensibly incongruous words, but still need to be analysed as the linguistic expression of metaphor in natural discourse.

When a discourse uses lexical units for the purpose of substitution and thereby still conveys a direct or indirect meaning that may be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or topic, insert a code for implicit metaphor (‘implicit’). An example is: ‘Naturally, to embark on such a step is not necessarily to succeed immediately in realising it’. Here step is related to metaphor, and it is a substitution for the notion of ‘step’ and hence receives a code for implicit metaphor (‘MRW: impl’).

When a text displays ellipsis and still conveys a direct or indirect meaning that may be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning or referent than the contextual meaning recoverable from the presumably understood lexical units, insert a code for implicit metaphor (‘implicit’). An example is but he is, which may be read as but he is [an ignorant pig], when that expression is taken as a description of a male colleague discussed before. The verb is may be coded as a place filler by the code <MRW: impl>.

In general, for implicit metaphor, we need one linguistic element of cohesion (which means substitution or ellipsis, including what Halliday and Hasan call ‘reference’) that is not necessarily metaphorical by itself but refers back to a previous word and concept that was metaphorically used. Potential elements of cohesion include third person pronouns, primary and modal verbs, and so on.

⇒ The first step in finding implicit metaphor will therefore be to decide whether a particular linguistic form from a list of potentially cohesive devices has in fact been used for cohesion as opposed to another function.

⇒ The second step is to decide whether the cohesion device is related to another word that was related to metaphor.

In principle it is possible for both demonstratives as well as general words such as thing and stuff to refer back to a metaphorically used expression. In that case, they are both indirectly metaphorical (because of their linguistic status) as well as implicitly metaphorical (because of their connection to a metaphorical concept in the text base). For this type of case we should add a code which combines ‘met’ with ‘impl’: ‘metimpl’.

Finally, tag questions within the same utterance are not included in our view of cohesion. They are grammatical forms enabling a particular form of asking a question. There is no alternative where the pro-forms in the tag could be replaced by full NPs or VPs. This is why these are not part of cohesion. (However, when parts of utterances are repeated by subsequent speakers in order to ask or confirm or deny what the preceding speaker said, these are core cases of cohesion.)
3.7 Signals of potential cross-domain mappings

Lexical signals of cross-domain mappings are those words which alert the language user to the fact that some form of contrast or comparison is at play (cf. Goatly 1997).

1. We focus on potential markers of simile and analogy and so on, such as *like, as, more, less, more/less ... than*, comparative case plus *than*, and so on. But we also include more substantial lexical markers such as *compare, comparison, comparative; same, similar; analogy, analogue*; and so on. Complex mental conception markers are also annotated as metaphor signals; they include *regard as, conceive of, see as; imagine, think, talk, behave as if* and so on; or simply *as if*. All of these lexical units are coded with ‘MFlag’.

2. We exclude more general signals of all indirectness, such as *sort of, kind of*, and so on, since it is not always clear that they signal metaphoricity or other aspects of discourse. We have also excluded what Goatly (1997) calls topic domain signalling, such as *intellectual stagnation*, since its nature and demarcation were not clear from the beginning of the project.

3.8 New-formations and parts that may be potentially explained by cross-domain mapping

We assume that new-formations, such as *honey-hunting* discussed above, have to be analysed as if they were phrases consisting of more than one lexical unit: each part of such new lexical units activates a concept and relates to a distinct referent in the discourse, which both have to be checked for metaphor. As a result, we sometimes have to mark parts of lexical units (morphemes) as indicating metaphorical meaning.

The guidelines for finding metaphor-related words in new-formations are a variant on the basic procedure for finding all metaphor-related lexical units described in Section 3.2.

1. Find metaphor-related words in new-formations by going through the text on a word-by-word basis and identifying all new-formations.

⇒ A new-formation is a complex lexical unit consisting of at least one independent lexical unit which, as a whole, is not defined in the dictionary.
⇒ A special group is formed by specialized technical and scientific terms which may be missing from the regular dictionary but may therefore be seen as new- formations for the general language user.

2. When a lexical unit in a new-formation is used indirectly and its meaning in the discourse may be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping, mark the word as related to metaphor (MRW, indirect).
⇒ If you are not sure about indirect word use that is explained by cross-domain mapping, go to Section 3.4.

3. When a lexical unit in a new-formation is used directly and its meaning may be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping, mark the word as direct metaphor (MRW, direct).
⇒ If you are not sure about direct use of lexical units that is explained by cross-domain mapping, go to Section 3.5.

4. When a lexical unit in a new-formation implicitly conveys a direct or indirect meaning that may be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping, insert a code for implicit metaphor (‘implicit’).
⇒ If you are not sure about implicit indirect meaning that is explained by cross-domain mapping, go to Section 3.6.

5. When a lexical unit in a new-formation functions as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, mark it as a metaphor flag (‘MFlag’).
⇒ If you are not sure about signals of cross-domain mappings, go to Section 3.7.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the complete MIPVU procedure, which formed the basis for the studies of the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction to be reported in Chapters 5 and 6, as well as for the empirical investigation of the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations of personification in fiction, which will be presented in Chapters 7 and 8.

The MIPVU procedure includes a number of specifications and additions to the original MIP. While MIP identifies metaphorically used words on the basis of indirect meaning, MIPVU was extended to allow for the identification for other forms of metaphor in discourse, namely direct expressions of metaphor (such as similes and analogies) and implicit expressions of metaphor (via substitution or ellipsis). In addition, MIPVU also includes the annotation of lexical units that signal direct metaphors, the so-called MFlags. New categories were also created to
include borderline cases (‘WIDLII’), and possible personifications (‘PP’), and to exclude cases where no contextual meaning could be determined (‘DFMA’). MIPVU also formulated explicit guidelines on how to determine what counts as a lexical unit (e.g., polywords, phrasal verbs, compound nouns), how to use the dictionary to establish contextual and basic meanings, and how to determine what counts as sufficient distinctness. As discussed in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b), the application of MIPVU to a corpus of 190,000 words of contemporary English and 100,000 words of Dutch news texts and conversations yielded reliable results and produced an instrument that will hopefully be considered a useful and relatively easy to use tool for the identification of metaphor in discourse.

Chapter 4 will now demonstrate the application of MIPVU to fiction and discuss a number of additions and specifications to MIPVU that proved central to the analysis of metaphor in naturally-occurring discourse. Reliability figures for the annotation of fiction on the basis of MIPVU will also be provided in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

The application of MIPVU to fiction

It was raining intermittently all the time they were in the cemetery, the pines bowing and shivering in the wind.
(BNC-Baby: CDB)

An earlier version of this chapter has previously been published as Chapter 5 of Steen, Dorst, Herrmann, Kaal, Krennmayr and Pasma (2010).
4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the MIPVU procedure, which was used in the Metaphor in Discourse project to annotate some 190,000 words of contemporary English from four different registers (academic discourse, conversation, fiction, news). As mentioned previously, MIPVU is an extended and refined version of the original MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007). During the application of MIP in the Metaphor in Discourse project, several difficulties were encountered and the MIPVU was formulated to resolve these issues and offer further refinements and additions. The current chapter will first demonstrate a number of additions and specifications of MIPVU that are most relevant to linguistic metaphor identification in fiction. After this discussion, Section 4.3 will demonstrate the application of MIPVU to an excerpt from one of the fiction files in the corpus, illustrating the refinements and additions that were discussed in Section 4.2. Section 4.4 offers a discussion of issues concerning the reliability of the procedure and provides an overview of the reliability testing carried out for the annotation of the fiction sample in the project. This will provide insight into the validity and reliability of the annotations that form the basis for the analyses presented in the remainder of this thesis. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a general discussion. The following chapter will then present a quantitative analysis of the results of the application of MIPVU in the project, demonstrating the frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words in fiction.

4.2 Additions and specifications in MIPVU

This section will focus on a number of the additions and specifications to MIPVU that played an important role in the annotation of fiction. These additions and specifications relate to the following phenomena: character descriptions (Section 4.2.1), similes and other figurative comparisons (Section 4.2.2), personification (Section 4.2.3), character names (Section 4.2.4), and cultural references (Section 4.2.5).

4.2.1 Character descriptions and the boundary between concrete and abstract

One of the main functions of fiction is to create a story world and to describe the characters, their behaviour and their surroundings as convincingly as possible. In
relation to the nature of realistic fiction, Leech and Short (2007) discuss two main features that play an essential role in its style, namely verisimilitude and credibility. Verisimilitude concerns the aim of realistic fiction to give us the illusion that we are in the ‘presence of actual individual things, events, people and places’ (p. 126), while credibility pertains to ‘the likelihood, and hence believability, of the fiction as a “potential reality”, given that we apply our expectations and inferences about the real world to fictional happenings’ (p. 127). When verisimilitude and credibility are the main forces driving the description of what certain characters look like, where they are, and what they are doing, this could result in a less metaphorical style, as too many metaphors may make the distortion of reality too obvious.

The expectation that realistic fiction would use metaphors sparingly is in line with the claim by Lodge (1977) that prose is essentially metonymic in nature while poetry is essentially metaphoric. In addition, Lodge argues that within prose, realism is at the metonymy end of the scale while Romanticism and symbolism are at the metaphor end. With regard to realistic fiction he argues that (p. 113):

[w]e would expect the writer who is working in the metonymic mode to use metaphorical devices sparingly; to make them subject to the control of context – either by elaborating literal details of the context into symbols, or by drawing analogies from a semantic field associated with the context.

These observations concerning the nature of fiction can be illustrated by comparing the following character descriptions from the fiction sample:

(1) Claudia Cohn-Casson is sitting under an enormous African fig tree nearby, at a camp table spread with a Somali cloth. She has in front of her a typewriter, her recorder and her notes. A servant is preparing lunch on a fire. Claudia hears something. She looks up into the sky in the direction of Ol Doinyo Lengai. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)

(2) Paula's bag and shoes were patent black leather, her gloves white, and she carried a long walking umbrella neatly furled in its fur-trimmed case. Perfectly groomed from head to toe and with all that assurance, she was ready to take on the world, Arlene thought with satisfaction, for she looked on Paula as her very own creation. The raw materials might have been there before indeed, hadn't it been she, Arlene, who had spotted them? But the transformation of a leggy young filly into a sleekly beautiful racehorse had been her doing. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

In the first fragment the reader is only presented with physical descriptions of the character and her surroundings. In this fragment no words were coded as metaphorically used. In the second fragment, however, there is a shift from physical description and relatively objective observation to mental processes,
interpretation and subjective evaluation. This shift corresponds with an increase in the number of metaphorically used words towards the end of the fragment, such as raw materials, filly and racehorse.

These examples illustrate that as soon as a text moves beyond a realistic physical description and seeks to describe mental states and psychological developments, to explain causes and consequences, or to provide personal insights or evaluations, then it is likely that the number of metaphorically used words will increase, since there is a transition from the world of concrete, physical objects and actions to the realm of emotions, feelings, evaluations and thoughts. Though there may of course be great differences in personal style between texts and authors, and some authors may prefer a more metaphorical style than others, it may well be that in realistic fiction authors may try to avoid too complex a metaphorical style. Some may even play with a literal versus a metaphorical style, as has been observed for Salman Rushdie by Heywood et al. (2002), or use different styles for different characters so that some characters will use many metaphors while others hardly any, as noted by Semino and Swindlehurst (1996) in the case of Ken Kesey’s One flew over the cuckoo’s nest.

Leech and Short (2007: 122) also point out that it is important to realize that ‘whenever a writer uses language, he seizes on some features of “reality” which are crucial for his purpose and disregards others’. Writers can never describe everything completely; they have to decide which information to include and which to leave out. This means that they have to consciously select how to describe people and places by foregrounding certain features while ignoring others. To enhance the illusion of reality, writers often try to create an image that is as vivid and rich as possible. This ties in with the issue of descriptive focus and the choice between descriptions of concrete physical properties or abstract mental and social properties. Since physical features are often linked to mental or emotional features in character descriptions, thereby blurring the boundary between concrete and abstract, it is sometimes difficult to decide what the exact contextual meaning of a lexical unit is.

These difficulties are particularly striking in the analysis of prepositions, as is illustrated by the following example from one of the reliability tests for fiction. The numbers between brackets indicate the number of analysts out of a total of four that marked the word as related to metaphor.

(3) Even in [4] physique they were very much alike, both being thick in [2] the shoulders and almost of the same colouring […]. (BNC-Baby: CFY)

In these examples there are two physical descriptions, namely in physique and in the shoulders, yet the first in has unanimously been marked as metaphorically used,
while the second in was marked by only two of the four analysts. Although the word *physique* itself clearly refers to a person’s physical make-up, all four analysts have apparently interpreted *in physique* as denoting an abstract state rather than a concrete location, so *in* here has the contextual meaning ‘used for describing a particular state, situation, or relationship’ (*Macmillan* sense 7) rather than its basic meaning ‘used for showing where someone or something is; inside a container, room, building, vehicle’ (*Macmillan* sense 1).

Part of the difficulty lies in deciding in what way the concreteness of the noun following the preposition determines whether *in* is still used non-metaphorically. In this case *in physique* has been treated similarly to the following example from the same text.

(4) It was only when you looked at their faces that you saw the difference in [4] both age and expression. (BNC-Baby: CFY)

Here *difference in age* clearly denotes an abstract state, not a physical location, but the coordinated noun *expression* – like *physique* – refers to an abstract concept that manifests itself physically: ‘a look on someone's face that shows what their thoughts or feelings are’ (*Macmillan* sense 2). This would suggest that though *in* is clearly metaphorically used in relation to *age*, it is less clearly so in relation to *expression*. For *in the shoulders* in example (3) this situation is even more complicated: *shoulders* is a physical location, but the expression *in the shoulders* does not seem to express a state of physical containment. This makes it hard to decide which contextual meaning of *in* is being used. This is probably the reason why two analysts still chose to code *in* as metaphorically used.

Two further examples from the same text (BNC-Baby: CFY) make clear that finding a distinct contextual meaning can still leave room for slight differences in application:

(5) There was now no difference in [4] their height although Harry was twenty-one and Joe sixteen.
(6) […] and his grey eyes, which at times seemed colourless, had in [2] their depths a touch of melancholy that had deepened with the years.

In this case *Macmillan* offers a separate appropriate contextual meaning for *in*: ‘in length/width/height/area etc. used when showing measurements’ (sense 5). Yet apparently the two examples do not work exactly the same way, since *in* has received four votes in example (5) and only two in example (6). In example (5) the analysts apparently agree that *height* denotes an abstract state of measurement, but in example (6) they seem to have had difficulties in deciding whether this is concrete or abstract, though *depth* is equally abstract as *height*. This difficulty is
most likely caused by the presence of the concrete concept *eyes*, which makes it difficult to decide whether *in* should be related purely to the abstract notion of *depth* or whether it metonymically applies to *eyes* and is therefore related to a physical location rather than an abstract state. This is further complicated by the presence of the abstract concept *melancholy*, since an abstract concept cannot be physically contained in something.

When compared to the following example from the same text, it is clear that a metonymic reading can sometimes take clear precedence:

(7) Joe started when Harry's elbow caught him in [0] the ribs as he said [...].

Here the annotation of *in* apparently did not raise any problems and was taken to indicate concrete containment in a concrete physical location, even though this may not be complete three-dimensional containment.

The methodological point these examples illustrate is that deciding whether these prepositions are related to metaphor is no simple matter. The problem is not automatically solved by determining whether the noun following the preposition is concrete, since *shoulders* is equally physical and concrete as *ribs*, and yet *in the shoulders* was marked as being related to metaphor while *in the ribs* was not. This suggests that the concept preceding the preposition also plays a role, which would explain why *difference in height* is more evidently metaphorical than *thick in the shoulders*, which in turn is more clearly metaphorical than *elbow in the ribs*. However, *melancholy in their [= eyes] depths* was marked by only two analysts, signalling that even with abstract nouns preceding and following the preposition, the situation is not necessarily clear.

This analysis shows that this issue cannot be resolved solely by consulting the sense descriptions in the dictionary; an analysis of the relationship between words, concepts, and referents in the text world is also required. This is of course precisely what the very first instruction of MIP and MIPVU aims to guarantee: ‘Read the entire text/discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.’ Given that framework, the following observations may be formulated by way of conclusion:

• Since the preposition *in* in its basic sense denotes a spatial relation between concrete objects, it follows that both concepts would have to be concrete for a prototypical *in*-relation to exist. In the case of *in the ribs* there seems to be at least a sense of two-dimensional containment, indicating a scenario in which one concrete object makes physical contact with or penetrates another concrete object and is therefore momentarily contained by that object.
• As for abstract concepts such as *height*, *length*, and *depth*, the analyst must take into account that the abstract notions of measurement manifest themselves concretely via the physical objects they apply to. They are therefore often interpreted as being concrete via metonymic inferencing, though it is the object the measurement applies to that is concrete, not the measurement itself. This may entail that if the object the measurement applies to is mentioned explicitly in the preceding text (as was the case for *eyes + depths*), the metonymic interpretation of *depth* becomes so foregrounded that *in their depths* is interpreted as concrete; when *in their depths* is interpreted as *in the depths of his eyes*, the concrete containment sense becomes foregrounded as the contextual meaning.

• Naturally it is also relevant whether the perceived object is concrete, since *he had a tear in his eye* is more concrete than *he had a touch of melancholy in his eye*, though people may feel that both situations are visually perceivable.

In order to streamline the annotation of such prepositions (and other words) that seem to be in a kind of no man’s land between concrete and abstract, MIPVU added the additional code WIDLII, which stands for When In Doubt, Leave It In. To reiterate, this allows analysts to mark the preposition as metaphorically used while at the same time indicating that its metaphorical status is unclear, and that the application of the procedure was not straightforward for this particular lexical item. This means that rather than a binary distinction between words that are not related to metaphor and words that are related to metaphor (as in MIP), MIPVU employs a three-way distinction between words that are clearly not related to metaphor (non-MRW), words that clearly are related to metaphor (clear MRW), and words that are borderline cases (i.e. borderline MRW). It should be pointed out that while the code “WIDLII” was used during the annotation process, this thesis will refer to the WIDLII cases as “borderline MRWs” for the sake of clarity of terminology and to facilitate the comparison between “clear MRWs” and “borderline MRWs”. Though it is a general property of prepositions that they may blur the boundary between concrete and abstract uses, their role in character descriptions in fiction often relates to the combination of physical description with abstract qualities, combining physical characteristics with emotional and psychological states.
4.2.2 Similes and the issue of linguistic metaphor based on direct meaning

The theoretical basis of both MIP and MIPVU is the global assumption of a one-to-one correspondence between words, concepts and referents. The words on the page evoke concepts, and these concepts in turn designate referents in the projected text world. In MIP, metaphorically used words are then identified on the basis of referential incongruity: words are marked as metaphorically used when they activate concepts that indirectly designate their presumed referents, which is then to be resolved by a comparison with the more appropriate referent. It should of course be noted that this is a technical reconstruction, as readers are typically not aware of this when encountering conventional metaphors. Moreover, it is debatable whether such metaphors are always understood via accessing the corresponding source domains.

However, the *Metaphor in Discourse* project also wished to take on board another form of metaphor in discourse which appeared to be relatively more frequent and important in the analysis of fiction, namely directly expressed metaphor in the form of similes and figurative comparisons (the frequency of direct metaphor in fiction will be discussed in Chapter 5). These expressions are considered “direct” since the words on the page activate concepts that refer directly to their referents in the text world, that is, the source domain terms are used directly (“literally”) at the linguistic level. An identification procedure that is based on detecting indirect meaning - such as MIP – cannot deal with such manifestations of metaphor in discourse, for in simile there is no referential incongruity. However, direct expressions of metaphor do introduce a new local source domain that has to be incorporated into the surrounding target-domain discourse (Steen 2007).

This phenomenon is illustrated by the following two examples from another reliability test for fiction. Italics have been added to signal the simile; only the words of the simile are taken into account in the analysis below.

(8) Sara was undressed and ready for bed but Jenny was fully clothed, moving about the room in her harlequin dress like some angry restless dragonfly. (BNC-Baby: J54)
(9) “He’s like a favourite old coat.” (BNC-Baby: J54)

In terms of establishing the relevant contextual and basic meanings of the lexical units *dragonfly* and *coat*, the following analysis can be given based on the sense descriptions found in the *Macmillan* dictionary.
DRAGONFLY (noun)

**Contextual meaning:** ‘an insect with a long narrow brightly coloured body and two pairs of transparent wings’ (monosemous in *Macmillan*)

**Basic meaning:** ‘an insect with a long narrow brightly coloured body and two pairs of transparent wings’ (monosemous in *Macmillan*)

**Sufficiently distinct:** No. The contextual and basic meaning are not sufficiently distinct and cannot be contrasted since they are the same.

**Comparison:** No. The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning.

COAT (noun)

**Contextual meaning:** ‘a piece of clothing with long sleeves that you wear over your other clothes when you go outside’ (*Macmillan* sense 1)

**Basic meaning:** ‘a piece of clothing with long sleeves that you wear over your other clothes when you go outside’ (*Macmillan* sense 1)

**Sufficiently distinct:** No. The contextual and basic meaning are not sufficiently distinct and cannot be contrasted since they are the same.

**Comparison:** No. The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning.

Both *dragonfly* and *coat* evoke concepts that directly designate their referents in the text world. This means that for both *dragonfly* and *coat* the conclusion of the application of MIP would be that these lexical units are not metaphorically used since there is no contrast or comparison between the contextual and basic meaning. However, it is also clear that both lexical units do set up a cross-domain comparison—*dragonfly* between a person and a dragonfly, *coat* between a person and a coat—by introducing an incongruous local referent into the discourse. The difference is that the words *dragonfly* and *coat* themselves are not used indirectly. The cross-domain mapping occurs in conceptual structure, and is expressed directly at the level of linguistic form. Moreover, such directly expressed metaphors are often—though not necessarily—explicitly signalled by the use of words such as *like, as a, seem, appear*, and so on (for an extensive overview, see *Goatly 1997*).

Though such lexical units are not metaphorically used themselves, they are related to metaphor. In order not to lose these directly expressed metaphors and their signals, MIPVU has extended MIP to be able to take these other manifestations of metaphor in discourse on board. In MIPVU, lexical units that directly express metaphors are coded as being metaphor-related words of the type “direct” (i.e. direct MRW), while indirectly expressed metaphors as identified by MIP are coded as being metaphor-related words of the type “indirect” (i.e. indirect MRW). The lexical signals that often occur together with directly expressed metaphors are also included in the annotations; they are coded as being metaphor-related words of the type “MFlag”, which indicates that the word “flags”, or
signals, the presence of direct metaphor-related words. As pointed out in the previous chapter, MIPVU did not consider as related to metaphor what Goatly (1997) calls topic domain signalling, as in ‘political dynamite’ or ‘emotional somersaults’.

There are, however, other issues that crop up as a result of the inclusion of similes and other direct forms of metaphor. The first issue is that of scope, i.e. which words should be regarded as belonging to the simile. In example (4), it is clear that the linguistic simile is *like some angry restless dragonfly*. However, the question arises whether all of the words inside the expression do in fact belong to the source domain; that is, do *angry* and *restless* belong to the source domain of *dragonfly*, or do they belong to the target domain of *Jenny*, or possibly even to both domains simultaneously? This kind of layering could be argued for *angry* and *restless* in example (4), where *angry* and *restless* may be seen to be part of the conceptual domain of humans. This projection of human behaviour and emotions onto the dragonfly would entail that *angry* and *restless* could be considered as being metaphorically used inside the simile in relation to *dragonfly*.

Since MIP and MIPVU are primarily concerned with the linguistic level of metaphor analysis, not the conceptual level, one way to resolve this issue is by taking into account syntax and punctuation. In this case, *angry* and *restless* occur after the metaphor flag (*like*) introducing the source domain as premodifiers to the most important word in the simile, i.e. *dragonfly*. Thus, *angry* and *restless* would be coded as belonging to the linguistic simile and therefore as part of the source domain (metaphor-related words of the type “direct”). Comments can then be added to the annotations that *angry* and *restless* are potentially metaphorical within the simile. This issue will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

Another issue regarding the analysis of similes is the question whether the comparison is in fact metaphorical rather than literal, since the word *like* can also indicate literal similarity. This has often been noted, for instance by Searle (1993), who speaks of ‘literal similes’ and ‘metaphorical similes’, and by Croft and Cruse (2004), who make a distinction between ‘similes proper’ and ‘statements of similarity’. The underlying problem is whether the domains that are being compared are in fact distinct enough to allow for classification as a mapping between domains (see also Low 2010). In analysing authentic discourse, it is not always easy to draw a line between literal similarity and metaphorical similarity, especially when physical appearance or other sensory influences are involved. Low (2010) notes that descriptions marked with *feel like* can be used to describe a physical stimulus or suggest a comparison, and that the comparisons with *feel like* ‘seemed to move in and out of metaphoricity’ (2010: 299).

This is illustrated by the following example taken from reliability test BNC-Baby: J54 (italics added).
(10) “Jenny, I don’t want to sound like an old auntie, but you are not being very sensible about Matthew.” (reliability test J54)

During reliability testing, two analysts argued this was a literal comparison and two said it was a metaphorical comparison. Emphasis on the commonality between the speaker and any old auntie, that they are human, might make the comparison non-metaphorical; but focus on the different social roles of the speaker as a friend and old aunties as stereotypical givers of unwanted advice makes it possible to distinguish between two domains, where the speaker is conceptualized in another—metaphorical—role. This decision is further complicated due to the fact that the verb sound can be taken as a linking verb meaning ‘to seem good, bad, interesting, exciting etc. based on what you have heard, read, or know’ (Macmillan sense 1) or as a full verb meaning ‘to produce a sound’ (Macmillan sense 2). The question is then whether actual sound has to be involved, or whether the focus is on the content of what is being said. In any case, at the linguistic level it can be concluded that these lexical units are potentially involved in a directly expressed metaphor. The exact nature of the mapping would have to be determined during subsequent conceptual analysis.

At the conceptual level, this problem can potentially be resolved by turning to the idea of an “image mapping” (Lakoff and Turner 1989), or rather a “sound mapping” in this case. Image mappings are metaphors based on comparison regarding physical appearance, as is also illustrated by the following examples from the fiction corpus (italics added):

(11) Delaney took risks, plummeting feet first through the hatchways, and partly breaking his descent with the handrails, falling like a parachutist, rolling instantly deploying his Uzi. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
(12) You wouldn't have recognized him, he looked like John the Baptist. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

We can say that example (11) involves an image mapping in which Delaney’s falling is compared to a parachutist’s falling, with parachutist introducing an incongruous local referent; the resulting cross-domain comparison between Delaney and a parachutist provides the reader with a vivid visualization of the manner in which Delaney was falling. Example (12) can be said to involve a cross-domain comparison between the target domain of modern people and the source domain of biblical people. The result of the comparison is an image mapping that yields a visualization of the physical appearance of the character, i.e. what his hair, beard and clothes look like. By having the reader retrieve this information indirectly via a comparison with a biblical person, the exact nature of his
appearance and any inferences to be drawn about the attitude to be taken towards this appearance are left implicit.

The methodological question remains, however, whether such examples are concerned with literal or metaphorical external resemblance, and whether the two domains are distinct enough to be compared. In such cases MIPVU follows Cameron (2003) in saying that two distinct and ‘incongruous domains’, however weak, should be considered as expressing a cross-domain mapping. By taking on board directly expressed forms of metaphor, the boundary between linguistic and conceptual analysis becomes somewhat blurred, since lexical units involved in directly expressed metaphors do not exhibit the same clear contrast between basic and contextual senses (Kaal and Dorst in press). This supports the idea that metaphoricity is a continuum rather than an absolute binary opposition. Applying a procedure such as MIPVU means deciding where to draw the line on this continuum, rather than deciding on the basis of inherent qualities that the words do or do not possess. Nevertheless, in direct expressions of metaphor the topical incongruity of lexical items can serve as a basis for deciding whether these lexical units are related to metaphor. During linguistic metaphor analysis, such examples can be retained as potentially related to metaphor, with the exact nature of the mapping to be determined during subsequent analyses. Other issues related to the annotation and analysis of directly expressed metaphor in fiction will be discussed in the following chapter.

4.2.3 Personification and the interaction between metaphor and metonymy

Though personification is often discussed in cognitive metaphor studies in relation to ontological metaphors and to illustrate the difference between metaphor and metonymy (e.g., Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989), its manifestation in naturally-occurring discourse has not been analysed systematically. Nevertheless, the pervasiveness of personification in authentic discourse has been noted (e.g., Cameron and Low 2004; Low 1999; Low et al. 2008; Semino 2008), and some issues involved in its identification have been pointed out (Low 1999). During the annotation process, it became clear that the identification of personifications proved problematic to the procedure as the personifications took many different forms, which differed in their conventionality, referential function and interaction with metonymy.

The analysis of the many forms and functions of personification in fiction turned out to be such a complex and rich matter that two separate chapters in this 134
thesis will be devoted to it. The linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of personification in fiction will be discussed in Chapter 7. The recognition of personifications in fiction by non-expert readers will be the main interest of the empirical study reported in Chapter 8. This section will briefly touch upon one specific issue concerning personification that resulted in an addition to the MIPVU, namely the interaction between metaphor and metonymy.

The issue of the interaction between metaphor and metonymy in many potential cases of personification in discourse can be illustrated by the following examples from fiction:

(13) ‘It's just a friendly letter, asking how you are. (BNC-Baby: FPB)
(14) Valentine's Day brought two happy events. (BNC-Baby: FPB)

In these examples, the adjectives friendly and happy and the verb asking have contextual meanings that may be taken as either related to metaphor or not. They can be analysed as related to metaphor when they are considered to personify the inanimate nouns letter and events. However, they can also be resolved by a metonymic interpretation, in which happy events are events that make people happy and the letter was written by a person with friendly intentions who wrote this letter to ask how she is doing. If letter and events are first resolved via metonymy then friendly, asking and happy can be considered not related to metaphor. In such cases, MIPVU did not want to disregard the linguistic potential for personification that is present in the use of such adjectives and verbs. Though they may normally not be intended as personifications or understood as personifications, the words do have this linguistic potential, which can be exploited in, for instance, word play or cartoons. MIPVU maintained that the possibility of the metaphorical interpretation at the linguistic level should not be lost, and therefore annotated such ambiguous cases as metaphor-related words, with the addition of the code “PP”, standing for “possible personification”.

This issue of ambiguity between a metaphorical and metonymic interpretation is even more clearly visible in one specific type of personification in fiction, namely in character descriptions that present an action or quality by focussing on a specific body part rather than the character as a whole. This phenomenon is illustrated by the examples below.

(15) Their tense, edgy faces watched Delaney closely. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
(16) They reached the main deck, dropping down in a defensive posture, eyes searching the stacked containers. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
Such examples are of course highly metonymic, since *faces* are used for *watching* and *eyes* are used for *searching*. But metonymy is not a necessary condition for such descriptions:

(17) His *gaze* came back to George, still sprawled over the control desk. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
(18) Paula's *stomach* turned a somersault. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

In examples (17) and (18) there is no such metonymy involved since *gazes* are not used for *coming back* and *stomachs* are not used for *turning somersaults*. In these cases the action is therefore more evidently attributed to the body part itself, not to the character to which the body part belongs. There also appears to be a difference in conventionality and deliberateness between the two cases, with (18) appearing to be a more deliberate example of personification than (17).

A detailed discussion of these examples will be provided in Chapter 7, but for now suffice it to say that such examples can be seen as exploiting the possibility of an ambiguous interpretation between metaphor (personification of the body part) and metonymy (body part standing for person). This phenomenon has also been noted by Goossens (2002), who argued that some cases involve ‘metaphtonomy’ and others ‘metaphor from metonymy’. The attribution of actions and qualities to body parts rather than to people and its role in making the narrative in novels more active and immediate has been noted by Leech and Short (2007). They point out that assigning agency to body parts can be done to suggest that the body part is acting on its own, sometimes even against the wishes of the character. In MIPVU the additional code “possible personification” was therefore adopted to make these instances of metaphor based on a possible personification interpretation easier to retrieve.

4.2.4 The analysis of proper names in fiction

One issue that seemed particularly relevant when analysing fiction was the analysis of proper names. When names such as *Freeman, Breakspear, Carpenter* or *Black* are encountered in a news report or academic article, they would normally not be analysed for metaphorical usage since they are simply people’s actual names in the real world. It can be argued that these names have been used in a purely referential function, indicating a specific referent in the text world describing the real world. There seems to be no reason to look up ‘carpenter’ in the dictionary and ask ourselves whether this word has been used metaphorically when a news report
reads that ‘John Carpenter announced that a new tax law will be passed today’. This point is also made by Lodge (1966: 45), who argues that:

In life, our surnames are determined by chance, our Christian names by our parents: in both cases we have no control over the names. […] Thus we do not expect to find any correspondence between a person’s name and a person’s character, and if some such correspondence does strike us we feel that in some freakish way art has trespassed into life.

In fiction, however, analysts (and readers) are far more likely to consider the semantic content of characters’ names since it is common knowledge that authors often choose these names deliberately to reflect a character’s personality or to signal symbolic meanings. These names often have a semantic function and the semantics of the name can be exploited in the text. The same principle applies to the names of companies, products, books, films, objects, etc. If an academic article mentions that Sylvia Plath’s novel The Bell Jar was published in 1963, the name of the book would probably not be analysed for metaphorical usage, but when the book itself is analysed then the meaning of the title will probably be considered in light of the content of the book and the possibility that the ‘bell jar’ is a metaphor for something else. To quote Lodge (1966: 45) again:

In the fictional world, however, characters rise up before the mind of the artist and, like Adam, he has to name them. Novelists respond to this task in different ways: some delight in the possibilities of symbolic names, while others see an unobtrusive ordinariness in their names. But even in the latter case a process of selection has taken place, one out of innumerable possibilities has been chosen, and the only possible motive for the ultimate choice is an aesthetic one.

One question that arises in light of this possibility of analysing proper names for their semantic function is whether each and every instance of the name should then be taken into consideration. Consider the following examples from a novel describing different boats (relevant names in italics):

(19) We decided that Masquerade would sail from the Bahamas to Panama, and thence to the Galapagos where we would find Darwin's giant tortoises. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
(20) She was moving back on board Wavebreaker in preparation for the next day's early departure. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
(21) This boat was called Dream Baby, and she was clearly an expensive infant for rods and whip-aerials and outriggers splayed from her upperworks like the antennae of some outlandish insect. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
(22) She swung lithely down to Dream Baby’s gaudily painted deck and cushioned the two hulls. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
All three of the names – Masquerade, Wavebreaker, Dream Baby – are obvious candidates for a semantic analysis, but only in the third example does the author seem to invite the reader to consider the meaning of the name by adding the description ‘she was clearly an expensive infant’. The metaphorical use of infant draws attention – in retrospect – to the meaning of the word Baby and its application to the boat. In the other examples, however, the names seem to have been used purely in their referential function. The methodological issue at stake is whether each and every instance of a name like Dream Baby should be counted as a linguistic metaphor regardless of its usage in a specific context, or whether only those instances in which the context indicates that a semantic analysis is validated should be taken on board.

The same principle also applies to the use of nicknames. Both in fictional worlds and the real world nicknames are used to say something about people’s personalities, making them prime candidates for metaphor analysis. Yet even though their semantic content is often clearly metaphorical, the question remains whether each individual occurrence should automatically be counted as a linguistic metaphor. Consider the nicknames in examples (23)-(24) (italics added):

(23)“He's precisely what anyone would expect of a drop-out Phys Ed basketball-playing retard,” Ellen said scornfully, “by which I mean that he's a jock with the brains of a dung beetle. He reminds me of your Neanderthal friend, the Maggot, except Rickie is a great deal more handsome.” (BNC-Baby: CCW)

(24)But at least, he thought as he gave a final wave, she hadn't asked him whether he had come to Norfolk to help catch the Whistler. (BNC-Baby: C8T)

In the first example the reader’s attention is drawn to the meaning of the nickname ‘the Maggot’ by the preceding metaphor ‘brains of a dung beetle’. In the second example, however, the meaning of the nickname and its relation to the character, though obvious, are not relevant to the meaning of the sentence.

Considering the high number of occurrences that such proper names and nicknames will have in fiction the decision whether or not to analyse such names for metaphor usage will considerably influence the number of metaphorically used words in a text and their type/token ratio. Following Sperber and Wilson (1981; Wilson and Sperber 1992) a distinction was therefore made between ‘use’ and ‘mention’ and proper names were only considered for metaphor analysis when there were clear indications in the context that these names were used in terms of their semantic content and not merely mentioned for referential purposes.
4.2.5 The analysis of cultural references in fiction

Another issue that can become problematic during linguistic analysis is the occurrence of intertextual and cultural references and allusions. As Heywood et al. (2002: 42) point out: “intertextual allusion can thus, on some (but not all) occasions, provide additional schemas which can give rise to metaphorical readings”. This situation becomes particularly complicated for metaphor analysts working on the basis of a method like MIP or MIPVU when such references have been conventionalized in the dictionary. In fiction, such cultural references appear to be quite common. Consider the following example (relevant parts in italics):

(25) The speed of descent must have cut down the exposure to any residual gas since he felt none of the earlier weirdness as he approached the still sealed engine room door. *Pandora's Box*. (BNC-Baby: BPA)

(26) Apart from the last one which he hadn't got to yet and the penultimate one which seemed to apply in America more than here (here he had joined the golf club) he had complied with all the rest. Or his nature and luck had complied for him. *Nemesis had still come down like the wolf on the fold*. He had not wanted to come back here. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

*Macmillan* gives a separate entry for *Pandora’s Box* with the following sense description: ‘something that could cause a lot of problems if you do it, use it, or say it’. Checking *Longman* for a second opinion also yields a separate entry with one sense description: ‘*open a Pandora’s box* to do or start something that will cause a lot of other problems’. This means that in both of these dictionaries only the derived abstracted meaning is given, without any explanation of the original source domain. Based on a method such as the MIP this entails that ‘Pandora’s Box’ in the example above is not a metaphorically used lexical unit since there is no more basic sense to compare the contextual sense to.

The analysis of (26) is even more complicated as this expression refers to a line from the poem ‘The Destruction of Sennacherib’ by Lord Byron:

```
The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold,
And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold;
```

However, it is unclear whether this cross-reference should be taken as providing the basic meaning for the current expression, and what the contextual meaning of *nemesis* is in this case. In *Macmillan*, *nemesis* only has one abstract meaning: ‘someone or something that continues to oppose you and cannot easily be defeated’. *Longman* has two sense descriptions, namely ‘an opponent or enemy that is likely to be impossible for you to defeat, or a situation that is likely to be
impossible for you to deal with’ (sense 1) and ‘literary a punishment that is deserved and cannot be avoided’ (sense 2). In terms of referents in the text world, it makes most sense that the character is referring to some kind of “divine or moral punishment”, as was executed by nemesis in Greek mythology. For the entire expression to make sense, however, the original meaning of nemesis (a person serving retribution) needs to be activated in the scenario, as a punishment cannot come down like a wolf on the fold. If the contextual meaning is therefore the person meaning, then this should perhaps be analysed as a form of directly expressed metaphor rather than indirectly expressed metaphor. What the exact contextual meanings of wolf and fold are also remains problematic, especially in relation to the cross-reference to Byron, though the meaning of the scenario as a whole, and what it says about the state of mind of the character is clear.

The methodological issue is that many metaphor analysts would likely wish to treat the original literary, mythical or cultural origin as the basic meaning of the lexical unit. Even when the abstracted meaning can be found in the dictionary, many analysts would still argue that the whole point of using such references is that people recognize the connection with the original meaning and context. Yet this is again a matter of metaphor recognition and processing, not of metaphorical usage on the linguistic level. Whether individual readers recognize such references will depend greatly on their background knowledge. There is no reason to assume that someone without any knowledge of classical culture would realize that words like ‘spartan’ or ‘colossal’ are meant to convey more than their conventionalized meanings ‘very plain and simple, without the things that make life comfortable and pleasant’ and ‘extremely great or large’. And such references need not always be metaphorical. For example, if one character says to another ‘So kindly curb your theatrical, James Bond streak.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB), it remains a methodological question whether this sets up a metaphorical or non-metaphorical comparison between the character and James Bond.

The problem for analysts working at the level of linguistic metaphor identification is whether the original source domain of the allusion can - perhaps even should - always be taken as the source domain for a metaphorical mapping, regardless of conventionalization in the dictionary. Working purely on the basis of the dictionary, some of these references cannot be considered metaphorical since the dictionary only gives the derived abstracted meaning. As dissatisfying as this may seem, basing the decision on a method like the MIP and specifying which dictionary was used ensures that analysts do not only include such examples as metaphors when they themselves recognize the reference. It also ensures that anyone who disagrees with the analysis can immediately see why this decision was reached. Analysts particularly interested in such cases could choose to include an
additional code to keep track of them (as MIPVU did for possible personifications) and possibly identify specific patterns in their use.

4.2.6 Summary

This section has discussed a number of additions and specifications in MIPVU that were relevant to the annotation of linguistic metaphor in fiction. It showed how prepositions in character descriptions can be problematic because the boundary between concrete and abstract becomes blurred when both physical features and abstract qualities are included. This resulted in the addition of the code WIDLII, which was used for borderline cases of metaphor-related words. MIPVU also took on board the annotation of directly expressed metaphor, such as similes and figurative comparisons. These were annotated as being direct rather than indirect metaphor-related words; additionally, the signals that often accompany similes were annotated as being MFlags, i.e. words “flagging” the presence of direct MRWs.

The interaction between metaphor and metonymy that proved problematic in the analysis of personifications resulted in the additional code PP, standing for possible personification. With regard to proper names and nicknames in fiction MIPVU specified that they should only be analysed for their relation to metaphor when such names are used in terms of their semantic content rather than merely mentioned. Cultural and literary references in fiction proved problematic as the question arose whether the original source should be taken as the basic meaning of the lexical units. Moreover, some cultural references have become conventionalized in the dictionary in an abstract meaning, without reference to the origin of the word. MIPVU specified that the dictionary should be taken as the point of departure for such analyses as much as possible, to constrain the influence of personal preferences and familiarity with the original source. The following section will now demonstrate the application of MIPVU to an excerpt from the fiction sample.

4.3 A demonstration of the application of MIPVU

Now that some of the main additions and specifications of MIPVU that are relevant to the annotation of linguistic metaphor in fiction have been discussed, this section will demonstrate the application of MIPVU to an excerpt from the fiction sample.
For reasons of space, the application of the procedure will only be written out for those words that were identified in the project as being related to metaphor. The final section in this chapter will comment on the validity and reliability of the annotations by presenting the results of the reliability tests that were carried out during the project.

The first step of MIPVU is of course to read the entire discourse. Although the analyses did not include entire novels, only excerpts, no difficulties were encountered in establishing the meaning of the excerpts. The excerpt below was from BNC-Baby file CDB and describes how a character named Rufus thinks back to a crime he once committed. The next step in the procedure involves the demarcation of lexical units. To establish the lexical units in the discourse, the divisions made in the BNC were followed, with every lexical unit receiving a separate POS-tag. However, phrasal verbs and compound nouns were taken as representing single lexical units (see Section 2.2.2 of the MIPVU procedure presented in Chapter 3), even though their parts received individual POS-tags in the BNC. The excerpt below contained 161 lexical units, including 3 phrasal verbs and 2 polywords. The analysis below will first provide the entire excerpt. Each sentence will then be analysed in turn, with back slashes added to show the demarcation of lexical units. A discussion of the excerpt will be provided after all of the analyses of the metaphor-related words have been given.

It should be stressed again that MIPVU, like MIP, aims to establish for each lexical unit in the text whether it is related to metaphor on the basis of an analysis of its basic and contextual meaning (referential incongruity) and its relation to the surrounding context (topical incongruity). As pointed out by the Pragglejaz Group (2007), this procedure adopts a maximal approach, and considers a wide range of words as being potentially related to metaphor. No claims are made about whether the author intended particular words to express metaphorical meaning, or whether readers will have understood them that way. The procedure offers a reliable method for determining whether words can convey metaphorical meaning in a particular linguistic context. No attempt is made to relate the identified metaphor-related words to conceptual metaphors, or to identify the exact nature of the cross-domain mapping. Rather, metaphorical meaning is established on the basis of a shallow lexical analysis.

4.3.1 The excerpt

Below is the selected excerpt from BNC-Baby file CDB (sentence numbers added).
[1] It must have been some time in August when I took those pictures, Rufus thought, and a couple of weeks later it was all over. [2] Coincidentally, as the community and their lives together broke up, so did the weather. [3] It was raining intermittently all the time they were in the cemetery, the pines bowing and shivering in the wind. [4] Sometimes they had had to stop and take shelter under the closely planted trees. [5] If the weather had held and still been hot and dry would they have dug deeper? [6] Probably not. [7] In spite of the rain, the earth was still as hard as iron. [8] A sheet of rain had come down then, a hard, gusty shower, while they were laying the squares of turf back in place, and Adam had said something about the rain making the grass grow quickly, the rain being on their side. [9] ‘We should all go our separate ways as soon as we can,’ Rufus had said. [10] ‘We should pack up now and go.’

4.3.2 The application of MIPVU

This section will now consider each sentence in turn, with back slashes indicating the demarcation of lexical units. Italics have been added to indicate which words were annotated as being related to metaphor. The application of MIPVU for each of these annotated words will then be written out. Section 3.3 provides a discussion.

Sentence 1: It / must / have / been / some / time / in / August / when / I / took/ those / pictures, / Rufus / thought, / and / a / couple / of / weeks / later / it / was / all / over.

There are 25 lexical units in sentence (1), 4 of which were annotated as being related to metaphor: the preposition in, the verb took, the determiner those and the adverb over. The analysis of each lexical unit is presented below.

**IN (preposition)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the preposition in in this sentence has to do with time, i.e. *Macmillan* sense 4 ‘used for showing when something happens, 4a during a particular period, year, month, or season, or during a part of the day’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of in relates to three-dimensional space and containment, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘used for showing where someone or something is’, particularly ‘1a inside a container, room, building, vehicle etc’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning is concrete and spatial while the contextual meaning is abstract and temporal.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand a time in terms of space.

**Decision:** The lexical unit in is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.
TOOK (verb)
Contextual meaning: The contextual meaning of the verb took in this sentence is Macmillan sense 10 ‘to get a picture or a measurement using a machine’.
Basic meaning: The basic meaning of take is Macmillan sense 1 ‘to move something or someone from one place to another’.
Sufficiently distinct: Yes, the basic meaning is concerned with physically moving concrete objects and people while the contextual meaning is concerned with the action of capturing an image.
Comparison: Yes. Although the result of this action is concrete (picture) the action expressed by take is in this case more abstract and no concrete object is moved from one place to another.
Decision: The lexical unit took is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

THOSE (determiner)
Contextual meaning: The contextual meaning of the determiner those in this sentence is referential, as in Macmillan sense 1 ‘the one that is known about’.
Basic meaning: The basic meaning of that/those is primarily related to spoken discourse and concerns pointing or looking at concrete objects or people, i.e. Macmillan sense 2 ‘the one that you are looking at’.
Sufficiently distinct: Yes, the basic meaning is concrete and physical while the contextual meaning is abstract and referential.
Comparison: Yes, we can understand referring to known information in terms of pointing towards concrete objects in our vicinity.
Decision: The lexical unit those is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

OVER (adverb)
Contextual meaning: The contextual meaning of the adverb over in this sentence relates to time and is Macmillan sense 11 ‘when something has ended’.
Basic meaning: The basic sense of over is spatial, namely Macmillan sense 1 ‘above someone/something’ and especially sense 1b ‘moving across the space above someone or something’.
Sufficiently distinct: Yes, similar to the preposition in in this sentence the basic meaning is concrete and spatial while the contextual meaning is abstract and temporal.
Comparison: Yes, we can understand the ending of a period of time in terms of movement in space.
Decision: The lexical unit over is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

Sentence 2: Coincidentally, as the community and their lives together broke up, so did the weather.

Sentence (2) consists of 13 lexical units, including one phrasal verb. Three lexical units were annotated as related to metaphor, namely the phrasal verb broke up, the adverb so and the auxiliary do. Although so and did represent separate lexical
units, this fixed construction has a specific use and meaning, namely to indicate that something that was just said is also true about another person or thing; they will therefore be analysed together.

**BROKE UP (phrasal verb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the phrasal verb *broke up* is related to *Macmillan* sense 3 ‘if a meeting or other event breaks up, or if you break it up, it ends and people leave’. In this sentence, rather than a meeting or an event, it is the time these characters have spent living together that has ended and they leave.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *break up* is *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘to break something to make smaller pieces’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning is concrete and relates to the physical breaking of concrete objects while the contextual meaning is abstract and is concerned with people and events.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand a group of people that were together for an event and now leave in terms of a concrete whole that is broken into separate pieces.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *broke up* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**SO (adverb) DID (auxiliary)**

**Contextual meaning:** To determine the contextual meaning of *so did* we first have to retrieve the antecedent it refers back to, which in this case is the phrasal verb *broke up*. As *broke up* was related to metaphor, the words *so did* are an instance of implicit metaphor as they are implicitly related to metaphor. Although the retrieved contextual meaning of *so did is broke up*, the use of this contextual meaning is slightly different as it now applies to the weather. There is no conventional contextual meaning relating to the weather for *break up* in *Macmillan*, but its contextual meaning can be said to be the same as one of the conventional senses of *break*, as in *Macmillan* sense 9: ‘if the weather breaks, it changes unexpectedly, and usually becomes worse’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *break up* is still the same as before, namely ‘to break something to make smaller pieces’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning relates to the physical breaking of concrete objects while the contextual meaning relates to the weather.

**Comparison:** Yes, though the exact mapping may be more complex, we can understand the weather suddenly changing in terms of something breaking, in this case a break in its continuity. Moreover, as breaking is often negative this entails that the weather breaking leads to bad weather rather than good.

**Decision:** The lexical units *so* and *did* are related to metaphor and are used implicitly.

Sentence 3: It / was / raining / intermittently / all / the / time / they / were / in / the / cemetery, / the / pines / bowing / and / shivering / in / the / wind.
Sentence (3) consists of 20 lexical units, 2 of which were annotated as being related to metaphor, namely the verbs bowing and shivering.

**BOWING (verb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the verb bowing in this sentence has to do with the bending of the trees in the wind. This contextual meaning of bow is not present in the Macmillan dictionary, which means it can potentially be considered novel. However, this contextual meaning is present in the Longman dictionary: ‘to bend or to make something bend’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic sense of bow is Macmillan sense 1 ‘to bend your head forwards so that you are looking down’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** One decision that needs to be made here is whether the basic sense applies only to humans, in which case the contextual use of bow in combination with pines can be considered a personification. As Longman separates the human and general sense, the contextual and basic meaning can be considered sufficiently distinct and this can be considered a conventional personification.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand the bending forward of the trees in terms of a bowing movement made by people.

**Decision:** The lexical unit bowing is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**SHIVERING (verb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the verb shivering in this sentence relates to the trees moving or shaking from side to side. This contextual meaning is neither in Macmillan nor Longman.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of shiver is the only meaning in Macmillan, namely ‘if you shiver, your body shakes slightly, for example because you are cold or frightened’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning applies to people while the contextual meaning applies to trees. This can be considered a novel personification.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand the movement of the trees in wind in terms of people’s bodies shaking because they are cold.

**Decision:** The lexical unit shivering is related to metaphor and it is used indirectly.

**Sentence 4:** Sometimes / they / had / had / to / stop / and / take / shelter / under / the / closely / planted / trees.

Sentence (4) consists of 14 lexical items, two of which are related to metaphor, namely the verb take and the noun shelter.
TAKE (verb)
Contextual meaning: The contextual meaning of the verb take in this sentence is related to Macmillan sense 21 ‘to do or to have something’, which applies to abstract situations such as take cover, take a risk, take responsibility, etc. This is a related though slightly different contextual use of take than take pictures in the first sentence.
Basic meaning: The basic meaning is again Macmillan sense 1 ‘to move something or someone from one place to another’.
Sufficiently distinct: Yes, the basic meaning is concerned with concrete movement and objects while the contextual meaning concerns abstract situations.
Comparison: yes, we can understand the start of a situation in terms of the taking of concrete objects. Although there is again a sense in which the result of take shelter involves concrete objects (the shelter), the meaning of the fixed expression take shelter is abstract and applies to the situation.

SHELTER (noun)
Contextual meaning: As the entries in Macmillan conflated concrete and abstract uses, Longman was consulted as a second opinion. The contextual meaning of the noun shelter in this sentence is Longman sense 2 ‘protection from danger or from wind, rain, hot sun etc.’
Basic meaning: The basic meaning of shelter is Longman sense 4 ‘a building or an area with a roof over it that protects you from the weather or from danger.’
Sufficiently distinct: This decision is complicated by the fact that the contextual meaning and basic meaning are metonymically related, as indicated by the fact that Macmillan conflates the place and situation sense. However, as the contextual meaning of the fixed combination take shelter relates to an abstract situation while the basic meaning relates to a concrete place, there is a possibility for a metaphorical interpretation in addition to a metonymic one. There is also the additional difficulty of deciding whether the trees in the story count as a concrete shelter that covers the characters. However, the idiomaticity of the expression signals that this contextual meaning is used different from its basic meaning, and that the combination take shelter involves an abstract use of shelter.
Comparison: Yes, we can understand the abstract situation of being protected in terms of being under or inside a concrete cover. However, since there is a strong sense of metonymy and a sense in which the trees in the story do provide concrete cover, this example is a borderline case rather than a clear case.
Decision: The lexical unit shelter is related to metaphor and is used directly. Additionally, it should be annotated as being a WIDLII, that is, a borderline case of MRW.

Sentence 5: If / the / weather / had / held / and / still / been / hot / and / dry / would / they / have / dug / deeper?
Sentence (5) consists of 16 lexical units, only one of which is related to metaphor, namely the verb *held*.

**HELD (verb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the verb *held* in this sentence is related to the weather, as in *Macmillan* sense 15 ‘if your luck or the weather holds, it continues to be good’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *hold* concerns the handling of concrete objects, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘to carry something using your hands or arms’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning applies to the handling of concrete objects by people while the contextual meaning applies to weather conditions.

**Comparison:** Similar to the weather breaking in sentence (2), the exact mapping may be unclear at this point but there is a sense in which we can understand the continuity in the weather being good in terms of people holding on to something.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *held* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**Sentence 6: Probably / not.**

Sentence (6) consists of two lexical units. There were no lexical units relating to metaphor in this sentence. In a way this sentence can be argued to be elliptical for ‘they probably would not have dug deeper’. However, as no metaphor-related words occur in this elliptic structure, there are no potential implicit metaphors in sentence (6).

**Sentence 7: In spite of / the / rain, / the / earth / was / still / as / hard / as / iron.**

Sentence (7) consists of 11 lexical units, including one polyword. In this sentence, three lexical items were annotated as being related to metaphor, namely the adverb *as*, the conjunction *as* and the noun *iron*. Since the combination of the two instances of *as* forms a fixed construction that is used to compare entities, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘used for comparing one person, thing, or situation with another’, they will be analysed together.

**AS (adverb) AS (conjunction)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of *as* is *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘used for comparing one person, thing, or situation with another’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *as* is also *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘used for comparing one person, thing, or situation with another’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** No. The contextual and basic meaning are not sufficiently distinct and cannot be contrasted since they are the same.
**Comparison:** No. The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning.

**Topical incongruity:** Yes, the lexical units *as ... as*... are involved in explicitly signalling the topical incongruity of the lexical unit *iron*. That is, the combination *as ... as*... functions as an MFlag.

**Cross-domain comparison:** Yes, the combination *as... as*... signals a cross-domain comparison between *earth* and *iron*, which belong to two distinct domains.

Decision: The lexical units *as* and *as* are related to metaphor and should be annotated as MFlag.

**IRON (noun)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the noun *iron* in this sentence is *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘a hard heavy metal that is a common element.’

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of iron is also *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘a hard heavy metal that is a common element.’

**Sufficiently distinct:** No. The contextual and basic meaning are not sufficiently distinct and cannot be contrasted since they are the same.

**Comparison:** No. The contextual meaning is identical to the basic meaning.

**Topical incongruity:** Yes, the word *iron* can be considered “incongruous” and needs to be integrated within the overall topical framework by means of comparison as explicitly signalled by the construction *as ... as*... That is, *iron* is a case of topical incongruity rather than referential incongruity. The combination *as ... as*... functions as an explicit signal or MFlag.

**Cross-domain comparison:** Yes, *earth* and *iron* belong to two distinct domains. In this case the texture of the *earth* is understood in terms of one of the prototypical qualities of *iron*, namely its hardness.

Decision: The lexical unit *iron* is related to metaphor and is used directly. In addition, the lexical units *as* and *as* are also related to metaphor and should be annotated as MFlag.

Sentence 8: A / sheet / of / rain / had / come down / then, / a / hard, / gusty / shower, / while / they / were / laying / the / squares / of / turf / back / in / place, / and / Adam / had / said / something / about / the / rain / making / the / grass / grow / quickly, / the / rain / being / on / their / side.

Sentence (8) consists of 41 lexical units, including one phrasal verb. In this sentence 8 lexical units were annotated as being related to metaphor, namely the noun *sheet*, the adjective *hard*, the noun *shower*, the adverb *back*, the preposition *about*, the verb *making*, the preposition *on* and the noun *side*. As the preposition *on* and the noun *side* are part of a fixed expression, they will be analysed together.

**SHEET (noun)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the noun *sheet* in this sentence is *Macmillan* sense 4 ‘a sheet of rain or fire looks like a wide
moving wall’, which is closely related to Macmillan sense 3 ‘a wide flat area of something such as water or ice’. Both senses are concerned with large areas of water.

**Basic meaning:** The basic sense of sheet is Macmillan sense 1 ‘a large piece of thin cloth that you put on your bed and use for lying on or covering your body when you sleep’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning concerns a large piece of cloth while the contextual meaning is concerned with large amounts of rain.

**Comparison:** Yes, as already signalled by the phrasing “looks like” in sense 4, we can understand the way the falling rain looks in terms of the shape of a large sheet of cloth.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *sheet* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**SHOWER (noun)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the noun *shower* in this sentence is Macmillan sense 2 ‘a short period when it rains or snows’.

**Basic meaning:** It can be argued that *shower* provides the same kind of distinction as *sheet* if we take the basic meaning of *sheet* to be Macmillan sense 1 ‘a piece of equipment that produces a flow of water that you stand under to wash your body’. However, this would be an interpretation that is driven by folk etymology, as historically the rain sense was prior. Unlike MIP, however, MIPVU prefers to leave etymology out of the picture if a decision can be made on the grounds of basic senses being concrete, embodied, human-oriented etc. This does still beg the question which sense should be taken as basic, as both are concrete and both can actually be used as the basis for a comparison. Since this possibility exists, and since the rain was already compared to a *sheet* earlier in the same sentence, the use of *shower* can be considered a borderline case.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning is concerned with a man-made machine while the contextual meaning is concerned with a natural phenomena.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand *shower* in terms of a shape metaphor similar to *sheet*, that is, we can understand the way the rain looks in terms of way water looks when it comes out of the shower. The notion of short duration can also be taken into account, as a shower of rain is relatively short, just as the duration of taking a shower is normally relatively short. That is, a shower of rain only lasts about the duration of someone taking a shower.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *shower* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly. Since it was not entirely clear which sense should be taken as the basic meaning, *shower* should be annotated as being a borderline case (i.e. WIDLII).

**HARD (adjective)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the adjective *hard* in this sentence has to do with the intensity of the rain, as in Macmillan sense 6
‘using a lot of physical force’ and *Macmillan* sense 8 ‘a hard winter is a very cold winter, 8a a hard frost is very severe’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic sense of *hard* relates to physical sturdiness, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘stiff, firm, and not easy to bend or break’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning relates to concrete, physical texture while the contextual meaning relates to intensity.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand intensity in terms of physical strength.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *hard* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**BACK (adverb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the adverb *back* in this sentence has to do with returning, as in *Macmillan* sense 3 ‘returning to a place or position’, 3a returning to an earlier state or condition’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *back* relates to backwards movement, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘in the direction that is behind you’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic sense is concerned with concrete backward movement while the contextual meaning relates to the notion of returning to places, positions and states.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand returning to a place in terms of moving backwards, which ties in with our understanding of the places we have been to, and therefore the past, as behind us.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *back* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**ABOUT (preposition)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the preposition *about* in this sentence is concerned with the subject matter of conversations, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘concerning a particular subject’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *about* is spatial and involves movement, as in *Macmillan* sense 3 ‘used for showing movement’ and particularly 3a ‘moving to many different parts or areas, or in different directions’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning is concrete and spatial and involves movement while the contextual meaning is abstract and involves topics in discourse.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand talking about and switching between different topic of conversation in terms of movement from one place to another, that is we can understand discourse in terms of space.

**Decision:** The lexical unit *about* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**MAKE (verb)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the verb *make* in this sentence relates to causation, as in *Macmillan* sense 4 ‘to cause someone or something to be in a particular state or to change to another state’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic sense of *make* is concerned with concrete creation or production, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘to create or produce something by working’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning involves concrete creation while the contextual meaning involves abstract causation.
Comparison: Yes, we can understand the abstract causation of a situation in terms of the concrete creation of an object.
Decision: The lexical unit *make* is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

**[BEING] ON (preposition) [THEIR] SIDE (noun)**

**Contextual meaning:** MIPVU, like MIP, treats the lexical units comprising idioms and fixed expressions as individual items that all potentially contribute to the mapping. However, the contextual meaning is the meaning of the whole expression, namely *Macmillan* sense 5 ‘if you are on someone’s side, you support them in an argument or fight’.

**Basic meaning:** If we compare the basic meanings of the lexical items in *rain being on their side* to the contextual meaning of the phrase, then it becomes clear that the preposition *on* and the noun *side* are not being used in their basic meaning. The basic meaning of the preposition *on* is concrete and spatial, as in *Macmillan* sense 1 ‘touching a surface or an object’; the basic meaning of the noun *side* relates to concrete surfaces, namely *Macmillan* 2 ‘an outside surface of an object or shape that is not its front, back, bottom, or top’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meanings of *on* and *side* are concrete and spatial while the contextual meaning relates to abstract approval in a situation of conflict.

**Comparison:** Yes, we can understand agreeing with someone in a situation of conflict in terms of being physically positioned together with that someone and removed from someone else.

**Decision:** The lexical units *on* and *side* are related to metaphor and are used indirectly.

---

Sentence 9: ‘*We / should / all / go / our / separate / ways / as soon as / we / can,*’ / Rufus / had / said.

Sentence (9) consists of 13 lexical units, including one polyword. One lexical item was annotated as being related to metaphor, namely the adjective *separate*.

**SEPARATE (adjective)**

**Contextual meaning:** The contextual meaning of the adjective *separate* in this sentence relates to being distinct and different. As the sense descriptions in *Macmillan* conflated concrete and abstract uses, *Longman* was checked for a second opinion. Based on *Longman*, the contextual meaning is *Longman* sense 1 ‘different’.

**Basic meaning:** The basic meaning of *separate* has to do with physical separation. Based on *Longman*, the basic meaning is *Longman* sense 3 ‘not joined to or touching something else’.

**Sufficiently distinct:** Yes, the basic meaning relates to physical separation while the contextual meaning relates to being different.
Comparison: Yes, we can understand people leaving each other to go different ways in terms of being physically separated from each other.

Decision: The lexical unit separate is related to metaphor and is used indirectly.

Sentence 10: ‘We / should / pack up / now / and / go.’

Sentence (10) consists of 6 lexical units, including one phrasal verb. There were no lexical units related to metaphor in this sentence.

4.3.3 Discussion

The excerpt from CDB consisted of 161 lexical units, including three phrasal verbs (broke up, come down, pack up) and two polywords (in spite of and as soon as). Of these 161 lexical units, a total of 24 were annotated as being related to metaphor: this means that 15% of the lexical units in this excerpt (roughly 1 in 7) was related to metaphor. Of the 24 lexical units that were related to metaphor, 22 cases were clear examples of MRWs, and only 2 were borderline cases, namely shelter and shower. This shows that the use of metaphor in this excerpt was generally unproblematic. Of the 24 metaphor-related words, 19 were examples of indirect MRWs, the classic form of metaphor as identified by the original MIP. In addition, two lexical items were annotated as being MFlags (as...as...), one was annotated as being a direct MRW (iron) and two were annotated as being implicit MRWs (so did).

In terms of conventionality, the descriptions of the contextual and basic meanings above reveal that in almost all cases both the basic meaning and the contextual meaning could be found in the dictionary. The only exception was the contextual use of shivering applying to the movement of trees in the wind. The contextual meaning of bowing, though not in the Macmillan dictionary, was included in the Longman dictionary. This could indicate that this sense has not fully been conventionalized or that the sense description in Macmillan should be taken as general rather than human-oriented. In any case, this did not pose any difficulties in the application of MIPVU as it was clear that both bowing and shivering were examples of the personification of nature, a well-known feature of literature sometimes referred to as the “pathetic fallacy” (see Lodge 1977). In this case, it projects inferences of the trees being cold and uncomfortable, which probably relates to how the character himself is feeling.
A closer examination of the MRWs in the excerpt reveals that several other metaphorical expressions can also be considered as potential cases of personification, namely *held* in *if the weather had held*, *making in the rain* *making the grass grow quickly* and *[being] on [their] side* in *the rain being on their side*. Though these examples were analysed above in terms of a contrast and comparison between abstract and concrete senses (continue to be good versus holding an object; abstract causation versus concrete creation; agreement versus position), the basic sense descriptions also signal that the actions of holding objects, making objects and being on someone’s side in a conflict are normally performed by people. However, the metaphorical uses of *hold* and *make* are so highly conventional that they are not likely to be interpreted as personifications. This is less so for *rain being on their side*, which is more clearly a personification as it is far less frequently used in combination with non-human entities. Its meaning is more likely to stand out as the issue of guilt plays a central role in this story and the use of this expression suggests that the character believes that nature is deliberately helping them cover up their crime.

The other metaphorical expression that is likely to stand out is the explicitly signalled direct metaphor *iron in the earth was still as hard as iron*. Although in this case the grounds of the comparison, *hard*, apply non-metaphorically to both the target domain (*earth*) and the source domain (*iron*), there is a potential additional inference that can be drawn from this comparison as a result of the conventional metaphorical meanings of the adjective *iron*, namely *Macmillan* sense 2 ‘very strong, strict or severe’ and ‘2a very determined’. So even though in this example *hard* is not itself related to metaphor, the comparison *as hard as iron* does suggest a sense of determination and rigidity rather than merely physical hardness. This relates again to the undercurrent of personification in the excerpt: while the hard earth is working against them, the rain is on their side.

Aside from the novel metaphorical expression *shivering* and the explicitly signalled simile *as hard as iron*, the metaphor-related words in this excerpt are highly conventional and not likely to stand out as metaphors. In line with the expectations formulated on basis of Leech and Short (2007) and Lodge (1977), the excerpt is characterized by local uses of metaphor and the distortions of the story-world reality are only small. As pointed out in Section 4.2.1, Lodge (1977) also argued that realistic fiction should prefer simile to metaphor and that would draw on ‘analogies from a semantic field associated with the context’ (p. 113). Though the current excerpt is too short to prove such claims about the predominance of simile in fiction (cf. Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Sayce 1954), it does show that the indirect forms of metaphor were far more frequent than the direct forms. However, both the indirect and direct MRWs do often draw on semantic fields associated with the context, particularly in the use of people, concrete objects, spatial relations...
and movement as source domains – semantic domains which are also frequently used non-metaphorically in fiction texts.

The handling of concrete objects is also a common source domain, as in the use of taking, making, breaking, and holding. The use of shape metaphors, which has been associated with literature by Lakoff and Turner (1989), can be seen in the use of sheet and shower. Though shower was a borderline case, its proximity to sheet and the alliteration of their initial sound support an inclusion as potentially metaphorical. Interestingly, these nouns also alliterate with the earlier used shelter, which was also a borderline case due to its strongly metonymic relation between the place that offers protection and the situation of being protected.

In summary, the application of MIPVU demonstrates that the different additions and specifications prove to be useful in the analysis of fiction. Most of the metaphorical expressions did not appear to be clearly literary, creative, or original. Rather, most of the metaphorical expressions could be related to highly conventional metaphorical patterns in language use. Only a small number of metaphorical expressions appeared to stand out, due to their novelty (shivering), explicit signalling (as hard as iron), co-ordination (bowing and shivering) or systematicity (personification of nature via shivering, bowing, being on their side, and possibly held and making).

This section has demonstrated the application of MIPVU to an excerpt of fiction, and has illustrated how the additions and specifications in MIPVU deal with specific phenomena encountered when analysing authentic discourse. While other analysts might make some different decisions when applying the procedure, MIPVU allows analysts to pinpoint the exact locus of any disagreement that might arise. This is also why group discussions were an integral part of the annotation procedure in the project. Cases of disagreement were in fact rare, and were always resolved during the group discussions. The reliability tests described in the following section will address the validity and reliability of the annotations and show how much agreement and disagreement there was between the four analysts in the project. The following chapter will provide a cross-register comparison of the actual frequencies and distributions of the different relations to metaphor and metaphor types in fiction as compared to the other registers. This will demonstrate how frequent and relevant the issues discussed in this chapter are in relation to the use of metaphor in other registers.
4.4 Reliability testing

As argued in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b) the identification of linguistic metaphor on the basis of a procedure such as MIPVU brings in issues of validity and reliability, and researchers have an obligation to show that their findings are not figments of their imagination. The explication of the coding scheme and the exhaustive set of coding instructions aimed to produce an independent tool for metaphor identification that can be critically discussed and evaluated. The fine-tuning and testing of this tool is an essential element in this process. However systematic and explicit the instructions and criteria may be, the procedure is useless if it cannot be shown that different analysts apply it in the same way. If the procedure does not lead to substantial agreement between analysts then it does not function as a useful tool.

The extent to which a number of analysts agree in making repeated decisions for any set of materials can be determined in at least two principally different ways (Dunn 1989; Scholfield 1995). One type of analysis examines the overall degree of difference between individual analysts by measuring the total number of cases that analysts marked as related to metaphor and then comparing the proportions between metaphorical and non-metaphorical cases across analysts. If the differences between the proportions are too great to be due to chance alone, that is, if there is a statistically significant relation between metaphor identification and individual analysts, then the analysis is not sufficiently reliable. Such an outcome suggests that metaphor identification is related to the bias and performance of (groups of) individuals. The question of analyst bias can be addressed by computing a test statistic called Cochran’s Q (e.g., Dunn 1989). It can be used to measure the importance of the differences between the metaphor analysts. If Cochran’s Q becomes statistically significant, the reliability of the procedure is compromised by the individual differences among the analysts.

One problem with this particular type of reliability measurement, however, is that it does not look at lexical units that are potentially metaphorical as individual cases. Even if there was a statistically significant difference between individual researchers in terms of the total number of cases that they identified, there could still be a core group of cases about which most or all analysts agreed, while having different opinions about another group of more marginal cases. Thus, some words in a text might be consistently marked as metaphorical by all analysts, whereas other words would be judged in a less consistent manner. Indeed, it is a common assumption in methodology that there will always be a large group of clear cases that everybody can agree on in most classification tasks.
Analysing the data as potentially metaphorical individual cases would give more weight to differences among metaphorically used words instead of among analysts. The appropriate coefficient of agreement for this measurement is kappa (e.g., Artstein and Poesio 2008). There are several variants, the most important of which, traditionally, are Cohen’s Kappa and Fleiss’ Kappa. The difference between the two measures is that the former can only gauge the degree of agreement between pairs of analysts, whereas the latter can analyse agreement across larger sets of analysts. What the measures share is their correction for chance agreement between analysts: if a set of data displays a particular percentage of metaphor-related words, there is a related magnitude of chance that analysts will obtain fortuitous agreement. Kappa corrects for this level of chance and measures how often analysts agree when chance is taken out of the equation. Though it is unclear which magnitude of kappa should be accepted as adequate, the most frequently used cut-off points are 0.66 and 0.80.

It is important to note that the reliability tests reported below examined agreement among the different analysts in the project before discussion. The reliability tests were intended to test the extent to which individual performance on the basis of MIPVU lead to comparable results. In all of the empirical work for the overall research project, and hence the results reported in the following chapters of this thesis, individual analysis was only the first step in a more elaborated protocol, in which additional checks and discussions were held to reduce the inevitable degree of error. A detailed discussion of the set-up of the reliability tests and their statistical testing is given in Chapter 8 of Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b), in addition to a description of further troubleshooting that was carried out after all of the annotations had been completed to check the final reliability of the corpus. The section below will report specifically on the reliability tests carried out for fiction.

4.4.1 Reliability in fiction

A series of five reliability tests was carried out throughout the entire period of annotation to measure the degree of agreement among the analysts who had to identify which lexical units were related to metaphor in the four registers included in the Metaphor in Discourse project. Fiction was included in the fourth and sixth reliability test. The fourth reliability test was carried out at the end of the first year when it was clear that two of the analysts would leave the project (see Steen, Dorst et al. 2010). The sixth reliability test was carried out after two new analysts had joined the team to check whether the new team produced similar results to the old team. Both study four and study six included all four of the registers. The tables for
both studies are reproduced in slightly adjusted form as Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 (originally Table 8.3 and Table 8.5 in Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b).

Table 4.1 Results reliability test 4, July 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File ID in BNC</th>
<th>Number lexical units</th>
<th>Percentage unanimous</th>
<th>Fleiss’ κ</th>
<th>Min MRWs</th>
<th>Max MRWs</th>
<th>Cochran’s Q (df=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not MRW</td>
<td>MRW</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA (acad.)</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBW (conv.)</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFY (fict.)</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7W (news)</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=204)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05; *** p < 0.001

Table 4.1 shows that of the 428 lexical units in fiction file CFY, 84.4% were unanimously coded as not being related to metaphor and 7.9% were unanimously coded as being related to metaphor. In all, the four analysts unanimously agreed on 92.2% of all cases while doing their analyses completely independently of each other. In other words, only 7.8% of the data were given different interpretations by the four analysts.

The reliability test that examines agreement between analysts on an item-by-item basis, and which corrects for the role of chance, yielded a Fleiss’ Kappa of 0.81 for fiction. This magnitude is in the highest category of all divisions made in the literature. It suggests that there is substantial and adequate agreement, and that the procedure produces reliable results.

The test checking for analyst bias showed a non-significant Cochran’s Q for fiction (df=3, Q=2.18). This suggests that the difference between the lowest scoring analyst, who identified 47 lexical units as related to metaphor, and the highest scoring analyst, who identified 52 lexical units as related to metaphor, is not significant, i.e. not large enough to be caused by analyst bias. In other words, the variation between analysts in metaphor identification in the reliability test is not due to analyst bias but to chance. However, since the difference between the lowest
score and the highest score is so small, it is possible that the fiction text was so clear in its use of metaphor that the biases of individual analysts simply never came into play.

Though unanimous agreement in fiction (92.2%) was lower than in academic discourse (93.6%), conversation (95.0%), and news (95.1%), it is still considerably high and reveals that none of the registers were problematic. A closer look at the cases that caused disagreement in CFY revealed that these problematic cases were mostly borderline cases between concrete and abstract in character descriptions, one of the issues discussed in Section 4.2.

Table 4.2 Results reliability test 6, March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File ID in BNC</th>
<th>Number lexical units</th>
<th>Percentage unanimous</th>
<th>Fleiss’ κ</th>
<th>Min MRWs</th>
<th>Max MRWs</th>
<th>Cochran’s Q (df=3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not MRW</td>
<td>MRW</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEF (acad.)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNR (conv.)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J54 (fict.)</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=44)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K58 (news)</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=231)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=231)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001

Table 4.2 shows that of the 401 lexical units in fiction file J54, 82.3% were unanimously coded as not being related to metaphor and 11.0% were unanimously coded as being related to metaphor. In all, the four analysts unanimously agreed on 93.3% of all cases while doing their analyses completely independently of each other. In other words, only 6.7% of the data were given different interpretations by the four analysts. Unanimous agreement in fiction (93.3%) was now higher than in academic discourse (87.4%), the same as in conversation (93.3%), and lower than in news (97.4%). Agreement between analysts on an item-by-item basis was high: Fleiss’ Kappa = 0.85. This Kappa is even higher than in study four, confirming that the procedure results in substantial and adequate agreement in fiction. The test checking for analyst bias showed another non-significant Cochran’s Q for fiction
(df=3, \( Q=6.57 \)). This time, fiction is the only register which yields a non-significant Cochran’s \( Q \). Surprisingly, this suggests that fiction is the register in which analyst bias seems to play the smallest role. However, as noted before, this is possibly the case because the text is so clear in its use of metaphor that analyst bias does not come into play. The difference between the lowest scoring analyst, who identified 52 lexical units as related to metaphor, and the highest scoring analyst, who identified 61 lexical units as related to metaphor, is again very small.

4.4.2 Conclusion

These reliability tests show that the MIPVU procedure produces reliable results for fiction, for both the old and new team of metaphor analysts in the project. The tests also showed that while analyst bias did affect the overall findings, this was less so for the fiction register (which did not have a significant Cochran’s \( Q \)) than for the other registers. It should again be noted that in the encompassing project, analyst bias in terms of error and preferences for more or less metaphor identification was neutralized by additional group discussion of the data after initial annotation. The tests also show that there was a consistently high level of agreement when the data were analysed on a case-by-case basis, with Fleiss’ Kappas of 0.81 and 0.85 for fiction. This suggests that there is substantial and adequate agreement. This interpretation is supported by the high figures of unanimous agreement for fiction in both tests (92.2% and 93.3%). Moreover, a closer look at the cases that caused disagreement reveals that these problematic cases are part of particular categories, such as uses of prepositions that are in between concrete and abstract. In summary, the reliability tests show that the quantitative findings concerning the frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words in fiction that will be reported in Chapters 5 and 6 are based on a reliable identification method that was consistently applied by the different analysts in the project.
4.5 General discussion and conclusion

This chapter first discussed a number of additions and specifications in MIPVU that were relevant to the annotation of linguistic metaphor in fiction. MIPVU added the code “WIDLII” to include borderline cases, for example in character descriptions blurring the boundary between concrete and abstract. The annotations “direct MRW” and “MFlag” were added in MIPVU to be able to take similes and figurative comparisons on board. The additional code “PP” allows analysts to keep track of possible personifications that involve both metaphor and metonymy. With regard to proper names and nicknames MIPVU specified that they should only be analysed when they are used rather than mentioned. With regard to cultural references MIPVU specified that the dictionary should be followed as much as possible to minimize the influence of personal preferences and familiarity with the original source.

The demonstration of the application of MIPVU to an excerpt of fiction showed how these additions and specifications prove to be useful in the analysis of authentic discourse. Most of the metaphorical expressions did not appear to be clearly literary, creative, or original but could be related to highly conventional metaphorical patterns in language use. Only a small number of metaphorical expressions appeared to stand out, due to their novelty (shivering), explicit signalling (as hard as iron), co-ordination (bowing and shivering) or systematicity (the personification of nature via shivering, bowing, being on their side, and possibly held and making). The analysis also demonstrated how the use of a procedure such as MIP or MIPVU allows analysts to specify their decisions at each point in the identification process, and invites other analysts to pinpoint exactly where they would make different decisions.

The reliability tests addressed the validity and reliability of the annotations and showed that the application of MIPVU produced reliable results for fiction. The tests also showed that while analyst bias affected the overall findings, this was less so for the fiction register than for the other registers. Moreover, analyst bias in terms of error and preferences for more or less metaphor identification were neutralized in the project by additional group discussions of the data after initial annotation. A closer look at the cases that caused disagreement revealed that many of these problematic cases were part of particular categories, such as the use of prepositions that are in between concrete and abstract in character descriptions. In summary, the reliability tests show that the quantitative findings concerning the frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words in fiction that will be
reported in the following two chapters are based on a reliable identification method that was consistently applied by the different analysts in the project.

In short, MIPVU is a reliable and flexible tool for the identification of metaphor-related words in context. Applying the procedure to authentic discourse and obtaining reliable results is not a task that can be accomplished easily or quickly, as the justification and consistency of decisions about individual words in context is often difficult. The steps of the procedure must all be followed consistently, for each lexical unit, without jumping to premature conclusions about the metaphorical nature of any case. However, the procedure allows analysts to discover the underlying bases for many of their intuitions about metaphoricity in language and can often provide new insights. MIPVU can be employed to identify metaphor-related words in discourse while demonstrating the exact decisions that were made in the identification process, allowing for easy comparison between analysts.
Chapter 5

The linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction: a quantitative cross-register comparison

She had been on his mind since the morning he had seen her from his horse; frightened yet defiant, sparking with anger.

(BNC-Baby: CB5)
5.1 Introduction

While Chapters 3 and 4 focused on the identification and classification of linguistic metaphor, this chapter offers a quantitative analysis of the occurrence of metaphor-related words in fiction. It addresses the question how fiction is similar to and different from academic discourse, news texts and conversations in terms of the frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words. This analysis adds a new lexico-semantic dimension to corpus-based register comparisons such as those performed by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001), as discussed in Chapter 2. The exploration of a three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor also provides additional insights to studies that have focused on patterns of metaphor in specific registers (e.g., Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2008; Steen 1994) or described general tendencies in the interaction between metaphor and word class (e.g., Deignan 2005), as discussed in Chapter 1. The results of this three-way analysis will thus provide the basis for a more systematic approach to the discussion of the typical forms and functions of metaphor in fiction.

A number of different expectations were formulated. First of all, it was expected that the distribution of the eight main word classes would differ significantly between fiction and the three other registers based on the established interaction between register and word class in studies performed by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001). Biber and Conrad (2001: 185) identified Dimension 1, ‘Involved versus Informational Production’, as the most important dimension of register variation. Involved text types (such as conversations) were characterized by a conspicuous presence of private verbs, present-tense verbs, first and second person pronouns, questions, discourse particles, and contractions on the one hand and a relative absence of nouns, prepositions, and attributive adjectives on the other. Informational text types (such as academic discourse and news texts) demonstrated the opposite pattern. Fiction was shown to occupy a neutral position on this dimension. It was suggested that this may be due to the fact that most fiction contains both dialogue and narrator text, potentially creating a hybrid register between spoken and written discourse (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 16). This issue will be given special attention in Chapter 6, which offers a quantitative analysis of the frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words in dialogue versus narrative in fiction.

Although the quantitative analyses reported below are not as detailed as Biber’s multi-feature model and do not distinguish between, for example, present-tense and past-tense verbs or attributive versus predicative adjectives, the patterns found for the eight main word classes can still be related in general to Biber’s
dimensions. That is, a marked use of nouns, prepositions and adjectives corresponds to an informational production while a marked use of verbs and the rest category corresponds to an involved production. As fiction should be situated in between the informational and involved ends of this dimension, the first main expectation was that fiction would use more nouns, prepositions and adjectives than the conversations but fewer than the news texts and academic discourse. In addition, it was expected that fiction would use more verbs and rest-category items than news and academic discourse but fewer than conversation. Fiction’s narrative concerns (Dimension 2) should be reflected in a marked use of past-tense verbs rather than present-tense verbs within the word class of verbs, and a marked use of third-person pronouns rather than first-person or second-person pronouns within the rest category. Fiction’s preference for situation-dependent reference (Dimension 3) should lead to a marked use of time and place adverbials within the word class of adverbs.

In the analyses in Section 5.3.1 below, the distribution of the eight main word classes (adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, determiners, nouns, prepositions, verbs, and rest category items) in fiction was compared to the other three registers to determine whether the samples for metaphor analysis are representative of the way in which these registers have been described in the studies by Biber and colleagues.

The next main question was whether there would be differences in the frequency and distribution of the metaphor-related words across these eight main word classes in the four registers. Many discourse-analytical studies have focused on patterns of metaphor in particular types of discourse, such as literature (Semino 2008; Steen 1994), education (Cameron 2003; Low 2008a, b; Low et al. 2008), politics (Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2008), religion (Charteris-Black 2004) and business (Koller 2004a, b). The current analyses offer a unique possibility of measuring metaphor variation in four different registers in precise quantitative terms on the basis of a reliable identification method. Moreover, the inclusion of word class in the interaction will reveal which patterns of metaphor are typical of a particular register and which follow more naturally from the general distribution of metaphor across word classes. That is, if a certain word class is often used metaphorically, then registers containing a higher proportion of this word class will most likely also contain more instances of metaphor, unless register-specific preferences counteract this influence. Similarly, if a certain word class is often used metaphorically but this is equally the case for all of the registers, then this metaphorical use of a particular word class does not characterize a specific register’s style.

Traditional approaches to metaphor in literature suggest that fiction, as the only literary register in the current study, should have the most instances of metaphorical language. Additionally, the distinction between the different relations
to metaphor (non-MRW, borderline MRW, clear MRW and MFlag) and the
different types of metaphor-related words (indirect, direct and implicit) identified
in Chapter 3 will reveal whether the registers differ in their distributions of these
relations and types of metaphor. This may provide new insights into some of the
general perceptions regarding metaphor in literature as discussed in Chapter 1, such
as the widespread belief that literary language not only contains a larger number of
metaphorical expressions than non-literary language but that it also typically
employs more creative and deliberate metaphors. The linguistic expression of
metaphor as either metaphor proper or simile has received much attention in
psycholinguistic studies (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe
and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008;
Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe
1999), but empirical evidence for the actual occurrence of these opposing rhetorical
forms is lacking. As direct expressions of metaphor, especially similes, have
traditionally been associated with literature (see Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Sayce
1954; Semino and Steen 2008), the current study will offer a unique possibility to
examine the relative frequency and importance of this specific type of metaphor in
fiction.

The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 5.2 will offer a brief
description of the materials and database used in the qualitative analyses reported
in this chapter. Section 5.3 will first examine the distribution of the eight main
word classes in fiction as compared to the other three registers, in line with the
research done by Biber and colleagues (Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Conrad 2001;
Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001). This analysis will then be followed by an
exploration of the distribution of metaphor-related words across these eight word
classes. For reasons of statistical power, this analysis will employ a binary
distinction between words that are related to metaphor (MRW) and words that are
not related to metaphor (non-MRW). These findings will be further refined in
Section 5.4 by distinguishing between the original four relations to metaphor that
were identified in Chapter 3 (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW, and
MFlag), while Section 5.5 will compare the distribution of the different types of
metaphor discussed in Chapter 3 (indirect MRW, direct MRW, and implicit
MRW). Finally, Section 5.6 will offer a general discussion of how fiction is similar
to and different from the other registers in its distribution and use of metaphor,
indicating which patterns appear to be typical of fiction and which can be related to
more general language patterns.
5.2 Method

5.2.1 Materials

All the files from the four registers included in the *Metaphor in Discourse* project were randomly selected from the BNC-Baby corpus, a four-million word subcorpus of the 100-million word British National Corpus. BNC-Baby was chosen because it offers a set of language materials that are parallel with the phenomena described in the *Longman grammar of spoken and written English* produced by Biber and colleagues (Biber et al. 1999). The alignment of the current analysis with Biber’s research facilitates the description of metaphor in the four selected registers that have been well studied from a lexico-grammatical point of view.

The files that were selected for the fiction sample were all classified by the BNC as being books belonging to the imaginative domain. Aside from the classification “imaginative writing”, no further subdivision into romance fiction, adventure fiction, horror fiction, etc. was made either by the BNC or within the *Metaphor in Discourse* project, though such distinctions have been made in studies by Biber (1988, 1989), Oostdijk (1990), and De Haan (1996) (see Chapter 6). Selected fragments were randomly taken from the beginnings, middles, and ends of the complete BNC-Baby files. The selection of the files was prepared by splitting up all files into separate fragments defined by the highest division into sections, i.e. chapter sections in the case of fiction.

In total, the fiction sample selected for quantitative analysis contained twelve excerpts from the following novels. A detailed overview of the annotated fiction files is given in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB9</td>
<td><em>Death of a partner.</em></td>
<td>Neel, Janet</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td><em>Man at the sharp end.</em></td>
<td>Kilby, Mike</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW</td>
<td><em>Folly's child.</em></td>
<td>Tanner, Janet</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td><em>The Titron madness.</em></td>
<td>Bedford, John</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8T</td>
<td><em>Devices and desires.</em></td>
<td>James, P D</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB5</td>
<td><em>Ruth Appleby.</em></td>
<td>Rhodes, Elvi</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW</td>
<td><em>Crackdown.</em></td>
<td>Cornwell, Bernard</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td><em>A fatal inversion.</em></td>
<td>Vine, Barbara</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAJ</td>
<td><em>Masai dreaming.</em></td>
<td>Cartwright, Justin</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FET</td>
<td><em>Still life.</em></td>
<td>Byatt, A S</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPB</td>
<td><em>Crimson.</em></td>
<td>Conran, Shirley</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G0L</td>
<td><em>The Lucy ghosts.</em></td>
<td>Shah, Eddy</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the analyses in this chapter are concerned with patterns of metaphor in fiction in general, rather than metaphor in specific works of fiction or metaphor as used by specific authors, the BNC identifier codes (i.e. AB9, AC2, etc.) will be used when examples from the corpus are discussed rather than references to titles or authors. As pointed out above, the fiction sample only contained excerpts from these texts, not the novels as a whole, as this would have yielded far too much text for the manual identification of linguistic metaphor. The excerpts varied in length between 2800 and 4600 words. As fiction may be characterized by very local uses of metaphor (cf. Lodge 1977), any generalizations about fiction in general will be made with caution. It should also be noted that as a result of the composition of the BNC corpus, all excerpts originated from texts published between 1984 and 1993.

Though Leech (2008) has claimed that each novel ever written may be entirely unique in its use of metaphor, examining twelve relatively long excerpts from twelve randomly selected novels will provide a first quantitative glimpse at any general tendencies that can be established in these texts. Moreover, Biber (1990) found that the linguistic features included in his multi-feature model (1988) proved to be stable across 1,000-word sub-samples of texts. As this stability was shown to hold across linguistic features as well as across text categories, Biber (1990: 261) argues that 2,000-word texts in corpora are ‘reliable representatives of their respective text categories for analyses of this type’. Relatively small but carefully sampled corpora may therefore already provide representative results.

5.2.2 Preparation of the data

In the Metaphor in Discourse project, the MIPVU procedure was applied to four samples of discourse, totalling some 190,000 words. These samples were manually annotated at the level of lexical units for their relation to metaphor based on the protocol described in Chapter 3. All files were originally annotated for metaphor use in an XML format by using the XML editor software called <oXygen/>\(^8\). For the current analyses the annotated XML files were converted into an SPSS database. During the conversion, all punctuation marks in the XML files were automatically converted into separate entries in the database, which entailed that they also contributed to the overall word count. As the punctuation marks themselves were not analysed for metaphor use, they were therefore all excluded from the database.

\(^8\) See http://www.oxygenxml.com/
A small group of lexical units (n = 401) received the code DFMA (Discard For Metaphor Analysis) during the annotation process; these lexical units were discarded for metaphor analysis because their contextual meaning could not reliably be determined, even after group discussion. Almost all of these cases came from the conversation sample, representing about 1% of the conversation data. No lexical items were discarded from the fiction sample. Another problematic group during annotation concerned the prepositions for (n = 1,384) and of (n = 4,796). These prepositions turned out to be delexicalized to such a degree that no clear decision could be reached on whether they still had any basic meaning. All cases of for and of were therefore treated as not related to metaphor. In total, these two prepositions comprised 33.8% of all the prepositions in the database, and 3.3% of the entire data set.

All lexical units were independently tagged for part of speech types and lemmas in the original British National Corpus from which they were extracted. These lexical units can be either simple (consisting of one orthographic word) or complex (consisting of several orthographic words). Examples of complex lexical units are phrasal verbs, compound nouns and polywords (such as of course). Of all the lexical units in the data, only 1.6% (2990 cases) were complex. Almost half of these complex lexical units were polywords (1458 cases). Since the complex lexical units comprised such a small part of the data, the following analyses will collapse simple and complex lexical units (but see Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b) for a full discussion). All contractions such as he’d for he would were treated as two distinct lemmas, while all separate POS-tags for genitive ’s or simply ’ have been ignored as separate cases in the statistical analyses. After collapsing single and complex lexical units, and deselecting all cases of DFMA and genitive ’s, the total number of cases (lexical items) in the SPSS database was 186,688. The fiction sample consisted of 44,648 lexical items in total, divided over the twelve abovementioned files. In comparison, the other samples were the following sizes: news texts 44,792 items (46 distinct texts); conversations 47,934 items (11 distinct conversations); academic texts 49,314 items (15 distinct texts).

For the analyses in Section 5.3, the original POS-types were converted into eight main word classes: adjective, adverb, conjunction, determiner, noun, preposition, verb and rest category. For reasons of statistical power, the four relations to metaphor (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW and MFlag) were converted into a binary distinction for the analyses in Section 5.3 by combining the MFlags and non-MRWs into one group of words that are not related to metaphor (non-MRW), and the clear MRWs and borderline MRWs into one group of words that are related to metaphor (MRW). The analyses in Section 5.4 will further refine the findings from the interaction between register, word class and metaphor by distinguishing between the original four relations to metaphor (non-MRW,
Section 5.5 also provides a further refinement of the findings from Section 5.3 by examining the four different types of metaphor (indirect MRW, direct MRW, implicit MRW and non-MRW). Together, these analyses will contribute to a better view of the various forms of linguistic metaphor in natural discourse, and their distribution and relevance in fiction in comparison to the three other registers.

5.3 Analysis 1: The interaction between register, word class and metaphor

This section will first examine the general distribution of the eight main word classes in fiction as compared to the distributions in the other three registers (academic discourse, news texts and spoken conversations). Based on the findings by Biber (1988, 1989), the main expectation was that there would be a significant two-way interaction between register and word class, and that the frequencies found in fiction would lie between news and academic texts on the one hand and conversation on the other. Second, the lexico-semantic dimension of metaphor was added to the comparison, and the three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor was tested using a loglinear analysis (see Field 2005). Subsequent chi-square tests were carried out to break down any interaction effects. Standardized residuals were compared to find out which cells contributed significantly to the interaction effects that were found. In light of the large number of cases, alpha was set at 0.01, so standardized residuals larger than 2.58 were considered significant.

Based on the findings by Biber and colleagues, the first main expectation was that fiction would have a different distribution of the eight main word classes than the other three registers (i.e. that there would be a significant two-way interaction between register and word class). Specifically, it was expected that fiction would use more nouns, prepositions and adjectives (features associated with Informational text types) than conversation but fewer than news and academic discourse; conversely, it was expected that fiction would use more verbs and rest-category items (features of Involved text types) than news and academic discourse but fewer than conversation. Additionally, fiction’s narrative concerns (Dimension 2) should also lead to a marked use of past-tense verbs and third-person pronouns, while its preference for situation-dependent reference should lead to a marked use of place and time adverbs. The subsequent three-way analysis of the interaction between register, word class and metaphor asked whether fiction differed significantly from the other registers in its distribution of metaphor-related words across the eight word classes. The alignment of this analysis with Biber’s research will facilitate the
description of metaphor in four registers that have been studied extensively from a lexico-grammatical point of view. The three-way interaction will add to the cognitive-linguistic description and explanation of metaphor in usage by addressing the question which forms of metaphor are used in which ways in which registers.

5.3.1 The interaction between register and word class

The frequencies and percentages of the eight word classes per register are presented in Table 5.1 below. A chi-square analysis showed that there was a significant interaction between word class and register, though the effect size was moderate: $\chi^2(21) = 18,213.74, p < 0.001$, Cramer’s $V = 0.18$. This indicates that the four registers differed significantly in their distribution of the eight major word classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>4659 (9.4%)</td>
<td>3760 (8.4%)</td>
<td>2969 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1750 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>2503 (5.1%)</td>
<td>2183 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2839 (6.4%)</td>
<td>4290 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>3028 (6.1%)</td>
<td>2437 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2498 (5.6%)</td>
<td>2401 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>6743 (13.7%)</td>
<td>5700 (12.7%)</td>
<td>4961 (11.1%)</td>
<td>4195 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>13342 (27.1%)</td>
<td>12930 (28.9%)</td>
<td>9648 (21.6%)</td>
<td>5582 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>6463 (13.1%)</td>
<td>5135 (11.5%)</td>
<td>4228 (9.5%)</td>
<td>2479 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>8147 (16.5%)</td>
<td>7869 (17.6%)</td>
<td>9788 (21.9%)</td>
<td>12158 (25.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>4429 (9.0%)</td>
<td>4778 (10.7%)</td>
<td>7717 (17.3%)</td>
<td>15079 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49314 (100%)</td>
<td>44792 (100%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
<td>47934 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 shows that verbs and nouns were the most important word classes in fiction: with 21.9% verbs and 21.6% nouns these two word classes each comprised almost a quarter of the fiction sample. The third largest group was the rest category (17.3%); this closed-class category formed almost 20% of the fiction data. The next two word classes were also closed-class categories: determiners (11.1%) and prepositions (9.5%). The open-class categories adjective and adverb both formed a little over 6% of the fiction sample. Conjunctions were the smallest group, with just under 6%.
Comparing these percentages for fiction to the percentages for the other registers, a first observation is that fiction is indeed situated between the conversations on the one hand and news and academic texts on the other. Fiction contained proportionally fewer adjectives, nouns and prepositions than the news texts and academic texts but more than the conversations, confirming the expectation based on Biber’s finding that a high frequency of these word classes marks an informational text type. Conversely, fiction contained more verbs and rest-category items than news and academic discourse but fewer than conversations; according to Biber’s research, these word classes are associated with involved text types.

Although the different tense forms of the verbs cannot easily be distinguished in the analyses, a quick look at the past-tense form was in the four registers revealed that this form was indeed much more frequent in fiction (697 instances; 7.1% of the verbs in fiction) than in conversation (342 instances; 2.8% of the verbs in conversation), news (325 instances; 4.1% of the verbs in news) and academic discourse (309 instances; 3.8% of the verbs in academic discourse). This confirms the expectations concerning fiction’s narrative concerns, which should lead to a marked use of past-tense forms. The high frequencies for the rest category were for a large part caused by the inclusion of the personal pronouns in this category. In accordance with the expectation concerning narrative concerns, the third-person pronouns were more frequent in the fiction sample than the first-person and second-person pronouns: he (1417), she (934), it (575), they (452), I (966), we (236), you (602). The relatively high frequencies for I and you may be related to the presence of dialogue in fiction, an issue which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, when narrative and dialogue in fiction are compared.

Fiction contained proportionally more determiners than the conversations but fewer than news and academic discourse, which can be related to the inclusion of the articles – a characteristic of written texts – in this word class. Conversely, fiction contained proportionally more adverbs than news and academic discourse but fewer than conversation. In relation to adverbs, one question was whether a preference for Situation-Dependent Reference – a characteristic of both conversation and fiction (Biber 1988, 1989) – would lead to a marked use of place and time adverbs. The results show first of all that conversation (8.9%) and fiction (6.4%) contain a larger proportion of adverbs than news (4.9%) and academic discourse (5.1%). A closer inspection of the adverb lemmas in fiction showed that time and place adverbial were among the most frequent, then being the most frequent adverb with 104 occurrences, now occurring in third place with 84 instances and here and there falling just outside the top ten with 49 occurrences each. Finally, fiction contained more conjunctions than both conversation and news, but fewer than academic discourse.
Standardized residuals revealed that fiction had the fewest word classes significantly contributing to the overall two-way interaction between word class and register. In fiction, the following word classes did not contribute to the interaction: adverbs (st. res. +0.3), conjunctions (st. res. +0.4), prepositions (st. res. -2.3) and rest-category items (st. res. +0.7). These four word classes did show significant associations with the other registers, with the exception of conjunctions in news texts, which also did not contribute to the interaction between word class and register (st. res. -1.0). Adverbs were overused in the conversations (st. res. +22.8) and underused in news (st. res. -12.2) and academic texts (st. res. -11.1). Conjunctions were underused in conversations (st. res. -5.0) and overused in academic texts (st. res. +5.5). Prepositions were overused in academic discourse (st. res. +23.4) and news texts (st. res. +11.2) but underused in conversations (st. res. -32.4). And the rest category was underused in the conversations (st. res. 75.7) and underused in news (st. res. -33.1) and academic discourse (st. res. -43.8).

In fiction, the following word classes did contribute to the significant interaction between register and word class: adjectives, determiners, nouns and verbs. Fiction significantly underused adjectives (st. res. -3.1), determiners (st. res. -2.8) and nouns (st. res. -2.8). The same three word classes were underused in conversation: adjectives (st. res. -27.9), determiners (st. res. -18.1) and nouns (st. res. -49.2). In news texts and academic discourse, on the other hand, these word classes were overused: adjectives (st. res. +10.8 in news and +20.2 in academic discourse), determiners (st. res. +7.2 in news and +13.7 in academic discourse), nouns (st. res. +29.8 in news and +22.7 in academic discourse). Fiction only significantly overused one word class, namely verbs (st. res. +7.4). Like the underuse of adjectives, determiners and nouns, fiction shared this overuse of verbs with conversation (st. res. +24.4). News and academic discourse again showed the opposite pattern and significantly underused verbs (st. res. -13.0 in news and st. res. -18.8 in academic discourse).

Although the chi-square analysis showed that fiction has the same underuse of adjectives, determiners and nouns and the same overuse of verbs as the conversations, the relative proportions of the word classes showed that fiction is clearly in between the conversations on the one hand and news and academic discourse on the other. A graphic representation of the distributions of the eight main word classes in the different registers is given in Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1 shows that in terms of general patterning, fiction is more similar to the other two written registers, though news and academic discourse are much more similar to each other than to fiction. Although this analysis is clearly not as refined as Biber’s multi-feature model, the results can be seen as a confirmation that fiction contains more informational features (e.g., adjectives, nouns, prepositions) than conversation but fewer than news and academic discourse; and
conversely, it also confirms that fiction contains more involved features (e.g., adverbs, verbs, rest-category items) than news and academic discourse but fewer than conversation. Fiction’s use of verbs and the rest-category can also be related to its narrative concerns (Dimension 2), while its use of adverbs can be related to fiction’s situation-dependent reference (Dimension 3). In summary, the texts in the corpus correspond to Biber’s corpus in terms of these linguistic features. The lexico-semantic dimension of metaphor use can now be added to further refine this register comparison.

Figure 5.1 Graphic representation of the distribution of word classes per register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Academic Discourse</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest Category</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 The interaction between register, word class and metaphor

Now that it has been established that there is an interaction between register and word class, and that these findings correspond to the findings of Biber (1988,
1989), another dimension can be added to this picture by looking at the distribution of metaphor-related words across the different word classes in fiction as compared to the other registers. The first step in this analysis was to determine whether there was a higher-order interaction between register, word class and metaphor. Since a high number of cells with expected counts below five is problematic for the test statistics, the four-way categorization of the different relations to metaphor reported in Chapter 3 was simplified into a binary distinction between words that are related to metaphor (MRW) and words that are not related to metaphor (non-MRW). This binary distinction included the MFlags in the category of non-MRWs and combined the clear and borderline MRWs into one MRW category. Using this binary distinction, all component two-way contingency tables showed expected frequencies in excess of five so that a loglinear analysis was allowed.

Based on the idea that there were likely to be significant differences between the registers included in this study, and the assumption that metaphor usage often plays a central role in the creation of a specific style, the question arose whether fiction had a different distribution of metaphor-related words across the eight word classes than the other registers. The three-way loglinear analysis produced a final model that retained all effects. The likelihood of this model was $\chi^2(0) = 0, p = 1$. The highest-order interaction (register x word class x metaphor) was significant: $\chi^2(21) = 1,694.052, p < 0.001$.

Since it was previously established that there is a significant interaction between register and word class, and since metaphor usage is the main focus of this study, this three-way interaction will be further investigated by examining the interaction between metaphor and word class for each of the registers, and by examining the interaction between metaphor and register for each of the word classes. Together, these analyses will show if and how the distribution of metaphor-related words in fiction differs from the distributions of the other registers. Separate chi-square analyses on the level of register showed that there were differences in the distribution of MRWs and non-MRWs across the eight main word classes for fiction ($\chi^2(7) = 3,473.98, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.28$), as well as for academic discourse ($\chi^2(7) = 4,879.22, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.32$), news ($\chi^2(7) = 4,252.00, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.31$), and conversation ($\chi^2(7) = 4,178.54, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer’s } V = 0.30$).

Table 5.2 shows the frequencies and percentages for non-metaphor-related words and metaphor-related words in each of the word classes in the four registers. Percentages per column are given to indicate the relative proportions of the word classes in either the group of words that are related to metaphor or the group of words that are not related to metaphor.
Table 5.2 The distribution of metaphor per word class divided by register with frequencies and percentages per column

5.2a Distribution in fiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2394 (6.1%)</td>
<td>575 (10.9%)</td>
<td>2969 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>2575 (6.5%)</td>
<td>264 (5.0%)</td>
<td>2839 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2473 (6.3%)</td>
<td>25 (0.5%)</td>
<td>2498 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>4583 (11.6%)</td>
<td>378 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4961 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>8632 (21.9%)</td>
<td>1016 (19.2%)</td>
<td>9648 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>2817 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1411 (26.7%)</td>
<td>4228 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>8233 (20.9%)</td>
<td>1555 (29.4%)</td>
<td>9788 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>7648 (19.4%)</td>
<td>69 (1.3%)</td>
<td>7717 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39355 (100%)</td>
<td>5293 (100%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2b Distribution in academic discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>3841 (9.6%)</td>
<td>818 (9.0%)</td>
<td>4659 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>2251 (5.6%)</td>
<td>252 (2.8%)</td>
<td>2503 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2987 (7.4%)</td>
<td>41 (0.4%)</td>
<td>3028 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>6199 (15.4%)</td>
<td>544 (6.0%)</td>
<td>6743 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>10997 (27.4%)</td>
<td>2345 (25.7%)</td>
<td>13342 (27.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3713 (9.2%)</td>
<td>2750 (30.1%)</td>
<td>6463 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>5892 (14.7%)</td>
<td>2255 (24.7%)</td>
<td>8147 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>4312 (10.7%)</td>
<td>117 (1.3%)</td>
<td>4429 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40192 (100%)</td>
<td>9122 (100%)</td>
<td>49314 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2c Distribution in news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2969 (7.9%)</td>
<td>791 (10.8%)</td>
<td>3760 (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>1942 (5.2%)</td>
<td>241 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2183 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2415 (6.4%)</td>
<td>22 (0.3%)</td>
<td>2437 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>5361 (14.3%)</td>
<td>339 (4.6%)</td>
<td>5700 (12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>11229 (30.0%)</td>
<td>1701 (23.2%)</td>
<td>12930 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3177 (8.5%)</td>
<td>1958 (26.7%)</td>
<td>5135 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>5697 (15.2%)</td>
<td>2172 (29.6%)</td>
<td>7869 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>4660 (12.4%)</td>
<td>118 (1.6%)</td>
<td>4778 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37450 (100%)</td>
<td>7342 (100%)</td>
<td>44792 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2d Distribution in conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>1517 (3.4%)</td>
<td>233 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1750 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>3969 (9.0%)</td>
<td>321 (8.7%)</td>
<td>4290 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2366 (5.3%)</td>
<td>35 (0.9%)</td>
<td>2401 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>3541 (8.0%)</td>
<td>654 (17.7%)</td>
<td>4195 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>5121 (11.6%)</td>
<td>461 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5582 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>1641 (3.7%)</td>
<td>838 (22.7%)</td>
<td>2479 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>11048 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1110 (30.1%)</td>
<td>12158 (25.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>15044 (34.0%)</td>
<td>35 (0.9%)</td>
<td>15079 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44247 (100%)</td>
<td>3687 (100%)</td>
<td>47934 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fiction, 29.4% of all the lexical items annotated as being related to metaphor were verbs and 26.7% were prepositions. Together, these two word classes accounted for over 50% of all the metaphor-related words in fiction. This means that half of the metaphor-related words in fiction was either a verb or a preposition. In comparison, verbs and prepositions only accounted for approximately 30% of the group of non-MRWs in fiction. This difference was primarily caused by the prepositions: prepositions formed only 7.2% of the non-MRWs while they formed 26.7% of the MRWs. For the verbs, this distribution was more balanced: 20.9% versus 29.4%. This indicates that verbs were an important part of both the group of words that are related to metaphor and the group of words that are not related to metaphor, while prepositions were a very important part of the group of words that are related to metaphor (over 25%) but were relatively unimportant in the group of words that are not related to metaphor (only 7.2%). The chi-square analysis showed that fiction was indeed characterized by an overuse of MRW prepositions (st. res. +40.6) and MRW verbs (st. res. +11.6). That is, fiction contained significantly more MRW prepositions and MRW verbs than expected by chance.

In comparison to the other registers, fiction (29.4%) contained almost the same proportion of MRW verbs as news (29.6%), while news (15.2%) contained a lower percentage of non-MRW verbs than fiction (20.9%). Academic discourse contained both fewer MRW verbs (24.7%) and fewer non-MRW verbs (14.7%) than fiction. Conversation, on the other hand, contained both more MRW verbs (30.1%) and more non-MRW verbs (25.0%) than fiction. The chi-square analysis showed that in fact MRW verbs were overused in all four of the registers: fiction (st. res. +11.6), academic (st. res. +19.3), news (st. res. +24.6) and conversation (st. res. +5.7). Non-MRW verbs, on the other hand were significantly underused in fiction, news texts and academic discourse (st. res. -4.2; -10.9; -9.2) while they were distributed according to chance in conversation (st. res. -1.7).

As far as prepositions were concerned, the news texts had roughly the same percentages as fiction for both MRW (26.7%) and non-MRW (8.5%) prepositions. Academic discourse had slightly higher percentages for both groups: 30.1% MRW prepositions and 9.2% non-MRW prepositions; conversely, conversation had slightly lower percentages for both groups: 22.7% MRW prepositions and 3.7% non-MRW prepositions. The chi-square analysis showed that all four registers significantly underused non-MRW prepositions and significantly overused MRW prepositions: fiction (st. res. -14.9 versus +40.6); academic texts (st. res. -21.4 versus +45.0); news texts (st. res. -17.0 versus +38.5); and conversations (st. res. -13.5 versus +46.9). Summarizing, while verbs and prepositions were clearly the most important word classes in the group of metaphor-related words in fiction, the
other registers showed a similar overuse of both MRW verbs and MRW prepositions.

For fiction, the next two important word classes for the group of metaphor-related words were the adjectives and nouns. These word classes accounted for 10.9% and 19.2% respectively of the MRWs in fiction. For the adjectives, the percentage for non-MRWs was again lower (6.1%), as was the case for the verbs and prepositions. For the nouns, on the other hand, the percentage for non-MRWs was higher, namely 21.9%. The chi-square analysis showed that MRW adjectives were overused in fiction (st. res. +11.9) while non-MRW adjectives were underused (st. res. -4.4). For the nouns, however, fiction showed an underuse of MRW nouns (st. res. -3.8) while the non-MRW nouns were distributed according to chance (st. res. +1.4). This shows that while nouns formed a larger proportion of the group of metaphor-related words than adjectives (19.2% versus 10.9%), there were in fact fewer MRW nouns than expected and more MRW adjectives than expected.

In comparison with the other registers, fiction had similar percentages for adjectives to the news texts, which had 7.9% non-MRW adjectives and 10.8% MRW adjectives. Academic discourse had more non-MRW adjectives than fiction (9.6%) but fewer MRW ones (9.0%); conversation had fewer adjectives in both groups: 3.4% non-MRW adjectives and 6.3% MRW adjectives. The chi-square analysis showed that fiction shared its significant overuse of MRW adjectives (st. res. +11.9) with news (st. res. +7.0) and conversation (st. res. +8.5), while adjectives in academic discourse did not contribute to the significant interaction (st. res. -1.5 for MRW adjectives and st. res. +0.7 for non-MRW adjectives). Non-MRW adjectives in conversation also did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. -2.4). News, on the other hand, was similar to fiction in its underuse of non-MRW adjectives (st. res. -3.1). In short, MRW adjectives were overused in relation to the other word classes in fiction while non-MRW adjectives were underused. The same pattern occurred in the news texts. Conversations also overused MRW adjectives in relation to the other word classes but did not show an underuse of non-MRW adjectives, while in academic discourse both MRW and non-MRW adjectives were distributed according to chance.

With respect to nouns, both academic discourse and news texts had a higher percentage of non-MRW nouns (24.7% and 30.0%) than fiction as well as a higher percentage of MRW nouns (25.7% and 23.3%). Conversely, conversation had lower percentages than fiction for both non-MRW nouns (11.6%) and MRW nouns (12.5%). News, like fiction, significantly underused MRW nouns (st. res. -9.1) but while the non-MRW nouns in fiction did not contribute to the interaction, the non-MRW nouns in news were overused (st. res. +4.0). In both academic discourse and conversation, the non-MRW nouns and MRW nouns did not contribute to the
interaction (st. res. +1.2 and -0.4 for non-MRW nouns in academic discourse and conversation respectively; st. res. -2.5 and +1.5 for MRW nouns in academic discourse and conversation respectively).

The other word classes were much less frequently related to metaphor in fiction. Adverbs and determiners formed only 5.0% and 7.1% of the group of metaphor-related words in fiction. For the adverbs, the percentage for non-MRWs was almost the same: 6.5%. When fiction is compared to the other registers, the percentages show that news had a smaller proportion of both non-MRW adverbs (5.2%) and MRW adverbs (3.3%) than fiction, as did the academic texts (5.6% non-MRW adverbs and 2.8% MRW adverbs). Conversations, on the other hand, contained a larger proportion of both non-MRW adverbs (9.0%) and MRW adverbs (8.7%) than fiction. In fiction, the MRW adverbs were underused (st. res. -4.0) whereas the non-MRW adverbs did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. +1.5). In conversation, neither the non-MRW adverbs nor MRW adverbs contributed to the interaction (st. res. +0.1 and -0.5). In news and academic discourse, the non-MRW adverbs were significantly overused (st. res. +2.7 and +4.7 respectively) while the MRW adverbs were underused (st. res. -6.2 and -9.8 respectively).

As far as the determiners are concerned, both academic discourse and news contained a higher percentage of non-MRW determiners than fiction (15.4% and 14.3% respectively) but a lower percentages of MRW determiners (6.1% and 4.6% respectively). The opposite was true for the conversations: the percentage for non-MRW determiners was the lowest of all four registers (8.0%) while the percentage for MRW determiners was the highest (17.7%). Fiction, news and academic discourse all significantly overused non-MRW determiners (st. res. +3.2; +8.6; +9.5 respectively) and underused MRW determiners (st. res. -8.7; -19.5; -19.9 respectively); conversely, the conversations significantly underused non-MRW determiners (st. res. -5.3) and overused MRW determiners (st. res. +18.4).

The two remaining word classes – conjunctions and rest category – accounted for only 0.5% and 1.3% of the MRWs in fiction and were both significantly underused as MRWs (st. res. -15.8 and -28.0). Their non-MRW counterparts, on the other hand, accounted for 6.3% (conjunctions) and 19.4% (rest category) of the fiction sample. This shows that although the rest category played a relatively important role in the group of non-MRWs in fiction (comprising almost 20% of the sample), they were hardly ever related to metaphor (only 1.3%). In comparison with fiction, academic discourse and news contained fewer non-MRW rest items (10.7% and 12.4%) and almost the same amount of MRW rest items (1.3% and 1.6%). Conversation contained a much higher percentage of non-MRW rest items (34.0%) but an even lower amount of MRW rest items (0.9%). In all four registers the non-MRW rest items were significantly overused (fiction +10.3; academic
+11.7; news +10.5; conversation + 9.5) and the MRW rest items underused (fiction
-28.0; academic -24.5; news -23.8; conversation -33.0).

The percentages for conjunctions in fiction were similar to the percentages for
the other registers: academic discourse contained slightly more non-MRW
conjunctions (7.4%) and almost the same percentage of MRW ones (0.4%); news
contained roughly the same percentages for both non-MRW conjunctions (6.4%)
and MRW ones (0.3%); the conversations contained the lowest percentage of non-
MRW conjunctions (5.3%) but the highest percentage of MRW ones (0.9%). In all
four registers the non-MRW conjunctions were significantly overused (fiction
+5.8; academic discourse +10.4; news +8.4; and conversation +3.2) while the
MRW conjunctions were significantly underused (fiction -15.8; academic
discourse -21.9; news -18.9; and conversation -11.0). That is, in all four of the
registers conjunctions were rarely related to metaphor.

The percentages in Table 5.2 revealed that there were considerable differences
in the distributions of metaphor-related words and non-metaphor-related words
across the eight main word classes in fiction, with some word classes making up
almost a quarter of the group of MRWs in fiction (e.g., prepositions and verbs)
while other word classes were hardly ever related to metaphor (conjunctions and
rest category). However, when fiction was compared to the other registers, similar
distributions across the word classes were often found. The results showed that
while the metaphor-related words were unequally distributed across the word
classes within fiction and within each of the other three registers, the four registers
often showed similar distributions. That is, the established uneven distribution of
metaphor-related words across the eight word classes need not be unique for
fiction. To determine the differences in interaction between register and metaphor
the distributions need to be compared from the point of view of word class. This
analysis will be presented next.

Table 5.3 shows the same frequencies as Table 5.2, but this time it gives the
percentages per row rather than per column, to indicate how the words that are
related to metaphor and the words that are not related to metaphor are divided over
the registers within each word class. Separate chi-square analyses on the level of
word class showed that there were significant differences in the distribution of non-
MRWs and MRWs across the registers for adjectives ($\chi^2(3) = 51.62, p < 0.001$;
Cramer’s $V = 0.06$), adverbs ($\chi^2(3) = 26.40, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.05$),
determiners ($\chi^2(3) = 309.68, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.12$), nouns ($\chi^2(3) = 398.79,$
$p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.10$), prepositions ($\chi^2(3) = 113.77, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V$
$= 0.08$), verbs ($\chi^2(3) = 1,626.80, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.21$) and the rest
category ($\chi^2(3) = 296.95, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.10$). The chi-square analyses
did not show a significant interaction between metaphor and register for the
conjunctions ($\chi^2(3) = 4.64, p = 0.2$).
Table 5.3 The distribution of metaphor per word class divided by register with frequencies and percentages per row

5.3a Distribution in fiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2394 (80.6%)</td>
<td>575 (19.4%)</td>
<td>2969 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>2575 (90.7%)</td>
<td>264 (9.3%)</td>
<td>2839 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2473 (99.0%)</td>
<td>25 (1.0%)</td>
<td>2498 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>4583 (92.4%)</td>
<td>378 (7.6%)</td>
<td>4961 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>8632 (89.5%)</td>
<td>1016 (10.5%)</td>
<td>9648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>2817 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1411 (33.4%)</td>
<td>4228 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>8233 (84.1%)</td>
<td>1555 (15.9%)</td>
<td>9788 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>7648 (99.1%)</td>
<td>69 (0.9%)</td>
<td>7717 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39355 (88.1%)</td>
<td>5293 (11.9%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3b Distribution in academic discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>3841 (82.4%)</td>
<td>818 (17.6%)</td>
<td>4659 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>2251 (89.9%)</td>
<td>252 (10.1%)</td>
<td>2503 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2987 (98.6%)</td>
<td>41 (1.4%)</td>
<td>3028 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>6199 (91.9%)</td>
<td>544 (8.1%)</td>
<td>6743 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>10997 (82.4%)</td>
<td>2345 (17.6%)</td>
<td>13342 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3713 (57.5%)</td>
<td>2750 (42.5%)</td>
<td>6463 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>5892 (72.3%)</td>
<td>2255 (27.7%)</td>
<td>8147 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>4312 (97.4%)</td>
<td>117 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4429 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40145 (81.4%)</td>
<td>9169 (18.6%)</td>
<td>49314 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3c Distribution in news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2969 (79.0%)</td>
<td>791 (21.0%)</td>
<td>3760 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>1942 (89.0%)</td>
<td>241 (11.0%)</td>
<td>2183 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2415 (99.1%)</td>
<td>22 (0.9%)</td>
<td>2437 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>5361 (94.1%)</td>
<td>339 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5700 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>11229 (68.8%)</td>
<td>1701 (31.2%)</td>
<td>12930 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3177 (61.9%)</td>
<td>1958 (38.1%)</td>
<td>5135 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>5697 (72.4%)</td>
<td>2172 (27.6%)</td>
<td>7869 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>4660 (97.5%)</td>
<td>118 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4778 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37450 (83.6%)</td>
<td>7342 (16.4%)</td>
<td>44792 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3d Distribution in conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>1517 (86.7%)</td>
<td>233 (13.3%)</td>
<td>1750 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>3969 (92.5%)</td>
<td>321 (7.5%)</td>
<td>4290 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2366 (98.5%)</td>
<td>35 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2401 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>3541 (84.4%)</td>
<td>654 (15.6%)</td>
<td>4195 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>5121 (91.7%)</td>
<td>461 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5582 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>1641 (66.2%)</td>
<td>838 (33.8%)</td>
<td>2479 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>11048 (90.9%)</td>
<td>1110 (9.1%)</td>
<td>12158 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>15044 (99.8%)</td>
<td>35 (0.2%)</td>
<td>15079 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44247 (92.3%)</td>
<td>3687 (7.7%)</td>
<td>47934 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 shows that of the adjectives in fiction 80.6% were not related to metaphor and 19.4% were related to metaphor. Academic discourse and conversation both contained more non-MRW adjectives than fiction (82.4% and 86.7%) and fewer MRW adjectives (17.6% and 13.3%). News, on the other hand, contained fewer non-MRW adjectives than fiction (79.0%) but more MRW adjectives (21.0%). The chi-square analysis showed that both the non-MRW adjectives and the MRW adjectives in fiction did not contribute to the significant interaction between register and metaphor (st. res. -0.6 and +1.2 respectively); the same was true for the non-MRW and MRW adjectives in academic discourse (st. res. +0.6 and -1.3). The non-MRW adjectives in news and conversation also did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. -1.8 and +2.4) but news significantly overused MRW adjectives (st. res. +3.8) while conversation underused them (st. res. -5.0). This means that while non-MRW adjectives are underused and MRW adjectives overused in fiction in relation to the other word classes, the distribution of non-MRW adjectives and MRW adjectives in fiction did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and register.

Of the adverbs in fiction 90.7% were not related to metaphor and only 9.3% were. Only conversation had a higher percentage of non-MRW adverbs (92.5%) and a lower percentage of MRW adverbs (7.5%). Both academic texts and news texts had fewer non-MRW adverbs than fiction (89.9% and 89.0%) and more MRW adverbs (10.1% and 11.0%). The chi-square analysis showed that the non-MRW adverbs were distributed according to expectation in all four of the registers: fiction (st. res. 0.0); academic discourse (st. res. -0.5); news (st. res. -0.9); conversation (st. res. +1.1). The MRW adverbs also did not contribute to the interaction in both fiction (st. res. +0.3) and academic discourse (st. res. +1.6), while they were overused in news (st. res. +3.0) and underused in conversation (st. res. -3.6). This shows that although MRW adverbs were significantly underused in fiction in relation to the other word classes, fiction’s distribution of non-MRW and MRW adverbs did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and register.

Of the determiners in fiction, 92.4% were not related to metaphor and 7.6% were. News had slightly more non-MRW determiners (94.1%) and fewer MRW ones (5.9%); academic discourse had slightly fewer non-MRW determiners (91.9%) and more MRW ones (8.1%). Conversation was most different from the other three registers, with twice as many MRW determiners (15.6%). The chi-square analysis showed that conversation significantly overused MRW determiners (st. res. +14.6) while fiction and news significantly underused them (st. res. -2.9 and -7.4). The distribution of MRW determiners in academic discourse did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. -2.2). The distribution of non-MRW determiners in fiction (st. res. +0.9), news (st. res. +2.3) and academic discourse (st. res. +0.7) also did not contribute to the interaction. Only conversations
significantly underused non-MRW determiners (st. res. -4.6) in relation to the other registers. These results show that within fiction MRW determiners were underused in comparison to the other word classes, and fiction also underused MRW determiners in relation to the other registers.

Of the nouns in fiction, 89.5% were not related to metaphor and 10.5% were related to metaphor. The distribution of the nouns across the registers showed a clear cline for the MRW nouns from the lowest percentage in conversation (8.3%), then fiction (10.5%), then news (13.2%), to the highest percentage in academic discourse (17.6%). The difference between academic and conversation was almost 10%, with news and fiction in the middle with a difference of 3% in each direction. The chi-square analysis showed that fiction overused non-MRW nouns (st. res. +2.9) and underused MRW nouns (st. res. -7.5); conversation also showed an overuse of non-MRW nouns (st. res. +4.1) and an underuse of MRW ones (st. res. -10.3). Academic discourse had exactly the opposite pattern, with an underuse of non-MRW nouns (st. res. -5.3) and an overuse of MRW nouns (st. res. +13.5). In news, both non-MRW and MRW nouns were distributed according to chance (st. res. +0.2 and -0.5). These results show that within fiction MRW nouns were underused in comparison to the other word classes, and fiction also underused MRW nouns in relation to the other registers.

Of the prepositions in fiction a third was related to metaphor (33.4%), as was the case for conversation (33.8%). For news and academic discourse the percentages of MRW prepositions were even higher (38.1% and 42.5%). The difference between the highest and lowest percentage was almost ten percent. The chi-square analysis showed that both fiction and conversation overused non-MRW prepositions (st. res. +3.8 and +2.7) and underused MRW prepositions (st. res. -4.9 and -3.4). Academic texts underused the non-MRW prepositions (st. res. -4.6) and overused the MRW ones (st. res. +5.9). In the news texts both the non-MRW and MRW prepositions were distributed according to chance (st. res. -0.1 and +0.1). For the prepositions this means that in fiction MRW prepositions were overused in relation to the other word classes, while in relation to the other registers fiction underused MRW prepositions.

Of the verbs in fiction, 84.1% were not related to metaphor and 15.9% were. With 15.9% MRW verbs fiction was positioned in between conversation (9.1%) on the one hand, and news (27.6%) and academic discourse (27.7%) on the other. News and academic texts contained over 1.5 times as many MRW verbs as fiction, and fiction in turn contained over 1.5 times as many MRW verbs as conversation. The difference between academic discourse and conversation was almost 20%. The chi-square analysis showed that MRW verbs were significantly underused in fiction and conversation (st. res. -6.4 and -24.4) and overused in news and academic texts (st. res. +18.3 and +18.8). The non-MRW verbs were overused in
fiction and conversation (st. res. +3.1 and +11.7) and underused in news and academic texts (st. res. -8.8 and -9.0). These findings show that while MRW verbs were overused within fiction in relation to the other word classes, they were underused in fiction in relation to the other registers.

Finally, Table 5.3 shows that for all four of the registers the number of items in the rest category that are related to metaphor was extremely low, ranging from 0.2% in conversation to 2.5% and 2.6% in news and academic discourse. With 0.9% fiction was positioned in between, but closer to conversation than the other two written registers. The chi-square analysis showed that in fiction both the non-MRW and MRW rest category items were distributed according to chance (st. res. +0.1 and -1.4). The distribution of non-MRW rest items in conversation (st. res. +1.0), news (st. res. -1.0) and academic discourse (st. res. -1.1) did not contribute to the interaction either. However, the MRW rest items were overused in news (st. res. +9.5) and academic texts (st. res. +10.2) and underused in conversation (st. res. -9.9). Yet although they were overused in news and academic discourse, these MRW rest items formed less than 2% of the MRWs. For fiction, the results show that while the MRW rest items were underused within fiction in relation to the other word classes, their distribution was according to chance in fiction in relation to the other registers.

5.3.3 Discussion of the interaction between register, word class and metaphor

The results show that there is a significant three-way interaction between word class, metaphor and register. When the interaction between register and word class was considered without including metaphor it was shown that fiction was characterized by an underuse of adjectives, determiners, and nouns, an overuse of verbs, and a neutral distribution of adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and the rest category. The inclusion of metaphor in the analysis revealed that the tendencies for words that are related to metaphor were different from the tendencies for words that are not related to metaphor. The underuse of adjectives in fiction can be broken up into an underuse of non-MRW adjectives and an overuse of MRW adjectives. That is, there were more adjectives that are related to metaphor than expected, and fewer adjectives that are not related to metaphor. Conversely, the underuse of determiners in fiction breaks down into an overuse of non-MRWs and an underuse of MRWs. So there were more non-metaphor-related determiners than expected and fewer metaphor-related ones. The underuse of nouns in fiction can be subdivided into a non-significant use of non-MRW nouns and an underuse of
MRW nouns, while the overuse of verbs in fiction divides into an underuse of non-MRW verbs and an overuse of MRW verbs.

The distributions of adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and rest category were non-significant before including metaphor. After including metaphor, the non-MRW adverbs did not contribute to the interaction while the MRW adverbs were underused. The non-MRW conjunctions and rest-category items were overused while their MRW counterparts were underused. Conversely, prepositions were underused when they are not related to metaphor and overused when they are related to metaphor. This shows that the MRWs and the non-MRWs have clearly distinct distributions across the different word classes in fiction. In relation to the other registers, however, it was shown that although fiction used more MRW adjectives than is expected within fiction, the distribution of MRW adjectives in fiction did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and register. The MRW adverbs, conjunctions and rest category, which were significantly underused in fiction in relation to the other word classes, also did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and register. MRW determiners and nouns, which were underused in fiction in comparison to the other word classes were also underused in relation to the other registers. MRW prepositions and verbs were overused in fiction in relation to the other word classes, but in relation to the other registers fiction underused MRW prepositions and verbs.

This section has examined how fiction is similar to and different from the other registers in terms of the general distribution of the eight main word classes as well as the distribution of metaphor across these word classes. However, the notion of word class is rather general and abstract, and the analyses presented in this section do not provide any insight into the kind of metaphors that occur in these word classes. In addition, the analyses do not shed light on whether the overuse of metaphor in a particular word class can be attributed to a small group of specific lemmas that have a frequent metaphorical use or whether the word class involves a large degree of variation in metaphor use. In addition, it was demonstrated that the four registers often showed the same overuse of metaphor in a particular word class, but it is at present unclear whether they involve the same dominant patterns of metaphor within these word classes. The overuse of metaphor in a particular word class may be related to metaphorical uses that are common in all language use or they may be related to specific uses in one or more of the registers. This is what the following section will examine.
5.3.4 Dominant patterns of metaphor and metaphor variation in fiction

So far the general distribution of the different word classes in fiction and the other registers has been analysed as well as the distribution of metaphor across these word classes. The main focus of the analyses in this section will be on the dominant patterns and variation within word classes in terms of type-token ratios and the most frequently used lemmas. This will demonstrate whether fiction differs from the other registers in terms of the kinds of words that are used metaphorically within these word classes. This will provide insight into which patterns of metaphor are dominant in fiction specifically, and which are dominant in all four of the registers more generally. The most important adjective, noun, and verb lemmas will be compared, first considering all words (i.e. both non-MRW and MRW taken together) and then considering only the metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs. This analysis will show, for both general use and metaphor-related use, if and how fiction differs from the other registers in terms of the dominant patterns and variation of metaphor.

The use of adjectives in fiction

The findings from Section 5.3.2 revealed that fiction contained fewer non-MRW adjectives than expected and more MRW adjectives than expected, showing that adjectives played a more important role in the group of metaphor-related words than in the group of words that are not related to metaphor. With 1280 adjective types and 2969 adjective tokens, fiction has a general type-token ratio for adjectives (both MRW and non-MRW) of 0.43. This type-token ratio is considerably higher than the type-token ratio for adjectives in conversation (0.24) and academic discourse (0.31). News has the same type-token ratio as fiction (0.43), though it has both more types (1607) and more tokens (3760). This reveals that both fiction and news are characterized by what Leech and Short (2007) call elegant variation.

With respect to metaphor-related adjectives only, fiction has 339 types and 575 tokens, and the type-token ratio for MRW adjectives in fiction is high: 0.59. Fiction actually has the highest type-token ratio for MRW adjectives, higher than conversation (0.39), academic discourse (0.43) and news (0.57). This shows that fiction is characterized by the greatest degree of variation in the use of metaphor-related adjectives.
Table 5.4 lists the ten most frequently used adjective lemmas in fiction and the other three registers.

Table 5.4 The ten most frequent adjective lemmas divided by register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Fiction Freq. (% of 2969 adj.)</th>
<th>Academic Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 4659 adj.)</th>
<th>News Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 3760 adj.)</th>
<th>Conversation Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 1750 adj.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>71 (2.4%)</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>86 (1.8%)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>57 (1.5%)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>108 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>46 (1.5%)</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>70 (1.5%)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>57 (1.5%)</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>91 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>43 (1.4%)</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>55 (1.2%)</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>41 (1.1%)</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>68 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>39 (1.3%)</td>
<td>criminal</td>
<td>47 (1.0%)</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>34 (0.9%)</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>59 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young</td>
<td>32 (1.1%)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>46 (1.0%)</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>34 (0.9%)</td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>46 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>31 (1.0%)</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>44 (0.9%)</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>33 (0.9%)</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>44 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>30 (1.0%)</td>
<td>inner</td>
<td>36 (0.8%)</td>
<td>labour</td>
<td>32 (0.9%)</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>34 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>29 (1.0%)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>35 (0.8%)</td>
<td>british</td>
<td>31 (0.8%)</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>33 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sure</td>
<td>28 (0.9%)</td>
<td>political</td>
<td>35 (0.8%)</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>28 (0.7%)</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>32 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>27 (0.9%)</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>35 (0.8%)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>27 (0.7%)</td>
<td>bloody</td>
<td>30 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 shows that in terms of frequency and relative importance, one important observation is that *good* was the most frequent adjective in fiction, news and conversation; however, it was relatively more important in fiction (2.4% of all the adjectives in fiction) than in news (1.5%) but much less important than in conversation (6.2%). *Old* was used almost equally frequently in fiction, news and conversation, and the difference in relative importance is small. This is also true for the relative importance of *new* in fiction, academic discourse and news, although *new* was used twice as frequently in academic discourse and news as in fiction. The most important adjective in academic discourse, *other*, occurred almost three times as often in academic discourse as in fiction, though the difference in relative importance is again small. The percentages for the most frequent adjectives in fiction are all small, as they are in news and academic discourse; conversation has much higher percentages than the other registers, though these also quickly drop to around 1%.

In terms of meaning, the most frequent adjectives in fiction are all relatively common and general, and form a number of semantically related groups. The adjectives *small* and *long* both have basic meanings relating to size and dimension; other frequent dimension adjectives in fiction are *great, large, high* and *big*. Some of these also appeared in the top tens of the other registers: *large and high* in news, *great* in news, and *big* in conversation. One important question here is of course how many of these dimension adjectives were used metaphorically (with size and dimension as the source domain); this issue will be discussed when the most frequently used MRW adjectives are considered. This will reveal whether the
relatively high frequency of long in fiction was caused by the fact that fiction used it both non-metaphorically to indicate space and metaphorically to indicate time while the other registers may have preferred only one of these uses. Other adjectives relating to time in fiction’s top ten are old, young and new. In news old and new are also among the most frequent adjectives, in academic discourse only new and in conversation only old.

The opposite colour terms white and black feature only in fiction’s top ten of most important adjectives. Other frequent colour terms in fiction are blue, yellow, red and golden, which are often used to describe the physical appearance of people, objects and surroundings. The adjective good is related to evaluation, and is the number one adjective in fiction, news and conversation. Its semantic opposite bad only occurs among the most frequently used adjectives in conversation. These adjectives of evaluation, colour, time and dimension seem clearly related to the description of people, places and events in fiction. As noted before, these adjectives are relatively common and general, and they are often used quite frequently in the other registers as well. This suggests that the most frequently used adjectives in fiction are not clearly register-specific. This can be contrasted with the presence of adjectives such as urban and criminal among the most frequent adjectives in academic discourse, adjectives such as local, national and labour in news, and even adjectives such as bloody, alright and nice in conversation. These adjectives appear to be more register-specific than adjectives such as good and long. In addition, adjectives such as social, criminal, urban, political, national, labour and British carry more specific semantic content and can be more clearly related to the specific subject matter discussed in these registers.

Nevertheless, fiction was characterized by a high number of unique adjectives (occurring only once), namely 857 out of 1280 types (67%) and 2969 tokens (29%). In comparison, academic discourse had 824 unique adjectives out of 1458 types (57%) and 4659 tokens (18%), news 1038 out of 1607 types (65%) and 3760 tokens (28%), and conversation 205 out of 424 types (48%) and 1750 tokens (12%). This means that fiction actually had the highest percentage of unique adjectives, namely 29% of all the adjectives in fiction was unique. Fiction also had the highest percentage of unique types: 67% of the types in fiction were unique. Some examples of unique and more clearly literary adjectives are wand-slim, unheralded, star-studded, quiescent, murky, crestfallen, and bifurcated.

Table 5.5 lists the ten most frequently used MRW adjective lemmas in fiction and the other registers.
Table 5.5 The ten most frequent MRW adjective lemmas divided by register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lemma</strong></td>
<td><strong>Freq. (% of 575 MRW adj.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Freq. (% of 818 MRW adj.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Freq. (% of 791 MRW adj.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>17 (3.0%)</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>35 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard</td>
<td>11 (1.9%)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>27 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golden</td>
<td>9 (1.6%)</td>
<td>serious</td>
<td>25 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>9 (1.6%)</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>22 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>8 (1.4%)</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>21 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale</td>
<td>8 (1.4%)</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>19 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole</td>
<td>8 (1.4%)</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>13 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>7 (1.2%)</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>13 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>7 (1.2%)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>11 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>6 (1.0%)</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>10 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 first of all shows that the lists of the most frequently used MRW adjectives are clearly distinct from the lists that included both non-MRW adjectives and MRW adjectives simultaneously. Of fiction’s overall most frequent adjectives only long and small remain. In fact, long was related to metaphor 17 out of 26 times, small 7 out of 39 times. The other adjectives – good, old, white, black, young, other, sure, bad – no longer appear in the top ten and are therefore predominantly not related to metaphor. Secondly, there is considerable overlap between the registers when it comes to the most frequently used MRW adjectives. Many of the size and dimension adjectives play an important role in this group: long in fiction, news and conversation; high in fiction, academic discourse and news; great in fiction, academic discourse and news; and big in fiction, news and conversation. In addition, small and whole are among the most frequently used MRW adjectives in fiction, large and wide in academic discourse, full in all registers except fiction, and little in conversation.

This shows that the source domain of size and dimension was one of the most important source domains for adjectives in all four of the registers. It also indicates that there were slight differences between the registers in their preferred adjectives from this source domain. Some examples of metaphorical uses of size and dimension adjectives in fiction are the following:

1) They stayed like that for a long moment and then he said, ‘Light the candle.’ (BNC-Baby: CB5)
2) Turnbull explains through the interpreter that time is short; (BNC-Baby: FAJ )
3) In high spirits, his father was talking about the immense advances made in forensic science in recent years. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
4) This is a very **big** war.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
5) Precautions are the symptoms of **small** and fearful minds. (BNC-Baby: CCW)

Another popular source domain was physical strength, which is represented by the adjectives **hard** (fiction and conversation), **powerful** (news) and **strong** (news and academic discourse). The adjectives **golden** and **pale** are related to the colour terms that were among the general most frequently used adjectives in fiction. However, unlike **black**, **white**, **blue**, etc., the use of **golden** and **pale** to describe colours can be considered metaphorical. The basic sense of **golden** is ‘made of gold’ (sense 2 in *Macmillan*) rather than ‘bright yellow in colour’ (sense 1) or ‘very happy or successful’ (sense 3). The basic sense of **pale** is concerned with humans: ‘a pale person has skin that is lighter than usual because they are ill, shocked or worried’ (sense 2 in *Macmillan*). When **pale** means ‘light and not bright in colour’ (sense 1) or ‘less impressive or not as good as before or when compared with someone or something similar’ (sense 3) it can therefore be considered metaphorical.

The metaphorical use of **golden** and **pale** is illustrated by the examples below.

6) The storm was abating rapidly, the evening sky clearing in the west with the **golden** rays of the setting sun adding a dying colour to the sullen slate blue water. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
7) This sombre giant — like a defeated proud man — contrasts, when considered in the nature of a living creature, with the **pale** smile of a last rose on the fading bush in front of him … (BNC-Baby: FET)

Though **pale** and **golden** were used almost equally frequently in their metaphorical senses (**golden** 9 times, **pale** 8 times), they differed considerably in their non-metaphorical use in fiction. While **pale** was used almost as often in its non-metaphorical sense, namely 5 times, **golden** was used exclusively in a metaphorical sense. The metaphor-related use of **golden** and **pale** appears to be more typical of fiction than the metaphor-related use of the other adjective lemmas, such as those relating to size and dimension. These are highly conventional and typical of general metaphorical language use rather than typical of fiction.

However, fiction is characterized by a large number of unique metaphor-related adjectives (i.e. metaphor-related adjectives occurring only once). Fiction contains 249 unique MRW adjectives out of 340 types (73%) and 575 tokens (43%). News has similar high percentages, containing 333 unique MRW adjectives out of 452 types (74%) and 791 tokens (42%). By comparison, academic discourse contains 224 unique MRW adjectives out of 352 types (64%) and 818 tokens (27%); conversation contains only 55 unique MRW adjectives out of 91 types (60%) and 233 tokens (24%). This shows that fiction and news are characterized by a much higher degree of unique variation in metaphor than the other two registers,
which can again be related to their role in elegant variation in these registers to make the text more attractive. However, it should be noted that uniqueness is concerned with number of occurrences in this case, which means that highly conventional metaphor-related adjectives that occur only once also count as “unique”.

In summary, this section has shown that even the most frequent metaphor-related adjectives are relatively infrequent. In addition, the most frequently used MRW adjectives are clearly distinct from the most frequently used non-MRW adjectives and relate to different semantic fields. There was some overlap between the most frequent MRW adjectives in the four registers, which was related to the fact that many of them involved size and dimension adjectives that have metaphorical uses that are common in general language use. Metaphor-related adjectives that did appear to be typical of fiction were golden and pale. More importantly, fiction is characterized by a high type-token ratio for MRW adjectives and a large proportion of unique MRW adjectives. This indicates that fiction is characterized by a large degree of variation in its use of metaphor-related adjectives.

The use of nouns in fiction

The findings from Section 5.3.2 showed that while fiction contained a higher proportion of MRW nouns (19.2%) than MRW adjectives (10.9%), fiction contained more MRW adjectives but fewer MRW nouns than expected by chance. The non-MRW nouns in fiction were distributed according to chance and did not contribute to the interaction between register, word class and metaphor. It was also shown that fiction contained a smaller proportion of MRW nouns than the other registers. However, with 3037 noun types and 9648 noun tokens, fiction had the second highest type-token ratio for nouns, namely 0.31. News had a higher type-token ratio (0.34) but both academic discourse (0.23) and conversation (0.26) had lower ones. With respect to MRW nouns, fiction had 574 types and 1016 tokens, resulting in a high type-token ratio of 0.56 – almost as high as for the MRW adjectives. As was the case with the MRW adjectives, fiction had by far the highest type-token ratio for MRW nouns, much higher than academic discourse (0.29) and conversation (0.36), and even higher than news (0.47). This shows that fiction is again the register that shows the greatest degree of variation in metaphor-related usage.

Table 5.6 below lists the ten most frequently used nouns in fiction and the other three registers.
Table 5.6 The ten most frequent noun lemmas divided by register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 9648 nouns)</th>
<th>academic</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 13342 nouns)</th>
<th>news</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 12930 nouns)</th>
<th>conversation</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 5582 nouns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>98 (1.0%)</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>167 (1.3%)</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>116 (0.9%)</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>107 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>87 (0.9%)</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>99 (0.7%)</td>
<td>mr</td>
<td>69 (0.5%)</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>78 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adam</td>
<td>81 (0.8%)</td>
<td>problem</td>
<td>88 (0.7%)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>69 (0.5%)</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>73 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paula</td>
<td>75 (0.8%)</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>83 (0.6%)</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>61 (0.5%)</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>71 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>60 (0.6%)</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>68 (0.5%)</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>54 (0.4%)</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>69 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>60 (0.6%)</td>
<td>murder</td>
<td>65 (0.5%)</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>54 (0.4%)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>67 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>53 (0.5%)</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>60 (0.4%)</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>45 (0.3%)</td>
<td>mum</td>
<td>58 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>52 (0.5%)</td>
<td>life</td>
<td>59 (0.4%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>45 (0.3%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>52 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>51 (0.5%)</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>58 (0.4%)</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>42 (0.3%)</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>50 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>48 (0.5%)</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>57 (0.4%)</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>40 (0.3%)</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>47 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 shows that, as was the case with the adjectives, the most frequent nouns in fiction are common, general nouns and they can be related to semantic groups. Adam and Paula clearly belong to the group of proper names, which is related to the fact that fiction is primarily concerned with telling stories about people, and often refers to the characters in the story by their first or last name. Although people are of course also referred to by name in the other registers, this does not occur so frequently that these proper nouns belong to the most important nouns in the registers. The second most important group of nouns in fiction is also related to the issue of identifying characters and consists of nouns indicating types of people, such as man and woman. Other frequent person nouns in the fiction sample are, for example, girl, child, people, father, friend, family, brother and boy.

These person nouns are clearly focused on identifying the relationships between the characters, especially in terms of gender and the family. Related forms are the nouns representing forms of address, such as mr in the list for news. It is interesting to see that in each register different forms are relatively most important: in fiction man and woman occur among the most frequent nouns, in academic discourse child and girl, in news mr and people, and in conversation people and mum. News and conversation both contain a lot of references to people, while this rather unspecific reference is much less often used in fiction (26 instances). The informal form mum is clearly typical of conversation, which also uses mummy, dad and daddy. None of these forms occurs in news or academic discourse, while fiction uses them only a handful of times: mum is used once, dad and mummy twice, and daddy three times, while the more formal forms father (22 instances) and mother (14 instances) are much more frequent. The extremely high frequency of child in academic discourse in combination with high frequencies for girl, boy and parent can be related to one specific text in the sample, which used these nouns extremely frequently. In fiction, on the other hand all the texts used a great variety of these nouns.
The next important group in fiction, which is still related to the description of characters, consists of nouns referring to the human body, such as *face* and *hand*. Other frequent body-part nouns in fiction are *eye, head, voice, hair, mind, arm, body* and *mouth*. Though all of these body-part nouns also occur in the conversations, the only one that occurs more than 10 times is *hand*, with 21 instances. In news *hand* and *body* occur more than 10 times, in academic discourse *hand, eye* and *body*. However, these body-part nouns are relatively more important in fiction and do not occur among the most frequently used nouns in the other registers. This high frequency of body-part nouns can therefore also be considered typical of fiction.

Another group which appears typical of fiction is represented by *house* and concerns nouns referring to descriptions of physical surroundings, especially in and around the house. Other frequent nouns in this group are *room, door, hall, kitchen* and *wall*. Related to this group are object nouns such as *chair, table, bed, boat, car* and *plane*. The noun *house* also occurs among the most frequent nouns in conversation, and conversation frequently uses nouns referring to locations and objects in and around the house. In academic discourse and news, on the other hand, such nouns are rare. The relatively frequent reference to *house* in the news texts is in part due to 13 instances of *house* in a text about buying and selling property. The great variety of these nouns in fiction and conversations suggests that these registers share a focus on the physical surroundings of the home. In academic and news texts the use of these nouns is related more to the topic of individual texts. The use of the vague object noun *thing*, which occurs among the most frequent nouns in fiction and conversation, is also related to this category. It may be that fiction and conversation have a relatively high frequency because they use it in both its non-metaphorical and metaphorical senses.

The last important group concerns indicators of time, such as *time* and *day*. Other frequent time indicators in fiction are *year, moment, week* and *evening*. These temporal nouns also play an important role in the most frequently used nouns in news and conversation: *year, time, day* and *week* in news, *time, week, day, night* and *year* in conversation. The percentages show that these nouns are slightly more important in conversation than in fiction and news, which is also indicated by the fact that 5 of the 10 most frequent nouns in conversation are concerned with time. Academic discourse, also contains frequent references to *time, year, day* and *week* but these nouns are relatively less important in academic discourse and do not occur among the most frequently used nouns.

In summary, the most important nouns in fiction belong to groups of nouns related to the description of characters, their social relations, their physical appearance and their physical surroundings. These are very general, common nouns referring to concrete entities. The high frequencies of proper nouns, person
nouns, and body-part nouns appears to be typical of fiction; the use of nouns describing locations and objects around the house is shared by conversation. The importance of nouns related to time is shared by all registers, though it is relatively more important in conversation, news and fiction than in academic discourse. As in fiction, many of the most frequently used nouns in news and conversation have relatively general, concrete meanings, while academic discourse is clearly more abstract in nature, with science, problem, law, history, murder, life, case and work as its most frequently used nouns.

Considering the use of unique nouns, the percentages are lower than for the adjectives: in fiction, there were 1679 unique nouns out of 3037 types (55%) and 9648 tokens (17%). In comparison, academic discourse had 1530 unique nouns out of 3113 types (49%) and 13342 tokens (11%), news 2410 out of 4361 types (55%) and 12930 tokens (19%), and conversation 680 out of 1446 types (47%) and 5582 tokens (12%). This means that fiction had the second highest percentage of unique nouns: 17% of all the nouns in fiction was unique. Only news had a slightly higher percentage. Fiction shares the highest percentage of unique types with news: 55% of the types in fiction and news were unique. It should, however, be noted that in news 107 of these unique nouns were numbers or amounts (e.g., 20ft.; 30p; £1000; etc.). In fiction there were only 4 of such nouns. Some examples of unique and more literary nouns in fiction are azure, bombshell, loincloth, monomania, reminiscence and tortoiseshell.

Table 5.7 lists the ten most frequently used MRW nouns in fiction and the other registers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td>Freq. (%) of 1016 MRW nouns</td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td>Freq. (%) of 2345 MRW nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>45 (4.4%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>51 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>32 (3.1%)</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>42 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>18 (1.7%)</td>
<td>form</td>
<td>41 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>14 (1.4%)</td>
<td>force</td>
<td>34 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td>13 (1.3%)</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>33 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world</td>
<td>12 (1.2%)</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>26 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>11 (1.1%)</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>26 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hell</td>
<td>10 (1.0%)</td>
<td>model</td>
<td>24 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>9 (0.9%)</td>
<td>section</td>
<td>24 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bastard</td>
<td>9 (0.9%)</td>
<td>stage</td>
<td>24 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was the case for the adjectives, there is a clear distinction between the nouns that are most important in the group of all nouns and the nouns that are most important in the group of only the metaphor-related nouns. With the striking exception of *thing*, none of the nouns that appeared in the general list of most frequent nouns in fiction occurs in the list of most frequent MRW nouns. As could be expected on the basis of their relation to the description of concrete people, objects and surroundings, the most frequent nouns in fiction were in fact almost always used non-metaphorically. The noun *thing*, on the other hand, was related to metaphor in 45 out of 60 cases, making it the most frequently used metaphor-related noun in fiction. This metaphorical use of *thing* is relatively more important even in conversation, making up 11.1% of the MRW nouns in conversation, and slightly less important in news, in which it only accounts for 1.5% of the MRW nouns. Some examples of the metaphorical use of *thing* in fiction are given below.

8) ‘What a funny *thing*,’ said Lewis. ‘We had ham salad that day too.’ (BNC-Baby: CDB)
9) In our country to exchange gifts does not mean the same *thing*. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
10) The wonderful *thing* about the human mind, Adam thought, is the way it copes when the worst happens. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

These metaphorical uses of *thing* are again highly conventional and not specific to fiction.

The nouns *way* and *point* were among the most frequently used nouns in all four of the registers. The metaphor-related use of *way* often involves a manner in which something is done, as in the examples from fiction below:

11) ‘I shall have to get in touch with the police. No two *ways* about it, I shall have to get in touch with them.’ (BNC-Baby: CDB)
12) This, Paula soon discovered, was the *way* of the fashion world — (BNC-Baby: BMW)
13) Sometimes he felt that he was the person he was because of them and acted the *way* he did because of their effects. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

The noun *point* is often used either metaphorically referring to a point in time or to a meaning or purpose:

14) Adam did not want at this *point* to speculate, it made him feel sick. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
15) At some *point* Rufus himself had taken the things out of the fridge and left the door open to defrost it. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
16) She took the *point* eagerly. “My dear, I know.” (BNC-Baby: FET)
17) ‘I can’t see any *point* in that. When you killed the district officer it was an accident.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
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18) Of course he knew there was no possibility of this, now or when he returned home, for when you were married you never could be alone. Presumably that was the point. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

The nouns end and hell were among the most frequently used metaphor-related nouns in both fiction and conversation, the noun model in both fiction and academic discourse. However, the high frequency of model in fiction was predominantly caused by one very specific metaphorical use in one specific fiction text about fashion models (BMW). The metaphorical uses of world were also related to this specific text, as it often occurred in sentences referring to the world of fashion. As the analysis of world proved to problematic for the application of MIPVU, it will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.4.2.1 below on borderline cases of MRW. The nouns hell and bastard are both related to the use of swearwords, which has been associated with spoken discourse (see Biber et al. 1999); this frequent use of hell and bastard in fiction will therefore be considered in more detail in Chapter 6, when narrative and dialogue in fiction are compared. Aside from these text-specific nouns, most of these MRW noun lemmas were highly conventional and their metaphorical use is not specific to fiction.

In terms of unique metaphor-related nouns, fiction was again characterized by a large proportion of MRW nouns. Fiction contains 433 unique MRW nouns out of 574 types (75%) and 1016 tokens (43%). With regard to unique MRW nouns fiction is considerably more varied than all three of the other registers: news contains 531 unique MRW nouns out of 802 types (66%) and 1701 tokens (31%); academic discourse contains 378 unique MRW nouns out of 689 types (55%) and 2345 tokens (16%); and conversation contains 103 unique MRW nouns out of 166 types (62%) and 461 tokens (22%). This shows that although fiction underused metaphor-related nouns, these MRW nouns are characterized by a high degree of unique variation.

In summary, this section has shown that the most frequently used MRW nouns in fiction are clearly distinct from the most frequent nouns overall. The noun thing was the only lemma to occur in both lists, and Table 5.7 showed that thing was in fact predominantly related to metaphor. Some of the other most frequent MRW noun lemmas were also predominantly used in a metaphor-related sense, such as point, way, and hell. The MRW nouns point and way were actually among the ten most frequent MRW noun lemmas in all four of the registers; thing was among the most frequent MRW nouns in fiction, news and conversation. The frequent use of the MRW noun lemma hell in fiction was shared by conversation; it was pointed out that this presence of hell, and bastard, in fiction may be related to the dialogues in fiction, as the use of expletives has been shown to be a characteristic of spoken discourse (Biber et al. 1999). In addition, fiction was characterized by a high type-
token ratio for MRW nouns and a large proportion of unique MRW nouns. This shows that with regard to the use of metaphor-related nouns, fiction is again characterized by a large degree of unique variation.

**The use of verbs in fiction**

The results from Section 5.3.2 showed that with 29.4% the verbs were the word class that was most often related to metaphor in fiction and fiction contained more MRW verbs than expected by chance. Fiction contained a larger proportion of MRW verbs than academic discourse (24.7%) but a smaller proportion than news (29.6%) and conversation (30.1%). In terms of type-token ratios, fiction had a much lower type-token ratio for verbs than for nouns and adjectives. With 1299 verb types and 9788 verb tokens, fiction had a type-token ratio of only 0.13. Academic discourse had the same ratio (0.13), while news had a slightly higher one (0.16) and conversation an extremely low one (0.05). With respect to MRW verbs, fiction had 553 types and 1555 tokens, resulting in a much higher type-token ratio of 0.36, though this ratio is much lower than for MRW adjectives (0.59) and MRW nouns (0.56) in fiction. However, fiction actually had the highest type-token ratio for MRW verbs of the four registers, much higher than conversation (0.19) and academic discourse (0.27) and slightly higher than news (0.33). As was the case with the MRW adjectives and nouns, fiction is again the register that shows the greatest degree of variation in metaphor-related usage.

Table 5.8 lists the ten most frequently used verb lemmas in fiction and the other three registers. Table 5.8 shows, first of all, that there is considerably more overlap between the registers than was the case for the adjectives and nouns, which is due to the fact that most of these verbs are auxiliaries and modals. Almost all of the most frequently used verbs occur in two or more of the registers. The verb see is relatively more important in fiction than the other registers, may and should in academic discourse, give in news and get in conversation. The auxiliary be is by far the most frequent verb in all four registers. Have and do also occur in all four registers; though all three verbs are used most frequently in conversation in absolute numbers, only do is relatively more important in conversation while be is relatively more important in academic discourse and have in fiction, which could possibly be due to fiction’s use of present-perfect tenses in line with Biber’s Dimension 2 (Narrative versus Non-narrative Concerns).
Table 5.8 The ten most frequent verb lemmas divided by register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Fiction (Freq. (% of 9788 verbs))</th>
<th>Academic (Freq. (% of 8147 verbs))</th>
<th>News (Freq. (% of 7869 verbs))</th>
<th>Conversation (Freq. (% of 12158 verbs))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>1939 (19.8%)</td>
<td>2245 (27.5%)</td>
<td>1810 (23.0%)</td>
<td>2942 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>808 (8.3%)</td>
<td>461 (5.7%)</td>
<td>543 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1188 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>369 (3.8%)</td>
<td>150 (1.8%)</td>
<td>204 (2.6%)</td>
<td>945 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>253 (2.6%)</td>
<td>144 (1.8%)</td>
<td>167 (2.1%)</td>
<td>529 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>188 (1.9%)</td>
<td>130 (1.6%)</td>
<td>164 (2.1%)</td>
<td>452 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>160 (1.6%)</td>
<td>103 (1.3%)</td>
<td>161 (2.0%)</td>
<td>415 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td>146 (1.5%)</td>
<td>89 (1.1%)</td>
<td>118 (1.5%)</td>
<td>390 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>142 (1.5%)</td>
<td>87 (1.1%)</td>
<td>79 (1.0%)</td>
<td>355 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>129 (1.3%)</td>
<td>83 (1.0%)</td>
<td>75 (1.0%)</td>
<td>284 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>126 (1.3%)</td>
<td>76 (0.9%)</td>
<td>72 (0.9%)</td>
<td>249 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it is not possible to distinguish between the auxiliary and full verb *have* from this Table 5.8. The verb *say*, which is often used to mark reported speech, is among the most frequently used verbs in fiction as well as news and conversation; the thought verb *know* and the motion verb *go* are relatively more important in fiction and conversation than in the other registers, which could also relate to their use in fixed expressions in informal language use. The modals *will*, *would* and *could* are relatively most important in fiction. *Will* is frequent in all four registers, while *would* is most frequent in the three written registers. *Could* is most frequent in fiction and news.

Considering only the unique verbs, the percentages are lower than for the adjectives and nouns. In fiction, there were 689 unique verbs out of 1299 types (53%) and 9788 tokens (7%). In comparison, academic discourse had 495 unique verbs out of 1087 types (46%) and 8174 tokens (6%), news 701 out of 1286 types (55%) and 7869 tokens (9%), and conversation 298 out of 636 types (47%) and 12158 tokens (2%). This means that fiction had the second highest percentage of unique verbs: 7% of all the verbs in fiction was unique. Only news had a higher percentage. Fiction also had the second highest percentage of unique types: 53% of the verb types in fiction were unique. Some examples of unique verbs in fiction are *transmute, slither, gouge, encroach, dawdle, and boomerang*.

Table 5.9 lists the ten most frequently used MRW verb lemmas in fiction and the other three registers. Table 5.9 shows that the most obvious difference with the overall most frequent lemmas is the absence of *be* and the modals. It is also striking that in all four of the registers almost all of the most frequently metaphor-related verbs are delexicalized verbs, such as *have, make, take, get, give, come* and *go*. The metaphorical uses of these delexicalized verbs are of course highly conventional, and will rarely be experienced as metaphorical by language users and metaphor
researchers have also questioned whether they should be analysed as metaphorical expressions (e.g., Cameron 1999; Deignan 2005). These verbs represent the most basic conceptual metaphors and their function is usually to allow us to express abstract processes in terms of concrete movement and possession. Some examples of their metaphorical use in fiction are given below.

Table 5.9 The ten most frequent MRW verb lemmas divided by register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td>Freq. (% of 1555 MRW verbs)</td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td>Freq. (% of 2255 MRW verbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>116 (7.5%)</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>120 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>72 (4.6%)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>98 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take</td>
<td>65 (4.2%)</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>73 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>56 (3.6%)</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>48 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>40 (2.6%)</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>40 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>37 (2.4%)</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>39 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>32 (2.1%)</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>34 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>31 (2.0%)</td>
<td>produce</td>
<td>26 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>31 (2.0%)</td>
<td>follow</td>
<td>25 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch</td>
<td>18 (1.2%)</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>22 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb *have*, which has a basic sense indicating concrete possession, is often used to express abstract situations or experiences:

19) ‘They didn't just *have* knowledge.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)
20) ‘We have never *had* a problem.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
21) ‘Can I *have* a little time to think it over?’ (BNC-Baby: BMW)

The verb *make*, which has a basic sense relating to concrete creation, is also used to express abstract situation, as in (22) – (23), similar to *have*. In addition, it is also frequently used to express causation, as in (24) – (25).

22) ‘Tell him that I am very sorry but I can not *make* exceptions.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
23) ‘I can't *make* plans,’ he said sharply. (BNC-Baby: CB5)
24) It *made* her feel strong, invincible almost, and just a tiny bit as if she had drunk too much wine. (BNC-Baby: BMW)
25) It was surprise which *made* him stop for a second. (BNC-Baby: CB5)
The verb *take*, which has a basic sense involving bringing something or someone from one place to another, is often related to metaphor in (semi-)fixed expressions:

26) ‘I did not *take* it seriously.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)  
27) She *took* the point eagerly. (BNC-Baby: FET)  
28) That *took* him by surprise. (BNC-Baby: CB5)  
29) ‘Don’t *take* that the wrong way.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)

The motion verbs *come* and *go* appear to differ slightly in their most frequent metaphorical uses. While *come* is most often used to express situations happening or starting to exist, as in (30) – (32), *go* occurs mainly in (semi-)fixed expressions, such as (33) – (35):

30) He would know more, much more, in the days to *come*. (BNC-Baby: CDB)  
31) Though she thought sleep would never *come*, eventually it did *come*. (BNC-Baby: CB5)  
32) As he did so, the sound *came* nearer; louder. (BNC-Baby: BPA)  
33) It was his, all of it, and it *went* to his head rather. (BNC-Baby: CDB)  
34) ‘How did the Planning meeting *go*?’ (BNC-Baby: AC2)  
35) ‘How many times must I tell you that if you let things *go* too far, nobody can stop what will undoubtedly happen?’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)

In addition to the delexicalized verbs, the verbs *feel*, *see* and *catch* are among the most frequently used metaphor-related verbs in fiction. In academic discourse and conversation *see* is also among the most frequent verbs, *feel* in news and conversation. In fiction, the verb *see* is often used in its conventional metaphorical sense expressing understanding rather than concrete seeing, while *feel* is used for emotions rather than physical sensations:

36) ‘I can't *see* any point in that.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)  
37) ‘It's the opposite of a cocaine high, you *see*.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)  
38) ‘As I *see* it we've got two choices.’ (BNC-Baby: BPA)  
39) Buzz never cheated to let Elinor win: she knew that Elinor would immediately sense this and *feel* humiliated. (BNC-Baby: FPB)  
40) ‘I know what you need, Clare: someone you know and trust, someone who won't make you *feel* anxious.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)  
41) ‘I can count on you, Paula, I *feel* sure.’ (BNC-Baby: BMW)  
42) He was aware that he was not managing to sound exactly like a senior officer making a recent arrival *feel* at home, but decided not to add any further riders to his invitation. (BNC-Baby: AB9)

When *see* involves both concrete vision and abstract understanding it can be considered to be metaphorically used as well as metonymically used. In the application of MIP and MIPVU, metonymy and metaphor are considered to be
independent though often interacting forces, and so the presence of metonymy does not mean that a word cannot also be metaphorically used. A similar argument holds for feel. Though some emotions may also lead to physical sensations in the body, emotions are generally taken to be abstract, and are often metaphorically described in terms of other source domains (for example, temperature). When there is a strong sense of an emotion being related to a particular physical sensation this would lead to the annotation of feel as a borderline case of MRW rather than disregarding feel as being metaphorical.

The verb catch, which only appears among the most frequently used metaphor-related verbs in fiction, is often used in (semi)-fixed expressions. Many examples involve different modes of transportation, as in (45) – (47).

43) Delaney’s stillness caught the attention of the others. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
44) She did — and caught her breath. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
45) ‘He caught a flight to Frankfurt.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)
46) ‘We park in the underground car-park, catch a special lift to the fifth floor and walk across the corridor into a special conference room.’ (BNC-Baby: G0l)
47) He took Adam on to Sudbury for him to catch a train there and at that point they parted. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

The results for the most frequent MRW verb lemmas show that although there were some slight differences between the registers, there was also considerable overlap between them regarding which verbs were most frequently related to metaphor, and most of the metaphorical uses of verbs in fiction relate to highly conventionalized metaphorical expressions. In terms of unique metaphor-related verbs, fiction has the largest proportion of the four registers, containing 360 unique MRW verbs out of 553 types (65%) and 1555 tokens (23%). News contains 406 unique MRW verbs out of 714 types (57%) and 2172 tokens (19%); academic discourse contains 306 unique MRW verbs out of 611 types (50%) and 2255 tokens (14%); and conversation contains 122 unique MRW verbs out of 209 types (58%) and 1110 tokens (11%). This shows that fiction is again characterized by a high degree of unique variation.

In summary, this section has shown that the most frequently used metaphor-related verbs in fiction are clearly distinct from the most frequent verbs overall. The majority of the most frequent MRW verb lemmas concern highly conventional metaphorical uses of delexicalized verbs (such as make, take, have, give and get), sensory verbs such as see and feel, and motion verbs such as come and go. There was considerable overlap between the four registers, as these metaphorical uses relate to general patterns of linguistic metaphor in everyday language use. Though the type-token ratio for metaphor-related verbs in fiction was much lower than the ratios for metaphor-related adjectives and nouns, fiction still clearly had the highest
ratio for MRW verbs of the four registers. Fiction also had a large proportion of
unique metaphor-related verbs. This shows that as far as the metaphor-related verbs
are concerned, fiction is still characterized by a relatively large degree of unique
variation in comparison to the other registers.

5.3.5 Conclusions

The analyses in Section 5.3.2 showed how fiction differed from the other registers
in terms of its general distribution of the eight main word classes as well as its
distribution of metaphor across these word classes. The current section examined
the dominant patterns of metaphor within three of these word classes (adjectives,
nouns, and verbs) to determine whether the use of metaphor within a particular
word class could be related to (groups of ) specific lemmas with frequent
metaphorical uses. It was also considered whether these dominant patterns were
specific to fiction or were common in all four of the registers. In addition to the
dominant patterns of metaphor, this section also considered variation within word
classes in terms of type-token ratios and unique lemmas. Together, these analyses
provide insight into the similarities and differences between fiction and the other
registers in terms of the linguistic forms of metaphor.

First of all, it was shown that the most frequent metaphor-related adjectives,
nouns and verbs were clearly distinct from the most frequent lemmas overall. This
suggests that there is a clear division of labour between the lemmas that are related
to metaphor and the lemmas that are not related to metaphor. For the non-MRW
adjectives, nouns and verbs, the dominant patterns in fiction could be related to
semantic groups that have specific functions in fiction, such as describing
characters, their actions and their surroundings. For the MRW adjectives, nouns
and verbs, the dominant patterns could be related to more general patterns of
metaphor in everyday language use. For example, many of the MRW adjectives
derive from the source domain of size and dimension, most of the MRW nouns are
general nouns such as thing, point, way and end, and the majority of the MRW verbs
concerned delexicalized verbs such as have, give, make and take. Metaphorical uses that appeared to be more typical of fiction were the adjectives
golden and pale and the use of swearwords such as hell, bastard and bloody. As
such expletives are generally considered a characteristic of spoken discourse (see
Biber et al. 1999) they will be considered in more detail in Chapter 6 when
narrative and dialogue in fiction are compared.

In terms of variation, fiction was shown to be characterized by high type-
token ratios for metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs. Fiction had the
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highest ratio for adjectives together with news, and the second highest ratio for nouns and verbs. Though fiction was characterized by a significant underuse of adjectives and nouns, fiction’s type-token ratios for these word classes were high (0.43 and 0.31), indicating that the nouns and adjectives that were used in fiction were considerably varied. When considering only the metaphor-related words, fiction had the highest type-token ratio for adjectives (0.59), nouns (0.56) and verbs (0.36). Fiction also had large proportions of unique metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs. This showed that fiction is characterized by a large degree of unique variation in its use of linguistic forms of metaphor and that where fictions stands out from the other registers is not in the frequency of its metaphor-related words or in its most frequently used metaphors, but in infrequent yet unique variations within word classes. The specific functions and effects of such more unique forms of metaphor will be considered in more detail in the following chapters.

5.4 Analysis 2: Borderline cases and metaphor signals in fiction

The analyses in the previous section were based on a binary distinction between words that are related to metaphor and words that are not. While MIP uses such a binary distinction, MIPVU distinguished between four different relations to metaphor, as discussed in Chapter 3. This section will investigate the distribution of these four different relations to metaphor: non-metaphor-related words (non-MRW), clear metaphor-related words (clear MRW), borderline metaphor-related words (borderline MRW, originally annotated as WIDLII: When In Doubt, Leave It In), and metaphor flags (MFlags). Section 5.4.1 below will examine how fiction differed from the other three registers (academic texts, news texts and conversations) with regard to the distribution of these four relations to metaphor. In Chapter 6 the fiction sample will be divided into narrative and dialogue to examine whether there are any systematic differences between these two components of fiction.

All of the findings below should of course be considered in light of the previously established three-way interaction between register, metaphor and word class (Section 5.3.2). This section will refine the interaction between register and metaphor by using the four originally identified relations to metaphor rather than the binary distinction between MRW and non-MRW used in Section 5.3 above. Unfortunately, it was not possible to statistically test the three-way interaction between register, relation to metaphor and word class because the number of cells with a frequency below 5 would become problematic due to the large number of
cells and the infrequent occurrence of some of the relations. The variable word class has therefore not been included in the analyses reported below.

5.4.1 Register and relation to metaphor

Table 5.10 below presents the frequencies and percentages of the four relations to metaphor across the different registers. As the previous analyses already showed that there is a cline in the frequency of MRWs from academic discourse through news and fiction to conversation, the table has been ordered to reflect this frequency distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>Clear MRW</th>
<th>Borderline MRW</th>
<th>MFlag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>40174</td>
<td>8624</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>37413</td>
<td>6854</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>39281</td>
<td>4883</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>44237</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161056</td>
<td>23660</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square analysis showed that there was a significant association between register and metaphor, though the effect size was small: $\chi^2(9) = 3.043.56, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer's } V = 0.07$. As established in Section 5.3, the non-MRWs exhibited an uneven distribution across the four registers, with fiction (88.0%) situated in between conversation (92.3%) on the one hand, and news (83.5%) and academic discourse (81.5%) on the other. The clear MRWs formed a complementary pattern to the non-MRWs, again with fiction in the middle (10.9%) between conversation (6.8%) on the one hand and news (15.3%) and academic discourse (17.5%) on the other. Together, these two relations to metaphor (non-MRW and clear MRW) comprised 99% of the data. The additional inclusion of the borderline MRWs and the MFlags in the analysis revealed that both of these relations to metaphor were rare, with borderline MRWs forming only 1.0% of the data and MFlags only 0.1%.

The significant chi-square analysis showed that there was a strong interaction between register and relation to metaphor. The fiction texts contained significantly more non-MRWs than expected (st. res. +3.8), as did the conversations (st. res. +14.1). Academic discourse and news texts, on the other hand, contained significantly fewer non-MRWs than expected (st. res. -11.5 and -6.3). The clear MRWs demonstrate the opposite pattern: fiction had significantly fewer cases of
clear MRWs than expected (st. res. -10.2), again similar to the conversations (st. res. -36.1), while the academic and news texts contained significantly more clear MRWs than expected (st. res. +30.2 and +15.8) This reflects the previous observation that fiction was more metaphorical than conversation, but less metaphorical than news texts and academic texts. This finding proved to be relatively stable across the sample. Although there were of course some differences in the percentages of metaphor-related words between the individual fiction files, these percentages ranged from 7.3% to 14.0% - a range that lies exactly in between the overall percentages for news and conversation. Of the twelve fiction files, only two texts underused metaphor-related words within fiction, with 7.3% and 9.8% MRWs, and three texts overused metaphor-related words within fiction, with 13.4%, 13.8% and 14.0% MRWs (see Appendix A).

The borderline MRWs did not interact with the registers. The borderline MRWs were evenly distributed across the four registers in relation to the non-MRWs, clear MRWs and MFlags, as shown by the standardized residuals for fiction (st. res. -1.3), conversation (st. res. -1.5), academic discourse (st. res. +0.6), and news (st. res. +2.3). This shows that not only were problematic cases extremely rare in all four of the registers, there were also no differences between the registers as far as the distribution of borderline cases was concerned, i.e. none of the registers contained more cases that posed difficulties to the identification procedure than others. Fiction had marginally fewer borderline MRWs (0.9%) than news (1.1%) and academic texts (1.0%) and the same amount as conversation (0.9%).

The category MFlags, on the other hand, though small in terms of frequency, did significantly contribute to the interaction between register and relation to metaphor. Fiction was the only register in which there were significantly more MFlags than expected (st. res. +6.9), although these MFlags comprised only 0.2% of the sample. In academic texts and conversations there were significantly fewer MFlags than expected (st. res. -2.8 and -4.4) and in news texts the MFlags were distributed according to chance (st. res. +0.5). While the clear MRWs and the non-MRWs showed a clear division between news and academic texts on the one hand and fiction and conversation on the other, the MFlags appear to be more typical of fiction than all three of the other registers, as indicated by the fact that fiction is the only register in which they were significantly overused. Although the percentage of MFlags in each of the registers was almost zero, the division of the 141 MFlags in the corpus across the four registers reveals that 52.5% of the MFlags occurred in the fiction sample. The news texts contained 26.2% of the MFlags in the corpus, the academic texts 14.2%, and only 7.1% of the MFlags occurred in the conversations. This clearly shows that MFlags are indeed most typical of fiction, as suggested by Goatly (1997), even though their absolute frequency is small.
Given the relationship between MFlags and direct expressions of metaphor (such as similes), this finding suggests that directly expressed metaphors may be typical of fiction, while indirectly expressed metaphors are not. Section 5.5 below will further investigate this issue by examining the distribution of the different types of metaphor in the four registers.

5.4.2 Further analysis and discussion

As most of the examples provided in Section 5.3 were examples of clear cases of metaphor-related words, this section will focus on the discussion of borderline MRWs and MFlags.

The use of borderline MRWs in fiction

The cross-register comparison showed that borderline cases in fiction did not contribute to the interaction between register and relations to metaphor. The average number of borderline cases in fiction was only 0.9%. On the whole, lexical items in fiction seem to be either clearly related to metaphor or clearly not related to metaphor. One question considering the interaction with word class established in Section 5.3, is whether borderline cases occurred more often in some word classes than others, and whether specific patterns can be observed. Table 5.11 below presents the borderline MRWs in fiction divided by word class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage of borderline MRWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11 shows that by far the most borderline cases are verbs (31.5%), nouns (25.9%) and prepositions (22.0%). These three word classes make up almost 80% of all the borderline MRWs in fiction. This pattern follows the same general distribution of metaphor across the different word classes in fiction: of the 5293 metaphor-related words in fiction, 1555 were verbs (29.4%), 1411 were prepositions (26.7%) and 1016 were nouns (19.2%). The borderline MRWs did not contribute to the significant interaction between metaphor and word class in fiction.

**Borderline MRW prepositions**

Table 5.12 below gives the frequencies and percentages of the preposition lemmas that were annotated as borderline MRWs in fiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 90)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 90)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(20.0%)</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
<td>without</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(12.2%)</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>in front of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 shows that some prepositions are clearly more often difficult to analyse than others. The prepositions that were most frequently annotated as borderline MRWs are at, with, in and to. Together, these four prepositions form 66.7% of all the borderline MRW prepositions. It is also interesting to see that not all pairs of prepositions behave the same way. For example, down and up and from and to were annotated as borderline cases roughly the same number of times (8 versus 10 and 9 versus 11) while with was problematic 16 times and without only 2 times, in 15 times but out never.

The most problematic prepositions are at, in, to and with. The difficulties these prepositions present can be related to specific usage patterns. One specific group of problematic prepositions was discussed in Chapter 4 and relates to character descriptions that involve both concrete and abstract elements, such as the examples below.
48) *With a shudder, Sylvie refused a cup of tea.* (BNC-Baby: FPB)
49) *With his hands in the pockets of his dinner jacket, he surveyed the room.* (BNC-Baby: FPB)
50) ‘Trouble is,’ Lawton said, *with a frown, ‘there aren’t enough of us to search the ship.’* (BNC-Baby: BPA)

A second group of prepositions is concerned with uses of particularly *at, to* and *with* in combination with verbs expressing communication and involving fictive motion:

51) Clare never felt embarrassed discussing sex *with* Gilda. (BNC-Baby: FPB)
52) ‘Are you looking for sex, or just someone to talk *to*?’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
53) He glared *at* his brother. (BNC-Baby: FPB)

Related to this group are the prepositions that are used in combination with events, which are metonymically related to locations.

54) ‘If you say that *at* your trial, they will kill you.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
55) *At* the opening party, an excited three-and-a-half-year-old Josh rode the pretty antique rocking horse in the shop window. (BNC-Baby: FPB)

The prepositions *up* and *down* were sometimes annotated as being borderline cases because their contextual meaning was ambiguous between horizontal and vertical movement, and vertical movement could potentially be considered metaphorical in comparison to horizontal movement:

56) So the laibon’s son from *up* there, *up* the valley past Lengai, he is a descendant of Mbatian, the great laibon, he tries to persuade Turnbull to let him take out his animal from the ones which have been selected. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
57) It was Paula's job to show samples, parading slowly *up* and *down* in front of the clients as they sat on the elegant spindle-leg chairs taking in every detail of the garments with a critical and practised eye. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

Such problematic cases, involving ambiguity between concrete and abstract descriptions, actual and fictive motion, metaphor and metonymy, and vague contextual meanings are clearly not typical of fiction. Rather, they represent general difficulties in the annotation of prepositions.

**Borderline MRW nouns**

Of the 106 borderline MRW nouns, 58 occurred only once and 10 only twice. The only ones that occurred more than twice in the fiction sample are: *world* (8), *hell*
(6), thing (5), contact (3) and nature (3). Even the most frequent noun in this group occurred only 8 times, which suggests that, at least in these selected fragments, these words have not unnecessarily increased the number of borderline MRWs. Although the borderline MRW nouns in fiction mostly involved isolated, incidental occurrences, one group that can be established involves nouns that have both a general and a specific meaning, such as world, nature and life. For example, the noun world has the following senses in Macmillan:

1 the world the planet that we live on
1a. [count] any other planet
2 [singular] society in general, in all countries
2a. [only before noun] involving or affecting all countries
2b. used about a particular group of countries
2c. used about a particular society at a particular time in history
2d. [usually singular] used about the particular type of place or situation in which someone lives or works
2e. used about ordinary society and its moral values, rather than religious or spiritual matters
2f. if someone moves up or down in the world, they move to a higher or lower social class
3 [singular] MAINLY LITERARY the state of being alive

If sense 1 is taken as the basic sense, since it is most concrete and specific, then the question remains whether the other senses are non-metaphorical or metaphorical extensions. Since the distinction is not clear-cut, world was considered not related to metaphor in examples (58) and (59), but a borderline MRW in examples (60) to (63).

58) Furthermore, Madame Mattli was a Frenchwoman, an accident of birth which added to her glamour, for was not Paris the fashion capital of the world? (BNC-Baby: BMW)
59) ‘If it works out we shall practically be neighbours, Paula.’ ‘What a small world!’ (BNC-Baby: BMW)
60) As for the House of Mattli, it might have been in a different world to the hostel, with its air of being a cross between a workhouse and a boarding school. (BNC-Baby: BMW)
61) This, Paula soon discovered, was the way of the fashion world — a constant frantic rush against the clock, to have collections ready on time or to complete individual
couture garments for customers who always considered their order more urgent, more important, than that of anyone else. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

62) Even the most popular of girls soon discovered that in this highly competitive world where models vied with one another for the most glamorous jobs and the wealthiest and best-looking men there was far more bitchiness than in the provinces – and Paula was far from popular. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

63) Perfectly groomed from head to toe and with all that assurance, she was ready to take on the world, Arlene thought with satisfaction, for she looked on Paula as her very own creation. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

MRW nouns such as hell and bastard were always coded as borderline MRWs in the analyses since it is unclear what the exact contextual meaning is when these words are used as swearwords or interjections and whether there is any relation to the original basic sense; the same principle also applied to adjectives and adverbs such as bloody or damned. Such interjections are typically associated with spoken language (Biber et al. 1999), and may therefore be associated with dialogue rather than narrative in fiction; this issue will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6 when narrative and dialogue in fiction are compared.

**Borderline MRW verbs**

Of the 129 borderline MRW verbs in fiction, 55 occurred only once and 7 twice. The only borderline MRW verb that occurred more than ten times is have (11 instances). Borderline MRW verbs occurring more than twice are: see (7), feel (4), get (4), go (4), manage (4), open (4), reach (4), dream (3), judge (3), leave (3), look (3), lose (3), and make (3). As was the case for the borderline MRW nouns, even the most frequent problematic verb was very infrequent, and the occurrences of have are not related to any specific text. As the basic sense of have concerns concrete possession, one of the borderline metaphorical uses of have is related to examples of have with a human object:

64) ‘You’re the only brother I have.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
65) ‘They [= flying school] have English instructors.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
66) ‘I’d have liked to have had Rickie Crowninshield in my platoon for just five minutes.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)
67) ‘But if you can tolerate company, I’m having a few people, mostly colleagues of Alex from the power station, to dinner on Thursday night.’ (BNC-Baby: C8T)

Examples (64) and (65) can be said to involve a metaphorical use of have as these people are not actual possessions that are owned. Examples (66) and (67) illustrate the use of have in combination with situations involving people rather than actual
Another form of metaphorical possession involves abstract entities rather than concrete objects, such as in the following examples:

68) His parents had not asked him what sort of holiday he had had or how the flight had been. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
69) The safest way to live is first, inherit money, second, be born without taste for liquor, third, have a legitimate job that keeps you busy, fourth, marry a wife who will cooperate in your sexual peculiarities, fifth, join some big church, sixth, don't live too long. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

Verbs such as see, feel and look are sometimes annotated as borderline cases of metaphor-related words because their contextual meaning is partly concrete and partly abstract:

70) ‘Find him and see what the son of a bitch is up to.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)
71) ‘I knew you wanted to see how far you could go.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
72) ‘I know how you feel, Mark,’ Muldoon said sadly. (BNC-Baby: AC2)
73) ‘I believe you are exactly what I’m looking for.’ (BNC-Baby: BMW)

As discussed in Section 5.3.4.3 such cases often involved a combination of metaphor and metonymy, for example between looking and searching, seeing and knowing, and emotions and the physical responses they entail.

The verbs dream and judge involve a related problem; these verbs raised the question whether the basic sense of dream necessarily involves sleeping, which makes ambitions potentially metaphorical, and whether the basic sense of judge is only the legal sense (i.e. deciding whether someone is guilty in a court of law), which makes forming an opinion about someone potentially metaphorical. These verbs were therefore problematic because their basic sense is either specific or general. If the basic sense is the specific sense, then the applications in (77) and (78) below are potentially metaphorical.

74) ‘You judge him so.’ ‘He judges me. Judging runs in the family.’ (BNC-Baby: FET)
75) ‘They never stopped being Germans. Maybe it's the only thing they ever dreamt about.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)

However, if the basic sense is general, then (74) and (75) are not related to metaphor and dreaming in sleep and judging in court are merely specifications of the general sense. In the application of MIPVU, it was decided to consider the specific sense the basic sense and include these cases as borderline MRWs (cf. Steen, Biernacka et al. 2010).
The use of MFlags in fiction

The analyses in Section 5.4.1 revealed that fiction was the only register in which MFlags were significantly overused. However, one problem with the analysis of MFlags is that some MFlags consist of multiple lexical units, such as *with the ... of a ... and as ... as ....* Such complex MFlag phrases were tagged as individual lexical units by the POS-tagger, which means that the frequencies in Table 5.10 cannot be taken to represent individual instances. That is, the presence of the complex MFlag phrase *as ... as ...* resulted in a count of two MFlags rather than one. After manually recoding the MFlags into simple (such as *like*) or complex (such as *as... as...*) cases, there are 64 MFlags in fiction rather than 74. This problem turned out to apply specifically to fiction, as the 37 MFlags in news, 20 in academic discourse, and 10 in conversation were all simple MFlags. Thus, this also revealed that the complex MFlag phrases *with the ... of a ... and as ... as ...* were only used in the fiction sample, and may even be typical of this register.

Even though after this recount the proportion of MFlags in fiction is now even smaller, it is still clear that MFlags are relatively more important in fiction than in the other registers. Of the 5357 words in fiction that were related to metaphor, 74 were MFlags. That is, of all the MRWs in fiction, 1.4% was an MFlag. In comparison, MFlags accounted for 0.5% of the MRWs in news (37 out of 7379), 0.3% of the MRWs in conversation (10 out of 3697), and 0.2% of the MRWs in academic discourse (20 out of 9140). A closer look at the distribution of direct MRWs in the registers in Section 5.5 will provide a clearer picture of the relation between fiction and the presence of similes and other directly expressed metaphors.

A closer look at the lemmas that are used as MFlags reveals that *like* is the favourite lemma by far (35 instances). The adverb *as* is the second most popular one (11 instances) and occurs in combination with verbs and adjectives as well as in the complex MFlag phrase *as... as...*. Some examples of these most frequent MFlags are provided below.

76) It was too large for her and the wide sleeves of limp cotton hung from her freckled arms *like* rags thrown over a stick. (BNC-Baby: C8T)
77) Usually the slightest whisper travelled *like* jungle drums through the world of fashion. (BNC-Baby: BMW)
78) In spite of the rain, the earth was still *as* hard *as* iron. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
79) Madame Mattli might be a stickler for detail, with a generous helping of the artistic temperament which kept her tight-coiled *as* a spring and which would explode into frenzy if the smallest detail was not as it should be. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

In addition to MFlags that are relatively straightforward markers of comparisons – such as *like* and *as* – there are also MFlags that relate to a common
feature of fiction, namely the creation of counterfactual situations. Such counterfactuals are signalled by MFlags such as seem, as though and as if, as in the examples below.

80) The house that when he first saw it had seemed to float on a raft of golden mist, now lay in a wilderness, amidst ragged grass and straggling bushes and trees dead from the heat. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

81) The light in the sky is there by courtesy of the vanished sun, but the tops of the mountains are still golden, as though honey had been poured lightly over them. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)

Similar to comparisons, counterfactuals – and their signals – can be but are not necessarily related to metaphor. Such counterfactuals are sometimes used, as in the case of (81) above, to describe the story world through the perception of a character in order to suggest a particular psychological or emotional mind set. Counterfactuals and similes will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.5 below when the direct MRWs in fiction are considered.

5.4.3 Conclusions

The analysis of the interaction between register and relation to metaphor revealed that in all four of the registers the bulk of the words that are related to metaphor involve clear cases of metaphor-related words. Borderline cases are rare, and the borderline MRWs do not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and register. That is, they are not only infrequent but they are also evenly distributed across the four registers. The MFlags, on the other hand, though also infrequent, did significantly contribute to the interaction. Fiction turned out to be the only register in which MFlags were significantly overused. This suggests that direct expressions of metaphor, which are typically signalled by MFlags, may be typical of fiction, an issue which is investigated in Section 5.5 below.

A closer look at borderline MRW prepositions, nouns and verbs in fiction revealed that many of the most frequent borderline cases can be related to general language tendencies that pose difficulties to the application of MIPVU, such as prepositions that involve fictive motion, nouns that have both general and specific meanings and verbs that involve both metaphor and metonymy. Some problematic cases could be related to specific texts in the fiction corpus, but no patterns could be established that indicated specific problem areas in the analysis of metaphor in fiction. In general, the identification of linguistic metaphor in fiction proved unproblematic.
5.5 Analysis 3: Direct and implicit metaphor in fiction

MIPVU not only distinguishes between four different relations to metaphor, but also between three different types of metaphor-related words. While MIP is only concerned with the identification of metaphorically used words, i.e. indirect metaphor, MIPVU distinguishes indirect MRWs, direct MRWs and implicit MRWs. The distinction between these different types of metaphor provides insight into the competition between different forms of linguistic metaphor, in particular between metaphor proper (indirect MRW in MIPVU) and simile (direct MRW in MIPVU). This traditional distinction between the metaphor and simile forms plays a central role in psycholinguistic models of metaphor comprehension, but these studies do not address the vital issue of the actual frequency of occurrence of these most familiar types of linguistic metaphor in natural discourse. It is the aim of the current section to provide insight into the distribution and use of the different types of metaphor in the four registers, and examine whether the three types of metaphor – indirect, direct and implicit – are distributed differently in fiction than in the other registers. Based on the traditional assumption that simile is typical of literature (e.g., Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Sayce 1954), the main prediction was that fiction would contain a larger proportion of direct metaphor than the other registers, as was also suggested by the overuse of MFlags established in the previous section.

In the analysis below, the clear and borderline cases of metaphor-related words will again be taken together in one category of metaphor-related words. This group can then be subdivided into indirect, direct and implicit MRWs. The group of lexical items that are not related to metaphor (non-MRWs) are included as a fourth type as the overall distribution of MRWs versus non-MRWs is uneven. Since the MFlags are signals of metaphor rather than being indirect, direct or implicit MRWs themselves, all MFlags have been included in the category of non-MRWs. This inclusion of the MFlags in the group of non-MRWs entails that the count for non-MRWs in this section is slightly higher than in Table 5.10 in Section 5.1. To sum up, in the analysis below the clear MRWs and borderline MRWs have been taken together in one group – the MRWs – which is further divided into the three types of metaphor: indirect MRW, direct MRW, and implicit MRW. The non-MRWs and MFlags have been taken together in one group – the non-MRWs – which is included as a fourth type.
Table 5.13 below presents the frequencies and percentages of the four metaphor types across the different registers. As the previous analyses have shown that there is a cline in the frequency of MRWs from academic discourse through news and fiction to conversation, Table 13 has been ordered to reflect this frequency distribution to reveal whether the three types of metaphor follow the same pattern.

A chi-square analysis showed that there was a significant association between register and metaphor type, though the effects size was again small: $\chi^2(9) = 3,044.84, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.07$. Table 5.13 shows that the majority of the metaphor-related words was of the indirect type. Indirect metaphor accounted for 13.3% of all data and 97.5% of all MRWs. The group of indirect metaphor was almost completely responsible for the complementary distribution pattern between MRWs and non-MRWs observed earlier. Both the group of direct MRWs and the group of implicit MRWs were small, each accounting for less than 0.5% of the MRWs within each register.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>Indirect MRW</th>
<th>Implicit MRW</th>
<th>Direct MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>40192 (81.5%)</td>
<td>8961 (18.2%)</td>
<td>121 (0.2%)</td>
<td>40 (0.1%)</td>
<td>49314 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>37450 (83.6%)</td>
<td>7145 (16.0%)</td>
<td>85 (0.2%)</td>
<td>112 (0.3%)</td>
<td>44792 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>39355 (88.1%)</td>
<td>5074 (11.4%)</td>
<td>54 (0.1%)</td>
<td>165 (0.4%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>44247 (92.3%)</td>
<td>3637 (7.6%)</td>
<td>31 (0.1%)</td>
<td>19 (0.0%)</td>
<td>47934 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161244 (86.4%)</td>
<td>24817 (13.3%)</td>
<td>291 (0.2%)</td>
<td>336 (0.2%)</td>
<td>186688 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 24817 indirect MRWs, 36.1% occurred in academic discourse, 28.8% in news, 20.4% in fiction and only 14.7% in conversation. The implicit MRWs followed the same pattern as the indirect MRWs, with most of the implicit MRWs occurring in academic discourse (41.6%), followed by news (29.2%), then fiction (18.6%), and finally conversation (10.7%). The direct MRWs, on the other hand, clearly followed a different pattern from the indirect and implicit MRWs, with fiction containing the most direct MRWs (49.1%), then news (33.3%), then academic discourse (11.9%) and lastly again conversation (5.7%). This shows that almost half of all the direct MRWs in the corpus occurred in the fiction sample, while fiction accounted for only approximately 20% of the indirect and implicit MRWs.

The chi-square analysis showed that direct MRWs were significantly overused in fiction (st. res. +9.4), as well as in news (st. res. +3.5). Direct MRWs were
underused in academic discourse (st. res. -5.2) and conversation (st. res. -7.2). Conversely, fiction significantly underused indirect MRWs (st. res. -11.2). Indirect MRWs were also underused in conversation (st. res. -34.3) but overused in news (st. res. +15.4) and academic texts (st. res. +29.7). Finally, the implicit MRWs in fiction did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. -1.9), as was the case for news (st. res. +1.8). The implicit MRWs were significantly underused in conversation (st. res. -5.1) and overused in academic discourse (st. res. +5.0).

The observed pattern for direct metaphor in fiction corresponds to the earlier observation that MFlags were overused in fiction. In fiction, both MFlags and direct metaphor were significantly overused. In news, direct metaphor was also overused, and it was signalled fairly often, but the MFlags in news did not contribute to the interaction between register and the relations to metaphor. In conversation and academic discourse, direct metaphor and MFlags were not as frequent as might be expected. These patterns reveal that the different metaphor types each have their own roles to play in the different registers, and that direct and implicit metaphor, though small categories, contributed significantly to the different register profiles. In fiction, the implicit metaphors were patterned like the indirect metaphor, and both occurred less frequently than expected. The direct metaphors, on the other hand, demonstrated the opposite pattern and occurred more frequently than expected by chance.

5.5.2 Further analysis and discussion

This section offers a more detailed discussion of the implicit MRWs and direct MRWs in fiction.

The use of implicit metaphor in fiction

The results of Section 5.1 showed that implicit MRWs did not contribute to the significant interaction between register and metaphor type. In fiction, there were 54 cases of implicit metaphor. The pronouns *it* and *they* were most frequently used as implicit MRWs: *they* 22 times (40.7% of implicit MRWs in fiction) and *it* 14 times (25.9%). Together, these two lemmas accounted for 66.6% of the implicit MRWs in fiction. Other lemmas were *can* (1), *do* (4), *one* (2), *other* (1), *so* (2), *that* (5), and *this* (3). This shows that pronouns were much more often used as implicit MRWs than modals or determiners. This is interesting considering that fiction
contained a much higher proportion of metaphor-related verbs (29.4%) than nouns (19.2%).

One question in relation to the use of implicit MRWs is whether they refer back to the same or different metaphor-related words, as illustrated by the excerpts below.

82) ‘We had centuries of contacts to fall back on. For all their [= contacts] bravery and resourcefulness, their [= contacts] information was often wasted, because Stalin didn’t believe them [= contacts]. But then, he found it difficult to believe anyone.

83) They had dug up those bones at Wyvis Hall and had decided it was murder they were investigating. Bones, skeletons, bodies, do not bury themselves. Those were the facts, as far as he knew them up to this moment. He would know more, much more, in the days to come. What was certain was that he could no longer use the escape key. It [= escape key] was defunct. The passages it [= escape key] cancelled had, in any case, as in certain programmes, not been lost but stored on some limbo disc from whence they [= passages] must now be retrieved. Adam sat in his parents' house, drinking tea. There must be a total retrieval now, the one good thing about which was that it [= retrieval] might banish his dreams. He was aware of a slight feeling of sickness and of cold, an absence of hunger, though he had been feeling quite hungry when he got off the plane. […] Adam might have escaped the file memories for years, suppressed them [= file memories] and jerked violently away from them [= file memories], but he had never been able to pretend he was unscathed by those events.

In excerpt (82) there are three implicit MRWs – their, their and them – that all refer back to the same metaphor-related noun contacts. In excerpt (83), on the other hand, the implicit MRWs refer back to a number of different lexical items that are all related to metaphor and belong to the same source domain, namely computers: escape key; passages; programmes; disc; retrieved; retrieval; file memories. One question this raises is until when such implicit references to a metaphor-related word should continue to be coded as implicit MRW, for example only in the same or the directly following sentence or until a new referent is introduced.

Another issue is that implicit MRWs may refer back to highly conventional and non-deliberate cases of metaphor or to novel and deliberate cases. Compare, for example, the implicit references in the example below.

84) ‘In 1942, in Germany, we had a GRU network named the Rote Kapelle…’
‘What’s that?’ asked the Exec Director.
‘Red Orchestra’.
The Nazis called it [= network] that [= Orchestra] because we had radio operators we code-named musicians. Their [= Orchestra] leader, the Chef, we called him, was Leopold Trepper.
In this excerpt the metaphor-related antecedent *network* is highly conventional while *Orchestra* is novel. Moreover, the use of *Orchestra* is much more deliberate due to the fact that its content is foregrounded by the transition from German to English and the explicit discussion of the meaning of the name by the characters. One empirical question this raises is whether implicit MRWs referring to novel and deliberate metaphors are themselves more noticeable, and whether they are processed differently from implicit MRWs referring to highly conventional and non-deliberate metaphors. Whether implicit MRWs are ever understood as metaphors and whether their metaphor-related content is actually retrieved or consciously activated by readers is of course a matter for behavioural analysis and lies beyond the scope of the current chapter. For the present purposes, all of these cases – referring to novel or conventional MRWs and referring to the same or different MRWs – are all marked in the same way as being implicitly related to metaphor.

The use of direct metaphor in fiction

The results in Section 5.5.1 showed that the direct MRWs were clearly distributed differently than the indirect and implicit MRWs. Moreover, direct MRWs were the only metaphor type to be overused in fiction. The proportion of direct metaphor was only small in comparison to the indirect metaphors: 97.5% of the MRWs was indirect while only 1.3% was direct. The proportion of direct MRWs in fiction was clearly higher than in the other registers. In fiction, 3.1% of the MRWs was direct, while in news this was 1.5%, in conversation 0.5% and in academic discourse 0.4%. Of the 336 direct MRWs in the entire corpus, 49.1% occurred in the fiction sample. In comparison, 33.3% occurred in news, 11.9% in academic discourse and only 5.7% in conversation. This shows that direct MRWs do indeed play an important role in fiction, as suggested by Goatly (1997), Lodge (1977) and Sayce (1954), though it is clearly not the case that direct MRWs are frequent in fiction or the dominant form of metaphor.

The observed low frequencies for direct MRWs in the corpus can be related to a number of studies on similes by Low (1997, 2008b, 2010; Low et al. 2008). Low’s (2010) study of two rhetorical-style and two conversational-style university lectures showed that there were hardly any similes in the data and that the similes that did occur were mostly found in the more conversational-style lectures. As Cameron (2003) and Carter (2004) had found many examples of similes in their conversation data, Low’s hypothesis was that similes would be relatively common in university lectures, ‘which are oral, given face to face and generally, one might suppose, aimed at helping students to conceptualise and understand ideas’ (p. 292).
However, the rhetorical-style lectures contained only one clear simile, the conversational-style lectures only 11. Moreover, Low found (2010: 304-305) that there were hardly any similes that could be described as imaginative, non-conventional or attention grabbing. This suggested that the speakers felt that they either already had the attention of the audience or that they preferred metaphor over simile to get the audience’s attention (Low 2010; Low et al. 2008). Low points out that these findings contradict Carter’s (2004: 125) suggestion that ‘simile is more frequent than metaphor in everyday speech’. In fact, the low number of similes in the lectures sharply contrasted with the proportions of metaphorically-used words that were found, which ranged from 10 to 15 per cent, similar to the present findings.

An important question that should be asked concerning the direct MRWs in the Metaphor in Discourse corpus is how many distinct expressions – i.e. how many distinct examples of similes or figurative comparisons – they actually represent. That is, these MRWs represent individual lexical units which occurred in direct expressions of metaphor such as similes, but they do not represent the number of similes in the corpus. This issue can be demonstrated by the following two examples [relevant parts in bold]:

85) She had known him since he was a very small five-year-old, perched like a mosquito on one of the placid beginners' ponies, so she told the class to carry on walking their ponies while she came to him. (BNC-Baby: AB9)

86) ‘He says that this particular animal is a favourite.’ He strokes its side, which is white and marked with round patches of black, like islands on a naively drawn map. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)

While in example (85) only the word mosquito would be annotated as being an MRW of the type direct, in example (86) the words islands, on, naively, drawn and map would all be annotated as direct MRWs. This means that although these examples both represent one individual simile, the first simile results in a count of 1 MRW while the second involves 5 direct MRWs. It may therefore be the case that fiction contains longer similes than the other registers, rather than more individual cases of similes. However, such elaborate similes may in fact be one of the characteristics of fiction, and one of the reasons why fiction is perceived as metaphorical. That is, such elaborate similes are hard to miss or forget.

This issue of the number of words that are part of the simile also raises the issue of which words should be included in the annotations as being direct MRWs. Since MIPVU operates on a word-by-word basis, rather than on the basis of vehicles (cf. Cameron 2003), the question is whether all lexical units that are structurally part of the simile should be individually annotated or whether only the content words should be considered for analysis. In case of the examples above, the
question is whether the article *a* should also be annotated. Though grammatical words are clearly part of the simile and have a function in its realization, the coding of such semantically empty words would increase the number of metaphor-related words considerably while they do not seem to be adding much to the metaphorical mapping in terms of content. Although one could therefore argue that similes should be annotated as one whole rather than as separate words, it is normally relatively easy to determine which individual words inside the simile map onto individual target-domain equivalents. The decision has therefore been to annotate all individual content words that add semantic content to the simile (cf. Kaal and Dorst in press). For example (87) below, this means that a total of 7 lexical units was annotated as being direct MRWs, namely *Maharajah, waiting, tiger, pounce, on, tied-up, and goat* (the preposition *for* was excluded for metaphor annotation in the project).

87) ‘I feel *like a Maharajah waiting for the tiger to pounce on the tied-up goat,*’ Forster grinned. (BNC-Baby: BPA)

A related issue to deciding which words should be included is the issue of determining which lexical units are actually part of the simile. In example (86) above, the simile clearly begins with the MFlag *like* and ends at the full stop. In example (85), however, the scope of the simile is less clear. It could be argued that either the simile is *perched like a mosquito* or *perched like a mosquito on one of the placid beginners' ponies*. Since in this case the simile modifies the verb *perched*, it makes most sense to say that the simile is *perched like a mosquito*, as the reference *on one of the placid beginners' ponies* refers much more clearly to the target domain of the boy than to the source domains of mosquitoes. Though punctuation and grammatical units can often be used as more objective guidelines to make such decisions, the role of each word in terms of reference to either target-domain or source-domain concepts is decisive.

Nevertheless, this distinction between target-domain concepts and source-domain concepts may not always be clear (see Chapter 4; Kaal and Dorst in press). Consider example (88) from the same text as example (87).

88) Was it even now shadowing them, moving soundlessly from cover to cover, *like a tiger in the steel jungle?* (BNC-Baby: BPA)

While in example (87) it was clear that *Maharajah, waiting, tiger, pounce, on, tied-up and goat* all referred to source-domain concepts, and were therefore all part of one elaborate simile, the question arises whether example (88) contains one elaborate simile *like a tiger in the steel jungle* or whether the simile is *like a tiger* followed by a separate indirect MRW *jungle* that refers indirectly to the steel boat.
The first interpretation results in 4 direct MRWs (tiger, in, steel, jungle); the second interpretation results in 1 direct MRW (tiger) and 1 indirect MRW (jungle) while steel and in are not related to metaphor. Additionally, the first interpretation also means that the word steel is used metaphorically within the simile – i.e. it is metaphorically used in relation to jungle. This means that the first interpretation involved a metaphor inside a simile. This potential blending of the source and target domain was also discussed in Chapter 4, in relation to one of the examples from the reliability test, repeated here as example (89).

89) Sara was undressed and ready for bed but Jenny was fully clothed, moving about the room in her harlequin dress like some angry restless dragonfly. (BNC-Baby: J54)

In this simile, the word dragonfly is clearly part of the source domain and Jenny part of the target domain. The question remains, however, whether angry and restless belong to the target domain (Jenny) or the source domain (dragonfly) or to both domains at the same time?

One way to resolve this question is to take the construction of the sentence into account. In this case, angry and restless occurring after the MFlag (like) and before the source-domain concept (dragonfly). Moreover, they structurally function as modifiers to the headword of the simile. It was therefore decided to annotate such cases as angry and restless as part of the simile, even though their meaning is more clearly related to human behaviour than animal behaviour. In example (88), however, the headword of the simile (tiger) occurs immediately after the MFlag, so the decision whether the simile continues until jungle cannot be made on similar grounds as the dragonfly example. However, since tiger and jungle are conceptually related and can be considered to form one coherent source-domain scenario, such examples were annotated as complex similes (i.e. the words were all annotated as direct MRWs) while making note of the potential layers of metaphor inside them.

5.5.3 Conclusions

The results showed that fiction was similar to news in its distribution of direct and implicit MRWs, but similar to conversation in its distribution of indirect MRWs. Each register had its own distinctive pattern when it comes to the metaphor types. Fiction was characterized by an overuse of direct MRWs and underuse of indirect MRWs, while the implicit MRWs were distributed as expected by chance. Fiction contained proportionally more indirect MRWs and implicit MRW than conversation, but fewer than news and academic discourse. However, fiction
contained proportionally more direct MRWs than all three of the other registers. It should again be noted that these direct MRWs represent individual lexical units inside direct expressions of metaphor such as similes and figurative analogies, not individual cases of similes.

On the basis of the binary distinction between MRWs and non-MRWs in Section 5.3, fiction was characterized by an underuse of metaphor-related words. This finding can now be refined by saying that fiction underused indirect MRWs, but actually overused direct ones. Since direct expressions of metaphor – such as similes – often use a noun as one of their main components (e.g., \( X \) is like a \( Y \), with the \( X \) of \( Y \)), it is interesting that Section 5.3 revealed that fiction underused MRW nouns but overused MRW adjectives and verbs. There is also a potential interaction between word class and implicit MRW, as many of the implicit MRWs involved pronouns substituting for metaphorically used nouns. However, this three-way interaction between register, metaphor type and word class could not be statistically tested since the number of cells with a frequency below 5 would become problematic due to the large number of cells and the infrequent occurrence of implicit and direct metaphor.

The results showed that almost 98% of the metaphor-related words in the corpus were classic cases of metaphorically used words, i.e. metaphor that was expressed indirectly. Implicit MRWs and direct MRWs were extremely rare. In terms of distribution, implicit MRWs followed the same pattern as indirect MRWs, with a highest proportion in academic texts, then news, then fiction, then conversation. The direct MRWs, on the other hand, were distributed differently, and almost half of the cases of directly expressed metaphor in the corpus occurred in fiction. Direct MRW, though infrequent, clearly has a separate role to fulfil in the four registers and appears most typical of fiction.

5.6 General discussion of the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction

Studies concerning metaphor in literature have traditionally focused on qualitative analyses of specific literary works or specific authors. Quantitative findings on the amount of metaphorical expressions in literary works are rare. The analyses in this chapter have provided a first glimpse at the actual occurrence and distribution of metaphor in fiction, and of the quantitative differences between fiction, news, academic discourse and conversation.

The analysis of the interaction between register and word class confirmed that the samples were representative of the text types identified by Biber (1988, 1989). It confirmed that in terms of the distribution of the main word classes, fiction used
more nouns, prepositions and adjectives than conversation but fewer than news and academic discourse. In addition, fiction uses fewer verbs and rest-category items than conversation but more than news and academic discourse. This corresponds to the claim that fiction takes a neutral position on Biber’s Dimension 1, ‘Involved versus Informational Production’, that is, fiction is in between an involved and informational text. The relatively high frequency of verbs and rest-category items in fiction also proved in line with fiction’s narrative concerns (Dimension 2) while the frequent use of adverbs proved in line with fiction’s preference for situation-dependent reference (Dimension 3).

The inclusion of metaphor in a three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor revealed that the distribution of words that are related to metaphor differs from the distribution of words that are not related to metaphor. Fiction overused MRW adjectives, verbs, and prepositions but underused MRW adverbs, conjunctions, determiners, nouns and rest-category items. However, the other registers showed similar distributions. All four registers overused MRW verbs and prepositions and all four registers underused MRW conjunctions and rest items. Fiction, news and academic discourse all underused MRW determiners and adverbs. Fiction, news and conversation all overused MRW adjectives. Fiction and news both underused MRW nouns. While there was a significant interaction between register and metaphor for all word classes except conjunctions, MRW adjectives, adverbs, and rest items in fiction did not contribute to this interaction. MRW determiners, nouns, prepositions and verbs were underused in fiction in comparison to the other registers.

While it was expected that fiction, being the literary genre in the corpus, would have more metaphorical expressions than the other three registers, fiction was situated between academic discourse and news on the one hand and spoken conversation on the other, as far as the frequency of metaphor-related words was concerned. However, the type-token ratios for MRW adjectives, nouns and verbs revealed that fiction had the highest type-token ratio in all three cases, as well as the largest proportion of unique adjectives, nouns and verbs. This shows that fiction was the register with the greatest degree of variation in its use of metaphor within these word classes. The examination of the most frequently used MRW adjective, noun and verb lemmas in fiction revealed that these were predominantly highly conventional uses that are common in general language use and not typical of fiction, though some uses could be considered more specific of fiction, such as the frequent metaphor-related use of the adjectives golden and pale. Many of the most frequent MRW adjectives were from the source domain of size and dimension, while the most frequent MRW verbs were delexicalized verbs such as have, make and take. The most frequent MRW nouns in fiction revealed some text-
specific uses, such as the nouns *model* and *world*, the latter of which was a borderline case.

The analysis of the different relations to metaphor revealed that the application of MIPVU was non-problematic in all four registers and borderline cases were extremely rare. The three word classes that were most often problematic were prepositions, nouns and verbs. These borderline cases could be related to general difficulties with the procedure, such as the influence of metonymy and the boundary between concrete and abstract or general and specific uses. In general, fiction revealed no register-specific difficulties. The MFlags were also rare, but this relation to metaphor did interact significantly with register. Fiction was the only register in which this relation to metaphor was overused, though the analysis of MFlags is complicated slightly by fiction’s use of the complex MFlag phrases *with the ... of a ...* and *as ... as ...*, which were not treated as complex units and therefore slightly increased the count. The use of these complex MFlag phrases appeared to be typical of fiction.

The division of the MRWs into the different types of metaphor revealed that the number of words that occurs in similes, analogies, comparisons and other directly expressed metaphors was low. Directly expressed metaphor was much less frequent in the four examined registers than indirect metaphor, even in fiction, which contained more directly expressed metaphor than expected by chance. The results showed that almost 98% of the metaphor-related words in the data concerned the classic case of metaphorically used words, i.e. metaphor that is expressed indirectly. Such indirect metaphors are used to indirectly evoke (by non-literal comparison) another referent than the one that is designated by their basic meaning. The identification of such metaphorically used words does not, in the approach of the *Metaphor in Discourse* project, assume a one-to-one correspondence to underlying conceptual metaphors. As pointed out in Steen (2007) and Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b), the relation between metaphor-related words in language on the one hand and cross-domain mappings in conceptual structure requires further investigation. This transition from linguistic forms to conceptual structures will be the centre of attention in Chapters 7 and 8.

The results also showed that the distribution of indirect metaphor, the classic form of metaphor, was uneven across the four registers and that the patterns of distribution did not correspond to one of the most common expectations about metaphor and register, namely that metaphor is most frequently used in literature. The results showed that fiction, with 11.4% indirect MRWs, was clearly situated between academic texts (18.2%) and news texts (16.0%) on the one hand and conversation (7.6%) on the other. However, for direct metaphor a different pattern emerged, with fiction containing the highest proportion of direct metaphor (0.4%), in comparison to news (0.3%), academic discourse (0.1%), and conversation
(0.0%). Though this group was small in numbers, it was functionally important. The presence of directly expressed metaphor – such as similes, analogies and comparisons – is typically signalled, and the direct reference to the source domain forces the reader to access the source domain as relatively autonomous. Steen, Dorst et al. (2010a) have proposed to interpret this distinction between the patterns for indirect and direct metaphor with reference to a neglected distinction of metaphor in discourse, namely the distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor (Steen 2008; Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2008). The popular belief that fiction is typically metaphorical may be based on the association of fiction with deliberate metaphor, typically in the form of simile (e.g., Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Sayce 1954; Semino and Steen 2008), which may have impinged on their awareness more often than in any other register.

Direct metaphor may have the typical communicative function of being deliberate: it intentionally and explicitly instructs the addressee to set up a cross-domain comparison. As pointed out by Steen (2008) and Steen, Dorst et al. (2010a), direct metaphor is almost by definition deliberate as it is virtually impossible to interpret such expressions without using some form of comparative processing and without postulating some intention on the part of the assumed sender to use the metaphor. Indirect metaphor, on the other hand, may typically be non-deliberate. Psycholinguists have also argued that indirect metaphor may often be understood by categorization rather than comparison (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008), especially when such expressions are conventional. However, indirect metaphor can be used deliberately as well, for instance when indirect metaphor is used in marked constructions such as the classic A is B format (e.g., Sam is a pig) or when a number of different words from the same source domain are used in the same or consecutive sentences, i.e. in elaborations and extensions of the metaphor. These issues concerning the deliberate versus non-deliberate use of metaphor, and its relation to the indirect or direct expression of metaphor, will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, which makes the transition from identifying the linguistic forms of metaphor to reconstructing the underlying conceptual structures.

However, before the transition from linguistic forms to conceptual structures can be taken, the following chapter will first further investigate the quantitative patterns of metaphor that characterized fiction by distinguishing between the narrative prose and the dialogues in fiction. The analyses in the current chapter indicate that in terms of the general distribution of word classes and the distribution of metaphor fiction is positioned in between news and academic discourse on the one hand and conversation on the other. One possible explanation that was proposed for this situation was that this neutral position is the result of the hybrid nature of fiction. As the cross-register comparison revealed interesting differences
between the written and spoken registers, it is possible that the narrative prose in fiction has a distribution that is similar to news and academic discourse while the dialogues in fiction have a distribution that is similar to conversation. If significant differences in metaphor use exist, then it may be the case that the more narrative prose and the fewer dialogues a novel contains, the larger the number of metaphor-related words may be.
Robin-Anne, despite her apparent frailty, attacked the sandwiches and salad with the savagery of a starving bear.

(BNC-Baby: CCW)
6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter investigated the frequency and distribution of metaphor in fiction, and analysed the quantitative differences between the register of fiction and three other registers (conversation, news and academic discourse). It was shown that in terms of the overall frequency of metaphor-related words, fiction was situated in between academic discourse and news on the one hand and conversation on the other. However, fiction did have the highest type-token ratios for metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs of the four registers as well as the largest percentage of unique metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs, indicating that fiction is the register with the greatest degree of unique variation. It was also shown that MFlags and direct MRWs were typical of fiction, which suggests that fiction may contain a relatively large proportion of deliberate metaphors, as signalled metaphors and directly expressed metaphors are often deliberate (see Steen 2008).

The current chapter aims to refine these findings for fiction by systematically distinguishing between narrative prose and dialogues in fiction. This will be done to investigate whether fiction is situated in between news and academic discourse on the one hand and conversation on the other in terms of the proportion of metaphor-related words due to the fact that fiction contains both narrative prose (with features that are typical of written registers) and dialogues (with features that are typical of spoken registers). In addition, as conversations were shown to be characterized by a clear underuse of MFlags and direct MRWs in the previous chapter, it will be investigated whether the MFlags and direct MRWs in fiction are more typical of the narrative prose than the dialogues.

Many scholars have noted the hybrid nature of fiction due to its inclusion of both narrative prose and various forms of speech and thought representation (e.g., Biber 1988, 1989; Biber and Finegan 1989, 1992, 2001; Fludernik 1993, 1996, 2009; Leech and Short 2007). The presence of direct speech in particular raises the question to what degree the dialogues in fiction are similar to real-life conversations and how the attempt to mimic spontaneous speech may influence the linguistic features of fiction. That is, it may be that the more dialogue a fiction text contains, the more similar it becomes in terms of linguistic features to spoken conversations rather than to written prose. Conversely, the more narrative a fiction text contains, the more it may resemble other written registers (in this case, news and academic discourse) rather than conversations.

In light of Biber’s (1988, 1989) multi-dimensional model of register variation, fiction’s neutral position on Dimension 1, ‘Involved versus Informational
Production’, may be due to the fact that the narrative prose in fiction is positioned towards the informational end of the scale (characterized by a high frequency of nouns, prepositions, attributive adjectives, place adverbials, longer words and a high type-token ratio) while the dialogues in fiction are positioned towards the involved end of the scale (characterized by a high frequency of private verbs, possibility modals, first-person and second-person pronouns, indefinite and demonstrative pronouns, adverbs, be as a main verb, do as a pro-verb, etc.). Additionally, while the narrative prose in fiction should have a high score on Dimension 2, ‘Narrative versus Non-narrative Concerns, characterized by, among other things, a high frequency of past tense verbs, perfect-aspect verbs, public verbs, third person pronouns, the dialogues in fiction should have low frequencies for these narrative features, in parallel with what happens in conversations, and possibly score higher on the negative features for this dimension, such as the use of present-tense verbs and attributive adjectives.

Biber and Finegan (1989) established that between the seventeenth and twentieth century, three English written genres – letters, essays and fiction – “drifted” towards a more oral style, that is, ‘more involved, less elaborated, and less abstract’ (p. 487). They use the term ‘drift’ in the same sense as Sapir (1921), to indicate ‘a cumulative series of gradual linguistic developments in a consistent direction’ (p. 489). In a subsequent study, Biber and Finegan (1992) extended this diachronic investigation by including two ‘speech-based’ or ‘speech-like’ genres, namely dialogue in drama and dialogue in fiction. Speech-based genres are preserved in writing but originate in speech. In addition to literary representations of speech, they include court proceedings, political debates and town meetings. They argue that although the two forms of literary dialogue are essentially written genres, their purpose in representing speech may affect their linguistic characteristics: ‘[a]lthough literary dialogue is carefully produced, it represents face-to-face conversation and thus is characterized by linguistic features of interaction and involvement’ (p. 691). Such linguistic features include the frequent use of, for example, first-person and second-person pronouns, indefinite and demonstrative pronouns, contractions, discourse particles, hedges and amplifiers, private verbs, and possibility modals. Involved texts are also characterized by a relative lack of nouns, prepositions and attributive adjectives and a low type-token ratio. Biber and Finegan indicate that essays, letters and literary dialogues all have different communicative purposes: literary dialogues have an essentially aesthetic and divertive function, while essays are usually informative and sometimes argumentative or persuasive, and letters are primarily aimed at interactive and interpersonal communication (p. 495-7).

Using a multi-dimensional approach, Biber and Finegan (1992) showed that the literary dialogue genres are remarkably similar to actual conversation with
respect to both Dimension 3 (‘Explicit versus Situation-Dependent Reference’) and Dimension 5 (‘Abstract versus Non-Abstract Information’). That is, the literary dialogues are situated and non-abstract. Linguistic characteristics associated with situated reference are a high frequency of time, place and other adverbials, and a lack of WH-relative clauses on object and subject positions, pied-piping constructions, phrasal coordination and nominalizations. A non-abstract style is characterized by a lack of conjuncts, passives, past participial adverbial clauses and other adverbial subordinators. With respect to Dimension 1, ‘Informational versus Involved Production’, however, Biber and Finegan (ibid.) note that both dialogue in fiction and dialogue in drama are considerably more informational and thus “literate” (i.e. characterized by language that is typical for writing) than face-to-face conversations are. Both forms of dialogue are characterized by a high frequency of nouns, prepositional phrases and attributive adjectives in combination with a high type-token ratio. Biber and Finegan (1992: 701-2) postulate that this informational focus of dialogue in drama and fiction may be due to their specific literary functions, namely to ‘carry the story line’ in drama and to ‘significantly advance the story line’ in fiction.

Abercrombie (1963) discusses the differences between conversation and what he calls ‘spoken prose’, noting that there are significant differences between actual conversations and the conversations found in novels, plays and films. He points out that many people believe that these forms of spoken prose are similar to conversations in real life, and that authors of novels are often praised for writing ‘naturalistic dialogue’ or criticized when their dialogues are found to be unconvincing as representations of real conversations. However, Abercrombie maintains that real people never speak like characters in novels, plays or films, or vice versa: ‘Life would be intolerable if they did; and novels, plays or films would be intolerable if the characters spoke as people do in life’ (p. 12).

Abercrombie (ibid.) stresses that the very structure of conversation is different from spoken prose, as prose necessarily needs to spell out in words everything that can remain unmentioned in conversation because it is retrievable from the context. Moreover, conversations rely a great deal on the information carried by changes in intonation or loudness, variations in tempo or voice quality, as well as pauses, interjections, re-starts and repetitions. In addition, speakers rely on the shared physical context of face-to-face interaction, as speakers gesture, point at objects, manipulate objects, make facial expressions, and so on; such non-verbal actions also carry information in the discourse and can themselves constitute turns (cf. Clark 1996; Kendon 2004).

When spontaneous conversations are written out according to the rules of writing, and judged by the standards of what is correct and logical in written prose, then the result is, as Abercrombie puts it (p. 12), ‘pretty horrifying’, since these
written transcripts are ‘sometimes unintelligible’ and practically always ‘illogical, disorganized, repetitious, and ungrammatical’. However, it should of course be noted that spoken conversation has its own grammar (Biber et al. 1999). As conversations involve face-to-face interaction in a shared context they tend to avoid elaboration and specification of meaning (p. 1044), which leads to vagueness, but this vagueness is efficient, as a greater precision would be superfluous, would require more processing and would delay the dynamics of the conversation (p. 1045). As conversations also take place in real time, speakers need to plan and execute their utterances as they are speaking, which leads to various forms of dysfluency, such as pauses, hesitations, repetitions, and anacolutha. However, these forms of dysfluency have clear functions in spoken discourse and do not impair understanding. As Halliday (1994b: 61) points out: ‘we look at spoken language through the lens of a grammar designed for writing. Spoken discourse thus appears as a distorted variant of written discourse, and not unnaturally it is found wanting’. However, spoken language is characterized by its own kind of complexity, and the complexity of spoken language ‘is in its flow, the dynamic mobility whereby each figure provides a context for the next one, not only defining its point of departure but also setting the conventions by reference to which it is to be interpreted (p. 61).

In the Metaphor in Discourse project the dysfluency features of spoken conversations are reflected in the fact that conversation was the only register in which lexical items were sometimes annotated as DFMA, standing for Discard For Metaphor Analysis (see MIPVU procedure in Chapter 3), to indicate that the contextual meaning of an utterance could not be determined due to the fact that sentences were aborted or too unclear. In addition, the analysts only had access to written transcriptions of the conversations that contained very scant extra-linguistic information (see Kaal in prep.). Abercrombie relates the absence of such dysfluency features in fictive dialogue to the fact that prose is essentially intended to be read, not heard, which is why spoken prose in novels is much further removed from spontaneous conversation than most people realize.

Fludernik (2009) also maintains that the impression that spoken language can faithfully be represented in written language is a false one, and adds that even in conversational narratives, which she identifies as the prototypical form of narrative, direct speech is ‘markedly different from the real thing, sometimes even entirely fictive, although we expect it to be authentic’ (p. 65). The dialogues between characters in fiction are not representative of the way real people speak to each other in spontaneous conversations as they are clearly a ‘stylized’ and ‘purified’ form of spoken language (ibid). For example, dialogues in fiction are usually grammatically and syntactically correct and lack a number of features that are characteristic of real-life conversations, such as repetitions, re-phrasings and fillers.
She also points out that many authors have a tendency to use clichés and formulaic phrases in their dialogues, including interjections such as ‘Bother!’ or ‘Oh dear!’.

According to Fludernik, these are much more frequently used in dialogues in fiction than they are in real-life conversations.

Oostdijk (1990) investigated the language of dialogue in fiction by looking at a number of features that are often discussed as being typical of spoken language, such as: frequent repetition; a tendency to string together coordinate clauses, often linked by *and*, rather than to use subordinate clauses; the juxtaposition of clauses with no explicit link at all; arguments and predicates that are not syntactically linked; the deletion of referents, including subjects of clauses; and topicalisation. She found that some of these features hardly occurred in the dialogues, and other were more clearly related to the personal style preferences of specific authors. For example, she found very few instances of repetition in the dialogues, and attributes this finding to the fact that reported speech in fiction is carefully planned and edited, unlike spontaneous conversation. She also notes that coordination at the clause level occurred quite frequently in both direct speech and indirect speech, but that the use of *and, or and but* as connective adjuncts at the beginning of sentences was typical of direct speech.

Other characteristics that Oostdijk found to be typical of direct speech in fiction were a large number of imperatives, interrogatives (especially tag-questions), exclamatory phrases, vocatives, interjections, clitic forms and responsive phrases, as well as various forms of ellipsis, for example, ellipsis of the question operator in interrogatives and of the subject in declarative sentences. She notes that instances of incomplete sentences and loose phrases were also frequent, as were topicalisations such as ‘And you, John, I tried to kill you.’ and ‘The bastards – they are covering up!’ (p. 239). She concludes that dialogue in fiction has its own typical characteristics, and that it is sometimes similar to and sometimes different from spoken language due to the fact that, on the one hand, authors try to write dialogues that seem representative of genuine conversations, while on the other hand, dialogues in fiction are carefully planned, revised and edited.

Given the three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor established in Chapter 5, a subsequent question is whether there are also differences between narrative and dialogue in fiction with regard to the interaction between word class and metaphor. That is, it may be that the narrative in fiction resembles news and academic discourse in its frequency and distribution of metaphor-related words while the dialogues in fiction resemble the conversations. This would entail that the narratives should contain a larger proportion of metaphor-related words than the dialogues, as the written registers (news and academic discourse) contained more metaphor-related words than the spoken
register (conversation). In addition, it was expected that the narrative prose in fiction should contain more MFlag s and direct MRWs than the dialogues, as these were found to be significantly underused in conversation.

The current comparative analyses will focus on establishing if and how narrative and dialogue in fiction differ in their distribution of metaphor-related words. These differences can then be related to the differences between conversation and the written registers established in Chapter 5. The studies described above suggest that the narrative in fiction may behave quite differently from the dialogues in fiction: the narrative parts of fiction may behave more like the two carefully planned, revised and stylized registers (news and academic discourse), while the dialogues in fiction – being carefully planned on the one hand but intended to represent spontaneous speech on the other – may behave either similar to news and academic discourse or similar to the conversations. It was expected that the narrative prose in fiction would be more similar to the informational text types than the dialogues and would therefore contain a different distribution of the main word classes as well as a larger overall proportion of metaphor. In addition, it was expected that the dialogues in fiction would contain a smaller proportion of metaphors than the narrative prose but a higher proportion than actual conversations, given their status as carefully planned and stylized discourse despite their purpose in representing speech. In line with the cross-register comparison that was presented in Chapter 5, and for the sake of convenience and brevity, the term ‘sub-register’ will be used as a cover term for narrative and dialogue in fiction, allowing for the current analyses to be referred to as a comparison between two sub-registers of the fiction register.

After a short description of the method in Section 6.2, Section 6.3 will first investigate whether narrative and dialogue in fiction differ in their general distribution of word classes (Section 6.3.1) to determine whether there is a two-way interaction between word class and sub-register that reflects the interaction between the registers established in Chapter 5. Section 6.3.2 will then investigate whether there is a three-way interaction between word class, sub-register and metaphor. Section 6.3.3 will provide a discussion of the results. As the findings from Chapter 5 also indicated that the written registers were characterized by a greater degree of variation than spoken conversation, Section 6.3.4 will consider the differences between narrative and dialogue in terms of the variation within word classes. This will indicate whether the narrative prose in fiction is more varied in its use of metaphor than dialogue, and whether they demonstrate differences in their most frequently used metaphor-related lemmas. Section 6.4 will then examine whether narrative and dialogue differ in their distribution of the four relations to metaphor (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW, and MFlag) while Section 6.5 examines their distributions of the four types of metaphor.
(indirect MRW, direct MRW, implicit MRW and non-MRW). Finally, Section 6.6 offers a general discussion of how narrative and dialogue in fiction are similar to and different from each other in terms of their distribution and use of linguistic forms of metaphor.

6.2 Method

The materials and method used in this chapter are the same as in Chapter 5 for the cross-register comparison between fiction, conversation, news and academic discourse. In order to separate the narrative prose in fiction from the dialogues, all twelve fiction files were manually re-coded in the following way: all lexical items that were part of direct speech – as signalled by single or double inverted commas – were annotated as being ‘dialogue’; all other lexical items were annotated as being ‘narrative’. Similar to Oostdijk (1990) and De Haan (1996), only direct speech was included as dialogue. All other instances of speech or thought representation – such as indirect speech, free indirect speech, interior monologue or psycho-narration – were disregarded as dialogue and included under narrative since these forms of speech and thought representation do not aim to mimic the interpersonal, interactive nature of spontaneous conversation between more than one speaker and, to varying degrees, bear the stamp of the style of the narrator (for a detailed discussion see Fludernik 1993, 1996, 2009; Leech and Short 2007; Semino 2004; Semino and Short 2004). Moreover, as Semino and Short (2004) point out, it is extremely difficult to accurately separate narrator text from character text in more indirect forms of speech and thought presentation.

In total, the fiction sample contained 44,648 lexical items. Of these 44,648 lexical items, 28,518 lexical items were subsequently coded as being ‘narrative’ (63.9% of the fiction sample) and 16,130 as being ‘dialogue’ (36.1% of the fiction sample). This means that almost two-thirds of the fiction sample consisted of narrative prose, which makes the finding that fiction behaved either neutrally or more like the conversations than the two other written registers (see Chapter 5) noticeable, as the predominance of narrative prose in the fiction sample would have suggested that fiction should have behaved more like the written texts.
6.3 Analysis 1: The interaction between sub-register, word class and metaphor

Section 3.1 of Chapter 5 showed that in terms of the general distribution of word classes fiction occupied a middle position between news and academic discourse on the one hand and conversation on the other. That is, fiction contained fewer adjectives, nouns and prepositions (informational features) than academic discourse and news but more than conversation. In addition, fiction contained more verbs and rest-category items (involved features) than academic discourse and news but fewer than conversation. It was hypothesized that this neutral position of fiction between informational and involved text types could be the result of the combination of narrative prose and dialogues in fiction, with the narrative prose showing a similar distribution of word classes to the other two written registers (news and academic discourse) while the dialogues have a similar distribution to the conversations.

This idea can now be tested in quantitative terms. That is, it is expected that the narrative prose in fiction will contain more adjectives, nouns and prepositions than the dialogues but fewer verbs and rest-category items. In addition, the three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor showed that fiction differed from the other registers in its distribution of metaphor across the eight word classes. The current analysis will investigate whether narrative and dialogue differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor across the different word classes. This will demonstrate whether narrative is more similar to the written registers in terms of its distribution of metaphor while dialogue is more similar to conversation. The three-way interaction will provide insight into which forms of metaphor are used in which ways within fiction.

6.3.1 The interaction between sub-register and word class

The frequencies and percentages of the eight main word classes in narrative and dialogue are presented in Table 6.1 below. A chi-square analysis showed that there is a significant interaction between word class and sub-register, though the effect size is moderate: \( \chi^2(7) = 991.83, p < 0.001; \) Cramer’s \( V = 0.15 \).

Table 6.1 shows that the narrative prose in fiction contains a higher percentage of adjectives, conjunctions, determiners, nouns, and prepositions than the dialogues in fiction. The dialogues in fiction, on the other hand, contain a higher percentage of adverbs, verbs and rest-category items than the narrative prose. These findings
are in line with Biber’s ‘Informational versus Involved Production’ (Dimension 1), as adjectives, nouns and prepositions are typical of informational text types while adverbs, verbs and rest-category items are typical of involved text types.

Table 6.1 Frequencies and percentages per word class divided into narrative and dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Total in fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2161 (7.6%)</td>
<td>808 (5.0%)</td>
<td>2969 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>1772 (6.2%)</td>
<td>1067 (6.6%)</td>
<td>2839 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>1700 (6.0%)</td>
<td>798 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2498 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>3306 (11.6%)</td>
<td>1655 (10.3)</td>
<td>4961 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>6780 (23.8%)</td>
<td>2868 (17.8%)</td>
<td>9648 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3016 (10.6%)</td>
<td>1212 (7.5%)</td>
<td>4228 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>5777 (20.3%)</td>
<td>4011 (24.9%)</td>
<td>9788 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>4006 (14.0%)</td>
<td>3711 (23.0%)</td>
<td>7717 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28518 (100%)</td>
<td>16130 (100%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the narrative prose the verbs form a fifth of the data (20.3%), in the dialogues almost a quarter (24.9%). In the narrative prose the nouns also form almost a quarter of the data (23.8%), while in the dialogues the rest category comprises almost a quarter of the data (23.0%). In the narrative prose, the rest category is the third-largest category with 14.0%, while in the dialogues the nouns are the third-largest category with 17.8%. This means that verbs, nouns and the rest category are the three most important word classes in both narrative and dialogue, though narrative favours nouns over the rest category while dialogue favours the rest category over nouns. In both narrative and dialogue these three word classes taken together account for half of the data in the sample.

In both narrative and dialogue the next two important word classes are determiners and prepositions. Narrative prose contains 11.6% determiners and 10.6% prepositions; the dialogues contain 10.3% determiners and 7.5% prepositions. This shows that the narrative prose in fiction contains both more determiners and more prepositions than the dialogues. The next largest group in narrative is the adjectives (7.6%) followed by the adverbs (6.2%); in the dialogues the adverbs (6.6%) come before the adjectives (5.0%). Narrative has a larger proportion of adjectives than dialogue while dialogue has more adverbs. In both narrative and dialogue the smallest category consists of the conjunctions, with 6.0% in narrative and 4.9% in dialogue.

As mentioned in Chapter 5, one complication is that the different verb forms and verb types cannot be easily distinguished in the current analyses, as they are in Biber’s analyses (which distinguish, for example, between past-tense, present-tense and perfect-aspect verbs, and between private verbs and public verbs). However, a
quick inspection of the past-tense verb form *was* reveals that this past-tense form, which is associated with narrative concerns on Biber’s Dimension 2, is indeed more frequent in narrative (537 instances, 9.3% of verbs in narrative) than in dialogue (160 instances, 4.0% of verbs in dialogue). This confirms that the narrative prose in fiction scores higher on features associated with narrative concerns than the dialogues. However, the percentage in dialogue is more similar to that found for news (4.1%) and academic discourse (3.8%) than for conversation (2.8%), which suggests that dialogues in fiction are “more narrative” than actual conversations.

With regard to the rest category, which includes the personal pronouns, a closer look reveals that the third-person pronouns *he* and *she* – which are associated with narrative concerns on Dimension 2 – are more frequent in narrative than in dialogue. In narrative *he* occurs 1153 times (28.8% of rest category) and *she* 821 times (20.5% of rest category); in dialogue *he* occurs 264 times (7.1% of rest category) and *she* 113 times (3.0% of rest category). However, the third-person plural pronoun *they* occurs as often in dialogue – 221 times (6.0% of rest category) – as in narrative – 231 times (5.8% of rest category). The first-person pronouns *I* and *we* and the second-person pronoun *you* – which are associated with an involved style on Dimension 1 – are more frequent in dialogue than in narrative. In dialogue *I* occurs 804 times (21.7% of rest category), *we* 201 times (5.4%) and *you* 570 times (15.4%); in narrative, the pronoun *I* occurs 162 times (4.0%), *we* 35 times (0.9%) and *you* 32 times (0.8%). These distributions thus also confirm that narrative has features associated with narrative concerns while dialogue has features associated with an involved production.

The adverbs, which are associated with situation-dependent reference in both conversation and fiction, show slight differences in terms of the preferred lemmas in narrative and dialogue. In narrative, the time adverbs *then* (79 instances, 4.5% of adverbs) and *now* (49 instances, 2.8%) are the two most frequent adverbs; in dialogue *then* occurs less often (25 instances, 2.3% of adverbs) though *now* is relatively more frequent (35 instances, 3.3% of adverbs). However, this frequent use of *now* is probably related to its use as a discourse marker rather than a time adverbial, considering that the five most frequent adverbs in dialogue are *so*, *just*, *how*, *now*, and *well*. The adverbs *down* and *back* are amongst the most frequent in narrative, which can be related to their use in spatial descriptions. These findings suggest that adverbs are indeed frequent in both narrative and dialogue but for different reasons.

Standardized residuals were inspected to determine which word classes in narrative and dialogue contributed to the significant two-way interaction (given the large number of cases alpha was set at 0.01 so residuals above 2.58 were considered significant). The chi-square analysis showed that narrative significantly
overused adjectives (st. res. +6.1), conjunctions (st. res. +2.6), nouns (st. res. +7.9) and prepositions (st. res. +6.1); the determiners in narrative did not contribute to the interaction between word class and sub-register (st. res. +2.4). In relation to the distributions of the eight main word classes in news and academic discourse that were established in Section 5.3.1, it is clear that the narrative prose in fiction shows the same overuse of adjectives, nouns and prepositions as academic discourse and news, features that are consistent with Biber’s informational text types.

Conjunctions were significantly overused in academic texts and narrative prose in fiction but not in news texts, while determiners were overused in news and academic texts but not in narrative in fiction. Narrative in fiction, like news and academic discourse, underused verbs (st. res. -6.0) and the rest category (st. res. -13.1). However, while news and academic texts also significantly underused adverbs, the observed frequency of adverbs in narrative did not differ significantly from the expected frequency according to chance (st. res. -1.0). This difference in the use of adverbs between narrative fiction and the other written registers can be related to the role of adverbs in situation-dependent reference, which was determined to be a feature of both fiction and conversation in Biber’s multi-dimensional model.

Inspection of the standardized residuals for dialogue in fiction revealed that the dialogues in fiction significantly underused adjectives (st. res. -8.1), conjunctions (st. res. -3.5), determiners (st. res. -3.2), nouns (st. res. -10.5) and prepositions (st. res. -8.1). The dialogues significantly overused verbs (st. res. +8.0) and the rest category (st. res. +17.5). The adverbs in dialogue did not contribute to the interaction between word class and sub-register (st. res. +1.3). These results show that the dialogues in fiction are almost perfectly aligned with the conversations, which also underused adjectives, conjunctions, determiners, nouns and prepositions, and which also overused verbs and the rest category. The only difference between the dialogues in fiction and the conversations is that conversations significantly overused adverbs, while the adverbs in dialogue did not contribute to the interaction. As mentioned previously, this could be due to the fact that narrative in fiction also uses relatively many adverbs given their role in situated-dependent reference, so that both narrative and dialogue in fiction use relatively many adverbs though this use in dialogues is related to Dimension 1 (‘Informational versus Involved Production’) while in narrative prose it is related to Dimension 3 (‘Explicit versus Situation-Dependent Reference’).

In the cross-register comparison presented in Chapter 5 only four word classes in fiction significantly contributed to the interaction between register and word class, namely adjectives, determiners, nouns and verbs. The other four word classes were distributed as expected by chance. However, the division of fiction into narrative and dialogue now reveals that narrative and dialogue in fiction differ
significantly in their distribution of seven of the eight main word classes. Only the
adverbs are distributed as expected by chance in both narrative and dialogue.

A comparison between the percentages for the eight word classes in narrative
and dialogue in fiction and the percentages in academic texts, news texts and
conversations will demonstrate whether there is indeed a similarity between the
distributions of narrative and the written registers (news and academic discourse)
on the one hand and the dialogues and the spoken register (conversation) on the
other. The informational text types, academic discourse and news texts, should
occur on the one far end of the scale and the involved text type, conversation on the
other. Narrative prose and dialogues in fiction should occur in the middle, with
narrative being placed at the informational end and dialogue at the involved end.
Table 6.2 below presents the percentages in the expected order from academic
discourse to conversation.

Table 6.2 shows that the narrative prose and dialogues in fiction do indeed
always end up in the middle. As expected, narrative always appears on the same
side of the scale as the written registers and dialogue appears on the same end as
conversation. Conjunctions form the only exception to this pattern: in this case
narrative appears in between academic discourse and news texts, rather than in
between the written and spoken registers. For the adjectives, determiners and
prepositions the order from highest to lowest percentage is: academic, news,
narrative, dialogue, conversation. For the nouns the order between academic texts
and news texts is reversed: news, academic, narrative, dialogue, conversation. For
the adverbs, verbs and rest category the order is conversation, dialogue, narrative,
news, academic. For the adverbs the order between academic texts and news texts
is again reversed: conversation, dialogue, narrative, academic, news.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>News</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
<td>8,4%</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>5,1%</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
<td>6,2%</td>
<td>6,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>6,1%</td>
<td>5,4%</td>
<td>6,0%</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>13,7%</td>
<td>12,7%</td>
<td>11,6%</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>27,1%</td>
<td>28,9%</td>
<td>23,8%</td>
<td>17,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>13,1%</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
<td>10,6%</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>17,6%</td>
<td>20,3%</td>
<td>24,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>9,0%</td>
<td>10,7%</td>
<td>14,0%</td>
<td>23,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 100,0%   | 100,0%| 100,0%  | 100,0%       | 100,0%       |
The distributions of the eight main word classes in conversations, dialogues in fiction, narrative prose in fiction, and news are represented graphically in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1 Graphic representation of the distribution of word classes per (sub-)register

Figure 6.1 shows that for all of the word classes the conversations appear on one end of the scale and the news texts at the other end, with the dialogues and narrative prose in between. Fiction’s neutral position between news and conversation in terms of the distribution of the different word classes does indeed result from the fact that the narrative in fiction has features that are more similar to news (Biber’s informational production) while the dialogues have features that are more similar to spoken conversations (Biber’s involved production). That is, narrative prose in fiction uses more adjectives, nouns and prepositions than dialogues in fiction and conversations but fewer than news. Conversely, narrative in fiction uses fewer adverbs, verbs and rest-category items than dialogues in fiction and conversations but more than news. Dialogues in fiction use fewer adjectives, nouns and prepositions than narrative in fiction and news but more than
conversation. Conversely, dialogues in fiction use more adverbs, verbs and rest-
category items than narrative in fiction and news but fewer than conversation.

This section has shown that narrative and dialogue in fiction differ significantly in their distributions of the eight major word classes. The differences in their distributions proved to be in line with an informational focus in narrative and an involved focus in dialogue, as suggested by Biber and Finegan (1992). Moreover, it was also shown that dialogues in fiction differ in important respects from real conversations – for instance in their use of nouns and determiners – a finding which can be related to Biber and Finegan’s claim that literary dialogue has a function in carrying the story line.

Now that the general distribution of word classes in narrative and dialogue has been shown to correspond with the findings of Biber (1988, 1989) and Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992), the next question is whether narrative and dialogue differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor-related words across the eight word classes. That is, the question arises whether the finding that fiction contains a higher percentage of metaphor-related words than conversation but a lower percentage of metaphor-related words than news and academic discourse can be related to a higher percentage of metaphor-related words in narrative than in dialogue. Given the previously established three-way interaction between register, metaphor and word class, it is expected that there will be differences between narrative and dialogue concerning which word classes are most often related to metaphor.

6.3.2 The interaction between sub-register, word class and metaphor

In the previous section it was shown that there are considerable differences between the narrative prose and dialogues in fiction when it comes to their general distributions of the eight major word classes. It can now be determined whether they also differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor-related words by running a three-way loglinear analysis that investigates the interaction between word class, sub-register and metaphor. For this analysis, the four-way categorization of the different relations to metaphor reported in Chapter 3 (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW and MFlag) was again simplified into a binary distinction between words that are related to metaphor (MRW) and words that are not related to metaphor (non-MRW), as was done in Chapter 5. This binary distinction includes the MFlags in the category of non-MRWs and combines the clear and borderline cases of metaphor into one MRW category. Using this binary
distinction, all component two-way contingency tables showed expected frequencies in excess of five so that a loglinear analysis was allowed.

Based on the assumption that narrative and dialogue have different roles to perform in fiction, and given the previously established three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor (see Section 5.3.2), it was expected that narrative and dialogue would have significantly different distributions of metaphor-related words across the eight main word classes. A three-way loglinear analysis produced a final model that retained all effects. The likelihood of this model was \( \chi^2(0) = 0, p = 1 \). The highest-order interaction was significant: \( \chi^2(7) = 155,518.00, p < 0.001 \).

Since it was previously established that narrative and dialogue had different distributions of the eight main word classes, and since metaphor usage is the main focus of this study, the three-way interaction will be further investigated by examining the interaction between metaphor and word class for both narrative and dialogue, and by examining the interaction between metaphor and sub-register for each of the word classes. Together, these analyses will show if and how the distribution of metaphor-related words in narrative differs from the distribution of metaphor-related words in dialogue. Based on the results of the cross-register comparison reported in Chapter 5, the main expectation was that narrative would contain a larger proportion of metaphor-related words than dialogue.

Separate chi-square analyses showed that there were differences in the distribution of MRWs and non-MRWs across the eight main word classes for both narrative \( \chi^2(7) = 2189.22, p < 0.001; \) Cramer’s \( V = 0.28 \) and dialogue \( \chi^2(7) = 1468.57, p < 0.001; \) Cramer’s \( V = 0.30 \). Table 6.3 shows the frequencies and percentages of the non-MRWs and MRWs in each of the word classes divided into narrative and dialogue. Percentages per column are given to indicate the relative proportions of the word classes in either the group of words that are not related to metaphor or the group of words that are related to metaphor.

In the fiction sample as a whole, verbs were the word class that was most often related to metaphor, accounting for 29.4% of the metaphor-related words in fiction. The significant \( \chi^2 \) showed that metaphor-related verbs were in fact overused in all four of the registers. Table 6.3 reveals that verbs are the word class that is most frequently related to metaphor in both narrative (28.9%) and dialogue (30.2%), with dialogue containing a slightly larger proportion. The chi-square analysis showed that metaphor-related verbs were significantly overused in both narrative (st. res. +11.1) and dialogue (st. res. +4.7). Verbs that were not related to metaphor were significantly underused in narrative (st. res. -4.1) but did not contribute to the interaction in dialogue (st. res. -1.7). With respect to the non-MRW verbs narrative is therefore more similar to news and academic discourse.
which both underused non-MRW verbs) while dialogue is similar to conversation (in which non-MRW verbs did not contribute to the interaction).

Prepositions were the second-largest group of metaphor-related words in fiction, accounting for 26.7% of the MRWs. In fiction, metaphor-related prepositions were significantly overused while non-MRW prepositions were underused. This situation was the same for all four of the registers. Table 6.3 shows that metaphor-related prepositions were the second-largest group of metaphor-related words in both narrative (27.6%) and dialogue (25.1%), this time with narrative containing a slightly larger proportion than dialogue. The chi-square analysis showed that both narrative and dialogue significantly overused metaphor-related prepositions (st. res. +30.3 in narrative and +28.2 in dialogue) while prepositions that were not related to metaphor were significantly underused in both narrative and dialogue (st. res. -11.1 and -10.4 respectively).

Table 6.3 The distribution of metaphor per word class divided into narrative and dialogue with frequencies and percentages per column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3a Narrative</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>1724 (6.9%)</td>
<td>437 (13.0%)</td>
<td>2161 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>1612 (6.4%)</td>
<td>160 (4.8%)</td>
<td>1772 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>1689 (6.7%)</td>
<td>11 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1700 (6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>3153 (12.5%)</td>
<td>153 (4.6%)</td>
<td>3306 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>6114 (24.3%)</td>
<td>666 (19.8%)</td>
<td>6780 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>2091 (8.3%)</td>
<td>925 (27.6%)</td>
<td>3016 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>4807 (19.1%)</td>
<td>970 (28.9%)</td>
<td>5777 (20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>3972 (15.8%)</td>
<td>34 (1.0%)</td>
<td>4006 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25162 (100%)</td>
<td>3356 (100%)</td>
<td>28518 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3b Dialogue</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>670 (4.7%)</td>
<td>138 (7.1%)</td>
<td>808 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>963 (6.8%)</td>
<td>104 (5.4%)</td>
<td>1067 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>784 (5.5%)</td>
<td>14 (0.7%)</td>
<td>798 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>1430 (10.1%)</td>
<td>225 (11.6%)</td>
<td>1655 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>2518 (17.7%)</td>
<td>350 (18.1%)</td>
<td>2868 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>726 (5.1%)</td>
<td>486 (25.1%)</td>
<td>1212 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>3426 (24.1%)</td>
<td>585 (30.2%)</td>
<td>4011 (24.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>3676 (25.9%)</td>
<td>35 (1.8%)</td>
<td>3711 (23.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14193 (100%)</td>
<td>1937 (100%)</td>
<td>16130 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that in both narrative and dialogue prepositions play a relatively important role in the group of metaphor-related words (accounting for a
quarter of the metaphor-related words in both narrative and dialogue), while their role in the group of words that are not related to metaphor is relatively small (8.3% in narrative and 5.1% in dialogue). Together, the metaphor-related verbs and metaphor-related prepositions accounted for half of the metaphor-related words in both narrative and dialogue. This shows, as the cross-register comparison in Chapter 5 also did, that these two word classes are most frequently used metaphorically regardless of the specific (sub-)register.

In fiction, the next important group of metaphor-related words concerned nouns, which accounted for 19.2% of the metaphor-related words in fiction as a whole. Despite this relatively large proportion, MRW nouns were underused in fiction, while non-MRW nouns were distributed according to chance. Table 6.3 shows that nouns accounted for 19.8% of the metaphor-related words in narrative and 18.1% of the metaphor-related words in dialogue. The chi-square analysis showed that in narrative the non-MRW nouns did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. +1.7) while the MRW nouns were underused (st. res. -4.7). In dialogue, on the other hand, both the non-MRW nouns and the MRW nouns did not contribute to the interaction (st. res. -0.1 and +0.3). Dialogue is similar to conversation in this respect, as neither MRW nouns nor non-MRW nouns in conversation contributed to the interaction. The situation for narrative is somewhat special, however, as the news texts underused MRW nouns but overused non-MRW nouns, and the academic texts showed a distribution of both MRW and non-MRW nouns that was according to chance.

Adjectives accounted for 10.9% of the metaphor-related words in fiction. The chi-square analysis showed that MRW adjectives were overused in fiction while non-MRW adjectives were underused. In narrative, MRW adjectives account for 13.0% of the metaphor-related words, and 6.9% of the words not related to metaphor. In dialogue, the MRW adjectives account for 7.1% and the non-MRW adjectives for 4.7%. The chi-square analysis showed that MRW adjectives are in fact significantly overused in both narrative (st. res. +11.5) and dialogue (st. res. +4.2). The non-MRW adjectives were underused in narrative (st. res. -4.2) but did not contribute to the interaction in dialogue (st. res. -1.5). With respect to adjectives narrative is similar to news, which also overused MRW adjectives and underused non-MRW adjectives, while dialogue is similar to conversation, which overused MRW adjectives but had a distribution of non-MRW adjectives that was according to chance.

In fiction, determiners accounted for 7.1% of the metaphor-related words. The chi-square analysis showed that MRW determiners were underused while non-MRW determiners were overused in fiction. In narrative, the determiners account for 12.5% of the word not related to metaphor and only 4.6% of the metaphor-related words. In dialogue, determiners account for 10.1% of the words not related
to metaphor and 11.6% of the metaphor-related words. This shows that metaphor-related determiners play a much more important role in dialogue than in narrative. Dialogue contains an even larger proportion of metaphor-related determiners than non-metaphor-related ones. The chi-square analysis showed that although the metaphor-related determiners form a relatively large proportion of the metaphor-related words in dialogue, they did not contribute to the interaction in the dialogues (st. res. +1.9). In narrative, the MRW determiners were underused (st. res. -12.0). The non-MRW determiners were overused in narrative (st. res. +4.4) and did not contribute to the interaction in dialogue (st. res. -0.7). Narrative is similar to news and academic discourse in its distribution of both non-MRW and MRW determiners. Dialogue, however, is not similar to conversation, as conversation underused non-MRW determiners and overused MRW determiners.

Adverbs accounted for 5.0% of the metaphor-related words in fiction as a whole. The chi-square analysis showed that metaphor-related adverbs were underused in fiction while the non-MRW adverbs did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and word class. In narrative, adverbs account for 4.8% of the metaphor-related words and 6.4% of the words not related to metaphor. In dialogue, the adverbs account for 5.4% of the metaphor-related words and 6.8% of the words not related to metaphor. The chi-square analysis showed that metaphor-related adverbs were underused in narrative (st. res. -3.4) but did not contribute to the interaction in dialogue (st. res. -2.1). The distribution of non-MRW adverbs did not contribute to the interaction in both narrative and dialogues (st. res. +1.2 and +0.8 respectively). Dialogue is again similar to conversation, which also had a distribution of both non-MRW and MRW adverbs that did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and word class. Narrative is similar to news and academic discourse in its distribution of both non-MRW and MRW adverbs.

The two remaining word classes, conjunctions and rest-category items, were rarely related to metaphor in fiction (0.5% and 1.3% respectively), while their non-MRW counterparts accounted for 6.3% (conjunctions) and 19.4% (rest category) of the fiction sample. This showed that while the rest category played an important role in the group of words that were not related to metaphor in fiction, they were hardly ever related to metaphor. In fiction, non-MRW rest items and non-MRW conjunctions were significantly overused, MRW rest items and MRW conjunctions underused. In narrative, conjunctions accounted for 6.7% of the non-MRWs and 0.3% of the MRWs. Dialogue contained 5.5% non-MRW conjunctions and 0.7% MRW conjunctions. In both narrative and dialogue the non-MRW conjunctions were overused and the MRW conjunctions underused (st. res. -13.4 and -8.4 respectively). MRW rest items account for 1.0% of the metaphor-related words in narrative and 1.8% of the metaphor-related words in dialogue. Similar to the
conjunctions, the non-MRW rest items are overused in both narrative and dialogue, while the metaphor-related rest items are underused (st. res. -20.1 and -19.5 respectively).

The percentages in Table 6.3 revealed that there were considerable differences in the distributions of metaphor-related words and non-metaphor related words across the eight main word classes in both narrative and dialogue in fiction. However, narrative and dialogue often showed similar distributions in terms of the proportions of metaphor-related words per word class. That is, the uneven distribution of metaphor-related words across the eight word classes may not differ significantly between these two sub-registers of fiction. To determine the differences in the interaction between sub-register and metaphor, the distribution of metaphor needs to be considered from the point of view of word class, which will be done next.

Table 6.4 The distribution of metaphor per word class divided into narrative and dialogue with frequencies and percentages per row

6.4a Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>1724 (79.8%)</td>
<td>437 (20.2%)</td>
<td>2161 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>1612 (91.0%)</td>
<td>160 (9.0%)</td>
<td>1772 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>1689 (99.4%)</td>
<td>11 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1700 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>3153 (95.4%)</td>
<td>153 (4.6%)</td>
<td>3306 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>6114 (90.2%)</td>
<td>666 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6780 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>2091 (69.3%)</td>
<td>925 (30.7%)</td>
<td>3016 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>4807 (83.2%)</td>
<td>970 (16.8%)</td>
<td>5777 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>3972 (99.2%)</td>
<td>34 (0.8%)</td>
<td>4006 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25162 (88.2%)</td>
<td>3356 (11.8%)</td>
<td>28518 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4b Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>670 (82.9%)</td>
<td>138 (17.1%)</td>
<td>808 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>963 (90.3%)</td>
<td>104 (9.7%)</td>
<td>1067 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>784 (98.2%)</td>
<td>14 (1.8%)</td>
<td>798 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>1430 (86.4%)</td>
<td>225 (13.6%)</td>
<td>1655 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>2518 (87.8%)</td>
<td>350 (12.2%)</td>
<td>2868 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>726 (59.9%)</td>
<td>486 (40.1%)</td>
<td>1212 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>3426 (85.4%)</td>
<td>585 (14.6%)</td>
<td>4011 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest category</td>
<td>3676 (99.1%)</td>
<td>35 (0.9%)</td>
<td>3711 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14193 (88.0%)</td>
<td>1937 (12.0%)</td>
<td>16130 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 presents the same frequencies as Table 6.3, but this time it gives the percentages per row rather than per column. This will indicate how the words that
are related to metaphor and the words that are not related to metaphor are divided over the two sub-registers within each word class. Separate chi-square analyses on the level of word class showed that there were significant differences in the distribution of non-MRWs and MRWs across narrative and dialogue in fiction for the following word classes: determiners ($\chi^2(1) = 125.99, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.16$), nouns ($\chi^2(1) = 12.12, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.04$), prepositions ($\chi^2(1) = 34.57, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.09$) and verbs ($\chi^2(1) = 8.62, p < 0.01$; Cramer’s $V = 0.03$), though the effect sizes are small. The chi-square analyses did not show a significant interaction between metaphor and sub-register for the following word classes: adjectives ($\chi^2(1) = 3.72, p = 0.054$), adverbs ($\chi^2(1) = 0.41, p = 0.524$), conjunctions ($\chi^2(1) = 6.72, p = 0.01$) and the rest category ($\chi^2(1) = 0.19, p = 0.66$).

Determiners are considerably more often related to metaphor in dialogue than in narrative. Table 6.4 shows that of the determiners in narrative, 95.4% were not related to metaphor and 4.6% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 86.4% of the determiners were not related to metaphor and 13.6% were related to metaphor. In relation to the other word classes, metaphor-related determiners were shown to be underused in narrative and distributed according to chance in dialogue. The current analysis shows that narrative uses significantly fewer MRW determiners than dialogue.

Nouns are slightly more often related to metaphor in dialogue than in narrative. Of the nouns in narrative, 90.2% were not related to metaphor and 9.8% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 87.8% of the nouns were not related to metaphor and 12.2% were related to metaphor. In relation to the other word classes, metaphor-related nouns were underused in narrative and distributed according to chance in dialogue. When narrative and dialogue are compared directly, dialogue uses significantly more metaphor-related nouns than narrative.

Prepositions are considerably more often related to metaphor in dialogue than in narrative. Of the prepositions in narrative, 69.3% were not related to metaphor and 30.7% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 59.9% of the prepositions were not related to metaphor and 40.1% were related to metaphor. While metaphor-related prepositions were overused in both narrative and dialogue in relation to the other word classes, they are overused in dialogue in relation to narrative.

Verbs were slightly more often related to metaphor in narrative than in dialogue. Of the verbs in narrative, 83.2% were not related to metaphor and 16.8% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 85.4% of the verbs were not related to metaphor and 14.6% were related to metaphor. While both narrative and dialogue overused metaphor-related verbs in relation to the other word classes, narrative uses significantly more metaphor-related verbs than dialogue.

Narrative and dialogue did not differ in their distributions of the other word classes (adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions and the rest category). Of the adjectives
in narrative, 79.8% were not related to metaphor and 20.2% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 82.9% of the adjectives were not related to metaphor and 17.1% were related to metaphor. Narrative and dialogue thus show the same overuse of MRW adjectives in relation to the other word classes. Of the adverbs in narrative, 91.0% were not related to metaphor and 9.0% were related to metaphor. In dialogue, 90.3% of the adverbs were not related to metaphor and 9.7% were related to metaphor. Dialogue does not use significantly more MRW adverbs than narrative even though MRW adverbs are underused in comparison to the other word classes in narrative but not in dialogue. Conjunctions and rest-category items were rarely related to metaphor: of the conjunctions, only 0.6% were related to metaphor in narrative and 1.8% in dialogue; of the rest category, only 0.8% were related to metaphor in narrative and 0.9% in dialogue. Narrative and dialogue thus showed the same underuse of MRW conjunctions and rest-category items in relation to the other word classes.

6.3.3 Discussion of the interaction between word class, sub-register and metaphor

The results show that there is a significant two-way interaction between word class and sub-register, as well as a significant three-way interaction between word class, sub-register and metaphor. The two-way interaction revealed that there are significant differences between narrative and dialogue in their distribution of the eight main word classes. Narrative overused adjectives, conjunctions, nouns and prepositions, and underused verbs and the rest category; determiners and adverbs did not contribute to the interaction between word class and sub-register in narrative. The dialogues, on the other hand, underused adjectives, conjunctions, determiners, nouns and prepositions and overused verbs and the rest category; the adverbs again did not contribute to the interaction. These findings are in line with a difference between narrative and dialogue along Biber’s (1988, 1989) Dimension 1, ‘Involved versus Informational Production’. The frequent use of nouns, prepositions and attributive adjectives, which are characteristic of an informational production, are typical of the narrative prose in fiction rather than of the dialogues. Conversely, the frequent use of pronouns (which are part of the rest category) and verbs, which are characteristic of an involved production, are typical of dialogue rather than narrative.

Comparing these differences to differences established in Chapter 5 between the written registers (academic and news texts) and the spoken register (conversation), narrative in fiction showed similar patterns to news and academic
texts while dialogue in fiction showed similar patterns to conversation. The exception to this general tendency concerned the adverbs, which did not show any differences in terms of their proportions in narrative and dialogue. It was suggested that this situation results from the fact that adverbs are frequently used in both narrative and dialogue but for different reasons. The frequent use of adverbs in narrative relates to their role in situation-dependent reference (Dimension 3) while their frequent use in dialogue relates to their role in an involved production (Dimension 1).

The subsequent three-way interaction revealed that the tendencies for words that are related to metaphor are different from the tendencies for words that are not related to metaphor in both narrative and dialogue. Before metaphor was included, narrative showed an overuse of adjectives, conjunctions, nouns and prepositions, and an underuse of verbs and the rest category; determiners and adverbs did not contribute to the two-way interaction. After the inclusion of metaphor, narrative showed an overuse of metaphor-related adjectives, prepositions and verbs, and an underuse of metaphor-related conjunctions, determiners, nouns, and the rest category. The adverbs, which did not contribute to the two-way interaction, are significantly underused in narrative when they are related to metaphor. Before metaphor was included, the dialogues showed an underuse of adjectives, conjunctions, determiners, nouns and prepositions, and an overuse of verbs and the rest category; the adverbs did not contribute to the interaction. After the inclusion of metaphor, dialogue shows an overuse of metaphor-related adjectives, prepositions and verbs, and an underuse of metaphor-related conjunctions and the rest category; in the dialogues, the metaphor-related adverbs, determiners and nouns did not contribute to the interaction between word class and metaphor.

Comparing narrative and dialogue directly, there was no significant interaction between metaphor and sub-register for the adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, verbs and the rest category. Both narrative and dialogue overuse metaphor-related adjectives and verbs and underuse metaphor-related conjunctions and the rest category; metaphor-related adverbs are distributed as expected by chance in both narrative and dialogue. Narrative and dialogue do differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor-related prepositions, nouns and determiners: these are all overused in dialogue in relation to narrative. Metaphor-related determiners were also overused in conversation in comparison to the other registers. Metaphor-related nouns and prepositions, however, were underused in conversation compared to the other registers. This suggests that the overuse of metaphor for these word classes in dialogue is not typical of actual spoken conversations.

This shows that while the general distribution of word classes showed significantly different patterns for narrative and dialogue in fiction, the two sub-registers show remarkably similar distributions of metaphor. That is, although the
distribution of metaphor across the eight word classes is uneven in both narrative and dialogue, these two sub-registers often have the same uneven distribution. There were no differences between narrative and dialogue for the metaphor-related adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, verbs and rest-category items. More unexpectedly, when narrative and dialogue did differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor across a specific word class, as was the case for the prepositions, nouns and determiners, it was in fact the dialogues which contained the larger proportion of metaphor-related words. These word classes are associated with an Informational production, which shows that the dialogues become more informational but in a metaphorical way. The dialogues in fiction are characterized by a larger proportion of metaphor-related words than would be expected given their purpose of representing spoken conversations.

This section has examined how narrative and dialogue differ in their general distribution of the eight main word classes as well as their distribution of metaphor across these word classes. However, the notion of word class is rather general and abstract, and the analyses presented in this section do not provide any insight into the kind of metaphors that occur in these word classes. In addition, the above analyses do not shed light on whether the overuse of metaphor in a specific word class can be related to a small group of specific lemmas that have a frequent metaphorical use or whether the word class involves a large degree of metaphor variation. In addition, it was demonstrated that narrative and dialogue often show the same general patterns of metaphor, but it is as yet unclear whether they involve the same uses of metaphor within these word classes. The overuse of metaphor in a particular word class may be related to metaphorical uses that are common in all language use or they may be related to specific uses in one of the specific sub-registers. This is what the following section will examine.

6.3.4 Dominant patterns of metaphor and metaphor variation in narrative and dialogue

So far the general distribution of the different word classes in narrative and dialogue has been analysed as well as the distribution of metaphor across these word classes. The main focus of the analyses in this section will be the dominant patterns and variation within word classes in terms of type-token ratios and most frequently used lemmas. This will demonstrate whether narrative and dialogue differ in terms of the kinds of words they use metaphorically. This will provide insight into which patterns of metaphor are dominant in fiction in general, and which in either narrative or dialogue. The most important adjective, noun and verb
lemmas in narrative and dialogue will be compared, first considering all words (i.e. both non-MRW and MRW together) and then considering only the metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs. This analysis will show, for both general use and metaphorical use, if and how narrative and dialogue in fiction differ in terms of the dominant patterns and variation within word classes.

**The use of adjectives in narrative and dialogue**

In Chapter 5 it was shown that fiction significantly underuses non-MRW adjectives and overuses MRW adjectives, suggesting that the adjectives play a more important role in the group of metaphor-related words than in the group of words that are not related to metaphor. The findings from Section 6.3.3 above revealed that metaphor-related adjectives were in fact overused in both narrative and dialogue. The non-MRW adjectives were underused in narrative but they did not contribute to the interaction between word class and metaphor in dialogue. This shows that in both narrative and dialogue in fiction adjectives play a more important role in the group of metaphor-related words than in the group of words that are not related to metaphor.

With 1100 adjective types and 2161 adjective tokens, narrative has a general type-token ratio for adjectives of 0.51. Dialogue, with 371 types and 808 tokens, has a general type-token ratio for adjectives of 0.46. In comparison, the news texts also had a high ratio of 0.43 while the conversations had a much lower ratio of 0.24. This suggests that dialogue in fiction is more varied in its use of adjectives than actual conversations, and therefore more similar to written registers.

With respect to MRW adjectives only, narrative has 289 types and 437 tokens, resulting in a type-token ratio of 0.66 for MRW adjectives in narrative. Dialogue has 85 types and 138 tokens, resulting in a type-token ratio of 0.62. This shows that narrative is slightly more varied in its use of metaphor-related adjectives than dialogue, though both are indeed characterized by a high degree of variation. In comparison to the other registers, both narrative and dialogue have a higher degree of variation in the use of metaphor-related adjectives. News also had a high ratio (0.57) while conversation had the lowest ratio (0.39), showing that both narrative and dialogue are more similar to news than conversation in terms of variation.

Based on the contrast between the low type-token ratios for conversation on the one hand, and the much higher ratios for fiction and news on the other, it was expected that narrative would have higher ratios than dialogue. However, unlike conversation, dialogue in fiction is characterized by high type-token ratios for both adjectives in general (0.46) and MRW adjectives only (0.62). This reveals that the adjectives in fictive dialogue are more varied that their real-life counterparts in
spoken conversations are. In terms of this variation, fictive dialogue is similar to written rather than spoken registers.

Table 6.5 lists the ten most frequently used adjective lemmas in fiction divided into narrative and dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 2161 adj.)</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 808 adj.)</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Freq. (% of 2969 adj.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>40 (1.9%)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>43 (5.3%)</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>71 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>39 (1.8%)</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>25 (3.1%)</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>46 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>30 (1.4%)</td>
<td>sorry</td>
<td>18 (2.2%)</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>43 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>28 (1.3%)</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>13 (1.6%)</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>39 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>28 (1.3%)</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>11 (1.4%)</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>32 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young</td>
<td>25 (1.2%)</td>
<td>european</td>
<td>11 (1.4%)</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>31 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>24 (1.1%)</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>11 (1.4%)</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>30 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>20 (0.9%)</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>11 (1.4%)</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>29 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>19 (0.9%)</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>10 (1.2%)</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>28 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>15 (0.7%)</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>9 (1.1%)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>27 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 shows that there is relatively little overlap between the ten most frequent adjective lemmas in narrative and dialogue, indicating that the two sub-registers prefer different lemmas. Only three lemmas overlap, namely good, old, and white: old is equally frequent in both, while white is slightly more important in dialogue; good, on the other hand, though among the ten most frequent adjectives in both sub-registers, is relatively more important in dialogue than narrative, accounting for 5.3% of the adjectives in dialogue and only 1.3% of the adjectives in narrative. In addition, most of the adjectives that occurred in the top ten for fiction as a whole are clearly associated with narrative rather than dialogue, namely small, long, young, black, other and new. Only one adjective in fiction’s top ten is clearly related to dialogue, namely sure.

The adjectives related to size and dimension, small, long and large, are relatively more important in narrative: 40 out of 46 occurrences for small (87.0%), 39 out of 43 occurrences for long (90.7%) and 15 out of 16 occurrences of large (93.8%) occur in the narrative. The adjectives relating to time – old, young and new – are also relatively more important in narrative than in dialogue: old occurs 28 out of 39 times in narrative (71.8%), young 25 out of 32 (78.1%) and new 19 out of 29 (65.5%), though old is among the ten most frequent adjectives in dialogue. The
colour adjectives white and black are also associated with narrative: 20 out of 31 occurrences of white (64.5%) and all of the occurrences of black. It was noted in Chapter 5 that fiction uses a large number of colour terms to give descriptions of people, objects and places. Of the adjectives that did not immediately fall into groups when fiction was considered as a whole, other is clearly associated with narrative (24 out of 29 occurrences, 82.8%) while sure is typical of dialogue (25 out of 28 occurrences, 89.3%). The presence of sure can now be related to other typical adjectives in dialogue, namely good, sorry and right, all of which are frequently used as discourse markers in spoken conversations. The presence of afraid and important in dialogue’s top ten can be related to their use in semi-fixed constructions such as I’m afraid and It’s important.

The adjectives good, bad, right and old also occurred in conversation’s top ten most frequent adjectives, with sorry falling just outside the top ten. Some of the other most important adjectives in conversation, such as nice, little and bloody, are apparently relatively less important in dialogue: nice represented 5.2% of the adjectives in conversation, being the second most important adjective, while it occurs only 4 times in dialogue, representing only 0.5%; little occurred 8 times in dialogue (1.0% versus 3.8% in conversation) and bloody 6 times (0.8% versus 1.7% in conversation). However, nice and bloody are clearly more important in dialogues: neither occurred in the narrative. By contrast, little occurred 11 times in the narrative (0.5%), which can be related to the other size and dimension adjectives. The only odd one out is the adjective European as one of the most important adjectives in dialogue; however, this particular adjective and its prominence in the data can be related to the topic of a single text, in which all 12 of the instances of European occurred, BNC-Baby AC2.

In terms of the number of unique adjectives (i.e. adjectives occurring only once), the high number of unique adjectives noted in the previous chapter can be now be said to be a feature of both dialogue and narrative in fiction. The dialogues contained 228 unique adjectives out of 371 types (61.5%) and 808 tokens (28.2%), the narrative 792 unique adjectives out of 1100 types (72%) and 2161 tokens (36.6%). Though narrative clearly has more unique adjectives than dialogue, the percentages for dialogue are much higher than those of conversation, namely 48% (types) and 12% (tokens), indicating again that dialogues in fiction are more varied than actual conversations.

When considering the unique adjectives in narrative and dialogue, it is particularly striking that narrative contains as many as 122 compound adjectives (i.e. hyphenated combinations). This means that of the 792 unique adjectives, 15.4% is a compound. In addition, 6 compound adjectives were used more than once. In the dialogues there were 16 unique compound adjectives (7% of the unique adjectives) and 2 that were used more than once. This suggests that
compound adjectives are most typical of narrative in fiction and that they are usually unique and created to add variation. Many of the compound adjectives in narrative are related to indicating precise colours, such as baby-blue, bluish-green, donkey-brown, honey-coloured, pine-green, red-gold, yellow-ochre, etc. Many others relate to character descriptions: bone-thin, haggard-looking, like-minded, long-legged, over-friendly, over-candid, sallow-skinned, etc. Examples of more creative, novel instances of compound adjectives are waif-like, wand-slim, wave-battered, moon-glossed and star-studded.

Table 6.6 lists the ten most frequently used MRW adjective lemmas in fiction divided into narrative and dialogue. Table 6.6 shows, first of all, that the top ten most frequently used MRW adjectives in narrative and dialogue are clearly distinct from the overall most frequently used adjectives. In narrative’s top ten, only long remains of the overall most-frequent adjectives; in dialogue, there is no overlap between the ten most frequent MRW adjectives and the overall top ten adjectives. This shows that there is a clear division of labour between non-MRW adjectives and MRW adjectives in both narrative and dialogue in fiction. Secondly, while Chapter 5 showed that there was considerable overlap between the four registers concerning the most frequently used MRW adjectives, there is very little overlap between narrative and dialogue: only high and clear occur in both top tens. MRW adjectives preferred in narrative are golden, pale, dark, sharp, soft, strong and bright; the dialogues in fiction prefer MRW adjectives such as hard, bloody, great, whole, big, clean and full. This indicates that narrative and dialogue prefer different metaphor-related adjectives, which can be related to their function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Total in Fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td>Freq. (% out of 437 MRW adj.)</td>
<td>Lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>14 (3.2%)</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golden</td>
<td>9 (2.1%)</td>
<td>bloody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pale</td>
<td>8 (1.8%)</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>4 (0.9%)</td>
<td>clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>4 (0.9%)</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6 shows that as an MRW, long is still strongly associated with narrative in fiction (14 out of 17 times, 82.4%); it also shows that long is predominantly related to metaphor, namely 17 out of 26 times (65.4%), which is due to its frequent use in indication of time rather than size or dimension. It occurred only 4 times in the dialogues, but 3 of those occurrences were MRW. As pointed out in Chapter 5, many of the most frequent MRW adjectives are from the source domain of size and dimension: small, big, long, high, and great. In addition, dialogue has two MRW adjectives that have basic senses relating to containment: whole, full. Another important domain is textures and sensory perception: hard, soft, sharp, strong, dark, bright, clear.

The MRW adjectives golden and pale, which were shown to be typical of fiction in Chapter 5, only occurred in the narrative, golden usually in descriptions of the weather and pale of colours:

1) It was another golden day. (BNC-Baby: CB5)
2) The storm was abating rapidly, the evening sky clearing in the west with the golden rays of the setting sun adding a dying colour to the sullen slate blue water. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
3) High arched walls of pale, honey-coloured stone were hung with bluish-green tapestries; (BNC-Baby: FPB)
4) This remark was overheard by Adam as, in pale blue shirt and jeans, he sauntered through the door. (BNC-Baby: FPB)

Bloody and hard, on the other hand, are typical of the dialogues. These adjectives also featured in the top ten metaphor-related adjectives for conversation, though other typical metaphor-related adjectives in conversation such as little, fine and fair do not feature in the top ten for dialogue. As metaphor-related adjectives, fine occurred only twice in the dialogues, fair only once, and little did not occur at all.

The MRW bloody, which is typical of dialogues in fiction, is part of the group of swearwords. Such swearwords appear to be used by authors to make the dialogues sound more authentic and powerful, as in (5) – (9) below. As bloody still had a clear basic sense as an adjective (though not as an adverb), its use as a swearword was included as an MRW in the analyses, whereas fucking and goddamned were not.

5) ‘How do I stop this bloody nonsense?’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
6) ‘A bloody charlatan!’ (BNC-Baby: AC2)
7) ‘Why can't bloody rabbits come and eat my lawns?’ (BNC-Baby: CDB)
8) ‘Take that fucking urbane look off your face and face reality, Adam. (BNC-Baby: FPB)
9) ‘I'm not some goddamned sultan's sister.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
It is interesting that *hard* appears to be more strongly associated with the dialogues in fiction while *soft* appears to be associated with the narrative prose, suggesting that these antonyms have different metaphorical functions. In fact, the metaphorical use of *hard* in dialogue is often related to describing difficulties, while the metaphorical use of *soft* in narrative relates to sensory descriptions of sound and vision rather than touch:

10) ‘It's *hard* to believe she's about to be worth six million dollars.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)
11) ‘And let me tell you, coming off coke is the *hardest* damn thing in the world, and you're real lucky if you have a rich daddy who pays for people to hold your hand while you go through the hell of it.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)
12) In a voice of *soft* persuasion, she said, ‘Will you do something for me, Adam?’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
13) Was it the faint smell of herbs and newly baked dough, the *soft* ticking of the wall-mounted clock which seemed both to mark the passing seconds and yet to hold time in thrall […] (BNC-Baby: C8T)
14) This one was in *soft* light green with a boxy shaped jacket and narrow skirt and the same green-and-white check material of the little sleeveless blouse had been used to line the jacket and face the wide reveres. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

This shows that most of the most frequently used adjective lemmas in narrative and dialogue can be related to rather general, conventional patterns of metaphor in language, though narrative and dialogue do seem to have different preferences in which lemmas are most often used. However, both narrative and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a large number of unique metaphor-related adjectives (i.e. metaphor-related adjectives occurring only once). The dialogues contained 58 unique MRW adjectives out of 85 types (68%) and 138 tokens (42%). The narrative prose contained 218 unique MRW adjectives out of 289 types (75%) and 437 tokens (50%). Though narrative has more unique metaphor-related adjectives than dialogue both in terms of types and tokens, the percentages for dialogue and narrative are both high, indicating that both have a large degree of unique variation.

However, it should be noted that this is uniqueness in terms of number of occurrences, which means that a highly conventional metaphor-related adjectives that occurs only once also counts as “unique”. In fact, almost all of the unique MRW adjectives in dialogue were highly conventional, as in examples (15) and (16). Unique occurrences that were novel or clearly creative were rare and almost all of them were compound adjectives in the narrative prose, as illustrated by (17) – (19).
15) ‘You are becoming so hard and bitter and it's not really like you.’ (BNC-Baby: AC2)
16) ‘You clearly think that you're a piece of worthless rubbish, and if I pick up those vibes, then so do the blokes.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
17) One lunchtime when she had been at the House of Mattli for a few months Paula went there for her usual coffee and the cottage cheese salad that was her staple diet now that it was so important that she did not add a single half-inch to her wand-slim figure. (BNC-Baby: BMW)
18) I like to be alone under the careless profusion of the stars, and alone on a moon-glossed sea. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
19) Madame Mattli might be a stickler for detail, with a generous helping of the artistic temperament which kept her tight-coiled as a spring and which would explode into frenzy if the smallest detail was not as it should be, but she also had a kind face and deep perceptive eyes.

In summary, this section has shown that even the most frequent metaphor-related adjectives are not very frequent. In addition, the most frequently used MRW adjectives are clearly distinct from the most frequently used non-MRW adjectives and they relate to different semantic fields. Moreover, there is relatively little overlap between the most frequent MRW adjectives in narrative and dialogue and in both sub-registers the most frequently used MRW adjectives relate to metaphorical uses that are common in general language use rather than being specific to metaphor in narrative or dialogue. Exceptions are the metaphor-related adjectives golden and pale, which appear to be typical of narrative in fiction, and bloody, which appears to be typical in both fictive dialogue and actual conversations. More importantly, both narrative and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a high type-token ratio for MRW adjectives and a large proportion of unique MRW adjectives, indicating that both narrative and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a large degree of variation in the use of metaphor-related adjectives. Dialogue in fiction is particularly interesting, as it shows a greater degree of variation in metaphor use than real-life conversations.

The use of nouns in narrative and dialogue

The results from Chapter 5 showed that fiction underused metaphor-related nouns while the non-MRW nouns did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and word class. The results from Section 6.3.3 showed the same pattern for narrative, but in the dialogues both the MRW nouns and non-MRW nouns did not contribute to the interaction between metaphor and word class. Dialogue was similar to conversation in this respect, as it was shown in Chapter 5 that both non-
MRW nouns and MRW nouns were distributed according to expectation in conversation.

In comparison to the other registers, fiction had the second-highest type-token ratio for nouns in general (0.31) and the highest ratio for MRW nouns (0.56), showing that fiction is varied in its use of nouns. With 2411 types and 6780 tokens, narrative has a general type-token ratio for nouns of 0.36. Dialogue, with 1260 types and 2868 tokens, has an even higher general type-token ratio of 0.44. When considering only the MRW nouns, narrative has a type-token ratio of 0.67, with 443 types and 666 tokens; dialogue, with 190 types and 350 tokens, now has a lower type-token ratio than narrative, namely 0.54. However, this type-token ratio for MRW nouns in dialogue is still much higher than that of conversation, which was only 0.26. This shows that while dialogue is more varied in its general use of nouns than narrative, narrative is more varied in its use of metaphor-related nouns. Nevertheless, dialogue in fiction is much more varied in its use of metaphor-related nouns than would be expected on the basis of the findings for conversation, suggesting again that this variation in dialogue is not typical of spoken discourse but of literary dialogue.

Table 6.7 lists the ten most frequently used noun lemmas in fiction divided into narrative and dialogue. Table 6.7 shows that most of the nouns in both narrative and dialogue are common, general nouns that can be related to clear semantic groups. Similar to the adjectives, only a few lemmas overlap between the top tens of narrative and dialogue, namely man, time and day. Of the other 7 most frequent noun lemmas in fiction, 5 are more strongly associated with narrative than dialogue: Adam, Paula, house, face and hand. The two nouns in fiction’s top ten that are more strongly associated with dialogue are thing and woman.

The results reveal that the frequent use of proper names for people is relatively more important in narrative than in dialogue, as indicated by the presence of 3 proper names (Adam, Paula, and Ellen). In fact, 66 out of 81 instances (81%) of Adam occur in the narrative, as do 63 out of 77 instances (82%) of Paula and all 35 instances of Ellen. Proper names for people are relatively less influential in dialogues, though there are two geographical nouns in dialogue’s top ten: Germany and Masai. These are related to two specific texts in which the geographical background of the characters plays a central role. In addition to proper names of people and places, there are also a number of nouns referring to types of people that are frequent in both narrative and dialogue. The general noun man is among the most frequent in both narrative and dialogue (though with a higher percentage in dialogue), while people, woman and son are also among the most frequently used nouns in dialogue.
Table 6.7 The ten most frequent noun lemmas in narrative and dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 6780 nouns)</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 2868 nouns)</th>
<th>Total in Fiction</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 9648 nouns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>lemma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adam</td>
<td>66 (1.0%)</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>43 (1.5%)</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>98 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paula</td>
<td>63 (0.9%)</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>39 (1.4%)</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>87 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>55 (0.8%)</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>31 (1.1%)</td>
<td>adam</td>
<td>81 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>48 (0.7%)</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>26 (0.9%)</td>
<td>paula</td>
<td>75 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>46 (0.7%)</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>21 (0.7%)</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>60 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>44 (0.6%)</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>20 (0.7%)</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>60 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>44 (0.6%)</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>19 (0.7%)</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>53 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>43 (0.6%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>18 (0.6%)</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>52 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellen</td>
<td>35 (0.5%)</td>
<td>germany</td>
<td>17 (0.6%)</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>51 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>34 (0.5%)</td>
<td>masai</td>
<td>17 (0.6%)</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>48 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nouns referring to body parts are more clearly associated with narrative than dialogue. Of the three body-part nouns in narrative’s top ten, almost all of the instances occur in narrative: 46 of the 51 instances of face, 43 of the 48 instances of hand, and all of the 44 instances of eye. This predominance of body-part nouns in the narrative prose relates to their function in descriptions of the appearance and actions of characters. The noun house is also clearly typical of narrative, with 44 out of 60 instances. This relates to the use of such nouns in describing the physical surroundings of the characters, which frequently involves their homes. This can also be seen in the frequency of the related nouns room and door in narrative: 34 of the 39 instances of room and 32 of the 35 instances of door occur in the narrative prose. Nevertheless, the cross-register comparison in Chapter 5 showed that such nouns relating to the house were also frequent in conversation, which suggests that people more often refer to their immediate surroundings in actual conversations (i.e. ‘The door’s open.’, ‘It’s on the table.’) than in literary dialogues.

The time indicators time and day appear amongst the most frequently used nouns in both narrative and dialogue, though time is relatively more important in dialogue (1.4%) than in narrative (0.7%). The general common noun thing is one of the most frequent nouns in dialogue, which corresponds to its relatively greater importance in conversation than in the other registers: thing occurred in fiction’s top ten (0.6%) and conversation’s top ten (1.7%), but its relative importance in fiction can now be ascribed to the dialogues rather than the narrative prose. This frequent use of thing in dialogues may be due to authors attempting to reflect its use in actual conversations as a quick and easy unspecified reference tool; such
unspecific references are normally avoided in news and academic discourse, and apparently also in narrative prose in fiction.

Considering the use of unique nouns in narrative and dialogue, the percentages are lower than for the adjectives. In narrative, there are 1417 unique nouns out of 2412 types (58.7%) and 6780 tokens (20.9%). In dialogue, there are 796 unique nouns out of 1260 types (63.2%) and 2868 tokens (27.8%). Interestingly, the dialogues have a higher percentages of unique nouns in both terms of types and tokens, suggesting that the dialogues contains more unique variation in their use of nouns than the narratives. This is particularly interesting given the fact that conversation had the lowest percentages of the four registers (with 47% of the types and 12% of the tokens being unique), suggesting again that dialogues in fiction are more varied than real-life conversations. Some of the unique nouns in narrative are *tourbillon, saccade, rhododendron, bodice, crescent, discomfiture*, and *incredulity*. In dialogue, the unique nouns include *cheapskate, enchantress, hoity-toity, monomania*, and *sourpuss*.

Table 6.8 lists the ten most frequently used MRW noun lemmas in fiction divided into narrative and dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 666 MRW nouns)</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 350 MRW nouns)</th>
<th>Total in Fiction</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 1016 MRW nouns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>19 (2.9%)</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>28 (8.0%)</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>45 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>17 (2.6%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>13 (3.7%)</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>31 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>12 (1.8%)</td>
<td>hell</td>
<td>11 (3.1%)</td>
<td>model</td>
<td>19 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world</td>
<td>11 (1.7%)</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>10 (2.9%)</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>14 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>10 (1.5%)</td>
<td>lot</td>
<td>8 (2.3%)</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>13 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>8 (1.2%)</td>
<td>bastard</td>
<td>7 (2.0%)</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>12 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign</td>
<td>7 (1.1%)</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>7 (2.0%)</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>11 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>6 (0.9%)</td>
<td>contact</td>
<td>6 (1.7%)</td>
<td>hell</td>
<td>14 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>5 (0.8%)</td>
<td>model</td>
<td>6 (1.7%)</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>9 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line</td>
<td>5 (0.8%)</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
<td>bastard</td>
<td>9 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 shows that for the nouns, as for the adjectives, the ten most frequently used MRW nouns in narrative and dialogue are clearly distinct from the overall most frequently used nouns. In narrative’s top ten, none of the words that were among the overall top ten occur in the top ten most frequent MRW nouns. In dialogue, the nouns *thing* and *way* are both among the overall top ten and the ten
most frequent MRW nouns. This shows that there is also a clear division of labour between the non-MRW nouns and MRW nouns in both narrative and dialogue.

More interestingly, the nouns thing and way are the two most frequent MRW nouns in both narrative and dialogue. In the cross-register comparison, way was the most frequent MRW noun in news and academic discourse as well, and the second-most frequent noun in conversation. In conversation, thing was the most frequent MRW noun; in news, thing was the third-most frequent noun. Other MRW nouns that overlap between narrative and dialogue are world, point, back, sign, air and line. MRW nouns preferred in dialogue are hell, plan, lot, bastard, bit, and contact. In conversation, lot, bit and hell also occurred in the top ten, as did line, point and end, which are now more typical of narrative than of dialogue. Point was also among the ten most frequent MRW nouns in news and academic discourse.

The presence of the swearwords hell and bastard in dialogue’s top ten most frequent MRW nouns relates to the presence of the swearword bloody among the most frequent MRW adjectives. The noun hell was also among the most frequent MRW nouns in conversation, though bastard was slightly less important. As argued before, the presence of swearwords appears to be a typical feature of fictive dialogue that seems to be used by authors to create a sense of authenticity and add emotional value, as in the examples below.

20) ‘Some of the stupid bastards won't be satisfied until we no longer make a single vehicle in the UK.’ (BNC-Baby: AC2)
21) ‘Who else do you owe money, Adam, you stupid bastard?’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
22) ‘I merely wanted to tell you that you’ve scared the hell out of everyone at Saracen — except me.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
23) ‘That's when the real hell begins.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)

The MRW nouns bit and lot are also typical of both dialogues and conversation; examples of their use as metaphor-related nouns are predominantly related to the semi-fixed constructions a bit of and a lot of, as in examples (24) – (27).

24) ‘Trepper was interrogated by the Gestapo and we believed he became a double agent, a lot of misinformation was received in Moscow.’ (BNC-Baby: G0L)
25) ‘And when the story was carefully leaked to the newspapers, quite a lot of other debts were suddenly settled in full.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
26) ‘How about a bit of generosity?’ Buzz said. (BNC-Baby: FPB)
27) ‘I've got another bit of good news.’ (BNC-Baby: AB9)

Two of the MRW nouns that appear to be more typical of the narrative prose in fiction than of the dialogues are sign and air, as in examples (28) – (31).
28) I explained all that to Chatterton, but stressed that we would run for cover at the first sign of trouble. (BNC-Baby: CCW)
29) Then as the minutes passed and there was no sign of him, she considered that perhaps he had overslept. (BNC-Baby: CB5)
30) Lewis's subdued air had changed to one of high good humour. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
31) The boat's wrap-around windscreens were made of black polarised glass which only added to Dream Baby's ugly air of menace. (BNC-Baby: CCW)

As was the case with the most frequent MRW adjectives, most of the most frequently used noun lemmas in narrative and dialogue can be related to rather general, conventional patterns of metaphor in language, though narrative and dialogue have some different preferences.

Both narrative and dialogue are again characterized by a large number of unique metaphor-related cases: the dialogues contained 141 unique MRW nouns out of 190 types (74%) and 352 tokens (40%). The narrative prose contained 350 unique MRW nouns out of 443 types (79%) and 666 tokens (53%). While narrative has more unique metaphor-related nouns than dialogue in terms of types, the dialogues have a larger proportion of unique MRW nouns in terms of tokens. In both narrative and dialogue, the percentages are high, indicating that both have a large degree of unique variation.

As pointed out before, these unique MRWs can still be instances of highly conventional metaphors. Most of the novel and creative uses in both narrative and dialogue occur in direct expressions of metaphor and will therefore be discussed in more detail in Section 6.5 below. Some examples of more novel and creative uses that are used indirectly are given in (32) – (35).

32) Once free of the knotted tentacles of the eastern suburbs, Dalgliesh made good time and by three he was driving through Lydsett village. (BNC-Baby: C8T)
33) His smooth brown hair was as thick as ever but shot now with needles of glittering silver. (BNC-Baby: FET)
34) 'I've found a super husband for Harriet. Champion of the breed at Crufts last year. Lives in the next village, believe it or not. Absolutely magnificent dog.' (BNC-Baby: AC2)
35) 'Don't they realise they're playing with political dynamite?' (BNC-Baby: AC2)

In summary, this section has shown that the most frequently used MRW nouns in both narrative and dialogue are distinct from the most frequently used non-MRW nouns. Some of the most frequent MRW nouns were always related to metaphor, such as hell, bastard and point, while others were predominantly though not exclusively related to metaphor, such as way and thing. There was some overlap between the most frequent MRW nouns in narrative and dialogue, but these MRW nouns were clearly related to general language patterns and were also
frequent in news, conversation and academic discourse. MRW nouns that were
typical of dialogue were *hell, bastard, bit* and *lot*, which were also typical of
dialogue. Typical of narrative were *world, sign* and *air*. Both narrative and
dialogue in fiction were characterized by a high type-token ratio for MRW nouns
and a large proportion of unique MRW nouns, indicating again that both narrative
and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a large degree of variation, with
dialogues being much more varied than would be expected on the basis of the
variation in face-to-face conversation.

**The use of verbs in narrative and dialogue**

The results from Chapter 5 showed that verbs were the word class that was most
often related to metaphor in fiction. Fiction significantly overused MRW verbs and
underused non-MRW verbs. Section 6.3.2 revealed that metaphor-related verbs
were overused in both narrative and dialogue in fiction. The non-MRW verbs were
underused in narrative but distributed according to expectation in dialogue. In
terms of type-token ratios, fiction had a low type-token ratio of only 0.13 for all
verbs, and a moderate type-token ratio of 0.36 for the MRW verbs only. Though
this was the highest type-token ratio for MRW verbs of the four registers, it was
much lower than fiction’s ratios for MRW adjectives (0.59) and MRW nouns
(0.56).

With 1078 types and 5777 tokens, narrative had a general type-token ratio for
verbs of 0.19. Dialogue, with 547 types and 4011 tokens, had a general type-token
ratio of 0.14. This low ratio for verbs in dialogue is, however, much higher than the
ratio for verbs in conversation, which was only 0.05. Considering only the MRW
verbs, narrative had a much higher type-token ratio of 0.45, with 439 types and 970
tokens. Dialogue, with 217 types and 585 tokens, had a more moderate type-token
ratio of 0.37 for the MRW verbs only. Though the use of metaphor-related verbs in
dialogue is therefore less varied than in narrative, it is clearly much more varied
than in conversation, which had a type-token ratio of 0.19 for MRW verbs. This
confirms again that dialogue is more similar to narrative and other written registers
than to actual conversation in terms of variation and metaphor use.

Table 6.9 lists the ten most frequent verb lemmas for fiction divided into
narrative and dialogue. Chapter 5 showed that there was considerable overlap
between the different registers as most of the most frequently used verb lemmas
were auxiliaries and modals. The same is true when fiction is divided into narrative
and dialogue: in both narrative and dialogue *be* and *have* are the two most frequent
verb lemmas, and *do, would,* and *know* also occur in both top ten lists, though *do* is
clearly more important in dialogue (6.4%) than in narrative (1.9%). In
conversation, *do* and *can* were also among the most frequent lemmas, and the importance of *do* and *can* in both conversation and dialogue can be related to Biber’s Dimension 1, as the use of *do* as a pro-verb and the use of possibility modals are associated with an involved production. The verb *say* is more important in narrative than dialogue, which can be related to the presence of reporting utterances marking direct and indirect speech. The vision verbs *see* and *look* are also more typical of narrative than dialogue. The motion verb *go* is more typical of dialogue while its antonym *come* is relatively more important in narrative. The verbs *want* and *get*, relating to possession, are more typical of dialogue. In terms of the unique verbs in narrative and dialogue, the percentages are lower than for adjectives and nouns.

**Table 6.9 The ten most frequent verb lemmas in narrative and dialogue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Total in Fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemmas</td>
<td>Freq. (% out of 5777 verbs)</td>
<td>Lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>1022 (17.7%)</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>508 (8.8%)</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>202 (3.5%)</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>111 (1.9%)</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would</td>
<td>111 (1.9%)</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>could</td>
<td>84 (1.5%)</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>80 (1.4%)</td>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>78 (1.4%)</td>
<td>would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>60 (1.0%)</td>
<td>want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td>59 (1.0%)</td>
<td>get</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 586 unique verbs in narrative out of 1078 types (54.4%) and 5777 tokens (10.1%). In dialogue, there were 320 unique verbs out of 547 types (42.0%) and 4011 tokens (8.0%). Though conversation had a higher percentage in terms of types (47%), its percentage for tokens was considerably lower (2%). However, both narrative and dialogue have much lower percentages for the number of unique verbs per token than for the adjectives and verbs. Some of the unique verbs occurring in the narrative prose were *awaken, beckon, muse* and *quiver*. Some unique verbs occurring in the dialogues were *boomerang, dawdle, encroach*, and *rabbit on.*
Table 6.10 lists the ten most frequently used MRW verb lemmas in fiction divided into narrative and dialogue.

Table 6.10 The ten most frequent MRW verb lemmas in narrative and dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 970 MRW verbs)</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 585 MRW verbs)</th>
<th>Total in Fiction</th>
<th>Freq. (% out of 1555 MRW verbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>41 (4.2%)</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>77 (13.2%)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>116 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>39 (4.0%)</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>31 (5.3%)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>72 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take</td>
<td>34 (3.5%)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>31 (5.3%)</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>65 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>27 (2.8%)</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>31 (5.3%)</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>56 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>26 (2.7%)</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>22 (3.8%)</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>40 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>25 (2.6%)</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>21 (3.6%)</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>37 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>21 (2.2%)</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>14 (2.4%)</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>32 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>16 (1.6%)</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>13 (2.2%)</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>31 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catch</td>
<td>16 (1.6%)</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>11 (1.9%)</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>31 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn</td>
<td>12 (1.2%)</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>10 (1.7%)</td>
<td>catch</td>
<td>18 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10 shows again the striking absence of the modals and auxiliaries and presence of delexicalized verbs when only metaphor-related verbs are considered. There is also considerable overlap between narrative and dialogue, as 7 of the 10 most frequent MRW verb lemmas overlap: make, have, take, feel, give, get, and come. The metaphorical use of have, however, is clearly more important in dialogue (13.2%) than in narrative (4.0%). While see was relatively more important in narrative when the general top ten was considered, it is now more important in dialogue and does not occur among the ten most frequent MRW verbs in narrative. Come is still slightly more important in narrative than dialogue, while go is still more important in dialogue. Typical of narrative are add, catch and turn; typical of dialogue are see and mean.

As shown in Chapter 5, the frequent metaphor-related use of catch relates to the use of this verb in (semi-)fixed expressions, particularly relating to modes of transportation, as in (36) and (37).

36) He took Adam on to Sudbury for him to catch a train there and at that point they parted. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
37) Rufus overtook a bus going to Colchester and dropped the two in the back so that they could catch it. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
It was also shown that the frequent metaphor-related use of *see* can be related to its use in discourse markers, which explains why this lemma is relatively more frequent in dialogue than narrative, as in (38) and (39) below.

38) ‘I wanted to say, you *see*, that I know you thought Frannie shouldn't have gone, and that it's ruined your holiday plans, and, on behalf of us all, I'm sorry.’ (BNC-Baby: AB9)

39) ‘It's the opposite of a cocaine high, you *see*.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)

These examples show that *see* is often used in the discourse marker *you see* (AB9 and CCW), where understanding is understood in terms of seeing. This is related to the use of seeing for considering, as in AC2 and BPA.

Considering only the unique MRW verbs, there were 302 unique MRW verbs in narrative, out of 439 types (68.8%) and 970 tokens (31.1%). In dialogue, there were 150 unique MRW verbs out of 217 types (69.1%) and 585 tokens (25.6%). This time narrative has more unique metaphor-related nouns than dialogue in terms of tokens while the dialogues have a larger proportion of unique MRW nouns in terms of types. Both percentages are again high in both narrative and dialogue, indicating that MRW verbs are also characterized by a large degree of unique variation. Interestingly, conventional verbal metaphors in the narrative prose often create relatively creative or deliberate effects, which appears to be due to the high-imagery value of the verb, as illustrated by examples (40) – (43).

40) ‘Oh yes,’ Paula said, *brimming* with suppressed excitement. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

41) But inside she was *bubbling* with excitement. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

42) Dirty grey clouds *tumbled* across the sky above the slate roof, now the only thing that shone, glazed with rain. (BNC-Baby: CDB)

43) Gary stared at her for a moment, pins *spewing* from his mouth and catching on the front of his black jersey. (BNC-Baby: BMW)

Though conventional, these metaphor-related verbs have a much clearer function in the discourse than the metaphorically-used delexicalized verbs.

In summary, this section has shown that the most frequently used MRW verbs in both narrative and dialogue are distinct from the most frequently used non-MRW verbs, and that most of them are highly conventional delexicalized verbs. Sensory verbs, such as *see*, *look*, *feel*, and motion verbs, such as *come* and *go*, were also among the most frequently used. There was considerable overlap between narrative and dialogue, and the use of these most frequent MRW verbs clearly relates to general patterns of metaphor in everyday language use. In terms of variation in metaphor use, both narrative and dialogue in fiction were characterized by a high type-token ratio for MRW verbs and a large proportion of unique MRW verbs.
verbs. It was also shown that of these unique MRW verbs, even conventional ones
are often used to create relatively deliberate and creative imagery effects.
Metaphor’s function in creating vivid images in fiction will be discussed in more
detail in relation to the nature of direct metaphor in narrative and dialogue in the
following section.

6.3.5 Discussion of the dominant patterns of metaphor and metaphor
variation in narrative and dialogue

The analyses in Sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 showed how narrative and dialogue
differed in their general distribution of the eight main word classes as well as their
distribution of metaphor across these word classes. The current section took a
closer look at the dominant patterns of metaphor within three of these word classes,
namely adjectives, nouns and verbs, examining whether the use of metaphor in a
specific word class could be related to groups of specific lemmas with frequent
metaphorical uses. In addition to dominant patterns, this section also looked at
variation within word classes. Together, these analyses provide insight into the
similarities and differences between narrative and dialogue in terms of the
linguistic forms of metaphor.

First of all, it was shown that the most frequently used metaphor-related
adjectives, nouns and verbs were clearly distinct from the overall most frequent
adjectives, nouns and verbs, suggesting a clear division of labour between
metaphor-related words and words that are not related to metaphor. For the non-
MRWs, the dominant patterns for adjectives, nouns and verbs could be related to
semantic groups with specific functions in narrative and dialogue. For example,
proper nouns and body-part nouns are associated with narrative prose, as are the
speech verbs say and ask. These nouns are used in narrative to describe characters
and their surroundings, while the speech verbs are used to mark the presence of
direct and indirect speech. For the MRWs, the dominant patterns in both narrative
and dialogue primarily relate to general patterns of metaphor in language use, such
as the metaphorical use of delexicalized verbs and size and dimension adjectives.
Metaphorical uses that could be related more clearly to a specific function in
narrative or dialogue were the use of the adjectives golden and pale in narrative
and the use of swearwords in dialogues. It was suggested that swearwords such as
bloody, hell and bastard may be used deliberately by authors to make the dialogues
sound more forceful and authentic.

More importantly though, both narrative and dialogue in fiction were shown to
be characterized by high type-token ratios for MRW adjectives, nouns and verbs,
as well as large proportions of unique MRW adjectives, nouns and verbs. This indicates that both narrative and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a large degree of variation in their use of linguistic metaphor. The high degree of variation in dialogue was particularly striking, given that the face-to-face conversations were shown to score low on variation in the cross-register comparison presented in Chapter 5. In fact, the patterns of metaphor in dialogue were more similar to those found in narrative. The dialogues in fiction were shown not only to use more metaphor-related words than would be expected on the basis of the findings for conversation, but also much more varied ones. Finally, the role of metaphor in creating vivid images in fiction was noted, which will be one of the main topics in the analyses to be presented in the following sections when the different relations to metaphor and metaphor types are discussed.

6.4 Analysis 2: Borderline cases and metaphor signals in narrative and dialogue

The analyses in the previous section were based on a binary distinction between words that were related to metaphor and words that were not related to metaphor. This section will investigate the distribution of the four different relations to metaphor that are distinguished in MIPVU (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW, and MFlag). In Chapter 5 it was shown that fiction was characterized by a significant overuse of non-MRWs and MFlags and a significant underuse of clear MRWs; the borderline MRWs were distributed according to chance. Section 6.4.1 below will investigate whether there are any significant differences between narrative and dialogue in terms of the distribution of the four relations to metaphor. Section 6.5 will distinguish between the four different types of metaphor identified in MIPVU (indirect MRW, direct MRW, implicit MRW and non-MRW).

The results presented in the sections below should of course be considered in light of the previously established three-way interaction between word class, sub-register and metaphor (Section 6.3.2). This section will refine the interaction between sub-register and metaphor by distinguishing between the four relations to metaphor rather than the binary distinction between MRW and non-MRW. However, it was not possible to statistically test the three-way interaction between sub-register, relation to metaphor and word class because the number of cells with a frequency below 5 would become problematic due to the large number of cells and the infrequent occurrence of some of the relations to metaphor. The variable word class has therefore not been included in the analyses reported below.
6.4.1 Relations to metaphor in narrative and dialogue

Section 6.3.2 revealed that there are significant differences between narrative and dialogue in fiction as far as the distribution of metaphor across word classes is concerned. This section investigates whether there are also systematic differences between narrative and dialogue with regard to the four main relations to metaphor that are identified in MIPVU (non-MRW, clear MRW, borderline MRW and MFlag). The distribution of these four relations to metaphor across the narrative and dialogues in fiction is presented in Table 6.11 below.

Table 6.11 Frequencies and percentages of the relations to metaphor divided by sub-register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>Clear MRW</th>
<th>Borderline MRW</th>
<th>MFlag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>25099 (88.0%)</td>
<td>3112 (10.9%)</td>
<td>244 (0.9%)</td>
<td>63 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>14182 (87.9%)</td>
<td>1771 (11.0%)</td>
<td>166 (1.0%)</td>
<td>11 (0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in fiction</td>
<td>39281 (88.0%)</td>
<td>4883 (10.9%)</td>
<td>410 (0.9%)</td>
<td>74 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square analysis showed that there is a significant interaction between sub-register and the relations to metaphor ($\chi^2(3) = 17.93, p < 0.001; \text{Cramer's } V = 0.02$). The analyses in Chapter 5 showed that fiction contained fewer non-MRWs than conversation, but more than news and academic discourse. Table 6.11 now shows that narrative and dialogue contain almost the same proportion of non-MRWs, namely 88.0% in narrative and 87.9% in dialogue. Narrative and dialogue also contain almost the same proportion of clear MRWs, namely 10.9% in narrative and 11.0% in dialogue.

This finding indicates once again that the dialogues in fiction are not similar to real-life conversations when it comes to metaphor usage. With 6.8% clear MRWs, conversation was the register with the fewest clear MRWs, a percentage much lower than fiction (10.9%), news (15.3%) and academic discourse (17.5%). However, the current analysis shows that the dialogues in fiction do not have a smaller proportion of clear MRWs than the narrative prose. The fact that fiction is situated in between conversation and news in terms of its proportion of clear MRWs is not caused by a difference between narrative and dialogue. In fact, there are no significant differences between narrative and dialogue in the distribution of non-MRWs (st. res. +0.1 and 0.0), clear MRWs (st. res. -0.1 and +0.2) or borderline MRWs (st. res. -1.1 and +1.5).

The only significant difference between narrative and dialogue in fiction is their distribution of MFlags: MFlags are significantly underused in dialogue (st. res. -3.0) and overused in narrative, though at alpha level .05 (st. res. +2.3). The differences in percentages are again very small, as narrative contains only 0.2%
MFlags and dialogue 0.1%. However, of the 74 MFlags in fiction, 63 cases occur in the narrative and only 11 in the dialogues. Additionally, of the 3419 words that were related to metaphor in narrative 1.8% was an MFlag while in the dialogues only 0.6% of the 1948 metaphor-related words was an MFlag. This shows that MFlags play a more important role in the group of metaphor-related words in narrative than in dialogue. The significant overuse of MFlags that fiction showed in comparison to the other registers is therefore clearly a feature of the narrative prose in fiction rather than the dialogues.

6.4.2 Summary

The analysis of the different relations to metaphor in narrative and dialogue in fiction showed that the underuse of clear MRWs in fiction and the overuse of non-MRWs in fiction are characteristics of both narrative and dialogue, since there were no significant differences between narrative and dialogue for these relations to metaphor. As far as the relations to metaphor are concerned, it is not the case that the narrative in fiction behaves more like news (which overused clear MRWs and underused non-MRWs) and the dialogues like conversations (which underused clear MRWs and overused non-MRWs). It is not the case that the dialogues in fiction contain fewer metaphor-related words than the narrative prose. Although narrative and dialogue in fiction are clearly distinct sub-registers of fiction in terms of their general distribution of word classes and their use of metaphor, both narrative and dialogue in fiction contain the same moderate proportion of metaphor-related words.

Borderline MRWs were shown not to interact with register in the cross-register comparison in Chapter 5, and they also did not show any significant differences in their distribution in narrative and dialogue. The only significant difference between narrative and dialogue in terms of the four relations to metaphor is their distribution of MFlags. MFlags were overused in narrative and underused in dialogue. The overuse of MFlags in fiction in comparison to the other registers can be attributed to their distribution in narrative. The fact that dialogues underuse MFlags is in line with their underuse in conversation, suggesting that the use of signalled metaphors may be unusual in both real and fictive spoken language. This issue will be discussed in more detail when the distribution of direct MRWs in narrative and dialogue is considered in the section below.
6.5 Analysis 3: Direct and implicit MRWs in narrative and dialogue

As was demonstrated in Chapter 5, MIPVU not only distinguishes between four different relations to metaphor but also between three types of metaphor-related words, namely indirect MRWs, direct MRWs and implicit MRWs. The distinction between indirect and direct MRWs proved especially useful in distinguishing between different linguistic forms of metaphor, as they correspond to the traditional distinction between metaphor proper and simile. Chapter 5 revealed that direct MRWs were rare in all four of the registers, and that they were more strongly associated with news and fiction (in which direct MRWs were overused) than conversation or academic discourse. In the cross-register comparison of the different types of metaphor (Section 5.5) fiction showed a significant underuse of indirect MRWs and a significant overuse of direct MRWs; the distribution of implicit MRWs was according to chance. This section will now examine whether there are significant differences between narrative and dialogue in terms of the distribution of the four types of metaphor-related words.

It should be noted again that this analysis of the different types of metaphor collapses the clear MRWs and borderline MRWs into one group of metaphor-related words which is then divided into indirect MRWs, direct MRWs and implicit MRWs. The group of words that are not related to metaphor (non-MRWs) are included as a fourth type in the analysis as the overall distribution of metaphor is uneven. Since the MFlags are signals of metaphor rather than metaphorically used themselves, they have been included in the group of non-MRWs. This inclusion of the MFlags in the group of non-MRWs entails that the count for non-MRWs in this section is slightly higher than in Section 6.4. To summarize, in the analysis below the clear MRWs and borderline MRWs have been taken together in one group which has been divided into three types of metaphor-related words: indirect MRW, direct MRW and implicit MRW. The non-MRWs and MFlags have been taken together as one group that functions as the fourth type in the analysis: non-MRW.

6.5.1 Metaphor types in narrative and dialogue

Table 6.12 presents the frequencies and percentages of the four metaphor types in narrative and dialogue. A chi-square analysis showed that there is a significant association between the metaphor types and narrative versus dialogue: ($\chi^2(3) = 60.29, p < 0.001$; Cramer’s $V = 0.04$). Table 6.12 shows that in both narrative and dialogue the majority of the metaphor-related words is of the indirect type. Indirect
metaphor accounts for 95.0% of all the MRWs in narrative and 97.3% of all the MRWs in dialogue. There are no significant differences between narrative and dialogue in terms of the distribution of indirect MRWs (st. res. -0.9 in narrative and +1.2 in dialogue), both containing a proportion of over 11% indirect MRWs.

Table 6.12 frequencies and percentages of the four metaphor types in narrative and dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Non-MRW</th>
<th>Indirect MRW</th>
<th>Implicit MRW</th>
<th>Direct MRW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>25162 (88.2%)</td>
<td>3189 (11.2%)</td>
<td>21 (0.1%)</td>
<td>146 (0.5%)</td>
<td>28518 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>14193 (88.0%)</td>
<td>1885 (11.7%)</td>
<td>33 (0.2%)</td>
<td>19 (0.1%)</td>
<td>16130 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in fiction</td>
<td>39355 (88.1%)</td>
<td>5074 (11.4%)</td>
<td>54 (0.1%)</td>
<td>165 (0.4%)</td>
<td>44648 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the direct MRWs, however, narrative and dialogue do behave in opposite ways: narrative significantly overuses direct MRWs (st. res. +4.0) while dialogue significantly underuses them (st. res. -5.3). With 146 out of 165 instances, narrative contains 88.5% of all the direct MRWs in fiction. Of the 3356 metaphor-related words in narrative, 4.4% is direct. In dialogue, only 1.0% of the 1937 metaphor-related words is direct. This shows that direct MRWs play a more important role in the group of metaphor-related words in narrative than in dialogue. While the direct MRWs appear to be typical of narrative in fiction, the opposite pattern is found for the implicit MRWs: in this case, dialogue shows a significant overuse (st. res. +3.1), while narrative shows a significant underuse, though the standardized residual is significant at alpha .05 rather than .01 (st. res. -2.3). Of the 3356 metaphor-related words in narrative, 0.6% is implicit. In dialogue, 1.7% of the 1937 metaphor-related words is implicit.

The observed pattern for indirect MRWs indicates that the underuse of indirect MRWs that was established for fiction in Chapter 5 is a characteristic of both narrative prose and dialogues in fiction. The direct MRWs, on the other hand, were shown to be a characteristic of narrative rather than dialogue. The significant overuse of direct MRWs in fiction in relation to the other registers can now be attributed to the narrative prose in fiction. This corresponds to the finding in the cross-register comparison that the two registers which normally include a large proportion of narrative – fiction and news – overused direct MRWs while conversations underused them. The implicit MRWs were shown to be a characteristic of dialogues in fiction. This finding is harder to interpret as the cross-register comparison indicated that implicit MRWs were underused in conversation, overused in academic discourse and did not contribute to the interaction in fiction and news. However, the analysis in Chapter 5 showed that the instances of implicit metaphor in fiction appear not be related to clear discourse functions but are caused
by individual cases of simple substitutions and repetitions. The remainder of this chapter will therefore focus on direct MRWs and their forms and functions in narrative and dialogue.

6.5.2 Forms and functions of direct metaphor in narrative and dialogue

In Chapter 5 fiction was shown to contain the largest proportion of direct metaphor of the four registers: 49.1% of all the direct MRWs in the corpus occurred in the fiction sample. In Section 6.5.1 above, it was shown that the overuse of direct MRWs in fiction could be attributed to the overuse of direct MRWs in narrative, while dialogue showed an underuse of direct MRWs. In fact, 88.5% of all the direct MRWs in fiction occurred in the narrative prose. In this section, this strong association between narrative and direct metaphor will be considered in more detail in relation to the forms and functions of direct metaphor.

As noted in Section 5.2.2, the direct MRWs represent individual words occurring in similes (and other forms of metaphorical analogies and comparisons) rather than individual instances of similes. It was shown that while some similes only included one word that was marked as direct metaphor (i.e. like a mosquito) other similes included a relatively large number of words being marked as direct (i.e. like islands on a naively drawn map). Although it remains a methodological issue whether it makes more sense to annotate individual words inside similes (the approach in MIPVU) or to annotate individual similes (i.e. a vehicle-based approach such as Cameron 2003), it is clear that the more elaborate the simile, the more noticeable it becomes. The present word-based approach reflects the fact that the rhetorical weight and the noticeability of a directly expressed metaphor increases as it involves more lexical items, just as a metaphor expressed by multiple indirectly used lexical items also involves several individually annotated indirect MRWs.

As similes are typically explicitly signalled (by MFlags), their status as metaphorical expressions is more likely to be deliberate and they are more likely to be recognized as metaphorical expressions (see Steen 2008). If such similes also involve more than one lexical item, it is likely that their rhetorical weight and noticeability is increased even further. This rhetorical weight and noticeability of similes may in fact be one reason why similes are strongly associated with fiction and news, as these domains of discourse often involve creative and persuasive uses of metaphor (e.g., Charteris-Black 2004; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Lodge 1977; Semino 2008). If the function of direct metaphor is to draw attention to the metaphor itself, then the use of direct metaphor may be more appropriate in
domains of discourse in which people expect creative or persuasive writing. Using such expressions in casual conversations may seem pretentious or over-exaggerated. The results from Section 6.5.1 suggest that this may even be true for fictive conversations.

In fact, almost all of the similes in the dialogues in fiction are relatively short and simple, such as examples (44) and (45) below.

44) ‘You look, how you say?, as a raccoon.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
45) ‘She studies the drug, you know? Like it was her enemy.’ (BNC-Baby: CCW)

While it is relatively easy to imagine someone actually uttering such similes in casual conversation, it is very unlikely that anyone would spontaneously produce a simile such as (46).

46) ‘I feel like a Maharajah waiting for the tiger to pounce on the tied-up goat,’ Forster grinned. ‘I hope I don’t have to wait all night.’ (BNC-Baby: BPA)

Narrative prose in fiction, on the other hand, often involves very elaborate direct expressions of metaphor, as in (47) – (49).

47) Only once had he returned after they all left and that had been bad enough, like a dream – no, like stepping into the set and scenario of some frightening film, a Hitchcock movie perhaps. (BNC-Baby: CDB)
48) The light in the sky is there by courtesy of the vanished sun, but the tops of the mountains are still golden, as though honey had been poured lightly over them. (BNC-Baby: FAJ)
49) He paused, reminding McLeish irresistibly of a Labrador wondering how best to approach an acquaintance. (BNC-Baby: AB9)

The frequent occurrence of elaborate directly expressed metaphors in narrative may account for part of the large difference in the proportion of direct MRWs in narrative and dialogue. Nevertheless, the difference in MFlags established in Section 6.4.2 showed that narrative also uses more MFlags than dialogue, indicating that narrative uses both more instances of directly expressed metaphor (signalled by the overuse of MFlags) and longer direct expressions of metaphor (signalled by the overuse of direct MRWs).

Considering the linguistic forms of these similes in dialogue and narrative it becomes clear that while simple similes often employ only a noun, the more elaborate similes involve combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs and prepositions, even determiners. Moreover, these direct expressions of metaphor are often combined with indirect expressions to create even more elaborate metaphors, such as in the examples below.
50) Now the nearest tree is an enormous trunk, struck by lightning and sawed-off. But one side branch shoots up very high and lets fall an avalanche of dark green pine needles. This *sombre giant* - *like a defeated proud man* - contrasts, when considered in the nature of a living creature, with the *pale smile* of a last rose on the fading bush in front of him. (BNC-Baby: FET)

51) At the top they came out into uncompromising, bright grey light, the bleak, hedgeless lane, the flat meadows where here and there stunted trees *squatted like old men in cloaks*.

In (50) the tree is first compared indirectly to a *sombre giant*, which is then compared directly to a *defeated proud man* and then contrasted indirectly with the *pale smile* of a rose. This combination of indirect and direct metaphorical expressions set up a complex personification of the tree and rose in terms of human appearances, emotions and behaviour. In (51) the direct expression *like old men in cloaks* is used to illustrate the indirect expression *squatted*. While this novel verbal metaphor may be difficult to interpret in isolation, the imagery of *old men in cloaks* makes its use in the context of trees clear. As personification proved to be one of the dominant types of metaphor in fiction, and was found to involve a complex interaction between linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions, an entire chapter will be devoted to the analysis of personifications in fiction (Chapter 7). In addition, Chapter 8 present an empirical study that investigated the cognitive representations of these personifications.

What is striking about the examples of direct metaphor given above, is that they have a high imagery value. This appears to be the case for almost all direct metaphor in fiction, in both narrative and dialogue, and the function of these high-imagery similes appears to be related to helping the reader in visualizing the described text world and adding vividness and emotional value to the description. This can be related to Gentner’s (1982: 118) finding that analogies in literary texts are ‘intended to evoke or describe’, whereas scientific analogies are ‘intended to explain and predict’. Gentner argues that the expressive analogies in literature tend to be richer in the associations they evoke and often involve the mapping of sensory attributes and object attributes rather than causal or spatial relationships (p. 121). The current findings also show that the similes are rich in their associations and often involve image mappings (e.g., Crisp 1996; Gibbs and Bogdonovich 1999; Gleason 2009; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989). Gleason (2009: 423) argues that such image metaphors, which link one concrete object to another, create a ‘mediating visual template’ that allows readers to ‘mentally shift back and forth between the two images’. When the two entities being compared are similar in shape, this ‘structural correspondence’ encourages readers to visualize the metaphor (p. 423).
In relation to this visualization function, it is striking that a large number of similes involve comparisons between people and animals (i.e. the person and raccoon in example (44) and the person and Labrador in (49)) and between different types of people (such as the simile involving a man and a Maharajah in (46)). Other examples of directly expressed metaphor that involves a comparison between different types of people were discussed in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2.2) in relation to the distinction between metaphorical and non-metaphorical comparisons and the issue of domain distinctness. The discussed examples were:

52) Delaney took risks, plummeting feet first through the hatchways, and partly breaking his descent with the handrails, falling like a parachutist, rolling instantly deploying his Uzi. (BNC-Baby: BPA)
53) ‘You wouldn't have recognized him, he looked like John the Baptist.’ (BNC-Baby: CDB)

It was argued that comparing the way Delaney is falling to the way a parachutist falls provides the reader with a vivid visualization, as does the comparison between the character’s appearance in (53) to the appearance of John the Baptist. Such potential cross-domain mappings between different types of people have not received systematic attention in the existing literature on metaphor. However, they appear to be typical of fiction and can be related to a clear discourse function. Moreover, such people mappings are predominantly but not exclusively expressed by direct linguistic expressions; they also occur as indirectly expressed metaphors, as illustrated by (54) – (56).

54) ‘You are a sorceress,’ he told her when it was all over. ‘An enchantress. Women as tempting as you should be kept out of the sight of mortal men.’ ‘You're not a mortal man,’ Ruth said.
55) ‘You're a god!’ (BNC-Baby: CB5)
56) ‘The man knows nothing about Europe. He's a novice.

In addition, some of the cultural references and derivational forms that are normally not considered to be metaphorically used on the basis of MIPVU can also be related to people-mappings (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.5), such as (57) – (60) below.

57) Clare said, ‘I'm not looking for Prince Charming.’ (BNC-Baby: FPB)
58) So kindly curb your theatrical, James Bond streak. (BNC-Baby: FPB)
59) He also kissed Frederica and introduced the woman, fumbling her name, as ‘a colleague’ and Frederica as ‘Frederica — you must forgive me, I never know what name you’re working under, women these days are so protean.’ (BNC-Baby: FET)
60) He grinned at her impishly. (BNC-Baby: BMW)
Though not considered MRWs themselves (based on MIPVU) such examples can often be related to cases of indirect and direct forms of metaphor expressing comparisons between different types of real and fictional people.

The use of animal metaphors in fiction was clearly related to the creation of patterns in a number of the texts in the corpus. For example, in text BPA the main characters are trying to catch and kill a “monster”. Throughout the excerpt, this monster is repeatedly described in terms of animal metaphors:

61) Was it even now shadowing them, moving soundlessly from cover to cover, like a tiger in the steel jungle?
62) ‘I feel like a Maharajah waiting for the tiger to pounce on the tied-up goat,’ Forster grinned.
63) Like a chameleon, it moved out of the aisle between machines, then stopped, and became utterly motionless.
64) When she checked through the spyhole it was standing in exactly the same spot, unmoving, like a lizard.
65) But it struck with the speed of an attacking snake.

All of these animal metaphors provide very vivid images of the monster, and help to define what it looks like and how it behaves and moves in terms of the typical characteristics of the animals that are selected for the metaphors. These animal metaphors carefully prepare the reader for the great shock the characters feel later on when they find out that the monster is “unmistakably human”, as readers suddenly have to adjust their mental image of the monster to conform to a human being. As Low (2010: 305) found that the similes in his university lectures did not form rhetorical networks that ‘spread’ or ‘arched’ over large areas of discourse, the current examples would thus provide support for the claim by Goatly (1997) and Semino (2008) that metaphor use in literature is characterized by an increased systematicity. Nevertheless, most of the similes in fiction do appear to have more local purposes, as found by Low (2010: 291), who argues that the similes in his data function as ‘one-off items serving immediate and short-term rhetorical purposes, what Conversation Analysts call “local control”, often associated with control of saliency and foregrounding at discourse level’.

In text CCW, the behaviour of a number of characters is also described using directly expressed animal metaphors:

66) They briefly appeared on deck for lunch; a meal which Rickie hardly touched, while Robin-Anne, despite her apparent frailty, attacked the sandwiches and salad with the savagery of a starving bear.
67) At supper, as at lunch, Robin-Anne ate with the appetite of a horse, though her brother hardly touched his chicken and pasta salad.
68) He's precisely what anyone would expect of a drop-out Phys Ed basketball-playing retard,’ Ellen said scornfully, ‘by which I mean that he's a jock with the brains of a
dung beetle. He reminds me of your Neanderthal friend, the Maggot, except Rickie is a great deal more handsome.’

In (66) there is an indirectly expressed metaphor attacked which is modified by the directly expressed metaphor with the savagery of a starving bear (in which with the ... of a ... functions as an MFlag). Although it is possible to say that this sentence involves an indirectly expressed metaphor that compares eating greedily to attacking and a directly expressed metaphor that compares a girl to a bear, it seems more informative to use the notion of scenarios, as proposed by Musolff (2006) and Semino (2008), and consider (66) to involve a complex scenario mapping, in which the indirect and direct MRWs are combined to describe one whole target-domain scenario of a girl greedily eating sandwiches in terms of one whole source-domain scenario of an attacking starving bear.

This entails that attack is included as part of the same source-domain scenario as the starving bear, even though there is no inherent semantic link between attack and bear as both belonging to the domain of bears, and even though attack is normally considered to represent the WAR domain, which is essentially human. It is possible to postulate an isolated mapping between eating greedily and physical attack on the basis of the conventional meaning of attack ‘to begin working on something or doing something with enthusiasm and determination’ (Macmillan sense 4). However, in the particular context of (66), the scenario created by the simile can be said to override this conventional mapping and create one complex source domain scenario in which attacking belongs to the BEAR domain. General world knowledge, perhaps including visualisations derived from documentaries on National Geographic, provide a vivid image of what an attacking bear looks like and what the hazards are of angering a starving bear. As Searle (1993) and Miller (1993) have pointed out, whether such knowledge is factually true or accurate of bears is irrelevant, since the interpretation of the metaphor relies on conventionalized assumptions about bears.

While in (66) the word indicating the grounds for the comparison, attacking, is used metaphorically, the words expressing the grounds for the comparisons in (67) – ate and appetite – are not. Both eat and appetite are non-metaphorically used to describe the behaviour of the girl, though appetite belongs syntactically to the simile and is therefore included as a direct MRW. In fact, the girl is eating with an appetite that is comparable to the appetite of a horse, indicating that she is eating as this appetite is too big for a small girl. She eats as much as a horse would, an interpretation which has been conventionalized in expressions such as ‘eat like a horse: to eat a lot’ (Macmillan). A similar situation applies to (68), in which the brains of the boy are compared to the brains of the beetle. Both literally have brains, but as beetles are tiny, this comparison suggests that the boy’s brains are too
small, implying that he is stupid. This interpretation is supported by the fact that he is described as a jock, a noun that has conventional negative connotations of stupidity, as reflected in the sense description ‘someone, especially a student, who plays a lot of sport and is often considered to be stupid’ in Longman.

Moreover, considering that humans generally do not think favourably of insects, but find them creepy and dirty (e.g., ‘creepy-crawly’), the comparison could have been used to infer additional features of beetles. However, the description a good deal more handsome suggests that although Rickie has the brains of a beetle, he is not creepy or ugly, as may be the case for the Maggot, who is described as being Neanderthal. This word also has a conventional sense relating to people who are ‘big and stupid, and thinks physical strength is more important than culture or intelligence’ (Macmillan sense 2). Although The Maggot is often used as a nickname in movies and stories, this use has not been conventionalized in the dictionary with a fixed meaning for people. Both dung beetle and maggot are therefore novel animal metaphors. Despite the fact that dung beetle and maggot both evoke negative associations with decaying flesh and rotting food, the context indicates that they are being compared to these animals because of their intelligence.

It is in fact a particularly striking feature of all three of these directly expressed metaphors that they present the behaviour or characteristics of the character as similar to the behaviour – as in example (66) – or characteristic – as in examples (67) and (68) – of a particular animal while at the same time emphasizing that the person is in fact not at all similar to the animal. It is made very explicit that the entities being compared are very dissimilar and that they should not be compared in any other way than with respect to the specific type of behaviour or characteristic mentioned. This simultaneous signalling of similarity and dissimilarity is particularly interesting as the type of similes that are normally discussed in the literature are considered to be interchangeable with their corresponding metaphor forms (i.e. ‘MY JOB IS (LIKE) A JAIL’, ‘ENCYCLOPAEDIAS ARE (LIKE) GOLDMINES’, etc.). This type of simile is considered to highlight the similarities between two entities. Yet what many of the similes in fiction appear to be doing is in fact highlight the dissimilarity between two entities, thus making the fact that the two entities show one particular similarity highly unexpected and noteworthy.

This characteristic of the similes in fiction is particularly noteworthy, as similes have traditionally been defined, as done by Low (2010: 292), as ‘a comparison involving two entities which (a) focuses on similarity rather than difference and (b) is explicitly flagged by a marker’. In the fiction data, however, similes appear to be used to focus on the dissimilarity between entities by pointing out an unexpected similarity. Low also points out that the two entities involved in
the comparison are usually both explicitly mentioned while the ground for the comparison ‘may or may not be mentioned’ (p. 293). However, the fiction data reveal that the ground for the comparison is often the most salient information and the focus of the expression. This is also one of the reasons why in almost all of the cases of simile in the fiction data, it is not possible to simply convert the simile into a corresponding metaphor, as most of the studies on the differences between metaphor and simile suggest (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe 1999). In the fiction data, similes – like metaphors – rarely occur in the traditional A IS LIKE B form, and they simply cannot be rephrased as A IS B metaphors as their form and function is too complex.

Low (2010: 295) argued that the ‘somewhat paradoxical combination of (a) retaining the focus on the main message and (b) nevertheless having an explicit comparison makes similes ideally suited to educational explanations’. Though he did not find that his university lectures exploited similes for explanation purposes, his argument can in fact be used to explain the paradoxical function of the similes in fiction: the simile form is apparently particularly suitable to point out the similarity between two entities while at the same time emphasizing the fact that these entities are very dissimilar and the entity that is being used to describe should not be confused with the entity being described. Unlike the similes found by Low (2010: 304-305), the similes in the fiction sample are predominantly imaginative, non-conventional and attention grabbing, and rather than being ‘precursors to a later climax’ (p. 305), the similes in fiction, and particularly the ground for the comparison, function as climaxes themselves.

The highlighting of the unexpectedness of a similarity between dissimilar entities also sometimes occurs with the people mappings in the fiction sample, as shown in (69) and (70) below.

69) In contrast to his sisters, Anthony was over-clad, a bundle of leggings, jumper and a padded jacket topped with a woollen helmet with a bobble pulled well down over his forehead, beneath which he surveyed their busyness, unsmiling, like a stout imperious Caesar. (BNC-Baby: C8T)

70) ‘Because you have come here my son is going to be killed. Hanged like a chicken by his neck, in town.’ (BNC-Baby: FAJ)

In (69) the comparison between the little boy all wrapped up in clothes and a Roman emperor creates a humorous effect, especially for people who know how serious small children can look. In example (70), the directly expressed metaphor hanged like a chicken cleverly exploits a double interpretation of the metaphor. On the one hand, this simile, like the other animal metaphors discussed above, creates
a vivid image of the son hanging by his neck, strung up like a dead chicken. At the same time, however, the conventional metaphorical meaning of *chicken* – i.e. *a coward* – simultaneously sets up a contrast between what his son is really like, namely extremely brave (he held a lion by the tail and killed it), and how he will be treated, i.e. like a coward. This interpretation would stress the seriousness and unfairness of the situation. Which interpretation will activated in the individual minds of the readers cannot of course be determined without doing behavioural research on the cognitive representations of such metaphorical expressions.

In summary, this section has looked at the forms and functions of directly expressed metaphors in narrative and dialogue. It was noted that most examples in the dialogues involve relatively short and simple similes involving only a single noun while the narrative prose often contains very elaborate, extended similes involving complex combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs and prepositions. It was argued that such elaborate similes can sometimes be used to compare entire scenarios rather than individual source and target entities. It was also argued that many of the directly expressed metaphors in both narrative and dialogue involve personifications and metaphors comparing people to either animals or specific types of people. In fact, it seems to be a typical feature of fiction that the domains which are most common as the non-metaphorical topic domains – such as people, animals, nature, concrete objects and movement – are also the domains which are most often used as source domains. That is, the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction draw on the same domains as the non-metaphorical language. Finally, it was shown that the directly expressed metaphor in both narrative and dialogue are more often novel and creative, and that they have a clear function in creating vivid images and adding emotional power to descriptions. One way in which emotional value is added is by emphasizing the dissimilarity between the entities being compared, which makes the fact that they have something in common more unexpected and noteworthy.

### 6.6 General discussion of the linguistic forms of metaphor in narrative and dialogue in fiction

While Chapter 5 investigated the frequency and distribution of linguistic metaphor in fiction in comparison to the other three registers in the *Metaphor in Discourse* project (academic discourse, news and conversation), this chapter aimed to refine the analysis by systematically distinguishing between narrative prose and dialogues in fiction. It was speculated that fiction’s position between the written registers on the one hand and conversation on the other was due to the fact that narrative in
fiction showed a similar distribution of metaphor to the written registers while dialogues in fiction showed a similar distribution to conversation. That is, the main expectation was that narrative would contain more metaphor-related words than dialogue in general, and more MFlags and direct MRWs in particular. It was also expected that there would be differences between dialogues in fiction and actual conversations, given the fact that dialogues in fiction are carefully constructed, edited and stylized and more informational than real-life conversations (Biber and Finegan 1992). As metaphor use was shown to correlate with an informational focus in Chapter 5, this suggested that the dialogues in fiction should use more metaphor-related words than the conversations.

The two-way interaction between word class and sub-register revealed that narrative and dialogue differed significantly in their general distribution of the eight main word classes and that narrative did indeed have more informational features (high frequency of adjectives, nouns and prepositions) while dialogue had more involved features (verbs and the rest-category items). These findings were thus in line with the expectations based on Biber’s (1988, 1989) Dimension 1, ‘Involved versus Informational Production’. Narrative and dialogue did not differ in their use of adverbs, which was argued to be due to the fact that narrative uses adverbs in relation to situation-dependent reference (Dimension 3) while dialogue uses adverbs in relation to an involved production (Dimension 1).

The subsequent three-way interaction revealed that there were significant differences between the distribution of non-MRWs and the distribution of MRWs across the eight main word classes in both narrative and dialogue. Before metaphor was included, narrative showed an overuse of adjectives, conjunctions, nouns and prepositions, and an underuse of verbs and the rest category; determiners and adverbs did not contribute to the two-way interaction. After the inclusion of metaphor, narrative showed an overuse of metaphor-related adjectives, prepositions and verbs and an underuse of metaphor-related conjunctions, determiners, nouns, and the rest category. The adverbs, which did not contribute to the two-way interaction, are significantly underused in narrative when they are related to metaphor. The dialogues showed an underuse of adjectives, conjunctions, determiners, nouns and prepositions before metaphor was included, and an overuse of verbs and the rest category; the adverbs did not contribute to the interaction. After the inclusion of metaphor, the dialogues showed an overuse of metaphor-related adjectives, prepositions and verbs and an underuse of metaphor-related conjunctions and the rest category; in the dialogues, the metaphor-related adverbs, determiners and nouns did not contribute to the interaction between word class and metaphor.

Though the distribution of metaphor across the eight word classes was uneven in both narrative and dialogue, the two sub-registers often had similar distributions.
There was no significant interaction between metaphor and sub-register for the adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, verbs and the rest category. Metaphor-related adjectives and verbs were equally overused in narrative and dialogue, while metaphor-related conjunctions and rest-category items were equally underused. Metaphor-related adverbs were distributed as expected by chance in both narrative and dialogue. Narrative and dialogue did differ significantly in their distribution of metaphor-related prepositions, nouns and determiners: these word-classes were all overused in dialogue in relation to narrative when related to metaphor.

This showed that while the general distribution of word classes was significantly different for narrative and dialogue, and in line with the findings of Biber (1988, 1989) and Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992, 2001), the two sub-registers were more similar in their distribution of metaphor than had been expected on the basis of the cross-register comparison. This was largely due to the fact that the dialogues in fiction were characterized by a larger proportion of metaphor-related words than would be expected given their purpose of representing spoken conversations. This finding can be related to the fact that dialogues in fiction are more informational than face-to-face conversations (Biber and Finegan 1992). In addition, the narrative prose in fiction did not contain a higher proportion of metaphor-related words similar to the news texts and academic discourse. Both narrative and dialogue in fiction contained a moderate proportion of metaphor-related words and a similar distribution of metaphor across the eight main word classes. The unexpected finding was that in terms of metaphor use, it was the dialogues that overused nouns and prepositions, word classes associated with an informational production (Biber 1988, 1989). This suggests that when it comes to metaphor-related words, the dialogues are more informational than the narrative prose.

The analysis of the dominant patterns of metaphor as well as metaphor variation for the adjectives, nouns and verbs in narrative and dialogue showed that the most frequently used metaphor-related adjectives, nouns and verbs were clearly distinct from the overall most frequent adjectives, nouns and verbs, confirming that there is a clear division of labour between MRWs and non-MRWs in discourse. For the non-MRWs, the dominant patterns for adjectives, nouns and verbs were shown to relate to specific functions within narrative and dialogue, while the MRWs in both narrative and dialogue were primarily related to general patterns of metaphor in language use, such as the metaphorical use of delexicalized verbs, size and dimension adjectives, and general nouns such as thing, way and end. Metaphorical uses that were shown to be more typical of the sub-registers were the use of golden and pale in narrative descriptions and the use of swearwords in dialogues. It was suggested that swearwords such as bloody, hell and bastard may be used
The analysis also showed that narrative and dialogue were characterized by high type-token ratios for MRW adjectives, nouns and verbs, as well as large proportions of unique MRW adjectives, nouns and verbs. This indicates that both narrative and dialogue in fiction are characterized by a large degree of variation in their use of linguistic metaphor. This high degree of variation in the dialogues can be related to the fact that dialogues in fiction are more carefully constructed and stylized than actual conversations. It suggests that authors try to avoid repetition and use more creative words than would be expected based on face-to-face conversations. The dialogues in fiction were shown not only to use more metaphor-related words than would be expected on the basis of the findings for conversation, but also much more varied ones. These results indicate that the frequency, distribution and variation of metaphor use in fictive dialogues is not an accurate reflection of what happens in conversations. This finding is in line with previous studies that have emphasized the differences between literary dialogues and real-life conversations and have argued that dialogues in fiction are not faithful representations of the characteristics of spontaneous speech (Abercrombie 1963; Biber and Finegan 1992; Fludernik 2009; Oostdijk 1990).

The analysis of the different relations to metaphor in narrative and dialogue in fiction showed that the underuse of clear MRWs in fiction and the overuse of non-MRWs in fiction are characteristics of both narrative and dialogue, since there were no significant differences between narrative and dialogue for these relations to metaphor. It was not the case that the narrative in fiction behaved more like the news texts (which overused clear MRWs and underused non-MRWs) and the dialogues more like the conversations (which underused clear MRWs and overused non-MRWs). Borderline MRWs were shown not to interact with the sub-registers but narrative and dialogue did differ significantly in their use of MFlags. As expected, these were overused in the narrative prose. Contrary to the expectations based on the findings from Chapter 5, the dialogues in fiction did not contain fewer metaphor-related words than the narrative prose. Both narrative and dialogue in fiction contained the same moderate proportion of metaphor-related words, resulting in a moderate proportion for fiction in comparison to the other registers.

With regard to the different types of metaphor, narrative and dialogue did not differ in their distribution of indirect MRWs. As expected, the direct MRWs were shown to be a characteristic of the narrative prose rather than the dialogues. This corresponds to the finding in the cross-register comparison that the two registers which normally include a large proportion of narrative – fiction and news – overused direct MRWs while conversations underused them. Although Cameron (2003) and Carter (2004) found many examples of similes in their spoken data (but
see Low 2010; Low et al. 2008), the findings from Chapters 5 and 6 indicate that
direct forms of metaphor are in fact unusual in both real conversations and fictive
dialogues. The significant overuse of direct MRWs in fiction in relation to the other
registers was attributed to the narrative prose in fiction. This finding can be
considered an interesting refinement of the claim that similes are typical of
literature (e.g., Goatly 1997; Sayce 1954). The implicit MRWs were shown to be a
characteristic of dialogues in fiction, but this finding was harder to interpret since
the use of implicit metaphors did not appear to be related to any particular
discourse functions and mostly resulted rather accidentally from simple cases of
substitutions and repetition.

With respect to the forms and functions of direct expressions of metaphor in
narrative and dialogue, the analyses showed that the similes in the dialogues were
usually short and simple while the similes in the narrative prose were often very
elaborate, complex and creative. It was argued that the more elaborate and complex
similes are in fact used to compare entire scenarios rather than individual source
and target entities (cf. Musolff 2006; Semino 2008). In addition, it was found that
many of the similes in both dialogue and narrative involved personifications or
mappings between people and animals or different kinds of people. The function of
these similes was related to the creation of image metaphors (e.g., Crisp 1996;
Gibbs and Bogdonovich 1999; Gleason 2009; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner
1989). The findings also support Lodge’s (1977: 113) claim that fiction should be
characterized by local uses of metaphor and ‘analogies from a semantic field
associated with the context’ (see Chapter 4), as direct MRWs were infrequent and
often used the same domains – such as people, animals, nature, concrete objects
and movement – as frequent source and target domains. That is, the linguistic
forms of metaphor in fiction appear to draw on the same conceptual domains as the
non-metaphorical language.

It was argued that the role of similes involving comparisons between different
types of people is an understudied area of metaphor in fiction and perhaps also
other forms of discourse. It was also emphasized that, contrary to traditional
assumptions about similes, the similes in fiction could not be converted into a
Corresponding metaphor form and the ground for the comparison was usually the
most salient information. This finding casts serious doubts on the validity of many
psycholinguistic studies on the differences between metaphor and simile (e.g.,
Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001;
Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008;
Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe 1999). Finally, it was shown
that the directly expressed metaphors in both narrative and dialogue are often novel
and creative and have a clear discourse function in creating vivid imagery and
adding emotional force and particular points of view to descriptions. Moreover, the
similes in fiction were often used to emphasize the great dissimilarity between the entities being compared, which makes the fact that they have something in common more unexpected and noteworthy.
Chapter 7

Personification in fiction: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions

No golden light bathed the red brick of the house. It no longer looked mellow. Beautiful, yes, but severe somehow and, to Adam's heightened awareness, reproachful.

(BNC-Baby: CDB)

An earlier version of this chapter was accepted for publication in Language and Literature as Dorst, A.G. (in press). Personification in discourse: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions.
7.1 Introduction

The previous two chapters have provided a quantitative description of the frequency, forms and distribution of metaphor in fiction. Chapter 5 compared the patterns of metaphor in fiction to those in academic discourse, conversations, and news text. Chapter 6 refined these findings by distinguishing between narrative and dialogue in fiction. However, these chapters were primarily concerned with the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction, and the quantitative results did not focus on any specific class of conceptual metaphor or cross-domain mapping. In the current chapter one particular class of metaphor, personification, will be analysed at all three levels of the three-dimensional model of metaphor, namely linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions. Chapter 8 will then consider the cognitive representations of personification in fiction.

Although the study of personification has a long and rich tradition in rhetoric and the arts, going back all the way to Erasmus and Quintilian, more recent publications by Paxton (1994), Edgecombe (1997) and Hamilton (2002) have pointed out that there is still much debate about the definition of personification. Hardly any empirical work has been done on the many manifestations of personification in fiction, though the pervasiveness of personifications in naturally-occurring discourse has been noted (Cameron and Low 2004; Low 1999; Low et al. 2008). Nevertheless, it remains unclear how personifications can be reliably identified and analysed or how personifications are recognized and understood by readers. The present chapter aims to present a more systematic investigation of the linguistic realizations, conceptual structures and communicative functions of personification in fiction in order to come to a proposed categorization of personification types.

Within cognitive metaphor studies, personification has been treated as one of the most basic ontological metaphors (Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and is often discussed in relation to the differences between metaphor and metonymy (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Low 1999; MacKay 1986). Some methodological issues regarding the identification of personifications in everyday discourse were discussed in Chapter 4, and it was illustrated how these difficulties led to the extension of MIP by an additional code “potential personification” in MIPVU. As discussed in Chapter 4, this additional code was only added to personifications that could be interpreted as involving metaphor or metonymy or both, so as not to lose these cases due to the presence of a metonymic interpretation.

As the Metaphor in Discourse project did not aim to annotate specific types of metaphor (e.g., personification, animation, animalization) or kinds of mapping
(e.g., from TIME to SPACE or from MOVEMENT to CAUSATION), the different linguistic manifestations of personification in fiction can unfortunately not be retrieved by a single automated procedure, and no exact indication of the amount of personification in fiction can be given at this time. However, the current systematic application of the three-dimensional model to the case study of personification in fiction will demonstrate precisely why the identification and analysis of personification in fiction proved to be such a complex issue. It will be shown how the level at which personification is analysed will greatly influence whether a specific instance counts as a personification and therefore how many instances of personification are identified.

This is also why the present chapter will propose a categorization model for the different types of personification. The systematic application of this model in future studies could provide invaluable insight into the frequency of personification in fiction. The cognitive validity of the proposed model was tested in a psycholinguistic study, which is presented in Chapter 8. Yet despite the present lack of exact numbers, the manual identification process did indicate that personification plays a central role in fiction, and that its many different manifestations make it one of the dominant forms of metaphor in fiction, which is consistent with previous claims about the importance of personification in literature (e.g., Lakoff and Turner 1989; Leech and Short 2007; Lodge 1977).

The present investigation of the different linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of personification will draw on different methodologies. The linguistic forms of personification will be analysed on the basis of MIPVU (see Chapters 3 and 4). Steen’s (1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) five-step procedure, as discussed in Chapter 1, will be used to move from the linguistic forms of personification to its underlying conceptual structures. The communicative functions of personification will be approached from the point of view of deliberateness, as formulated in Steen’s (2008) Paradox of Metaphor (See Chapter 1).

The organization of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 offers a theoretical background to the definition of personification. Section 3 explores the different linguistic manifestations of personification while Section 4 makes the transition from linguistic forms to conceptual structures and considers the influence of conventionality. Section 5 discusses the tension between conventionality and deliberateness. Section 6 considers the interaction between metaphor and metonymy by examining body-part personifications. Section 7 will then propose a categorization of the different types of personification in fiction. Section 8 will summarize the findings for all three levels of analysis – linguistic, conceptual, and communicative – and will offer suggestions for further research.
7.2 Theoretical background: defining personification

Within cognitive metaphor studies, Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 33) defined personification as an ontological metaphor involving a cross-domain mapping where an object or entity ‘is further specified as being a person’, as in the following examples:

1) His *theory explained* to me the behavior of chickens raised in factories.
2) This *fact argues* against the standard theories.
3) *Life has cheated* me.
4) *Inflation is eating up* our profits.

In their discussion they stress that ‘personification is not a single unified general process’ and that each personification ‘differs in terms of the aspects of people that are picked out’ (p. 33). When examples such as ‘Inflation is eating up our profits’ and ‘The dollar has been destroyed by inflation’ are encountered, the relevant conceptual metaphor is therefore not *INFLATION IS A PERSON* but *INFLATION IS A DEVOURER* and *INFLATION IS A DESTROYER*. This relates to the fact that an abstract concept such as inflation is not merely seen as a person, but as a particular kind of person, such as a destroyer. The particular kind of person that is selected determines the salient features that are mapped onto the non-human concept, so that we ‘think of inflation as an adversary that can attack us, hurt us, steal from us, even destroy us’ (p. 34).

Lakoff and Turner (1989) discuss personification in relation to the *EVENTS ARE ACTIONS* metaphor, which allows us to ‘conceive of agentless events as if they were caused by agents’, as, for example, in ‘My car just refused to start this morning’ (p. 36). In combination with the identification of a specific type of agent, such as a thief or destroyer, this will result in a personification. This personification is a separate process from the *EVENTS ARE ACTIONS* metaphor itself; it is the choice of a specific entity that leads to personifications such as *TIME IS A DESTROYER*, *TIME IS A THIEF* and *TIME IS A HEALER*. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 38-39) emphasize that personification should therefore be distinguished from “mere agency” in which no specific agent is identified.

In addition to being contrasted with “mere agency”, personification is also often opposed to metonymy. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35) argue that examples such as ‘The ham sandwich is waiting for his check’ are not personifications but metonymies since the expression *the ham sandwich* is used to refer to the person who ordered the sandwich and ‘we do not understand “the ham sandwich” by imputing human qualities to it’. Other examples include *Acrylic has taken over the art world (= the use of acrylic paint)*’ and *The Times hasn’t arrived at the press*
conference yet (= the reporter from the Times)” (p. 35). However, it has often been pointed out that the distinction between metaphor and metonymy is not always easy to make, and that metaphor and metonymy can interact in various ways (e.g., Geeraerts 2002; Goossens 2002; Radden 2002).

MacKay (1986) points out that it is virtually impossible to read such examples as ‘Acrylic has taken over the art world’ without a spill-over effect of human qualities: ‘acrylic acquires human properties even though the author of the sentence clearly means “the use of acrylic”’ (p. 102). MacKay argues that people use human beings as their prototypical or default frame of reference and such examples can be considered ‘personification in disguise’ (p. 102). According to MacKay, personification pervades human cognition and often comes disguised in other figurative devices (such as metonyms, spatial metaphors, and container metaphors) or syntactic expressions (for example, frozen word orders and obligatory nominal gender marking). Similarly, Wales (1996: 148) exposes a lingering sexism underlying the use of pronouns in present-day English to talk about cars, countries, pets, and so on, and argues that personification takes the form of ‘he’ as the male norm by default.

Moreover, the same metonymic reading can in fact be applied to Lakoff and Johnson’s personification examples (1) and (2) above. As Steen (2007: 57-61) points out, the important question is whether a metonymic reading and a metaphorical reading may not sometimes be equally plausible and occur alongside each other. For example, in a sentence such as I see what you mean both concrete seeing and abstract understanding may be involved simultaneously, with literal seeing entailing understanding (metonymy) and understanding being understood in terms of seeing (metaphor). The same point is made by Cameron (2003: 69) for expressions such as see what you can do and I’ve been able to see what their problem is in class-room interaction.

Low (1999) points out that for expressions such as This essay thinks analysts can effectively choose between a metonymic and a metaphoric interpretation, ‘depending on whether the writer's starting point for a decision is seen as the noun or the verb’ (p. 222-223). If the writer started from the noun phrase This essay and then tried to find an appropriate verb, then the decision between verbs like believes, thinks or intends represents ‘the humanisation of the essay’ and this expression should be interpreted as an instance of the metaphor AN ESSAY IS A PERSON (p. 223). However, if the writer started from the verb think and then consciously decided to avoid the personal pronouns I and we in order to avoid an inappropriately “subjective” style, then the author can opt to name the product in place of the producer; this should be regarded as metonymy rather than metaphor since the objectifying strategy does not involve ‘the creation of animacy’ (p. 223).
Graesser et al. (1989) focus on personification as ‘yet another strategy of facilitating comprehension by giving abstract processes and notions a concrete conceptual foundation that is familiar to members of a culture’ (p. 141). Their definition of personification is therefore much more general: ‘Personification occurs when animals, objects, social organizations, and abstract notions are given qualities of people’ (p. 141). For example, in an expression such as common sense tells us that common sense acquires the ability of speaking to people while normally only people can speak to people. Graesser et al. also include examples that could count as metonymic according to other researchers, and their focus is more on the different abstractions that can be personified, i.e. in ‘The weapon is vulnerable’ an object receives human characteristics, in ‘Japan announced that…’ a country receives human characteristics, and in ‘The court declared that…’ a social organization receives human characteristics (p. 141).

Within literary studies, Hamilton (2002: 411) offers the following definition: ‘We personify when we metaphorically ascribe agency to normally inanimate objects, turning non-existent or imaginary entities into realistic actors or agents’. Hamilton points out that the rhetorical tradition, which distinguishes between prosopopoeia (i.e. when authors address their audience by speaking with the voice of another person or object) and prosopographia (i.e. the personification of objects or abstractions), suggests that ‘personification is merely a categorization issue’ and that this two-fold division ‘overlooks how we personify, why we personify, or what metaphorical domains are involved’ (p. 411). Moreover, personified abstractions that function as characters in poetry and novels (such as Chastity and Justice in Spenser’s Faerie Queen) or paintings and sculptures (such as the female representations of the Seven Virtues or the Four Seasons) appear to be of a different order than the examples discussed so far. Concerning such allegorical personifications, Crisp (2005: 116) has pointed out that ‘[in] the case of such abstract personifications, an abstract noun refers via a metaphoric pragmatic connector to a character in a fictional situation. This character is then projected back onto the relevant abstract property’.

The differences between the definitions discussed above suggest that what counts as personification will depend greatly on the analysts’ field of research (psychology, literature, linguistics, visual arts) and on whether personification is studied at the linguistic, conceptual, communicative or cognitive level. One essential factor seems to be the assignment of agency via a violation of selection restrictions. Such selection restrictions play a central role during linguistic analysis, while the specification of a particular agent occurs primarily at a conceptual level. Another important influence is the possibility of a metonymic reading. Although it remains an empirical question whether personifications are processed as metaphors or metonymies or both, the study reported in Chapter 8 on the recognition of
personifications by non-expert readers showed that readers refer to both metaphoric and metonymic readings in their interpretations and indicate that the metonymic reading yields additional stylistic information in the interpretation of the personification. The different levels of analysis and the relations between them will be now be considered in turn.

7.3 Linguistic realizations of personification

The first factor that plays a role in the identification of personification in discourse is its linguistic realization. The examples discussed in the previous section illustrate that conceptual personifications such as those postulated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002) take a nominal form, i.e. INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY, while their linguistic realization depends heavily on the use of verbs, e.g., ‘The dollar has been destroyed by inflation’. The nature of the relationship between the verbal linguistic expression and the nominal conceptual personification and the process by which the one is derived from the other are both left implicit. However, when analysts are involved in doing metaphor analysis at the linguistic level, the role of word class cannot be ignored. Consider, for instance, the following two examples from fiction:

5) She has an obsession with the drug that verges on monomania. She tells me she needs to understand it if she's going to defeat it (BNC-Baby: CCW).
6) She studies the drug, you know? Like it was her enemy (BNC-Baby: CCW).

To determine whether the verb defeat and the noun enemy are used metaphorically in these sentences, the MIPVU procedure (see Chapters 3 and 4) can be applied. With regard to personification, the application of a procedure such as MIP or MIPVU entails that there should be a non-human contextual sense (step 3a) and a human basic sense (step 3b) and that these can be contrasted but also compared (step 3c). One essential decision is therefore whether the basic sense is human. Though this may sound straightforward, the dictionary used in MIP and MIPVU to determine contextual and basic senses – the Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners – does not necessarily refer to humanness in its definitions. Thus it may not always be clear whether a basic sense should be interpreted as human only, human and animal, sentient beings, animate beings, concrete entities, and so on.

For defeat and enemy in (5) and (6) above the following senses can be found in the Macmillan dictionary:
Defeat
1 to win against someone in a game, fight, or election
2 if something defeats you, it is so difficult that you are unable to do it
3 to prevent something from happening or being successful

Enemy
someone who is opposed to someone else and tries to do them harm
a. a country that is fighting another country in a war
b. relating to a country’s enemy
c. something that harms or threatens someone or something

Both defeat and enemy can be said to involve a personification of the drug in question, cocaine, such that COCAINE IS AN ENEMY, and more generally DRUGS ARE AN OPPONENT. In (5) this mapping is expressed by the verb defeat, in (6) by the noun enemy. In (5) the personification results from the fact that the verb defeat normally requires both a human subject (a human agent) and a human direct object (a human patient).

The personification in (5) is thus realized via the selection restrictions of the verb. The important role metaphorically used verbs play in realizing personifications has also been noted by Wales (2001). She uses the famous lines ‘Night’s candles are burnt out, and jocund day / Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops’ from Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet to argue that ‘[i]n terms of generative grammar [...] the metaphor in the second line would be a deviation, since the selection restrictions of subject and verb are here violated’ (p. 251). She points out that ‘stands tiptoe on would normally co-occur with nouns marked with animate/human reference (as also jocund normally)’ and that ‘it is day which is personified, and acquires by ‘contagion’ the connotations also perhaps of youthful impishness’ (p. 251).

In example (6), on the other hand, the nominal comparison at the linguistic level closely resembles the nominal conceptual structure, which may cause it to be more noticeable as a personification than example (5). Though most metaphor analysts would probably agree that defeat is used metaphorically, they are less likely to agree that it is a personification. For metaphor annotation purposes, these examples raise the additional question which word should be annotated as involving personification, since it is the verb defeat that is metaphorically used and evokes the mapping but it is the entity COCAINE expressed by the noun drug that is technically being personified.

This situation can be visualized as in Figure 7.1. The personification set up by the noun-to-noun comparison can be visualized as a straightforward entity-to-entity
mapping between a human source domain (ENEMY) and a non-human target
domain (COCAINE).

Figure 7.1 Personification set up by a noun-to-noun comparison

Personifications that are derived from a violation of selection restrictions – such as
those linguistically expressed by verbs like *defeat* – would be visualized as in
Figure 7.2.

Figure 7.2 Personification derived from the argument structure of the verb
Figure 7.2 shows that the personification is the result of a mapping between arguments within the conceptual domains, rather than between the domains themselves.

As personifications are often realized by verbs and adjectives rather than nouns (see also Crisp 2008), selection restrictions play a vital role in the analysis of personification at the linguistic level, while its visibility as personification may indeed, as MacKay (1986) suggested, be considered “in disguise”. When personifications are realized by verbs, adverbs or adjectives, their presence may not be established until the underlying conceptual structure is analysed, though the tension between human and non-human roles in argument structures plays a role at the linguistic level. Whether or not such instances are also processed and understood as personifications is of course a matter for behavioural research.

Related to the issue of word class is the fact that personifications can be expressed in the form of either linguistic metaphors or similes. Consider examples (7) and (8) below:

7) Leaves and yellow blossoms obscured the top of the window, while the bottom was covered by aggressive pink hollyhocks, seemingly determined to fight their way inside (BNC-Baby: FPB).
8) At the top they came out into uncompromising, bright grey light, the bleak, hedgeless lane, the flat meadows where here and there stunted trees squatted like old men in cloaks (BNC-Baby: CDB).

Both examples involve a personification of plants, but in (7) this personification is realized by the metaphorically used adjectives aggressive and determined and the verb fight, while in (8) it is realized by the metaphorically used verb squatted and the simile like old men in cloaks. Since similes are necessarily more explicit in setting up and signalling comparisons, personifications expressed by similes are likely to be more noticeable and deliberate than those expressed by metaphors, as also suggested by Steen (2008). Moreover, since similes often focus on attributional correspondences rather than relational ones (see Aisenman 1999), personifications realized as similes may be similar to image mappings (e.g., Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989), with a strong visualization effect. Such personifications are more likely to be noticed as personifications and have a clearer communicative function as personifications, though the underlying linguistic mechanisms remain the same. This issue of image mappings will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter on the recognition of personifications in fiction by readers.

The examples above have illustrated that at the linguistic level personifications can be set up by entity-to-entity mappings expressed by nouns, as in example (6), or via the argument structure of verbs or adjectives, as in example
(5). In addition, personifications can be linguistically realized as metaphors or as similes, with personifications realized as similes often involving more noticeable cases of personification due to their explicit form. With respect to realization by different word classes, the psycholinguistic study reported in Chapter 8 specifically investigated whether there were differences in the recognizability of personifications realized by different word classes.

7.4 The role of conventionality

The role of conventionality can be illustrated by the use of many verbs of motion and possession in combination with non-human subjects:

9) Though she thought sleep would never come, eventually it did come (BNC-Baby: CB5).

10) The gangway lamps seemed to give no light (BNC-Baby: BPA).

11) Valentine's Day brought two happy events (BNC-Baby: FPB).

In the Macmillan dictionary, the verbs in (9) – (11) above have conventional human and non-human sense descriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Sense 1</th>
<th>Sense 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Come</td>
<td>to move or travel to the place where you are</td>
<td>6 to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give</td>
<td>1 to put something in someone’s hand or pass something to someone</td>
<td>4 to cause a general result or effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring</td>
<td>1 to take someone or something from one place and have them with you when you arrive somewhere else</td>
<td>4 to be the cause of a state, situation, or feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These verbs can be analysed as being metaphorically used on the basis of a contrast and comparison between basic senses involving concrete movement and objects and contextual senses involving abstract processes, time and causality. However, what is less noticeable is that the basic senses of these verbs involve human agents while the contextual senses involve non-human entities. This means that these
verbs can be considered instances of conventionalized linguistic personification. Their sense of human agency has been backgrounded since their abstract metaphorical uses are so conventional that their human origins have become bleached. The resulting mappings are therefore more obviously from concrete to abstract than from human to non-human. The fact that an abstract process or causation is compared to concrete motion backgrounds the fact that there is also a distinction between human and non-human agency. In essence, however, delexicalized verbs such as *give, get, take, make, go, come* have human basic senses (cf. Deignan 2005).

On the basis of both MIP and MIPVU it can therefore be argued that examples (9) – (11) are instances of linguistic personification, involving a mapping between a human basic sense and a non-human contextual sense. However, experiments by Bowdle and Gentner (2005) and Gentner and Bowdle (2001, 2008) have shown that derived metaphorical senses of a word can become so conventional that they are no longer *experienced* as metaphorical by language users, and are normally accessed directly (i.e. via categorization) during processing. As target and base terms become conventionally associated the base term becomes polysemous, ‘having both a domain-specific meaning and a related domain-general meaning’ (Bowdle and Gentner 2005: 228). When the metaphorical senses of a polysemous word become so conventional that the original connection with the literal base term becomes irrelevant or is lost altogether, the result is a so-called “dead” metaphor; this change in processing from comparison to categorization is called the Career of Metaphor (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008).

Verbs such as those in examples (9) – (11) can be considered “dead” personifications. This illustrates the point that conventional personifications can occur on a purely *linguistic* level without the need for these words to be *processed* as personifications – i.e. when the polysemous senses are accessed via categorization. However, given the right linguistic context the original human sense can be revitalized – for instance in poetry – causing the conventional non-human sense to be recognized and processed as a personification again. When linguistic, conceptual and behavioural analyses of personification are kept separate, this creates the possibility to analyse examples as personifications at the linguistic level but not necessarily the conceptual or cognitive level.

Such decisions are not only based on the conventionality of the expression, but also on the deliberateness of its usage. Consider the following two examples:

12) Beyond the bridge, the disused railway embankment along which they were walking became built up, so that water *ran* off it (BNC-Baby: AB9).
13) The arrested water shone and *danced* (BNC-Baby: FET).
The verbs *run* and *dance* have both conventional human and non-human senses in the *Macmillan* dictionary:

**Run**
1. to move quickly to a place using your legs and feet
4. if a liquid runs somewhere, it flows there

**Dance**
1. to move your feet and your body in a pattern of movements that follows the sound of music
3. if something dances, it makes a series of quick light movements

However, *dance* is more likely to be analysed as a personification than *run* as *run* has many frequently used non-human senses. The verb *dance* has only three sense descriptions in the *Macmillan* dictionary and only the one quoted above is non-human; the verb *run*, on the other hand, has nineteen main sense descriptions (excluding phrases), of which more than ten are non-human, such as ‘if a play, film, or television programme runs, it continues to be performed or shown’ (sense 5) and ‘if a bus, train etc runs, it travels somewhere at regular times’ (sense 6).

Additionally, *dance* can be considered more clearly human in its basic meaning as it is a cultural construct involving music and choreography in addition to physical movement. Other potential influences are sentence position (*dance* appears in focus position) and interaction with other poetic effects, such as alliteration or assonance. However, from the point of linguistic identification based on basic and contextual meanings, *run* and *dance* involve the same type of conventional personification via the argument structure of the verb. Steen’s (1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) five-step procedure can be used to examine how these two verbs are similar and different at the linguistic and conceptual levels of analysis.

Step 1 of the five-step procedure involves the identification of the metaphor focus, the expression that evokes the source domain. In the case of examples (12) and (13), the metaphor foci are *run* and *dance*, since both words have a non-human contextual sense that can be contrasted and compared to a human basic sense. Step 1 shows that in terms of conventionality and the human/non-human distinction both verbs behave exactly the same way on the linguistic level, i.e. both can be analysed as conventionalized linguistic personifications.

**Step 1: Metaphor focus:**

12) Run
13) Dance
Step 2 reconstructs the propositional structure underlying the surface text and identifies the metaphorical proposition. As discussed in Chapter 1, this text base is written in the form of propositions, representing minimal idea units (see Bovair and Kieras 1985; Kintsch 1998). The proposition containing the metaphorically used concepts is called the metaphorical proposition. In the case of (12) there is a proposition (“P”) that contains the predicate RUN and a single argument WATER; in the case of (13) there is a proposition (“P”) containing the predicate DANCE and a single argument WATER. The metaphorical propositions are thus P(RUNs WATER) and P(DANCEs WATER). Note again that RUN and DANCE have been underlined to signal that they are the metaphor foci while the index “s” signals that these concepts belong to the source domain. Step 2 shows that as far as the conceptual structure underlying the surface text is concerned, run and dance have the same propositional structure.

Step 2: Metaphorical proposition:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) P (RUNs WATER)</td>
<td>13) P (DANCEs WATER)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3 separates the concepts belonging to the source domain (“s”’) from those belonging to the target domain (“t”). In this step, an open comparison between the two domains is constructed and the operator SIM, standing for similarity, is used to indicate that there is a comparison between these two domains.

Step 3: Open cross-domain comparison:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) SIM {∃F, ∃x (F WATER) t (RUN x) s }</td>
<td>13) SIM {∃F, ∃x (F WATER) t (DANCE x) s }</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constructed open comparison for the current example can be read as follows: there is a similarity between an unspecified target domain “t” which contains an unknown predicate “F” and the argument WATER and an unspecified source domain “s” which contains the predicate RUN/DANCE and an unknown argument “x”. The existential operators ∃F and ∃x indicate that the comparison contains open slots that will need to be filled in during step 4.
In step 4 the open slots of the comparison are filled in. Analysts can use the dictionary definitions from step 1 to constrain this process and avoid unwarranted interpretations, though contextual knowledge and general world knowledge play the most important role in the choice of the required concepts. It is important to realize that the point is not to find “the one and only right option”, but to show at which points specific choices were made, how these were made and why, so that others may pinpoint exactly where they would make different choices leading to different results in the final reconstructed mapping. As discussed in Chapter 1, Semino et al. (2004) have noted that this step involves more problematic decisions. For the current examples the word “flow” from the contextual sense established for run can be used to fill in the predicate $F$ in both comparisons.

Selecting a concept to represent $x$ in the source domain slots is slightly more difficult. Since the dictionary often does not specify whether a sense applies specifically to humans, analysts have to use their world knowledge and intuitions here, and can check corpora to confirm these intuitions. In this case, it can be argued that “person” would be the typical or default agent for both run and dance, though for run this is obviously less clearly the case. This is reflected in the use of “you” in the basic sense for dance, implicitly signalling a human agent. Run is already far more semantically bleached and can be used non-metaphorically with animal nouns. However, as MacKay (1986) pointed out, the default interpretation for such verbs is normally human. For example, give birth in Lakoff and Johnson’s personification example ‘The Michelson-Morley experiment gave birth to a new physical theory’ applies to mammals rather than humans only. In any case, it should be clear that structurally speaking, the same set of correspondences can be derived for run and dance. For run there is a similarity between a predicate flow and an agent water in the source domain and a predicate run and an agent person in the target domain. For dance there is a predicate flow and an agent water in the source domain and a predicate dance and an agent person in the target domain.

At this point it should be noted that the labelling of $s$ and $t$ can actually be used to foreground or background the personification in the underlying conceptual structure since the tension between the domains is either $t=water$ versus $s=person$ or $t=flowing$ versus $s=running/dancing$. If flowing and running/dancing are chosen as the dominant domain labels then the personification would be backgrounded, occurring only as part of the correspondences but not as the overarching mapping. Since these contextual senses are highly conventional, it is easy to find non-human equivalents for run and dance and use these as the domain labels. As soon as the mapping becomes more novel and creative it may become increasingly difficult to find these equivalents and the personification will become the dominant mapping, with the exact target-domain equivalents remaining unspecified.
Due to the conventional nature of run and dance, the dominant mapping in step 5 will most likely be FLOWING IS RUNNING and FLOWING IS DANCING, with run and dance mapping onto flow and person mapping onto water. The inference drawn from these mappings is the manner of motion, and since these verbs have different profiles (Langacker 2009), they focus attention on different aspects: for run the derived manner of motion involves a fast, straight and uninterrupted movement, for dance it involves quick, light, small and gentle movements in patterns, with an added qualitative aspect of beauty and gracefulness to it.

The complete five-step analysis shows that the personifications involved in run and dance have the same conventionality, argument structure and conceptual structure. Both are conventionalized linguistic personifications, and both can be reconstructed as personifications in the underlying conceptual structure based on the correspondence between water and a specific type of person, namely a runner and a dancer. However, the personifications are unlikely to be the dominant mappings as the conventionality of the verbs foregrounds the correspondence between flowing and running/dancing and backgrounds the personification. What is inferred from the mapping is the manner of motion, not the similarity between water and a specific kind of person. Nevertheless, if such expressions are used
deliberately enough, the personification mapping can become foregrounded again. The following section will relate the findings concerning the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of personifications to their use in context, which brings in the issue of deliberateness.

7.5 Deliberateness and elaboration

Deciding whether *run* and *dance* should be analysed as personifications raised the question: when is something a deliberate personification? Steen (2008: 222) proposes that a metaphor is used deliberately ‘when it is expressly meant to change the addressee’s perspective on the referent or topic that is the target of the metaphor, by making the addressee look at it from a different conceptual domain or space, which functions as a conceptual source’. Clear examples of such deliberate metaphors are novel metaphors, similes and figurative analogies, extended or elaborated metaphors, or metaphors expressed in an explicit *A IS B* format. The influence of elaboration and extension can be illustrated by the following example:

14) Now they guard the body, which is motionless in a lake of blood that is rapidly drying, *drunk* by the *thirsty, insatiable* soil. You can almost hear the soil *gulping* (BNC-Baby: FAJ).

Compared to the examples of *run* and *dance*, the presence of *drunk, thirsty, insatiable* and *gulping* in such close proximity makes this a more likely case of deliberate personification. In (14) there are two verbs and two adjectives that can be interpreted as referring by default to humans but now referring to the non-human entity *soil*.

Though this may seem a clear case of personification due to its elaboration, the linguistic and conceptual analyses are not as straightforward as they may seem. The verb *drink* is defined in the *Macmillan* dictionary as ‘to take liquid into your body through your mouth’. Animals can of course also literally drink, yet it is clear that the verb is metaphorically used when applied to the inanimate noun *soil*. The adjective *thirsty* has a conventional plant sense ‘thirsty plants or areas of land need a lot of water’. This means that *thirsty* counts as a conventionalized or even “dead” personification, whereas a verb like *drink* would have to be analysed as a personification based on a violation of selection restrictions. The fact that *drink* and *thirsty* are clearly related to the source domain of drinking while *insatiable* and *gulping* are not restricted to drinking means that even though these words seem to
create one coherent mapping, they do in fact behave differently at the linguistic and conceptual level.

The mapping between the soil absorbing blood and a person drinking liquid is not as uncomplicated as it may seem. When the individual words are analysed using the five-step procedure (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) four individual mappings are derived that all make sense in their own right. However, since each of these four individual mappings evokes the same correspondence between soil and person, the personification mapping becomes foregrounded. Moreover, although the individual mappings each make sense in their own right, what results from their co-occurrence is one complex personification SOIL-ABSORBING-BLOOD IS A PERSON-DRINKING-LIQUID. This extended personification is the mapping that yields the most informative inferences, since this information can be interpreted in light of general knowledge about how people drink when they are extremely thirsty and carries the negative connotations of insatiable and gulping describing inappropriate or unseemly behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drunk:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSORBING IS DRINKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRINK ➔ ABSORB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON ➔ SOIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUID ➔ BLOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thirsty:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEEDING-WATER IS BEING-THIRSTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRSTY ➔ NEEDING-WATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON ➔ SOIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insatiable:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY-DRY IS INSATIABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSATIABLE ➔ EXTREMELY-DRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON ➔ SOIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gulping:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSORBING-QUICKLY IS GULPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULP ➔ ABSORB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON ➔ SOIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This example illustrates that conventional personifications such as thirsty can become more deliberate personifications when they are used in combination with other personifications. Nevertheless, it remains an empirical question for behavioural research whether readers construct such overarching personifications or solve each personification by a mapping at the local word level. Now consider the following example:
15) No golden light bathed the red brick of the house. It no longer looked *mellow*. Beautiful, yes, but *severe* somehow and, to Adam’s heightened awareness, *reproachful* (BNC-Baby: CDB).

In this sentence, there is a strong sense that the house is being personified into an antagonistic or disapproving person but several different things are happening. While *mellow*, *beautiful* and *severe* have conventional non-human senses *reproachful* does not. However, for *mellow* it is difficult to establish a basic meaning and the human senses ‘relaxed and satisfied’ (*Macmillan* sense 1) and ‘gentle, wise, and easy to talk to’ (*Macmillan* sense 5) are not necessarily the most likely candidates for the basic sense given that historically *mellow* has to do with fruits. Similarly, the basic sense of *beautiful* concerns external evaluation rather than inherent qualities, so it could be argued to have a general basic sense.

In the context of (15), however, a human interpretation of *mellow* and *beautiful* can become foregrounded by the presence of *severe* and *reproachful*. That is, they can become involved in “metaphor attraction”, where ‘words that might not be treated as metaphoric if the “base” metaphor had not been present, [acquire] metaphoric resonance’ (Cameron and Low 2004). This means that they can be analysed as personifications in this particular contextual combination. This influence of context on the possibility of re-analysis in metaphor identification has also been noted by Heywood et al. (2002). Moreover, while in the case of example (14) individual meaningful mappings could be constructed for each word, in the case of (15) the result is a rather unspecified overarching mapping that the house is being compared to an antagonistic person. What the individual mappings for *severe* and *reproachful* would be and which literal target concepts would apply is almost impossible to say.

This situation is further complicated by the fact that the description of the house is filtered through the emotions it evokes in one of the characters, rather than being an actual physical description; this makes the communicative function of the personification stand out more conspicuously than its conceptual function. Leech and Short (2007: 160) have shown how authors can exploit quasisimiles involving words like *seemed* and *appeared* to suggest that ‘anthropomorphism may only be a “manner of speaking”’. That is, it becomes less relevant to construct a full conceptualization in terms of humanness since the stylistic effect of such personifications is more important. In this case, the text suggests that the character is intimidated by the appearance of the house, but a full conceptualization of the house as a person seems unwarranted.

The examples above illustrate that personifications can have similar linguistic forms and conceptual structures but differ in deliberateness and therefore have
strikingly different communicative functions. Even when personifications are highly conventional from a linguistic and conceptual point of view, they can still produce clear personifications if their usage is deliberate. Moreover, in some cases the stylistic effect of a personification may be more important than the realization of a full conceptualization.

7.6 Body-part personifications

One type of personification that was frequently encountered in the fiction corpus concerns what can be called body-part personifications, involving a personification of parts of the human body. Body part is used here (following Goossens 2002) in the broadest sense, including such instances as “voice” and “breath”. These personifications are usually realized by verbs or adjectives, but can also be expressed by other word classes. It is important to note that in body-part personifications the body parts are part of the target domain, i.e. they are the entities being personified; these cases should not be confused with examples such as (16) and (17) below, in which the body parts are part of the source domain and can be used to personify other entities:

16) To his right the ground rose gently towards the southern cliffs and he could see the dark mouth of a concrete pillbox (BNC-Baby: C8T).
17) There was a low table and three or four dainty chairs with aubergine velvet seats and gilded spindle legs (BNC-Baby: BMW).

When it comes to body-part personifications, it can be observed that some are highly conventional, such as come in (18) below, while others are more novel and more deliberately personifying, such as play and hunt in (19):

18) We were alone on deck, though not the only ones awake for I could hear Rickie and Ellen's voices coming from the open skylight of the main saloon (BNC-Baby: CCW).
19) The voices played with the slaughter of the innocents, treble and descant hunting each other, while she bowed her head, unable to sing in tune (BNC-Baby: FET).

Additionally, these examples can be said to involve a metonymic relation between voices and people in line with Langacker's (2009: 43) ‘active-zone metonyms’. Though body parts are often used metonymically to stand for a specific character, metonymy is not a necessary condition in body-part personifications.
Conventionality, metonymy and deliberateness are independent forces interacting in different ways, as illustrated by the following examples:

20) Their tense, edgy faces watched Delaney closely (BNC-Baby: BPA).
21) They reached the main deck, dropping down in a defensive posture, eyes searching the stacked containers (BNC-Baby: BPA).
22) His gaze came back to George, still sprawled over the control desk (BNC-Baby: BPA).
23) Paula's stomach turned a somersault (BNC-Baby: BMW).
24) Dimples played in his cheeks (BNC-Baby: BMW).
25) With Mrs Cranbrook's words Ruth's appetite immediately returned (BNC-Baby: CB5).

While faces are used for watching, and eyes are used for searching, you do not use your gaze for coming back, your stomach for turning a somersault, your dimples for playing or your appetite for returning. This means that the first two examples score high on metonymy while the last four involve no metonymic reading. And while all of the verbs in (20) – (25) have conventional non-human senses in the Macmillan dictionary, the addition of somersault to turn makes its use more creative and deliberate, causing it to have a stronger sense of personification. While all of these examples concern verbs that essentially require a human agent, different interactions between conventionality, metonymy and deliberateness lead to different degrees of personification.

This issue is even more complex in the case of adjectives, such as in examples (26) – (29) below.

26) He traced the contours of her face with gentle fingers (BNC-Baby: CB5).
27) Forster suppressed a nervous giggle (BNC-Baby: BPA).
28) Madame Mattli waved a dismissive hand (BNC-Baby: BMW).
29) ‘Be still my restless heart,’ the man had a strong, caressing voice and the slow luscious accent of America's deep south (BNC-Baby: CCW).

Similar to the verbs, these personifying adjectives differ in conventionality, influence of metonymy, and deliberateness. Structurally, they are similar to thirsty soil and reproachful house, but it is extremely difficult to find target-domain equivalents when the five-step procedure (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009) is applied. Nevertheless, these adjectives suggest a similar projection of agency and control as the previously discussed examples.

More deliberate and poetic examples of such personifications are discussed by Hamilton (2002: 416), who uses examples from Auden’s poetry to show ‘more than mere metonyms for a person, the body and the mind for Auden here are individual personified beings at odds with one another’. Although it may seem hard
to conceptualize body parts as ‘individual personified beings’, this actually happens quite frequently in popular culture. For example, one of the main characters in *Lord of the Rings* is the disembodied, ever-watching Eye of Sauron, and *The Addams Family* would not be complete without their faithful servant Thing, a disembodied, conscious hand. Television commercials abound in body-part personifications, often involving our bodies telling us what is good or bad for us. Coca Cola created a series of commercials involving two eyes, a tongue, a nose and a brain bickering over the taste of Coca Cola Zero, Levi’s had belly buttons singing ‘I’m coming out!’ and Nike launched a commercial involving a beer belly chasing a man down a street (‘Belly’s gonna get ya!’).

When such examples involve metonymy, analysts may favour a purely metonymic interpretation and disregard such examples as personification. Yet scholars like Radden (2002) and Goossens (2002) have pointed out the possibilities for “metaphor from metonymy”, and Goossens discusses possible interactions between metaphor and metonymy in so-called metaphtonymies. One possible interaction described by Goossens (2002: 356) is metaphor from metonymy, which involves a metaphorical interpretation in which ‘the conceptual link with the metonymic reading is still present’. Another possible interaction between metaphor and metonymy is metonymy within metaphor, involving metaphors with a ‘built-in metonymy’ (p. 363). Goossens points out that his body part data contained a striking number of metonymies, either purely metonymic or in some interaction with metaphor. He stresses that such cases exploit the ‘double possibility’ between metonymy from metonymy or metonymy only and that ‘not infrequently both the metonymy reading and the metaphor-from-metonymy interpretation could fit a given context: it is typical of these items that in context their interpretation will sometimes have to remain “undecided”’ (p. 357).

The body-part personifications from the fiction corpus can also be said to involve this ‘double possibility’. Moreover, the personification mapping does not seem to occur between two distinct domains, or between arguments in two distinct domains, but rather between distinct arguments within one and the same domain. This process can be visualized as in Figure 7.3, for ‘eyes searching the stacked containers’ in example (21).

Figure 7.3 shows that the metonymy and the personification metaphor are simultaneously present and this double possibility can be used to create particular stylistic effects: actions and qualities can be attributed to body parts as a way of making the narrative seem more immediate and creating a kind of zooming-in effect, similar to close-ups in films. Leech and Short (2007) discuss how this is often done to create a specific mind style in fiction. They point out that the choice of a body part as subject instead of a character is ‘a fairly common device for suggesting that the part of the body involved acts of its own accord’ (p. 152), as
actions can be presented as being performed by the character or by the body part, automatically or non-automatically, and with or without conscious effort.

Figure 7.3 Personification based on a metaphor-metonymy interaction

Examples from the fiction corpus that illustrate this technique are the following:

30) *None of them allowed their eyes to turn* towards the pine wood (BNC-Baby: CDB).
31) *Their minds had not reached out* to the terror of what had in fact happened (BNC-Baby: CDB).

These examples represent relatively isolated cases, but the technique of assigning agency to body parts is used extensively in the novel *The Inheritors* by William Golding. Black (1993) points out that in this novel examples such as ‘Lok’s feet were clever. They saw.’ and ‘Lok’s ears spoke to Lok.’ play an important role in how the reader perceives the characters, since they ‘may be interpreted as being (almost) literally true for the people, who regard parts of the body as independent entities, but metaphorical for the reader’ (p. 39). Leech and Short (2007: 156) point out that expressions such as ‘listening face’ and ‘twinkling eyes’ are quite unremarkable in everyday discourse but they become significant when an author consistently uses this type of structure to ‘imbibe a particular flavour to the description’.
Since body-part personifications may play an important role in creating such descriptive flavours in fiction, they should not be excluded from the analysis of personifications in discourse. Though their linguistic and conceptual analysis as personifications may at times be tenuous, their communicative function as personifications via the projection of agency seems clear. Such body-part personifications are related to metonymy-based personifications as *This article explains*... or *This theory claims*... to avoid personal pronouns in academic writing, and *The government decided*... or *The White House denies*... to avoid assigning responsibility in journalism. The body-part personifications can be exploited to create a specific narrative point of view or stylistic effect in fiction and can be considered instances of personification, though perhaps not at all levels of analysis.

### 7.7 Proposal for a categorization of personification types

The categorization model outlined below starts from the assumption that personification is a specific type of metaphor involving a cross-domain mapping between a human source domain and a non-human target domain. The previous sections have shown how personifications in fiction differ in linguistic form, conceptual structure and communicative effect. Some important factors that were discussed were conventionality, deliberateness, elaboration, and metonymy. Taking the observed differences into account, the identification of personification on the basis of a method such as MIP or MIPVU can now be refined to distinguish between four main types of personification during linguistic metaphor identification. The essential decisions concern whether the basic sense can be said to be human only (rather than human and animal/animate/alive/etc.) and whether there is a sufficiently distinct non-human contextual sense that can be understood in comparison with the human basic sense.

With regard to the basic sense, the dictionary will sometimes provide a basic sense that is clearly human, for instance for the noun *dancer*: ‘someone who dances, especially as their job’. In this case the word *someone* signals that this sense applies to people rather than animate beings in general. Other signal words for humanness are *people, someone, you*, and references to body parts, for example: *to gather* = ‘if people gather or someone gathers them, they come together in one place to see or do something’; and *to pinch* = ‘to squeeze someone’s skin between your thumb and finger so that it hurts them’. Sometimes there are no signal words that indicate whether a sense is human but general world knowledge indicates this, as in the case of the verb *to write*: ‘to use a pen to make words, numbers, or symbols’. There is nothing in this definition that signals that
only humans can write, but general world knowledge indicates that this is the case, especially when using a pen. The compilers of the dictionary may have left this information out for various reasons, including reasons of space or because they considered this to be self-evident or irrelevant for general usage.

After having determined that the basic sense can be considered human, the next step is to check whether there is also a non-human contextual sense in the dictionary. If so, then the example can be considered a conventional personification. An example is the adjective *obstinate*. The basic sense of *obstinate* is ‘not willing to be reasonable and change your plans, ideas, or behaviour’ (*Macmillan* sense 1). It also has a conventional non-human sense ‘difficult to remove’ (*Macmillan* sense 2), which applies to stains, as in the example *This soap will remove the most obstinate stains*. The first type of personification can therefore be defined as follows: a conventionalized personification is a personification involving a mapping between a human basic sense and a distinct non-human contextual sense that can both be found in the dictionary.

If the dictionary does not provide a conventional non-human contextual sense, then the example is potentially an unconventionalized or “novel” personification. It is important to note that in a procedure such as MIPVU, this use of “novel” is related to conventionalization in terms of the dictionary, not absolute usage; this means that a non-human contextual sense may sometimes be familiar to people even though it has not been conventionalized to such a degree that it has received a separate entry in the dictionary. Moreover, it may be a novel linguistic expression of a highly conventional conceptual mapping. An example of a novel personification is the verb *to shiver* in the sentence *The pines were bowing and shivering in the wind*. The basic sense of *shiver* is ‘if you shiver, your body shakes slightly, for example because you are cold or frightened’ (*Macmillan*). In this case there are no other sense descriptions in the dictionary (neither in *Macmillan* nor in *Longman*), and the non-human contextual sense applying to the movement of trees can therefore be considered novel. This second type of personification can be defined as follows: a novel personification is a personification involving a mapping between a human basic sense that can be found in the dictionary and a novel non-human contextual sense.

In some cases, a slightly different situation occurs. In these cases the dictionary provides a basic sense that appears to favour a human interpretation due to its formulation while general knowledge suggests that the word should in fact be equally applicable to animals. Examples are the definitions of the verb *to drink* and the verb *to climb*. For *to drink* *Macmillan* gives the description: ‘to take liquid into your body through your mouth’ (sense 1); for *to climb* it gives: ‘to use your hands and feet to move up, over, down, or across something’ (sense 1). The dictionary may even include a separate animal (sub)sense, though the conclusion that the
expression should therefore be considered a conventional personification seems controversial. One example of this is the verb *hop*, which has a basic sense ‘to move forward by jumping on one foot’ (sense 1) and a separate subsense ‘if a bird or animal hops, it uses both or all feet to jump forward’ (sense 1a). The problem thus lies in deciding whether the basic sense can be taken as “human only”, regardless of the presence of a conventional non-human sense in the dictionary.

In many of such cases the interpretation of the basic sense as human occurs by default, as has also been suggested by MacKay (1986). This third type of personification can therefore be defined as follows: a default personification is a personification based on a default interpretation of the basic sense as human when it could technically also be taken as animate or general. Depending on whether such personifications are used deliberately or non-deliberately they will be more likely to stand out as personifications. One example from Section 7.5 above is *drunk* in *drunk by the thirsty, insatiable soil* (example 23). Both humans and animals drink, but the default interpretation of this sense is human, which is further enforced by the presence of the conventionalized personification *thirsty* and the novel personification *insatiable*. As mentioned in Section 7.4, the same principle applies to Lakoff and Johnson’s example ‘The Michelson-Morley experiment gave *birth to* a new physical theory’, as giving birth is something all female mammals can do, not just humans.

The fourth and last type of personification involves personifications that can be argued to involve both a metaphorical and a metonymic mapping. This type of personification occurs when the argument structure of especially verbs, adjectives and adverbs requires the presence of a human argument but this human argument has been metonymically replaced by a non-human argument, causing a violation of selection restrictions. This can be seen in the case of the verbs *search* and *telephone* in the following examples: ‘Their *eyes* were *searching* the stacked containers’; ‘The *CND office telephoned to* ask her for voluntary evening help’. Starting from the nouns *eyes* and *office* it can be argued that it is people doing the searching with their eyes and people in the office doing the telephoning. However, starting from the verbs *search* and *telephone* it can also be argued that these verbs require the presence of a human agent while in this case they are applied to agents that are not human themselves.

Section 6 showed how this metonymic transfer of agency can be exploited to create the effect that body parts are performing actions against the wishes of the person they belong to (i.e. ‘my feet seemed to be moving on their own’, ‘his eyes betrayed him’), similar to the creation of a distancing effect in academic writing (‘this essay argues’ instead of ‘I argue’) or an objectifying effect in journalism (‘the company denied’ instead of ‘Mr Smith denied’). This fourth type of personification can be defined as follows: a personification-with-metonymy is a
personification based on a violation of the selection restrictions of the basic sense caused by the replacement of a human argument with a metonymically related non-human argument.

In summary, the proposed categorization model includes four different types of personification occurring in natural language data, namely:

- **Conventionalized personification**: based on a mapping between a human basic sense and a distinct non-human contextual sense that can both be found in the dictionary.
- **Novel personification**: based on a mapping between a human basic sense that can be found in the dictionary and a novel non-human contextual sense.
- **Default personification**: based on a default interpretation of the basic sense as human when it can technically be interpreted as animate or general.
- **Personification-with-metonymy**: personification based on a violation of the selection restrictions of the basic sense caused by the replacement of a human agent or patient with a metonymically related non-human agent or patient.

Chapter 8 will report the findings of an empirical study that examined the cognitive relevance of this categorization. It asked whether and how these four personification types differed in how often they were recognized when participants encountered them in excerpts taken from the fiction corpus, and whether their recognition was influenced by other internal or external factors.

### 7.8 General discussion and conclusions

This chapter has shown that from a linguistic, conceptual and communicative point of view all personifications are not equal, and they do not merely differ in the specific human aspects that are picked out. Personifications can be analysed in terms of their linguistic forms, conceptual structures or communicative functions; though interrelated, these levels of analysis may each yield a different answer to the question whether something is a personification. In addition, analysts can investigate the cognitive representations of personifications, their processing, comprehension, interpretation and appreciation by language users.
Section 3 illustrated that personifications can linguistically be realized by different word classes, and that selection restrictions play a crucial role in this process. Section 4 showed that conventionality may disguise the personification mapping and emphasized the need to distinguish between personification on a purely linguistic level, or even as a historical development in the language system, and personifications that are fully realized on a conceptual level or in processing. Section 5 illustrated how deliberateness can revitalize or foreground a personification mapping, for instance through extension. Section 6 discussed body-part personifications and the involved interaction between metaphor and metonymy. In Section 7 the findings were integrated into a categorization model for personification identification in discourse based on a procedure such as MIP or MIPVU.

It was demonstrated that applying a three-dimensional model of metaphor and using explicit methods such as MIPVU and the five-step procedure can help to define what counts as a personification at which level of analysis. Since it makes a world of difference whether analysts are talking about personification at the level of linguistic form, conceptual structure, communicative function, or cognitive representation, analysts can only communicate effectively if they are clear about their methodological choices.

The literature suggests a bias in favour of conceptual personifications on the one hand, and an emphasis on deliberate and poetic personifications on the other. The relation between the linguistic forms and the conceptual structures of personification has not been discussed systematically, nor has the influence of conventionality, deliberateness and metonymy received much attention. Personifications that are so conventional and automatic that we hardly notice them should not be disregarded, and the fact that an expression may not be processed as a personification or give rise to a full conceptualization should not mean that the linguistic personification is ignored. Each level of analysis yields interesting results, and more research is needed to investigate how these levels interact, especially when it comes to the comprehension, interpretation and appreciation of personification by language users. The following chapter presents an empirical study that investigated the cognitive relevance of the proposed categorization model for personification by examining the recognition of personification in fiction by non-expert readers. The following chapter will therefore add a behavioural approach to metaphor in fiction in addition to all of the semiotic analyses provided so far.
Chapter 8

Recognition of personifications in fiction by non-expert readers

*The plane climbs reluctantly, one set of wings dipping drunkenly.*

*(BNC-Baby: FAJ)*

8.1 Introduction

The previous chapter focused on methodological and empirical issues concerning the identification and analysis of personifications in fiction, resulting in a proposed categorization of four different types of personification. However, the reported linguistic, conceptual and communicative analyses of personification in fiction do not say anything about how people deal with personifications “in the real world”. As argued in Chapter 1, one major concern in contemporary metaphor research has been the reliable identification and analysis of metaphoric language in naturally occurring data rather than isolated constructed examples. The publications of MIP and MIPVU have demonstrated that an explicit and reliable procedure for linguistic metaphor identification is possible. Nevertheless, as argued previously, the application of MIPVU in the Metaphor in Discourse project revealed that the identification of personifications in authentic discourse turned out to be more complex due to its complex nature in the interaction between linguistic form, conceptual structure and communicative function.

The detailed analysis of the different forms of personification in fiction in the previous chapter resulted in a categorization model involving four different types of personification. The empirical study that will be reported in this chapter was carried out to investigate how psychologically relevant the proposed categories are in relation to what “real people” do with personifications when they read fiction. Though many experimental studies have focused on differences in processing between literal and metaphorical language (e.g., Gerrig and Healy 1983; Glucksberg et al. 1982; Inhoff et al. 1984; Ortony et al. 1978), and between novel and conventional metaphors (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008), hardly any empirical work has been done on the processing, understanding or appreciation of personifications.

Graesser et al. (1989) investigated what types of metaphors were salient to adult comprehenders when reading persuasive texts and found that personification was one of the three metaphor categories that significantly predicted metaphor recognition scores as well as “persuasive impact scores”, i.e. the number of times a metaphor was underlined as being persuasive. Low (1999) investigated the acceptability of the AN ESSAY IS A PERSON personification in student essay introductions and found that the teachers’ primary concern was to ‘limit the possibility of the essay becoming an independent agent, which would be tantamount to its becoming a second person and thus the rival of the author’ (p. 247). Low’s study also found differences in acceptability between academic essays and news articles, as the use of verbs such as be convinced and believe were considered unacceptable in combination with the subject This essay but acceptable in combination with The Guardian (p. 244).
Both studies suggest that it can be beneficial for language users to be aware of the presence and effect of personifications, and that writers can exploit them for different purposes. Yet the question remains when readers actually become aware of personifications. Moreover, experimental studies rarely use natural discourse data or stretches of connected text. The study reported in this chapter addressed both issues by focusing on the recognition of personifications in short fiction excerpts by non-expert readers (that is, they are not experts at identifying or analysing metaphor). The study tried to determine whether the proposed types of personification are all equally recognizable and whether the recognisability of the four types is further influenced by other inherent properties or external factors. This will provide insight into whether the categorization model is primarily an analytical construction that is useful for metaphor analysts or whether it also reflects differences that are recognized in “the real world”.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 offers the operationalization of the different types of personification. Section 3 describes the study. In Section 4 the issue of clustering effects is discussed, while Section 5 takes a closer look at the comments provided by the participants. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the findings of the study and offers a discussion as well as suggestions for further research.

8.2 Operationalizing personification

In the previous chapter four main types of personification were identified, which are summarized below (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 7). As the references to basic and conventional senses indicate, these four types of personification have been formulated in such a way that their linguistic identification can be based on a rigorous method such as MIP or MIPVU.

The proposed categorization model includes four different types of personification occurring in natural language data, namely:

- **Conventionalized personification**: based on a mapping between a human basic sense and a distinct non-human contextual sense that can both be found in the dictionary. An example of a conventionalized personification is the adjective obstinate. The basic sense of obstinate is ‘not willing to be reasonable and change your plans, ideas, or behaviour’ (*Macmillan* sense 1). It also has a conventionalized non-human sense in the dictionary, namely ‘difficult to remove’ (*Macmillan* sense 2), which applies to stains, as in the example *This soap will remove the most obstinate stains.*
- **Novel personification**: based on a mapping between a human basic sense that can be found in the dictionary and a novel non-human contextual sense. An example of a novel personification is the verb *to shiver* in the sentence *The pines were bowing and shivering in the wind*. The basic sense of *shiver* is ‘if you shiver, your body shakes slightly, for example because you are cold or frightened’ (*Macmillan*). In this case there are no other sense descriptions in the dictionary, and the non-human contextual sense applying to the movement of trees can therefore be considered novel.

- **Default personification**: based on a default interpretation of the basic sense as human when it can technically be interpreted as human or animate or general but a default human interpretation is favoured. This type of personification is illustrated by the definitions of the verbs *to drink* and *to climb*. For *to drink* *Macmillan* gives the sense description ‘to take liquid into your body through your mouth’ (sense 1) and for *to climb* it gives ‘to use your hands and feet to move up, over, down, or across something’ (sense 1). *Macmillan* gives no separate sense descriptions that apply to animals.

- **Personification-with-metonymy**: personification based on a violation of the selection restrictions of the basic sense caused by the replacement of a human agent or patient with a metonymically related non-human agent or patient. This type of personification is illustrated by the use of the verbs *search, telephone* and *ask* in the following examples (italics added): ‘Their eyes were searching the stacked containers’ and ‘The CND office telephoned to ask her for voluntary evening help’.

The study reported in this chapter examined whether and how these four personification types differed in recognizability, and whether their recognition was influenced by internal properties or external factors.

As is clear from the model discussed above, the main variable in this study, *personification type*, takes into account that some personifications are fully conventionalized, some are entirely novel, and some are in between, relying on either a default interpretation of the basic sense as human or on a violation of selection restrictions due to metonymic replacement of a human agent (see Chapter 7). Gentner and Bowdle (2001, 2008) and Bowdle and Gentner (2005) have shown that as metaphors become increasingly conventionalized, they are more likely to be processed by means of categorization rather than comparison due to the emergence of an abstract superordinate category that covers both the source and target term. They have called this shift in processing from comparison to categorization the “Career of Metaphor” (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008). Novel metaphors are normally processed by comparison since no abstract
category exists, while conventional metaphors are normally processed directly via categorization. As such, highly conventional metaphors usually remain “invisible” to readers, since their meanings are directly accessed.

The finding that many metaphors are in fact processed by categorization leads to what Steen (2008) has called the “Paradox of Metaphor”: ‘a lot of metaphor may not be processed metaphorically, that is, with language users activating two comparable or parallel domains and retrieving or (re)constructing a mapping between them’ (p. 220). According to Steen, this paradox can be resolved by using a three-dimensional analytical framework that does not only include linguistic form and conceptual structure but also communicative function. In Steen’s three-dimensional framework, conventional metaphors may still be processed by comparison (as metaphors) rather than categorization as long as they are used deliberately. With regard to reception, Steen argues that the metaphor will be experienced as deliberate if the reader recognizes that the metaphor has been used as such a rhetorical device which introduces a change of perspective on the target concept in context (p. 224).

Given the Career of Metaphor hypothesis (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008) and the Paradox of Metaphor (Steen 2008), it is likely that novel personifications will be recognized more often than conventional ones since novel metaphors require more processing effort and are generally read more slowly than conventional metaphors. Being in between novel and conventional, default personifications and personifications-with-metonymy are likely to be recognized more frequently than entirely conventional ones and less frequently than entirely novel ones. It is also possible that novel personifications affect the recognizability of subsequent conventional personifications since the novel personifications will require more processing effort, potentially resulting in a raised awareness for personifications.

Experiments by Gentner and associates have investigated whether extended metaphors are processed as domain mappings and found a ‘mapping consistency effect’ (e.g., Boronat 1990; Gentner and Boronat 1992; Gentner et al. 2001; Gentner and Imai 1992). However, these consistency effects only occurred when novel metaphors were used; when conventional metaphors were used there did not appear to be any cost in processing due to the shift between different metaphors (Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Gentner et al. 2001).

The same difference between novel and conventional expressions was found by Keysar et al. (2000), who found that conventional expressions did not facilitate comprehension, indicating that readers did not rely on the activation of conceptual mappings. Only when the context included novel expressions did the readers seem to rely on conceptual mappings (2000: 591). These findings suggest that the personifications in the present study may become linked in the mental imagery or
text representation of the readers and that especially the presence of extended and/or novel personifications may affect the recognition of subsequent personifications if such personifications activate conceptual mappings (in this case a personification mapping), leading to an increased awareness for personifications. This could presumably be explained as due to some awareness of metaphor deliberateness.

The present study therefore also investigated how the presence and placement of novel personifications affected the recognition of the other types of personification. In particular, it asked whether the presence of a sentence containing novel personifications early in a text “primes” the reader’s awareness of personification (i.e. does it lead to a greater sensitivity to personification) in such a way that personifications are recognized more often when they occur after this priming sentence than if before it. The assumption is that the novel personifications activate the conceptual mapping and thereby facilitate the recognition of subsequent personifications. Note, however, that the present study is concerned with conscious, post-comprehension recognition rather than unconscious processing or comprehension. Even if activation of a conceptual domain facilitates comprehension, it may not facilitate recognition.

In addition to an external influence on recognition such as the presence of a novel prime, the recognizability of the different personification types could also be influenced by other inherent properties, such as word class (verb, noun, adjective, adverb), the specific nature of the source domain (human body, character traits, movement, control) and the specific nature of the target domain (object, abstract, body, nature). The variable word class was considered a potential influence since Steen (2004) found that nominal metaphors boosted metaphor recognition while verbal metaphors decreased it, and suggests this may be due to the high imagery value of nominal metaphors, ‘nominal metaphors may be pictured more easily as deviant from real world descriptions and be recognized more frequently’ (p. 1310). This finding corresponds to the high imagery effect found for nouns by Graesser et al. (1989). As conceptual personifications can be expressed by different word classes at the linguistic level it may be that personifications realized by some word classes are more easily recognized than those expressed by other word classes.

The variable source domain consists of the values movement, character traits, the human body, and control. This variable homes in on which features of the human source domain are picked out by the personification. Personifications can be based on a comparison with the human body, human behaviour, human character traits, human emotions, human actions, types of people, and so on. It is likely that these specific features – the specific source domain within the more general encompassing “human source domain” – influence the recognizability of the personification. Since movement is more concrete than control it may be
recognized more often, though control may sometimes be more clearly human (rather than animate) than motion. The human body source domain is also concrete but may be conflated with the animal body domain and therefore potentially less recognizable as human. Conversely, human character traits are more abstract in nature but are more clearly recognizable as human.

The relevant target domain values were object, nature, body part and abstract, where object refers to concrete objects and abstract to abstract entities. The nature of the target domain, i.e. the entity actually being personified, may also have an effect on the recognizability of the personification. It may very well be that personifications of concrete entities are easier to recognize – perhaps because they can more easily be visualized – than abstract entities, and that certain target domains lend themselves better for personification than others; moreover, some target domains are more often expressed in terms of personifications (i.e. the personification of nature in literature is so frequent that it is referred to as “the pathetic fallacy”) and may therefore be more familiar or seem more natural to readers.

These three inherent properties (word class, source domain and target domain) were included in addition to the variable personification type and the priming manipulation in an attempt to answer the following research questions. Firstly, which personification types do non-expert readers find, and which of the other variables influence their recognizability? Central to this question is the issue whether novel personifications are recognized more often than conventional personifications, default personifications, and personifications-with-metonymy. Secondly, does the presence of a sentence containing highly novel personifications early in a text “prime” the reader’s awareness of personification (i.e. does it lead to a greater sensitivity to personification) in such a way that other personifications are recognized more often when they occur after this sentence than if they occur before it? If novel personifications “trigger” conscious comprehension processes and lead to mapping consistency effects, then the presence of a novel prime may raise a reader’s awareness of the presence of personifications in the text and increase the recognizability of other types of personification.

8.3 The study

Given the Career of Metaphor (Bowdle and Gentner 2005) and the Paradox of Metaphor (Steen 2008), this study assumed that the four types of personification that were identified would differ in their recognizability (i.e. how often they are recognized) due to differences in their degree of conventionalization, extension,
and marking. In addition to personification type, three other inherent properties (word class, source domain and target domain) were included to determine whether these properties increased or decreased the recognizability of specific personifications, and whether they had different effects on different types. Finally, based on the assumption that novel personifications activate conceptual mappings and thereby facilitate the recognition of other personifications, the present study investigated whether the presence of a sentence containing novel personifications early in a text “primes” the reader’s awareness of personifications (i.e. leads to a greater sensitivity to personifications) in such a way that personifications are recognized more often when they occur after this priming sentence than if before it.

The findings concerning the recognition of the different types of personification will provide insight into the cognitive relevance of the proposed categorization model. If there are significant differences in recognizability between the types, this supports the decision to treat the four types as distinct categories.

### 8.3.1 Method

An empirical study was conducted to test whether the four types of personification (novel personification, conventional personification, personification-with-metonymy, default personification) differed in their recognisability and whether this recognisability was affected by different inherent properties (personification type, word class, source domain and target domain) or by the presence of a priming sentence. This study was conducted at the Cognition and Language Lab at Northwestern University, Evanston (IL), USA, under the supervision of Dedre Gentner. The results were analysed at VU University Amsterdam in consultation with Gerard Steen and Gerben Mulder.

**Subjects**

Sixty undergraduate students from the participant pool of the Cognition and Language Lab participated in the study for credits towards their course requirements.

**Materials**

Three fragments were selected from the texts in the annotated fiction sample used in the Metaphor in Discourse project. The selected fragments were taken from BNC-Baby texts BMW, C8T and FAJ. As discussed in Chapter 2, these texts were classified as contemporary British novels belonging to the imaginative domain.
The selected fragments were between 200 – 260 words long and were left intact as much as possible to ensure that they read naturally and the personifications fitted the context.

A total of 73 words in these three text fragments was identified as being metaphorically used on the basis of MIPVU. Of these 73 metaphor-related words, a total of 32 words were subsequently identified as personifications, on the basis of the operationalization of personification given above. These personifications were distributed as follows: 16 in Text 1; 5 in Text 2; and 11 in Text 3. Text 2 contained a very small number of personifications to act as a kind of neutralizing “filler” text between texts 1 and 3. It was decided that there would not be a text without any personifications because this could have distracted, confused or annoyed the participants since they were specifically instructed to look for personifications. The distribution of the four types of personifications was as follows: 10 novel personifications, 11 default personifications, 9 conventional personifications and 2 personifications-with-metonymy. The low number of personifications-with-metonymy is due to fact that the texts were not manipulated to include specific types of personifications.

In addition to the personifications, a number of “attractor items” was identified, i.e. words that were not personifications according to the procedure but were likely to be recognized as personifications by the participants if they are “attracted” by the novel primes. The attractors may appear to be personifications due to similarities in form or function with the actual personifications. For instance, a specific noun may take two modifying adjectives, one of which is an attractor and one a personification. For example, in ‘the warm and friendly sun’, only friendly is a personification, not warm. Or a specific subject may be related to two verbs, one verb being a personification and one an attractor, as in the phrase ‘the plane lurches and bounces’, in which lurches is a personification and bounces an attractor. The recognition of these attractors would count as “understandable” rather than “incorrect”.

One important issue was that highly novel personifications could affect the recognizability of subsequent conventional personifications since the novel ones would require more processing effort, possibly resulting in a raised awareness for personifications. To balance this effect, the texts were offered in two versions, with the highly novel personifications occurring either at the beginning of the text (an “early” placement) or the end of the text (a “late” placement). Text 1 and Text 3 were manipulated for this early versus late placement of a priming sentence. The priming sentence contained two personifications that were both highly novel. In the remainder of this paper these four highly novel personifications will be called the “primes”. Aside from this early versus late placement of the sentence containing the primes, the texts were completely identical. In the remainder of this paper the
early-late prime placement manipulation will be referred to as the variable “placement”.

The filler text, Text 2, was not manipulated for placement, and was always the second text. As mentioned before, it contained a very low number of personifications to act as a kind of neutralizer between the two manipulated texts. The order of the early-late placement manipulation and the order in which texts 1 and 3 were given were both counterbalanced. In total, there were four different versions of the experiment; there were sixty subjects in total, with fifteen subjects randomly assigned to each version. Below is Text 1 in the early placement condition (i.e. with the sentence containing the primes appearing early in the text); the primes are given in capital letters, the personifications in bold and the attractor items in italics. A full overview of the texts in each condition is given in Appendix B. Appendix C provides an overview of the personifications and attractor items per text, including the classification of the personifications based on the proposed model as well as the classification of the attractor items as based on MIPVU.

He was driving now across the open headland towards the fringe of pine trees which bordered the North Sea. The only house to his left was the old Victorian rectory, a square, red-brick, UNCOMPROMISING building, incongruous behind its BELLIGERENT hedge of rhododendron and laurel. To his right the ground rose gently towards the southern cliffs and he could see the dark mouth of an army shelter, undemolished since the war, and great stumps of wave-battered concrete, remnants of the old fortifications which lay half-submerged in the sand along part of the beach. The road he was on, veering left, would eventually lead to the station but was, he knew, seldom used since normal traffic and all heavy vehicles used the new access road to the north. The headland was empty and almost bare. A few straggling trees, distorted by the wind, struggled to keep their precarious hold in the arid soil. On his previous visits to Larksoken he had seen Martyr's Cottage spread out beneath him from the small top window under the cone of the mill. But he had never been closer to it than the road and now, driving up to it, it struck him again that the description ‘cottage’ was hardly appropriate.

**Procedure**

The participants were given a booklet that contained a short introduction, instructions and the three texts. The introduction explained what a metaphor is and that personification is a type of metaphor. It also gave six examples of
personifications, which were specifically chosen not to correspond to the actual personifications in the texts. The participants were told that they would be reading three fragments of contemporary fiction. They were instructed to circle any words they considered involved in setting up personifications and to write down any comments or unknown words. It was emphasized that they could circle individual words or stretches of text, to signal that several words were “working together” to set up a personification. They were also asked to write down any comments on how the personification worked and what it added to their interpretation of the text. The instructions stressed that participants should read as normally as possible and should therefore read the texts in one go and not go back to change their decisions. The introduction and instructions are given in Appendix D.

8.3.2 Results and discussion

Recognition of personifications, attractors, and false alarms

The three fragments together contained 672 words, 32 of which were pre-identified as personifications and 20 as attractor items. The minimum number of personifications circled by the participants was 3, the maximum 19 (out of 32), with an average number of recognized personifications of 11.42 (standard deviation 3.27). The minimum number of attractor recognitions was 0, the maximum 11 (out of 20), with an average of 2.88 (standard deviation 2.31). This suggests that even though the participants were specifically looking for personifications, they did not suddenly “see them everywhere”. In fact, as the Career of Metaphor hypothesis (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008) predicts, participants did not seem highly aware of the personifications, most likely because most of them were conventional.

Table 8.1 below presents the number of personifications, attractors and false alarms recognized by the 60 participants taken together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of recognitions</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personifications (N = 1920)</td>
<td>685 (35.7%)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractor items (N = 1200)</td>
<td>173 (14.4%)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False alarms (N= 37200)</td>
<td>788 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.1 shows that the personifications had a 36% chance of being recognized. This chance is much lower for the attractors (14%) and especially the false alarms (2%), though the standard deviation for personifications is much larger, indicating considerable differences in the number of personification recognitions. The percentages in Table 8.1 also show that there are very few false positive recognitions, that is, very few words were recognized as personifications while they should not have been because they were not personifications according to the procedure.

However, there was a considerable percentage of false negatives, that is, words that should have been recognized as personifications but were not, namely 64.3%. This shows that the participants found less than half of the personifications in the three texts, but the ones they found were predominantly “correct” (i.e. the ones that should be recognized based on the procedure). The differences in recognition between the three groups differed significantly ($F (2, 45.33) = 32.42, p < 0.001$). The personifications were recognized significantly more often than both the attractor items and the false alarms. Additionally, the attractor items were recognized significantly more often than the false alarms; this reflects the fact that linguistic categories such as personification and metaphor are often not clear dichotomies but rather scales with clear examples at the extreme ends and borderline cases in between.

Table 8.2 presents the total recognitions in the early placement condition and the late placement condition. This analysis only includes the recognitions in Text 1 and Text 3, since the filler text (Text 2) was not manipulated for placement. In total, there were 12420 words in these two texts, 810 of which were personifications and 540 attractor items.

Table 8.2 Total number of recognitions of personifications, attractor items and false alarms for early placement versus late placement condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of recognitions</th>
<th>Standard deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early placement</td>
<td>Late placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personifications (N = 810)</td>
<td>267 (33.0%)</td>
<td>289 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractor items (N = 540)</td>
<td>74 (13.7%)</td>
<td>68 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False alarms (N = 11070)</td>
<td>289 (2.6%)</td>
<td>292 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 shows that slightly more personifications were recognized in the late placement condition (35.7% versus 33.0%), while slightly more attractor items were recognized in the early placement condition (13.7% versus 12.6%). The percentage of false alarms recognized is identical in the two conditions (2.6%). The standard deviations are almost identical between the two placement conditions. To
investigate whether the placement condition significantly affected the recognition of personifications a subsequent mixed model analysis was carried out, which will be reported in the following section.

**The influence of prime placement on the recognition of personifications**

As the placement of the priming sentence was the main manipulation in this study, the possible effect of this prime on the recognition scores will be discussed first. The question was whether the presence of a novel personification early in the text would prime the reader’s awareness of personifications and lead to a higher number of recognitions than if this prime occurs late in the text. A mixed model analysis was carried out in SPSS to analyse the influence of priming on the recognition of the personifications. Individual participants (N=60) and individual personifications (N=32) were both included as crossed random variables. The simultaneous inclusion of participants as well as items as random variables allows for the results to be generalized to both the population of participants and the population of items at the same time. The dependent variable was whether a personification was recognized or not (recognition score 0 = no and 1 = yes).

In addition to the placement variable (text with an “early” or “late” prime sentence), the personifications were also all classified according to their conventionality (“conventional” or “unconventional”). Unconventional is used rather than novel since only the primes were selected to be novel. Default personifications and personifications-with-metonymy count as unconventional, since these personified senses are not fully conventionalized as such in the dictionaries, i.e. they do not have separate entries in the dictionary. Lastly, the personifications were classified according to their position with regard to the two novel primes. The personifications could appear before the primes, after the primes, or be the primes themselves (the primes were also personifications). Therefore, there were three possible positions: “before prime”, “after prime”, and “prime”.

Since the primes were specifically selected to be novel, the combination of “position=prime” with “conventionality=unconventional” was not possible. Since Text 2, the filler text, was not manipulated for placement, only Text 1 and Text 3 were included in the following analyses concerning the placement manipulation. In total, there were 10 possible combinations of the variables placement (early versus late placement of the primes), position in relation to the primes (before the prime; prime; after the prime) and conventionality (conventional versus unconventional). Table 8.3 shows the mean recognition score per combination of placement, position and conventionality.
Table 8.3 Recognition score per combination of placement, position and conventionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination of variables (placement and position)</th>
<th>Recognition score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early – before prime</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early – prime*</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early – after prime</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late – before prime</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late – prime*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late – after prime</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primes were always novel so there are no scores for prime + conventional

Table 8.3 shows that for each combination of placement and position, the mean recognition score for any combination with unconventional was always higher than its equivalent with conventional. It also shows that – disregarding the primes – all combinations with unconventional had similar recognition scores (33%; 35%; 32%; 39%) as did all the combinations with conventional (22%; 23%; 26%; 28%). Finally, Table 8.3 shows that the two prime positions scored considerably higher than all of the other combinations (which was to be expected since only the primes were novel) and that this score was roughly the same for the early and late placement (69% and 67%). This indicates that regardless of the priming placement the unconventional personifications were clearly in between the conventional personifications on the one hand and the novel personifications on the other. It also shows that the novel personifications were most recognizable and that this high recognizability did not depend on their position in the text (i.e. at the beginning or end).

A mixed model analysis in SPSS showed that the mean recognition scores for these ten combinations differed significantly ($F(9, 58.85) = 2.05, p < .05$). Planned contrasts were used to further investigate these differences. Subsequent T-tests revealed that the recognition of personifications did not differ significantly between the early and late version of the texts ($t(1577.96) = -0.724, p = .469$), indicating that whether the priming sentence containing the two novel personifications occurred early or late in the texts did not influence the recognition scores of the other personifications in the texts. That is, participants did not recognize more personifications if they had encountered the novel primes early in the texts. The novel personifications did not boost the recognition of other personifications in the text.

A main effect was found for position ($F(2, 21.06) = 6.125, p < .01, r = 0.6$). There was a significant difference between the recognition of personifications before the primes and the primes themselves: ($t(13.435) = 2.947, p < .05$) and 328
there was a significant difference between the recognition of personifications after the primes and the primes themselves ($t(11.784) = 3.452, p < .01$). This shows that the novel primes were recognized more often than both personifications occurring before them and personifications occurring after them. However, the recognition scores of the personifications before the primes did not differ significantly from the recognition scores after the primes ($t < 1$), that is, personifications occurring after the novel primes were not recognized more often than those occurring before the primes. This shows that participants recognized the novel personifications most of all but they did not recognize more personifications after they had encountered a novel personification.

There was no ordering effect for texts 1 and 3 ($F(1, 25.011) = 0.367, p = .55$), indicating that there was no learning effect between the first and last text, i.e. participants did not recognize more personifications if a text was offered as the last text rather than the first. There was also no interaction between the texts and the early versus late prime condition ($F(1, 50.401) = 0.907, p = .345$). There was a significant effect for conventionality when the novel primes were included ($t(25.13) = -2.488, p < .05$), but not when the primes were excluded ($t(23.93) = -1.182, p = .249$). This means that the novel personifications were recognized significantly more often than the conventional personifications, but the unconventional personifications were not recognized significantly more often than the conventional personifications. No two-way interaction was found between position and conventionality ($t(449.209) = -0.097, p = .923$), between position and prime condition ($t(1588.696) = 0.699, p = .485$ and $t(1586.007) = 0.977, p = .329$), or between conventionality and prime condition ($t(893.233) = 0.128, p = .898$). No three-way interaction was found between position, conventionality and prime condition ($t(1562.528) = -0.347, p = .729$).

**The influence of other structural properties on personification recognition**

The personifications included in this study varied considerably in structural properties. They belonged to different word classes (*adverb, adjective, noun, verb*), had different source domains (*movement, control, human body, character traits*) and different target domains (*concrete, abstract, body part, nature*), and most importantly, they were classified as being different types of personifications (*novel, conventional, personification-with-metonymy, default personification*). As *personification type* reflects a personification’s conventionality, it was expected that this variable would be the most influential.

Table 8.4 below presents the total combined recognition scores (out of 60 participants) for each individual personification item in the three different texts.
The percentages in Table 8.4 reveal that there were considerable differences in the recognition of the individual items, with the lowest percentage being only 2% (recognized by only one out of the sixty participants) and the highest 80% (recognized by 48 out of 60 participants). This suggests that some personifications...
are indeed more recognizable than others. A logistic regression analysis was carried out in MLwiN to investigate whether the four item properties discussed above could predict which personifications are more recognizable. This analysis disregarded text order and priming placement since no significant effects were found for these factors.

The statistical software package MLwiN fits multilevel models using both maximum likelihood estimation and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. Four different models were compared in a stepwise logistic regression using backward elimination. The full model (Model 3) contained all four of the item characteristics, the empty model none (Model 0). MLwiN assigns each model a Deviance Information Criterion (DIC), with smaller values indicating a better model. Starting from the full model, each step involved the elimination of one variable that did not contribute significantly to the model (critical value for chi square = 7.815). Model 1 retained the only two significantly contributing variables: source domain and personification type. Both participant and item were included as random factors simultaneously, so the findings can be generalized to both the population of participants and the population of items simultaneously.

The results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 8.5. Since a logistic model was used, the reported beta weights range from \(-\infty\) to \(+\infty\) rather than from 0 – 1 (where 0 = not recognized, 1 = recognized). A significant positive beta weight in the table indicates that the chance of personifications with that value being recognized as a personification increases (i.e. a bigger chance of being recognized); a significant negative beta weight indicates that the chance of being recognized as a personification decreases (i.e. a smaller chance of being recognized). Chi squares are given for each factor included in the model, indicating the overall significance for any specific factor, i.e. target domain, source domain, word class, and personification type, taking all of its values together (critical value at alpha .05 = 9.488). Standard errors are presented between brackets. Both participants and items were included as random factors so that the results can be generalized to both the population of participants and the population of items simultaneously.

A comparison of the four models presented in Table 8.5 shows that the Deviance Information Criterion values (indicating how well the model fits the data) were very similar for all four models, ranging from 1837.006 in the empty model to 1833.210 for Model 2, and that the differences between the full model (with all four variables) and the model with only the two significantly contributing variables (Model 1) were small. Models 1 and 2 had a DIC of 1833, indicating that these two models fit the data slightly better than both the full model (1834) and the empty model (1837).
Table 8.5 Overview of models for logistic regression analysis of item properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed factors</th>
<th>Model 0</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.911</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>2.779</td>
<td>2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td>(0.436)</td>
<td>(0.605)</td>
<td>(0.983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target domain

\[ \chi^2 = 1.687 \]

- Object versus nature: 0.526 (0.491)
- Object versus body: 0.273 (0.677)
- Object versus abstract: -0.352 (0.866)

Word class

\[ \chi^2 = 6.409 \]

- Adverb versus verb: -1.342 (0.789) -1.251 (0.889)
- Adverb versus noun: -0.429 (0.669) -0.086 (0.860)
- Adverb versus adjective: -1.382 (0.614) -1.470 (0.680)

Source domain

\[ \chi^2 = 41.472 \]

- Movement versus character trait: -3.207 (0.534) -2.964 (0.526) -2.806 (0.515)
- Movement versus body: -1.945 (0.543) -2.343 (0.704) -2.478 (0.792)

Personification type

\[ \chi^2 = 15.646 \]

- Metonymy versus default: -2.179 (0.465) -2.625 (0.971) -2.436 (0.709)
- Metonymy versus conventional: 0.426 (0.498) -0.239 (0.706) -0.257 (0.686)

Random factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 0</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item variance</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant variance</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1837.006</th>
<th>1833.291</th>
<th>1833.210</th>
<th>1834.721</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Moreover, the unexplained item variance in the empty model was 3.128 while the other three models had an item variance between 0.902 and 0.961, meaning that these models accounted for 30% of the item variance. The full model had the lowest item variance, but the factors word class and target domain did not contribute significantly to the model (chi squares below critical value). The model containing only the two significant factors source domain and personification type (Model 1) was the most efficient model with the best combination of DIC, variance and number of variables included. Using Model 1, two-thirds of the variance between the items can be explained using only two variables. Unlike the item variance, the variance between participants remained constant across all four models, ranging from 0.254 in the empty model to 0.267 in Models 1 and 2. This shows that while there are considerable differences between the different items, the differences between the participants are relatively small and constant.

The differences between the different values of each factor can also be considered (df = 1; critical value at alpha .05 = 3.841). For the variable personification type, the beta weights showed that the novel personifications were recognized most often but not significantly more than the personifications-with-metonymy. The default personifications were recognized less often than the personifications-with-metonymy; the conventional personifications were recognized least of all. Novel personifications were recognized significantly more often than default personifications ($\chi^2 = 5.571$) and conventional personifications ($\chi^2 = 17.454$), but not than personifications-with-metonymy ($\chi^2 = 0.565$). Personifications-with-metonymy were recognized significantly more often than default personifications ($\chi^2 = 4.309$) and conventional personifications ($\chi^2 = 19.116$). Default personifications were recognized significantly more often than conventional personifications ($\chi^2 = 5.716$).

These results shows that there is a clear cline from novel to conventional, with personifications-with-metonymy and default personifications in the middle. It is interesting that the personifications-with-metonymy do not differ significantly from the novel personifications. This could suggest that although a metonymic relation is also involved, the participants were still aware of the possibility of a personification interpretation. Unlike the default personifications, which behave more like the conventional personifications, the personifications-with-metonymy behave more like novel personifications and are therefore a potentially interesting area for further research.

For the variable source domain, personifications based on the source domain movement were recognized most, but not significantly more so than those based on character traits. The next source domain was human body, and the least recognized source domain was control. Movement personifications were recognized
significantly more often than body personifications ($\chi^2 = 12.827$) and control personifications ($\chi^2 = 36.023$), but not character personifications ($\chi^2 = 2.216$). Character personifications were recognized significantly more often than control personifications ($\chi^2 = 17.476$) but not body personifications ($\chi^2 = 3.228$). Lastly, body personifications were recognized significantly more often than control personifications ($\chi^2 = 3.945$).

There is some overlap between the variable source domain and the variable word class here since movement and control mostly apply to verbs (e.g., lurch and keep), while character traits usually applies to adjectives and adverbs (e.g., dismissive and drunkenly) and human body to nouns (e.g., mouth). However, source domain contributed significantly to the model while word class did not.

A follow-up experiment that carefully balances all word classes and source domains would be required to determine precisely how this effect works. However, the outline of a cline can be seen from the concrete source domain movement, which was recognized most, to the abstract source domain control, which was recognized least. This result may be related to the influence of imagery and visualization, since concrete phenomena are easier to visualize and may therefore be easier to recognize. The difference between character traits and human body may in part be caused by a conventionality effect, since most of the human-body personifications were highly conventionalized (e.g., mouth) while many of the character-trait personifications were novel (e.g., drunkenly), though not necessarily (e.g., gently). A more carefully balanced sample would again help determine whether the observed tendencies represent genuine effects.

8.4 Clustering effects in recognition

It has been noted by researchers working on the identification of metaphor in natural discourse that metaphors have the potential to “attract” each other or affect each other’s interpretation retroactively. In the current study, the instructions given to the participants allowed them to circle any words they wanted, either individually or in combination. As a result, participants sometimes circled personifications in single units (i.e. alone) and sometimes in multiple units (i.e. together with other words).

Of the 685 recognized personifications 261 were circled individually and 424 – over half as many – were circled in combination with other words. Some words were circled almost as often individually as in combination while other words, while others showed a clear preference. For example, Text 1 contained the sentence: A few straggling trees, distorted by the wind, struggled to keep their
precarious hold in the arid soil. The personification keep was circled 13 times but exclusively in multiword units, never individually. In the same sentence hold was circled 22 times, 18 of which in multiword units. Struggled, on the other hand, was circled more often as an individual unit (34 times) than in combination (14 times), and straggling is divided evenly (11 versus 12). This suggests that straggling and struggled were clearer personifications to the readers, and that keep and hold did not have a strong personifying effect on their own but mostly worked in combination with the surrounding words, potentially being “attracted” or drawn into the personification due to the presence of struggled.

The combinations straggling trees and precarious hold illustrate another finding, namely that participants often circled functional combinations, for example adjective+noun (straggling trees), verb+adverb (climbed reluctantly), verb+DirectObject (turned a somersault), Subject+verb (plane lurches), etc. In most cases, the combinations include the verb, adjective or adverb that sets up the personification on the one hand, and the noun that identifies the entity being personified on the other, for example dismissive hand and ground rose gently. In these examples, the words dismissive, rose and gently set up the personification while the hand and ground are the entities personified.

Interestingly, when circling individually participants almost always circled the word setting up the personification (expressed by an adjective or verb) not the entity being personified (expressed by a noun). This suggests that although personification is traditionally discussed as an ENTITY IS PERSON mapping, usually constructed as a NOUN A IS NOUN B formulation, participants notice the personification in the tension between constituents at the linguistic level. That is, even though the plane climbs reluctantly personifies the plane, participants circle climbs and reluctantly. This may in part be due to the fact that the instructions talked about words that “set up personifications”, but the wealth of multiword recognitions including the entity personified suggests that participants were aware of both elements. Examples of this influence are the verb dips in it [= plane] dips its wings in acknowledgement of the landing strip (circled 6 times individually but 29 times in combination), the adverb gently in the expression the ground rose gently (rose was circled 13 times individually and 21 times in combination, while gently was circled only 3 times individually but 16 times in combination), and both somersault and turned in the expression Paula’s stomach turned a somersault (both were circled 44 times in combination, somersault only 4 times in isolation and turned only once).

These results show that personification types involving a tension between the subject and the verb or between a verb and its direct object may be more likely to be recognized as personifications. This supports the decision to take such information into consideration in a categorization of different types of...
personification. The influence of argument roles on the recognition of personifications provides an interesting topic for further research. The frequent recognition of multi-word units suggests that grammatical information concerning argument roles reflects psychologically relevant distinctions. It also suggests that a word-based recognition procedure and a vehicle-based recognition procedure, such as Cameron (2003), may have complementary roles to fulfil as single-word units may not reflect how people understand personifications during the reading process.

8.5 Participant comments

The participants were also instructed to comment on their decisions, indicating how the personifications work or what they add to the text. Only four participants did not write down any comments. The other participants often formulated their decisions in terms of what counts as human or in terms of what entities can and cannot do. For example, one participant remarked that “Most of the words are describing the plane in humanlike emotions or actions, for instance the plane climbs reluctantly”, and another wrote that “Ground cannot move, roads either. The action verbs used to emphasize a setting’s characteristics are personifications. Also, though trees may have movement, they cannot have intention and thus cannot ‘struggle’”.

A number of participants commented on the fact that the personifications in Text 3 work by assigning actions that take place in the text to the plane rather than the pilot, making it seem as if the plane is a conscious being acting on its own and in control of its actions: ‘The words that set up personification in this story are all verbs that the plane adapts. A plane can’t really “dip” or “climb reluctantly”. Rather, it is the pilot directing these actions’. This shows once again that participants apparently have no problems with having a metonymy reading and a personification reading alongside each other, and that the metonymy reading does not negate the personification reading. Some participants even indicated that they believed this to be a deliberate stylistic device used by the author: ‘I circled instances where I felt the author was describing the plane’s actions as if it came from the plane’s decisions, rather than from the pilot’s decisions’. Just as participants felt that ascribing actions to the plane rather than the pilot counts as personification, they also did not seem to have problems with other personifications-with-metonymy such as vehicles used the road and dismissive hand: ‘Vehicles using something – usually the people in the vehicles do that’ and ‘Dismissive hand – character to hand’.
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Only a few participants focused on retrieving the “literal meaning” of the personifications, or on what the personifications infer or imply: ‘Ground rose really just means there was a hill. Gathers speed – speed isn’t actually gathered like you would gather berries, it means the plane sped up’ and ‘Uncompromising implies that the building is personally being difficult on purpose; Heavy vehicles use of road implies the vehicles themselves consciously choose that road’. Most participants, however, focused on describing what the effect or function of the personification was. The described functions fall into four main categories: to create imagery/visual effect; to evoke emotions/atmosphere; to aid understanding; and to provide insight into entities in story.

The largest number of comments had to do with the visual effect of personifications, and their function to create a mental image or add detail to descriptions: ‘The personifications add detail, imagery and characteristics to the text. They helped me visualize the passing scenery’ and ‘In saying the wings tilted drunkenly, we are supposed to get a mental image of the wings being unstable as like one is unstable when drunk’. In relation to this function of creating images, many participants referred to the fact that personifications make the imagery more vivid: ‘The personifications used to describe the motions of the plane make the whole picture more vivid’. This function relates to the concreteness of the source domain, which was shown to influence the recognisability of personifications. Studies by Gibbs (2006b) suggest that embodied simulation may play an important role in how readers deal with personifications during the reading process. These studies showed that readers make sense of narratives and the conventional metaphors in them by imagining what it must be like to perform the described activities. This can be seen in the remark by the participant that the plane is ‘as like one is unstable when drunk’, which suggests that the reader imagined what a drunk person would look like and how he would move and behave.

As such embodied simulations are inherently performed from the perspective of the human body, it makes sense that the simulation process creates a sense of personification even for conventional personifications such as ‘the plane climbs’ and ‘the ground rose’, as well as examples such as ‘the lamps seemed to give no light’ discussed in Chapter 7. When readers encounter such descriptions, they may easily form mental images of what people would look like if they were performing the described activities or if they had the described characteristics, in which case the resulting personification is closely related to the function of image metaphors (e.g., Crisp 1996; Gibbs and Bogdonovich 1999; Gleason 2009; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989). Gibbs and Bogdonovich (1999) point out that such image metaphors may involve the mapping of concrete, detailed mental images rather than more general cognitive knowledge. This may be part of the reason why some personifications may be clear from the perspective of their communicative function.
or their cognitive representation while at the same time being extremely difficult to write out as detailed correspondences and mappings in the conceptual structure of the metaphor, as was argued in Chapter 7.

Another function the participants identified was to add emotion to or evoke a certain atmosphere in the text: ‘Descriptions of buildings and landscaping take on human characteristics. The scene appears very ominous, hostile, and hopeless. Even the plants appear angry and are not afraid to “leave” one another behind’. This may be an indication of the reason why the source domain character traits was recognized almost as often as movement. Human emotions are central to our own lives and they allow us to imagine how we would feel in the described situations or how we would react. This sense of aiding understanding and making it easier to relate to objects when they are described in human terms was also often commented on: ‘Personifying helps reader relate better to objects/scenes; gives better understanding/description’ and ‘These personifications do a great job of illustrating the flight of the plane by using words every human is familiar with so we can relate better to it’.

The necessity of people to be able to relate to things may be one reason why personification is such a basic principle in our language, and why so many personifications are highly conventionalized or occur by default. The participants also noticed that personifications can be used to reveal something about how a character feels – ‘Hands themselves aren’t dismissive but it gives us a sense of Mme’s air and manner’ – or how a character perceives the personified entities: ‘Again, as an inanimate object, the building is not uncompromising, nor is the hedge belligerent but these adjectives illustrate how the building and hedge seem to “him” by giving them human traits’. And although it has generally been assumed that personifications identify specific types of people such as an enemy, thief or reaper (Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989), only two comments referred to a specific type of person. Interestingly, both refer to the same personification, namely stomach turned a somersault: ‘Stomachs don’t do (physically) somersaults, but it would be funny to think of our innards as a limber gymnast’ and ‘Paula’s stomach is like an acrobat, turning a somersault’.

These results correspond to Steen’s (1994) findings from his underlining and think aloud studies on different processing categories. Steen (1994: 142) found that during literary reading participants built contexts in terms of author intentions more often than in non-literary reading, that they explicitly identified metaphors more often, and that they expressed their judgment about literary metaphors more repeatedly. Similarly, studies by Gibbs et al. (1991) in which participants read metaphoric, literal and anomalous comparisons showed that the participants rated the metaphoric comparisons as more meaningful when they thought that they had been written by famous 20th-century poets than when they thought they had been
written by a computer program. This indicates that ‘the mere mention of an implied, and anonymous, author influences the interpretation of metaphor’ (p. 26). The comments provided by the participants in the present study support the claim by Steen (1994) that explicit recognition and explicit appreciation play a central role in literary reading. Most of the comments provided concerned these two processes. Steen argues that both of these processes ‘can be taken as concrete evidence for argument that literary text processing favours subjectivity, awareness of fictionality, and orientation to form’ (p. 143). It is likely that the participants felt the need to explicitly comment on rhetorical or poetic effects and relate these to author intentions due to the fact that they knew they were reading literary fiction.

Another similarity between the participant comments and verbalizations in Steen’s study and the comments provided by the participants in the present study is that neither commented on structural relationships or related the metaphors to underlying analogies. This supports Steen’s claim that analogizing pertains to unconscious and automatic comprehension rather than interpretative reasoning (p. 125). In both Steen’s studies and the present study the comments provided by the participants reflect the different kinds of processing that occur after the “click of comprehension” has taken place (see Gibbs 1994; Gibbs and Gerrig 1989). These comments indicate that the processes involved in unconscious comprehension stages and those involved in conscious post-comprehension stages may be very different and that both can reveal interesting – and complementary – information on the nature and (perceived) function of personification.

8.6 General discussion and conclusions

The findings of this exploratory study suggest several interesting tendencies that provide useful starting points for further research. The finding that there were no significant differences between the recognitions in the early-placement condition versus the late-placement condition suggests that the early placement of a priming sentence containing novel personifications did not boost the recognition of personifications. Whether the priming sentence occurred early or late in the texts did not influence the total number of personification recognitions in the texts. That is, participants did not recognize more personifications if they had encountered novel personifications at the beginning of the text. After seeing a novel personification participants apparently do not suddenly become more aware of personifications or become more likely to recognize attractor items.

Participants recognized the novel primes significantly more often than the personifications occurring either before or after these primes. However,
personifications occurring after the novel primes were not recognized more often than those occurring before the primes, suggesting that there is no spill-over recognition effect after seeing novel personifications. That is, participants did not recognize more personifications after they had encountered a novel personification. The number of recognitions was also not influenced by the order in which the texts were received, suggesting that the recognition of personifications is also not influenced by a cumulative effect, i.e. participants do not see more personifications in the last text than in the first. There appears to be no learning effect that makes participants recognize more personifications in the last text they see than in the first one. Together with the finding that priming did not boost recognition, this suggests that there is no recognition effect across sentence or text boundaries.

However, both the absence of an early-late priming effect and the absence of a before-after position effect may be due to the specific nature of this study, as the use of natural data makes such effects harder to discern. More carefully constrained and manipulated stimuli may be needed to investigate these effects. Additionally, there may be differences in reading times, which could not be detected using the current pen-and-paper set-up, but which could be revealed when participants read from a computer screen. This would also prevent them from re-reading sentences, though both situations entail once again moving away from how readers normally read. The comparison between the different priming conditions did reveal a conventionality effect: unconventional personifications were recognized more often than conventional ones, but primarily when the unconventional ones were novel, i.e. the primes. The novel primes were recognized significantly more often than either the unconventional personifications or the conventional personifications.

The regression analysis also indicated an effect of conventionality, as one significant factor was personification type. The regression analysis showed that novel personifications were recognized most often, though not significantly more than the personifications-with-metonymy. The default personifications were recognized less often than the personifications-with-metonymy and the conventional personifications were recognized least often. This suggests that there is a cline from novel personifications to conventional personifications, with personifications-with-metonymy and default personifications in the middle. This in-between status of the latter two types can be interpreted in the light of the fact that they are not fully conventionalized, i.e. they do not have separate senses in the dictionary, but they are not entirely novel either.

The finding that the personifications-with-metonymy did not differ significantly from the novel personifications suggested that although a metonymic relation was involved, the participants were still aware of the possibility of a personification interpretation. Unlike the default personifications, which behaved
more like the conventional personifications, the personifications-with-metonymy behaved more like novel personifications and are therefore a potentially interesting area for further research. However, since not all categories were fully crossed in the study, there may be other influences at work here and a more extensive and carefully balanced sample would have to be used before any real conclusions can be drawn. The findings do suggest that the differences between the proposed categories reflect differences that are psychologically relevant.

The source domain variable showed that personifications based on the source domain movement were recognized most often, though not significantly more so than those based on character traits. The next most recognized source domain was the human body, and the least recognized source domain control. These observed tendencies serve as another interesting starting point for further research, particularly studies that more carefully separate the variables source domain and word class to see which has the clearest influence on recognisability. There are some indications that the concreteness of the source domain plays a role, as the concrete domain movement was recognized most and the abstract domain control least. This tendency could be related to the influence of imagery and visualization, since concrete phenomena are easier to visualize and therefore potentially easier to recognize as personifications. The difference between character traits and the human body in the current study may in part have been caused by a conventionality effect, since most of the human-body personifications were highly conventionalized (e.g., mouth) while the character-traits personifications were mostly novel (e.g., drunkenly), though not necessarily so (e.g., gently).

The multiword recognitions suggested that participants took grammatical information about typical argument structures into consideration when looking for personifications and that personifications are not always attributable to individual words. It was often a combination of words that seemed to make participants aware that something was happening in the sentence that could be classified as personification but they did not necessarily pinpoint the “exact location” of this personification. The number of multiword recognitions suggests that there could be spill-over effects within sentences, making it hard to pinpoint exact words that set up personifications. Moreover, when single words were circled, participants circled the source domain element, not the target domain element, that is, they usually circled verbs, adjectives and adverbs rather than nouns.

The comments provided by the participants suggested that they felt quite strongly about the function and effect of the personifications they recognized, even though they found less than half of the personifications in the texts. The functions they mentioned seem closely related to people’s perception of the function of literature, e.g., their comments emphasized imagery, visualization, vividness, emotions and atmosphere. This suggests that they were very aware of the poetic
and aesthetic effect personifications can have, or perhaps even that they assumed this should be so. This clearly relates to the results of studies on the relation between literary reading, discourse context and reader expectations: the literary discourse context influences the expectations of the reader and the way the text is read and these literary reading strategies boost attention to metaphor (Gibbs et al. 1991; Steen 1994; Zwaan 1994). It would be interesting to see if participants gave different interpretations when looking for personifications in news texts or academic discourse, as Low (1999) also found acceptability differences between genres. The many comments about personifications being an aid in understanding or relating to the story are clearly linked to MacKay’s (1986) claim that people naturally take humans as a default source domain, since we can more easily understand the world around us in terms of how people think, feel and behave. The notion of embodied simulation (Gibbs 2006b) may help to explain why personification is such a basic and automatic mechanism, as embodied simulations necessarily start from the perspective of the human body.

It should of course also be noted that this study was only concerned with post-comprehension recognition, and that the materials may not have been manipulated or controlled carefully enough to detect genuine effects. In a more controlled setting, for instance when reading sentence by sentence on a computer screen without the possibility of going back in the text, different effects may be found. Moreover, nothing can as yet be said about effects on processing speed. Nevertheless, the findings of the current study do provide some interesting starting points for further research, and offer a first glimpse of what “real” readers do when they are asked to find personifications in natural discourse. It is interesting that the findings suggest that the recognition of personifications in a relatively normal reading setting seems impervious to any priming or learning effects, and that there are such considerable differences between items while the differences between participants are relatively small. This suggests that the recognisability of personifications in discourse is determined by inherent properties rather than external influences, and that the proposed categorization model of the four different types of personification offers useful distinctions when identifying and analysing personifications in authentic discourse.
The headland was empty and almost bare, the few straggling trees, distorted by the wind, struggled to keep their precarious hold in the uncompromising soil.

(BNC-Baby: C8T)
9.1 Introduction

Throughout this thesis a myriad of definitions, acronyms, examples, statistical information and qualitative data has been presented. This rather technical and methodological approach to metaphor in fiction may have struck researchers working on metaphor in literary texts from more traditional literary-critical approaches as somewhat overwhelming, perhaps even beside the point. This final chapter hopes to make clear what exactly has been gained from constructing, annotating and analysing the fiction corpus the way it was done in the *Metaphor in Discourse* project, and how this perhaps unusual approach to metaphor in literary texts has yielded exciting new insights.

This chapter will first summarize the main findings of this thesis in relation to the research aims as outlined in the Introduction (Section 9.2). First the three-dimensional approach taken to analysing metaphor in discourse will be discussed (9.2.1), as well as the corpus-linguistic approach taken to analysing metaphor in literature (9.2.2). Section 9.2.3 will then discuss the MIPVU procedure (as presented in Chapter 3) and its application to the fiction sample (as presented in Chapter 4). The findings concerning the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction (Chapters 5 and 6) will be summarized in Section 9.2.4, followed by a summary of the findings concerning the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of personifications in fiction and their communicative functions and cognitive representations (Chapters 7 and 8) in Section 9.2.5. Finally, Section 9.3 will reflect on how specific choices and decisions that were made in the *Metaphor in Discourse* project may have given rise to specific limitations of the research presented in this thesis, while at the same time revealing interesting directions for future research.

9.2 Summary of the main findings

9.2.1 A three-dimensional approach to metaphor in discourse

As pointed out in the Introduction and Chapter 1, one of the innovative aspects of the *Metaphor in Discourse* project is its integrated three-dimensional approach to analysing metaphor in authentic discourse. Cognitive linguists have shown that metaphor is a matter of thought rather than of language and have argued that metaphor is pervasive in everyday language (e.g., Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and
Johnson 1980). Corpus linguists and discourse analysts have, however, pointed out that claims about the ubiquity of metaphor in language and thought should be based on an examination of its occurrence in authentic discourse contexts rather than on invented or elicited examples (e.g., Cameron and Low 1999; Deignan 2005). They have also emphasized that metaphors should be analysed in authentic and rich linguistic contexts, as corpus evidence reveals that the forms and functions of linguistic metaphor cannot be reliably predicted on the basis of conceptual metaphors (e.g., Deignan 2005). Recent studies have demonstrated the importance of considering metaphor in authentic discourse settings (e.g., Cameron 2003; Cameron and Low 1999; Charteris-Black 2004; Deignan 2005; Heywood et al. 2002; Semino 2008; Steen 1999a, b, 2002b, d) and have demonstrated the need for reliable identification procedures that can account for the many different forms of metaphor in discourse and the way in which metaphorical expressions can be related to underlying conceptual structures.

In addition to critiques from corpus linguists and discourse analysts about the relation between linguistic and conceptual metaphors, psycholinguists have demonstrated that not all metaphorical expressions are necessarily processed as metaphor, that is, via comparison (cf. Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Giora 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006). This points to the need to distinguish not only between metaphor in language and metaphor in thought, and between metaphor in grammar and metaphor in usage, but also between semiotic and behavioural approaches to metaphor (Steen 2007). Only behavioural analyses can provide insight into the cognitive representations of metaphor during discourse comprehension. As was also pointed out by Gibbs (1994), the products of metaphor (i.e. metaphorical expressions) cannot be used to make claims about the processes of metaphor (i.e. metaphor processing). The *Metaphor in Discourse* project therefore adopted an encompassing approach to metaphor analysis that systematically distinguished between the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, and communicative functions of metaphor in different domains of discourse, as well as their semiotic versus behavioural analysis. Within the project, metaphor was defined as a cross-domain mapping in conceptual structure (e.g., Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and it was argued that these cross-domain mappings can be realized by different linguistic forms which may have different functions and effects in different discourse settings. The project’s corpus-based approach enabled a large-scale and exhaustive investigation of all the different forms and functions of metaphor in four distinct domains: academic discourse (Herrmann in prep.), conversation (Kaal in prep.), news texts (Krennmayr in press) and fiction (this thesis). In a parallel project at VU *University Amsterdam* the same systematic approach was applied to a corpus of Dutch conversations and news texts (Pasma in press).
Following Steen (2008, in press a), this thesis has argued in favour of adopting a three-dimensional approach to metaphor in discourse that includes metaphor in language, metaphor in thought and metaphor in communication as three independent levels of analysis. Including metaphor in communication as an independent level of analysis allows researchers to explain why and how the same linguistic forms and conceptual structures of metaphor can sometimes be used deliberately to achieve a particular rhetorical goal rather than being a general tool in language and thought to fill lexical gaps in the language system or frame complex and abstract concepts that can only be understood (partially) indirectly. Whether metaphorical expressions are used deliberately or non-deliberately in communication will most likely affect how these metaphors are cognitively represented during comprehension, that is, whether they are also processed as metaphors. The communicative properties of metaphor are closely related to its specific communicative purpose (divertive, informative, persuasive, etc.) and the particular domain of discourse (see also Cameron 2003; Charteris-Black 2004; Semino 2002a; Steen 2008). This thesis has hopefully demonstrated the advantage of adopting a three-dimensional model of metaphor in discourse that distinguishes between metaphor in thought, language and communication as it allowed for a more detailed description of the similarities and differences in metaphor use between the four included domains of discourse.

9.2.2 A corpus-linguistic approach to metaphor in literary texts

The preliminary example of metaphor in fiction from *Life of Pi* that was discussed in the Introduction illustrated a number of common assumptions about metaphors in literary texts. The personifications in the excerpt were so detailed, complex and well-structured that it was hard to imagine them occurring in a non-literary context. It was also argued that such metaphors are more likely to have been created and used deliberately by the author as well as recognized and understood as metaphors by the readers. This was related to the fact that such creative, complex, extended and deliberate personifications are foregrounded, which draws attention to their status as metaphors. Such foregrounding and its defamiliarizing effect are generally claimed to be a typical characteristic of literature (e.g., Leech 1969, 2008; Mukařovský 1970; Nowottny 1962; Short 1996), as the language itself becomes the centre of attention and this makes its aesthetic qualities more noticeable and memorable.

It was argued that the metaphors from *Life of Pi* illustrate the kind of metaphors that are generally associated with literature – such as personifications,
similes, deliberate metaphors and extended metaphors (e.g., Ben-Porat 1992; Leech and Short 2007; Lodge 1977; Sayce 1954; Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008; Steen and Gibbs 2004; Werth 1994, 1999) – as well as the functions commonly attributed to such metaphors, such as the expression of subjective experiences and the creative or novel use of conventional metaphors to offer new perspectives (e.g., Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008). Goatly (1997) and Semino (2008) have also argued that metaphor in literature is characterized by a high degree of systematic textual patterning, for example in the form of repetition, clustering, and literalization. With regard to the relation between metaphor in literature and metaphor outside literature two main approaches were discussed: the discontinuity approach, which sees metaphor in literature as primary and considers the metaphors in everyday language to be lesser derivations, and the continuity approach, which sees metaphor in everyday language use as primary and considers the metaphors in literature to be creative elaborations and extensions of conventional patterns. Nevertheless, both approaches assume that the metaphors in literature are somehow more novel, creative, meaningful and aesthetically pleasing than the metaphors in everyday language use.

This may in part be due to the fact that most studies of metaphor in literature have focused on the distinctive use of metaphor in specific genres, in specific texts, or by specific authors (cf. Semino 2008; Semino and Steen 2008; Steen 1994; Steen and Gibbs 2004). Moreover, studies of metaphor in literary texts have typically focussed on novel and unique uses, aiming to show how particular uses or patterns form an essential part of the particular style of a literary work, author or genre (e.g., Crisp 1996; Donald Freeman 1993, 1995, 1999; Margaret Freeman 1995; Hamilton 2002; Hiraga 1999; Popova 2002, 2003; Semino 2002b; Semino and Swindlehurst 1996; Simon-Vandenbergen 1993; Werth 1999). By contrast, the texts that were included in the present thesis were not selected because they were known to contain interesting uses, forms or functions of metaphor. It was argued that as many studies of metaphor in literature have focused on exceptional literary works and exceptional literary writers, the common view of literary metaphor as being exceptionally creative, original, elaborate and complex may not accurately represent metaphor use in most popular fiction. Although exceptional writers such as Shakespeare and Donne are clearly “masters of metaphor”, the mastery of metaphor that is displayed in most novels may be of an entirely different kind.

Steen and Gibbs (2004) have pointed out that only corpus-linguistic studies can address the question whether literary metaphors are indeed more rhetorically prominent or used more deliberately than metaphors in non-literary discourse. This thesis therefore considered it to be an empirical question whether the type of creative, original, elaborate and deliberate metaphors typically associated with literature are in fact frequent in fiction and whether they are more frequent in
fiction than in other domains of discourse. To answer this question, a corpus-based approach was used and explicit identification methods were employed to ensure that metaphors were identified in the same way in each domain of discourse, as only such an encompassing cross-register comparison can shed light on the question which forms and function are typical of fiction. Studies on literary metaphor have typically not provided quantitative evidence for claims that literature contains a greater number of metaphors and have tended to concentrate on what is specific to literature without paying sufficient attention to patterns of metaphor in general language use and cognition and without systematically distinguishing between the use, function and effect of metaphor (e.g., Gibbs and Steen 1999; Steen 1994; Steen 2007). As this thesis was aimed at establishing the forms, frequency and distribution of metaphor in fiction based on an explicit identification procedure and corpus-linguistic techniques, it has not offered the kind of attractive, challenging or original interpretations of unique uses of metaphor that many literary scholars may be used to. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the current approach shows how literary and linguistic approaches to metaphor in fiction can successfully be united. The corpus-based analyses provided in Chapters 4 to 8 hopefully provide new insights into the extent to which the specific properties of metaphors in fiction, their distribution and their use in context are part of the specific nature of metaphor in literary texts.

9.2.3 The development of a more comprehensive and explicit method for the identification of the linguistic forms of metaphor in discourse: MIPVU

The *Metaphor in Discourse* project aimed to examine the interaction between the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of metaphor in discourse and consider their use and function in four distinct domains (academic discourse, news texts, fiction and conversation). As discussed in Section 9.2.1, the project’s corpus-linguistic approach enabled a detailed investigation of all the different linguistic forms of metaphor. One first goal of the *Metaphor in Discourse* project was therefore to test and further develop the Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group 2007). Although MIP had already been shown to yield reliable results, the *Metaphor in Discourse* project aimed to extend the procedure in such a way that not only indirect expressions of metaphor in discourse could be reliably identified and annotated but also direct expressions (i.e. metaphor expressed by simile and analogy) and implicit expressions (i.e. metaphor expressed via ellipsis and substitution). This resulted in a number of specifications, adaptations and
additions to the MIP procedure (see Steen, Biernacka, et al. 2010), which finally led to the development of MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a, b).

The complete MIPVU procedure was presented in Chapter 3 of this thesis. The most important addition in MIPVU with regard to the original MIP concerns the addition of separate categories for direct and implicit forms of linguistic metaphor. This distinction was created to indicate that the linguistic forms of metaphor in discourse can relate to their underlying conceptual structures in three different ways, namely indirectly, directly or implicitly. In line with this addition in MIPVU, the term ‘metaphor-related word’ (“MRW”) was introduced to signal that words can be related to metaphor without being used metaphorically themselves, as is the case in similes. In addition, the binary distinction of metaphor that was used in MIP (i.e. words are either used metaphorically or not) was turned into a three-way distinction between words that are clearly related to metaphor, words that are clearly not related to metaphor and words that are borderline cases. A fourth relation to metaphor (“MFlag”) was created to allow for the annotation of metaphor signals, such as *like* and *as* (cf. Goatly 1997).

The application of MIPVU to fiction was demonstrated in Chapter 4. This chapter showed that MIPVU can be used as a reliable and flexible tool for the identification of metaphor-related words in fiction. It also discussed a number of additions and specifications in MIPVU that proved to be most relevant to the analysis of fiction. Firstly, the extension of the procedure to include the annotation of similes and analogies (i.e. “direct MRWs”) as well as their signals (i.e. “MFlags”) proved particularly useful for fiction: these directly expressed linguistic forms of metaphor were shown to play an important role in fiction and the fiction sample actually contained almost half of all the direct MRWs in the corpus (see Chapters 5 and 6). Similarly, the additional code for possible personification (i.e. “PP”) allowed the analysts to mark cases that could be considered personification from one perspective but metonymy from another; these linguistic forms of personification were also shown to have a clear discourse function in fiction: these PPPs were often used in body-part personifications, which create the effect that body parts are acting of their own accord independently of the character they belong to (see Chapters 7 and 8). The addition of a category for borderline cases of metaphor (coded “WIDLII” for When In Doubt, Leave It In) proved useful in the analysis of character descriptions that blur the boundary between concrete and abstract uses of especially prepositions and verbs. With regard to the analysis of proper names and nicknames, MIPVU introduced the distinction between mention and use (Sperber and Wilson 1981; Wilson and Sperber 1992), while it was specified that in the case of cultural references the dictionary should be followed as much as possible to minimize the influence of personal preferences and familiarity with the original source.
The subsequent demonstration of the application of MIPVU to an excerpt of fiction showed how these additions and specifications in MIPVU enabled the procedure to deal with the many different manifestations of metaphor in fiction. The analysis of the excerpt also revealed that most of the metaphorical expressions in the fiction sample did not appear to be comparable to the highly literary, creative, elaborate and original metaphors that were found in the excerpt from *Life of Pi* (Martel 2001). The great majority of the metaphors in the fiction sample, and the corpus as a whole, involved cases of unmarked, highly conventional metaphorical expressions from everyday language use. Nevertheless, a few cases were shown to stand out in the fiction excerpts due to their novelty, explicit signalling or systematicity. These cases were related to two phenomena that turned out to be essential forms of metaphor in fiction, namely simile and personification. Both of these types of metaphor were shown to involve a complex interaction between linguistic forms and conceptual structures that were not captured by MIP but could be taken on board by MIPVU thanks to the discussed additions.

The results from the reliability tests discussed in Chapter 4 showed that the application of MIPVU produced reliable results for fiction and that the annotation of fiction was less subject to analyst bias than the other registers, indicating that the majority of the lexical units in fiction are either clearly related to metaphor or clearly not related to metaphor. The reliability tests provide evidence for the reliability and validity of the quantitative analyses concerning the frequency and distribution of the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction reported in Chapters 5 and 6, as well as the analyses concerning the different forms, functions and effects of personification reported in Chapters 7 and 8.

In short, it was demonstrated that MIPVU is able to identify the types of metaphor that are generally discussed in studies of metaphor in literature, such as simile and personification but also extended and novel metaphors, by starting from a systematic and encompassing approach. MIPVU can therefore be considered a valuable addition to current studies of literary metaphor, providing a sound methodological basis for claims that are now often made on the basis of intuitions and specially selected examples that may not be representative. Though literary texts may indeed more often contain unique and creative metaphors than other registers, this thesis has hopefully shown that it is possible and valuable to identify and analyse the different linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction on the basis of an explicit and flexible method like MIPVU as the use of such a method adds reliability and validity to the claims that are made about the nature of metaphor in literature which may then be directly compared and contrasted with findings for metaphor in other domains of discourse.
9.2.4 The linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction

As pointed out in the Introduction, the overall goal of the Metaphor in Discourse project was to describe and analyse which linguistic forms with which attending conceptual structures are used in which discourse situations, for which purpose and to which cognitive effect. Chapters 5 and 6 of this thesis provided a detailed account of the patterning of the linguistic forms of metaphor in fiction. In Chapter 5 the patterns found for fiction were compared to those established for academic discourse, news, and conversation. In Chapter 6, the patterns of linguistic metaphor in fiction were further refined by systematically distinguishing between narrative and dialogue. The main similarities and differences that were found between fiction and the other registers (academic discourse, news, and conversation) as well as between the sub-registers of fiction (narrative prose and dialogue) are presented below.

The frequency of metaphor in fiction

In many ways, these quantitative analyses are the most newsworthy part of this thesis. Although metaphor in literature has been studied by researchers from many different fields using many different models for many different purposes, the present quantitative, cross-register investigation of the patterns of linguistic metaphor in fiction is rather exceptional. It has generally been assumed that literary texts are highly metaphorical and that literary texts contain more metaphors than non-literary texts. The current analyses provide quantitative evidence that neither claim appears to be true for the current sample of contemporary fiction texts. Fiction in fact had a relatively moderate proportion of metaphor-related words: 11.9% of the lexical units in fiction was related to metaphor. This proportion was considerably lower than the proportions found in academic texts (18.6%) and news texts (16.4%) though considerably higher than the proportion of MRWs found in conversation (7.7%). This finding suggests that the importance attributed to metaphor as being the language of literature (e.g., Leech 1969, 2008; Mukařovský 1970; Nowottny 1962; Short 1996) may have given a false impression regarding its relative frequency both within literature and in comparison to other domains of discourse.

However, this moderate frequency does not take away the fact that metaphor may still have an essential role to play in literary texts, and that this role may be different from metaphor’s role in other genres. The relative differences in metaphor frequency between the four domains of discourse in the project can be related to the findings of Biber (1988, 1989). The three-way interaction between register,
word class and metaphor revealed that much of the observed variation in metaphor can in fact be accounted for from the perspective of the natural and functional variation between word classes across registers (e.g., Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a, b). When the interaction between metaphor and word class is temporarily fixed, the bulk of metaphor can be seen as a constant function of the four registers, with academic discourse having the highest incidence of metaphor-related words, followed by news, then fiction, then conversation. It was argued that this variation can be related to Biber’s (1988, 1989) distinction between an ‘Informational versus Involved Production’ (Dimension 1). That is, the use of metaphor appears to correlate with an informational production: academic discourse and news texts, which are characterized by an informational production, have the highest incidence of linguistic forms of metaphor. Conversation, which is characterized by an involved production, has the lowest incidence. Fiction, which is characterized by a moderate score that is in between an informational and an involved production, is situated in between academic discourse and news on the one hand and conversation on the other hand in terms of its instance of metaphor-related words. These findings suggest that news texts and academic discourse, and to a lesser extent fiction, have more need for metaphor-related words to express their content than conversation does. This may be related to the fact that conversations are interactional rather than transactional.

With respect to the eight main word classes (adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, determiners, nouns, prepositions, verbs and the rest category) it was shown that in fiction verbs, prepositions and nouns were most often related to metaphor; together, these three word classes accounted for 75% of the metaphor-related words in fiction: verbs (29.4%), prepositions (26.7%) and nouns (19.2%). Adjectives (10.9%), determiners (7.1%), and adverbs (5.0%) were less often related to metaphor. Conjunctions (0.5%) and the rest category (1.3%) were hardly ever related to metaphor. The results showed that MRW verbs, prepositions and adjectives were significantly overused in fiction, while MRW nouns, adverbs, conjunctions, determiners and rest items were significantly underused. However, the same patterns were often found in the other registers, indicating that the overuse of particular word classes related more to general patterns of metaphor in language than to specific patterns of metaphor in particular registers.

For instance, all four of the registers overused MRW verbs and prepositions. This overuse of MRW verbs in all four registers was related to the frequent metaphorical use of the delexicalized verbs, such as make, take, give, get, come and go (cf. Cameron 1999; Deignan 2005; Heywood et al. 2002). The overuse of MRW prepositions in all four registers was related to the fact that most prepositions have basic spatial senses while they are frequently used metaphorically in their abstract temporal and causal meanings. These findings show that while claims about the
importance of particular word classes for metaphor in specific genres may be true (e.g., Lodge (1977) on the importance of verbs and adjectives in personification metaphors; Cameron (2008) on the importance of metaphorically used verbs and prepositions in conversation), they should also be considered in light of the finding that this importance may be due to general language tendencies rather than the use of metaphor for specific purposes or in specific types of discourse (cf. Deignan 2005).

Fiction overused MRW adjectives while the non-MRW adjectives were underused. This pattern was also found in the news texts and conversations, but this word class was neutral for metaphorical and non-metaphorical usage in academic discourse. The analysis of the most frequently used MRW adjective lemmas revealed that many of the metaphorical uses in all four of the registers could be related to adjectives with basic meanings involving sizes (e.g., big, small, great) and dimensions (e.g., deep, long, high). Nevertheless, fiction and news were characterized by high type-token ratios for metaphor-related adjectives and a high percentage of unique MRW adjectives. This suggests that the overuse of MRW adjectives in fiction and news also relates to their role in creative variation aimed at enlivening the style of a text and making it more aesthetically pleasing. The same can be argued for the use of metaphor-related verbs in both fiction and news texts.

MRW nouns, on the other hand, were underused in fiction and news while non-MRW nouns were distributed as expected according to statistical chance. It was speculated that the underuse of MRW nouns in fiction may be due to the fact that referents in the text world are anchored by using non-metaphor-related nouns, which are then described in creative and original ways by using metaphor-related adjectives and verbs. It may even be that metaphor-related nouns are – consciously or unconsciously – avoided when writers select which information to present. Fiction centres on the description of characters who interact with other characters, handle concrete objects, go to different locations, and so on. These characters, objects and locations are then repeatedly referred to as the story unfolds. It seems likely that the nouns referring to these entities will remain predominantly non-metaphorical while the adjectives and verbs used to describe the characteristics, behaviour and actions of the entities vary and change over the course of the narrative. Thus, it makes more sense for metaphor-related uses of nouns to be more local and one-shot, as in That girl is a dog or He turned on me like a snake, while repeatedly referring to a girl by using the noun dog would be too excessive and even confusing. This corresponds with the finding that the most frequently used MRW nouns were all nouns that are semantically relatively empty, such as thing, point, way and end, which are highly conventional and likely to go unnoticed as being metaphorically used.
Nevertheless, both fiction and news were again both characterized by a high type-token ratio for MRW nouns and a high percentage of unique MRW nouns, suggesting that despite their relative underuse in these registers they are characterized by a high degree of creative variation. In both conversation and academic discourse the MRW nouns were distributed according to chance but their degree of variation was much lower. MRW adverbs were also underused in fiction, news, and academic discourse while they were distributed according to chance in conversation. Conversation was also the only register that overused MRW determiners, while MRW determiners were underused in fiction, news and academic discourse. The significant underuse of MRW conjunctions and rest-category items was a characteristic of all four registers and shows that this word class is hardly ever related to metaphor regardless of the domain of discourse.

Even more surprising than the finding that fiction was less metaphorical than academic discourse and news texts was the finding that there was no significant difference between narrative and dialogue in fiction with respect to the proportion of metaphor-related words they contained: the dialogues in fiction contained 12.0% metaphor-related words while the narrative prose contained 11.8%. This was contrary to the expectations formulated on the basis of the differences found between the spoken and written registers in Chapter 5. On the basis of the low incidence of metaphor in conversation it had been predicted that the dialogues would contain fewer metaphor-related words than the narrative prose. The finding that the narrative prose and the dialogues contained the same proportion of metaphor-related words indicated that fiction’s moderate proportion of metaphor-related words in the cross-register comparison was thus not caused by a difference between narrative and dialogue. With regard to metaphor use, dialogue in fiction is therefore more similar to narrative in fiction than to face-to-face conversations. This finding provides further support for the claim that literary dialogues are not an accurate or faithful representation of spoken conversation (e.g., Abercrombie 1963; Fludernik 1993, 1996, 2009; Oostdijk 1990). Conversely, the narrative prose in fiction was more similar to the dialogues in fiction than to the news texts and academic discourse. This was particularly interesting given the fact that the two-way interaction between sub-register and word class showed that in terms of the general distribution of the eight main word classes, the narrative prose in fiction had a distribution that corresponded to an informational production (similar to news and academic discourse) while the dialogues had a distribution that corresponded to an involved production (similar to conversation).

This reveals that the distribution of metaphor-related words in narrative and dialogue in fiction did not follow the same opposition between involved and informational productions as the cross-register comparison did. Narrative’s moderate proportion of metaphor-related words was more similar to dialogue than
to news and academic discourse; it was suggested that this may be due to the fact that realistic fiction is primarily aimed at describing characters, their appearance, their surroundings and their actions in a realistic way, which will lead to very local uses of metaphor (Lodge 1977). News and academic discourse are more informational than narrative prose in fiction and may typically also need more metaphors as they deal with more a complex and abstract subject matter. The dialogues in fiction were shown to contain a much larger proportion of metaphor-related words than was expected on the basis of the findings for conversation. In addition, they were characterized by high type-token ratios and large proportions of unique metaphor-related adjectives, nouns, and verbs. In this respect, the dialogues were again similar to the narrative prose in fiction and dissimilar to the real-life conversations. Taken together, these findings indicate that dialogues in fiction do not only contain more metaphor-related words than real-life conversations but also more varied ones. This can be related to the finding by Biber and Finegan (1989, 1992, 2001) that literary dialogues (in fiction and drama) were considerably more informational than face-to-face conversations due to their role in carrying the story line. As metaphor was shown to correlate with an informational production, it makes sense that the dialogues thus also contain more metaphor-related words than the conversation.

**Types of metaphor in fiction**

The quantitative findings in Chapters 5 and 6 also provided a more accurate view of the occurrence and relative importance of indirect versus direct and implicit forms of linguistic metaphor. It was shown that in all four registers, both direct forms of metaphor and implicit forms of metaphor were rare. The bulk of metaphor in discourse is expressed indirectly, that is, by language that is metaphorically used. Moreover, these indirect expressions of metaphor were typically unsignalled. Together, these findings show that the amount of attention that has been paid to the traditional *A IS B* and *A IS LIKE B* forms within cognitive linguistics (e.g., Kövecses 2002; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989) and psycholinguistics (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe 1999) may have given a wrong impression about the frequency and importance of these forms in authentic language use. The indirect MRWs are predominantly responsible for the differences in the overall degree of metaphor between the four registers. That is, academic discourse had the highest percentage of indirect metaphor-related words (18.2%), followed by news (16.0%), then fiction (11.4%)
and finally conversation (7.6%). Of all the indirect MRWs in the corpus, 20.4% occurred in the fiction sample, compared to 36.1% in academic discourse, 28.8% in news, and 14.7% in conversation. A similar pattern was found for the distribution of the implicit metaphors across the four registers: of all the implicit MRWs in the corpus, 41.6% occurred in academic discourse, 29.2% in news, 18.6% in fiction and 10.7% in conversation. This shows that for both indirect and implicit MRWs fiction is situated in between academic discourse and news on the one hand, and conversation on the other.

The direct expressions of metaphor, such as similes and analogies, were shown to follow a different distributional pattern than the indirect and implicit forms. While fiction was situated in between academic discourse and news on the one hand and conversation on the other in its distribution of both indirect and implicit MRWs, the direct MRWs turned out to be most typical of fiction. Of all the direct MRWs occurring in the corpus, 49.1% occurred in fiction, 33.3% in news, 11.9% in academic discourse and only 5.7% in conversation. These quantitative findings provide empirical support for the claim that direct forms of metaphor play an important role in fiction (e.g., Goatly 1997; Lodge 1977; Sayce 1954), though they are not as frequent as has been assumed. In comparison with the other registers, direct MRWs are indeed clearly associated with fiction. However, although these direct forms of metaphor are relatively more frequent and influential in fiction, they are in fact not frequent. In fiction, they only account for 3.1% of all the metaphor-related words and 0.4% of all the lexical units. The fact that researchers have associated such expressions with literary texts may therefore be due to other factors than sheer frequency, for instance their deliberateness (due to their explicit signalling) or their high imagery value (due to the fact that many similes create image metaphors). As mentioned above, the amount of attention that such direct forms of metaphor have received may have created the impression that they are frequent and perhaps even more frequent than indirect forms of metaphor. However, the majority of metaphor-related words in fiction was used indirectly (95.9%) rather than directly (3.1%) or implicitly (1.0%).

Moreover, the comparison between narrative and dialogue in fiction revealed that direct MRWs were typical of the narrative prose in fiction rather than the dialogues. Though direct MRWs were rare in both narrative (0.5%) and dialogue (0.1%), 88.5% of all the direct metaphor-related words in the fiction sample occurred in the narrative prose and only 11.5% in the dialogues. This finding was related to the fact that direct forms were also relatively frequent in news texts but infrequent in conversations (Chapter 5), suggesting that direct forms are preferred in domains of discourse in which style and rhetoric play an important role. This could be due to the fact that such direct forms are usually more explicit and deliberate, which makes them more likely to be used in texts in which authors use
rhetorical devices to make their texts more attractive and add creativity and colouring. In conversations such direct forms are probably rare since conversations take place in real time and it would require too much time and effort to carefully consider and construct such creative or elaborate metaphors. This may also be why they are apparently avoided in fictive dialogue as well, as authors may feel such metaphors would be misplaced in representations of casual conversations.

It was also shown that the direct expressions of metaphor in narrative were typically longer and more complex than the direct expressions in dialogue. It is likely that short and simple similes are preferred in fictive dialogues as authors expect that too complex and elaborate similes would strike the reader as unnatural or unrealistic. In the narrative prose, on the other hand, such elaborate direct expressions were used to create vivid imagery and complex mappings between entire source-domain and target-domain scenes rather than entities. In such cases it is more likely that authors wish to demonstrate their creativity and impress the reader. With respect to their underlying conceptual structures, it was discussed that in both narrative and dialogue in fiction, many of the direct MRWs involve comparisons between people and animals or between different types of people. These comparisons are therefore closely related to image metaphors (e.g., Crisp 1996; Gibbs and Bogdonovich 1999; Gleason 2009; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989) and Gleason’s (2009) claim that image metaphors promote visualizations. The direct metaphors involving comparisons between people and animals or different kinds of people often emphasized physical resemblances that help the reader visualize what a character looks or behaves like. This finding was related to Gentner’s (1982) claim that analogies in literature are mostly used for expressive purposes and involve rich attribute mappings rather than mappings of causal or spatial relationships.

In relation to the direct expressions involving mappings between people and animals or different types of people, it was argued that many of these expressions seemed to foreground the unexpectedness of the described similarity by emphasizing the dissimilarity between the entities compared; this entails that the dissimilarity between the entities is foregrounded information that is essential to the point of the comparison, otherwise the comparison loses its effect of unexpectedness. This characteristic is particularly noteworthy, as similes have traditionally been considered to highlight the similarity between entities rather than the dissimilarity. In addition, it was argued that for many of the direct expressions the ground of the comparison provided the most salient information; in relation to this characteristic, it was demonstrated that most of the similes in the fiction data cannot be converted into corresponding metaphors, as most of the studies on the differences between metaphor and simile suggest (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner

For example, in the expression ‘Robin-Anne, despite her apparent frailty, attacked the sandwiches and salad with the savagery of a starving bear’ (example 66, Chapter 6), the simile with the savagery of a starving bear is in fact used to highlight an unexpected similarity between Robin-Anne and a starving bear. The unexpectedness of the similarity is emphasized by the addition despite her apparent frailty. It is the point of the simile to show that Robin-Anne is actually nothing at all like a bear, and yet she still eats like one. The simile serves to provide a rich visualisation of Robin-Anne’s attacking her food: the ground of the comparison, attack, is therefore the most salient information. The simile does not say something about Robin-Anne – it says something about her attacking, that is, the way she’s eating. This complex simile cannot be reduced to ROBIN-ANNE IS LIKE A BEAR, much less ROBIN-ANNE IS A BEAR. In the fiction data, similes and metaphors rarely occur in the traditional A IS (LIKE) B form, and they simply cannot be rephrased as A IS B metaphors or A IS LIKE B similes as their form and function is too complex.

Unlike the similes found by Low (2010) in his academic lectures, the similes in the fiction data are often imaginative and non-conventional and they are clearly aimed at drawing the attention of the reader. In some texts they were also used to create rhetorical networks throughout the text, which provides support for the claim by Goatly (1997) and Semino (2008) that metaphor use in literature is characterized by an increased systematicity in textual patternings. Nevertheless, most of the similes in fiction did appear to serve relatively local purposes and have local effects, as was also found by Low (2010: 291), who argues that the similes in his data are used for the type of “local control” that is often associated with control of saliency and foregrounding at the discourse level. As direct expressions of metaphor are typically signalled (by MFlags) they are more likely to be used and understood as deliberate metaphors. The current findings suggest that directly expressed metaphors do indeed appear to be typical of fiction – and narrative prose in fiction in particular – and that this may be due to their deliberateness and the fact that they often draw attention to their status as metaphors.

Conclusion

These quantitative findings demonstrate the value of doing linguistic metaphor identification and analysis in the way that was done in the Metaphor in Discourse project. This precise, exhaustive and quantified cross-register comparison has revealed new insights into the patterns of linguistic metaphor in fiction and has
provided quantitative evidence that either confirmed or refuted a number of claims that are commonly made about literary metaphor: for instance, it was shown that fiction was in fact not highly metaphorical (only 11.9% of the lexical items in fiction was related to metaphor), and that fiction was less metaphorical than news and academic discourse. On the other hand, the claim that direct expressions of metaphor such as similes play an important role in fiction was confirmed, as fiction contained by far the largest proportion of all direct MRWs in the corpus, though even in fiction this direct form of metaphor was rare (accounting for only 3% of the MRWs in fiction) in comparison to indirect forms of metaphor (which accounted for almost 96% of the MRWs in fiction).

The annotation and analysis of the corpus have led to a better understanding of the different forms and functions of metaphor in fiction, especially in relation to other registers. The cross-register comparison has led to an exhaustive account of the actual occurrence and relative importance of the different linguistic forms of metaphor. Its results have direct implications for theoretical debates on the study of metaphor, particularly in relation to the distinction between metaphor and simile in many psycholinguistic studies on metaphor understanding (e.g., Aisenman 1999; Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Chiappe and Kennedy 2000, 2001; Chiappe et al. 2003; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008; Glucksberg 2001, 2008; Glucksberg and Haught 2006; Kennedy and Chiappe 1999). The quantitative findings presented in this thesis show that A IS B metaphors and A IS LIKE B similes are rare in all four registers, suggesting that these psycholinguistic experiments may be asking participants to do things that they rarely have to do in real-life encounters with metaphor and simile.

9.2.5 Personification in fiction: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations

The Metaphor in Discourse project aimed to examine the interaction between the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of metaphor in discourse, and establish its communicative functions in four domains of discourse as well as its cognitive representation during comprehension. The manually annotated corpus provided new insights into the most frequent forms and functions of metaphor in fiction. One particular type of metaphor that appeared to be both frequent and important in fiction – personification – was selected for a detailed case study. In Chapter 7 the different linguistic forms of personification were discussed in relation to their underlying conceptual structures as well as their communicative functions. This case study resulted in a proposal for a distinction between four types of personification in discourse (see Dorst in press). In Chapter 8 the cognitive
representations of these four types of personification were investigated in a psycholinguistic study of the recognition of personifications in fiction by non-expert readers (that is, readers who were not experts in metaphor analysis).

Chapter 7 showed that the identification of the linguistic forms of personification in fiction proved to be a complex matter. Some examples appeared to be clear personifications at a linguistic level while a full realization as a personification in conceptual structure seemed tenuous. Others, such as the body-part personifications, could be related to clear personification effects in communication although their analysis as linguistic and conceptual personifications was less straightforward. It was therefore argued that what counts as a personification may differ considerably between analysts depending on which level of analysis is considered.

It was shown that at the linguistic level, selection restrictions play an important role in the realization of personifications by verbs and adjectives. For example, in an expression such as ‘She tells me she needs to understand [the drug] if she’s going to defeat it’ (example 14, Chapter 7), the personification of the drug is realized via the selection restrictions of the verb defeat as this verb requires both a human agent and a human patient when it is used in its basic sense of winning against someone in a fight. Moreover, the conventionality of linguistic expressions may disguise the personification, in which case the personification can be considered historical or “dead”, as in the case of many verbs of motion and possession such as come in ‘Though she thought sleep would never come’ (example 18, Chapter 7) or give in ‘The gangway lamps seemed to give no light’ (example 19, Chapter 7). Nevertheless, such “dead” personifications may be revitalized and become foregrounded as personifications if the linguistic expressions are used deliberately, for instance in explicitly signalled similes or in extended personifications. For example, in an expression such as ‘The plane climbs reluctantly’ (see Chapter 8), the use of the adverb reluctantly revitalizes and foregrounds a human interpretation of the dead or at least highly conventional personification climb.

The possible personification of body-parts was shown to be frequent in the fiction data. These personifications proved to be problematic during the annotation process as their analysis in context was often ambiguous between a metaphorical and a metonymic interpretation, as illustrated in expressions such as ‘Their tense, edgy faces watched Delaney closely’ (example 30, Chapter 7) and ‘Madame Mattli waved a dismissive hand’ (example 38, Chapter 7). It was shown that while such body-part personifications can normally only be related to skeletal conceptual structures, which renders their status as personifications at the conceptual level tentative at best, their communicative function as personifications is typically clear and relates to the presentation of body parts as acting of their own accord. It was
pointed out that this phenomenon is not only frequently exploited in fiction but also in movies, commercials and cartoons.

The findings from Chapter 7 demonstrate that the general definition of personification within cognitive linguistics as an ontological metaphor in which a non-human entity is described in terms of a specific type of person (e.g., Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989) is insufficient to serve as a basis for a systematic analysis of the different manifestations of personification in authentic discourse. The findings were therefore integrated in a new model for the identification of personifications in discourse based on a distinction between four different types: novel personification, personification-with-metonymy, default personifications and conventional personifications.

In Chapter 8 a psycholinguistic study was presented that investigated the cognitive relevance of the proposed categorization model by examining the recognition of personification in fiction by non-expert readers. The results of this exploratory study suggested that the recognition of personifications in fiction was not influenced by the presence of novel personifications. Though participants recognized the novel personifications significantly more often than the other types of personification, they did not become more aware of the other personifications in the text or recognize more personifications after they had encountered a novel personification. This suggested that personifications are recognized and dealt with locally, without a spill-over effect between sentences or texts.

The results did demonstrate a conventionality effect, as predicted by the Career of Metaphor hypothesis (Bowdle and Gentner 2005; Gentner and Bowdle 2001, 2008). Of the four proposed types, the novel personifications were recognized most often, though not significantly more than the personifications-with-metonymy. The default personifications were recognized less often than the personifications-with-metonymy and the conventional personifications were recognized least often. This suggests that there is a cline in the recognizability of personifications ranging from novel personifications to conventional personifications, with personifications-with-metonymy and default personifications in the middle. This in-between status of the latter two types was interpreted in light of the fact that they are not fully conventionalized (i.e. they do not have separate senses in the dictionary) but not entirely novel either. The finding that the participants recognized the personifications-with-metonymy as personifications while noting the involvement of a metonymy supports the claim that metaphor and metonymy are independent and interacting forces (e.g., Geeraerts 2002; Goossens 2002; Pragglejaz Group 2007; Steen 2007). In general, the findings suggested that the differences between the proposed categories reflect differences that are psychologically relevant to readers.
The recognisability of the personifications in the fiction excerpts also appeared to be influenced by the nature of the source domain. It was suggested that the concreteness of the source domain may have a considerable influence on the recognisability of personifications since concrete source domains involving for example movement or character traits often lead to visualisation effects. Such personifications thus play an important role in the creation of imagery in fiction texts, similar to the similes involving mappings between people and animals or different types of people (see Chapter 6). It was argued that such personifications may be understood via embodied simulation, as studies by Gibbs (2006b) have shown that readers often make sense of conventional metaphors in narratives by imagining what they themselves would do in the described situations or what it would feel like to perform the described activities. Since such embodied simulations are inherently performed from the perspective of the human body, it makes sense that the simulation process creates a sense of personification even for conventional personifications such as ‘the plane climbs’ or ‘the lamps gave no light’.

As was the case for many of the similes, the potential visualisation effect of many personifications is closely related to the function of image metaphors (e.g., Crisp 1996; Gibbs and Bogdonovich 1999; Gleason 2009; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989). Gibbs and Bogdonovich (1999) have shown that such image metaphors often involve mappings of detailed mental images rather than general knowledge about the entities involved. This may in part explain why some of the personifications in fiction appeared to have a clear communicative function as personifications while their conceptual analysis was problematic; if such personifications convey an image rather than knowledge then this may be the reason why there were no clear candidate concepts to fill in during steps 4 and 5 of the five-step procedure (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009).

That such personifications can still have a clear communicative function is supported by the finding that the participants in the study appeared to feel quite strongly about the function and effect of the personifications they recognized. Their comments frequently referred to the creation of vivid imagery and the fact that the personification allowed them to relate to the entities described. They also emphasized that the personifications add emotion to the text and help evoke a certain atmosphere. These comments revealed the participants’ perception of the function of literary metaphor and literature in general, as most of them referred to aesthetic qualities and effects rather than explanatory or instructive functions aiding general cognition and understanding. Participants also referred to the author’s intentions in using the personifications. This suggests that the participants were aware of the literary status of the texts and focused on identifying poetic and aesthetic effects and functions that the personifications should have given the
discourse context and the author’s intentions. This finding was related to observations that discourse context and authorial intentions influence the way texts are read and processed and that literary reading strategies boost attention to metaphor (Gibbs et al. 1991; Steen 1994; Zwaan 1994).

The analyses of the linguistic forms, conceptual structures and communicative functions of personification in fiction, as well as their cognitive representations, together reveal that personification may have been treated as an unproblematic phenomenon within cognitive linguistics (e.g., Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989) due to the fact that only clear and deliberate examples of particular types of personification were used. The systematic analysis of the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of personification in this thesis emphasized the influence of conventionality, deliberateness and metonymy. It was noted that many highly conventional, even “dead”, personifications can be analysed as personifications in their linguistic forms and conceptual structures independent of the fact that they have likely not been used deliberately as personifications by the author and are likely not recognized or understood as personifications by the readers. The linguistic and conceptual analysis of such personifications still yields interesting results concerning the general cognitive power of personification in the language system. It was emphasized that more research is needed to investigate how the different levels of analysis interact, especially in relation to the deliberate versus non-deliberate use and the conscious versus unconscious processing of the different linguistic forms and conceptual structures of personification.

The case study of the linguistic forms and conceptual structures of personifications in fiction, and their relation to different communicative functions and cognitive representations, has hopefully demonstrated the value of adhering to a three-dimensional approach to metaphor in discourse as proposed by Steen (2008, in press a). This approach allows analysts to distinguish between personifications in language, thought and communication (see Steen 2007) but also to keep analyses of the products of metaphor (i.e. metaphorical expressions) separate from analyses of the processes of metaphor (see Gibbs 1994). The personification study also highlighted the benefits of using explicit identification and analysis methods such as MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b) and the five-step procedure (Steen 1999b, 2001, 2002d, 2009). The systematic three-dimensional approach helped to demonstrate why personification in discourse is a more complex matter than has generally been assumed (e.g., Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989; but see Low 1999; MacKay 1986) and helped to define what counts as a personification at which level of analysis. Both a clear theoretical model and an explicit methodology are indispensible in enabling comparisons
between studies and fruitful discussions between analysts working within different disciplines.

9.3 Limitations and suggestions for future research

In analysing nearly 190,000 words manually, in a systematic and consistent way, a wide range of decisions had to be made, some of which were more practical in nature than others. These decisions have sometimes steered the **Metaphor in Discourse** project in particular directions, thereby focusing on particular aspects while not addressing others. Some of these decisions and their consequences for the research reported in this thesis are discussed below.

As pointed out before, MIPVU did not consider historical metaphor or metaphor in morphology and syntax. In addition, MIPVU did not cross word category boundaries when basic and contextual senses were compared and contrasted, such that the meaning of the noun *dog* could not provide a basic sense for contextual meanings of the verb *to dog*. In the case of animal metaphors, which were shown to be frequent in fiction, this decision has led to the exclusion of such potential cases of metaphor by morphological conversion (see Deignan 2005). Derived verb and adjective forms (e.g., *to dog, foxy*), although graphically often still closely related to the noun form (e.g., *dog, fox*), can be considered another form of historical metaphor. However, detailed studies of animal metaphors in fiction could decide to include derivational animal metaphors as one particular type and consider whether such forms are more or less frequent than other forms, such as explicit metaphors and similes comparing people and animals (e.g., ‘That girl is a *dog*’ (BMW); ‘You look […] as a *raccoon*’ (FAJ) or animal-related verbs, nouns and adjectives that are used to describe people (e.g., ‘Keep your voice down, Adam *growled*’; ‘the workrooms beyond were a *hive* of frenzied activity’ (BMW).

Although this thesis discussed animal metaphors and personifications as two specific types of metaphor that were frequent in fiction, the annotation method did not include a specification of the metaphor type or an indication of the source domain. As such, there was no easy way to retrieve different linguistic realizations of a particular source domain or to compare the frequency of linguistic realizations of different source domains in the corpus. Moreover, as the annotations also did not distinguish between novel and conventional linguistic expressions, no specific quantitative evidence for the occurrence of novel metaphors in the corpus can be given. In subsequent studies such additional information may provide new insights into possible differences between the registers in preferred source domains or differences in the degree of novel metaphor. It may turn out that fiction contains a higher incidence of novel metaphor than the other registers. However, it was noted
during the manual annotations that the occurrence of novel metaphor was rare, and usually corresponded to the presence of direct expressions of metaphor or the presence of deliberate and extended personifications.

The psycholinguistic study was of course only concerned with post-comprehension recognition. Moreover, the absence of a priming effect may have been due to the specific nature of the study, as the use of authentic stretches of discourse makes such effects harder to discern due to a considerable amount of “noise” in the data. More carefully constrained and manipulated stimuli may be needed to investigate these effects. Additionally, there may be differences in reading times, which could not be detected using the current pen-and-paper set-up, but which could be revealed when participants read from a computer screen. This would also prevent them from re-reading sentences, though both situations entail a move away from how readers normally read. The present study did, however, provide some interesting starting points for further research. The finding that the default personifications behaved more like the conventional personifications while the personifications-with-metonymy behaved more like the novel personifications suggests that both default personifications and personifications-with-metonymy may be interesting areas for further research. However, since not all of the categories were fully crossed in the study, other influences may have been at work and a more extensive and carefully balanced sample would have to be used before any real conclusions can be drawn. The same is true for the finding that the nature of the source domain influenced the recognizability of the personifications.

Due to its quantitative focus, this thesis has had little room left for more extensive qualitative analyses of particular stretches of text. As a result, this thesis has not presented the kind of qualitative analyses that most analysts in literary fields are used to. Nor has it offered detailed discussions of the use of metaphor in a particular text or by a particular author. Though a comparison was made between the narrative prose and the dialogues in fiction, the patterns of metaphor in the individual texts in the corpus were not compared, though it was established that they contained similar proportions of metaphor-related words. Nevertheless, future studies would most likely benefit from a more balanced approach combining quantitative evidence with more detailed qualitative analyses of stretches of discourse from individual fiction texts. In addition, no attention was paid to potential differences between serious and popular fiction, though several studies have claimed that these are linguistically distinct (Nash 1990; Radway 1984; Van Peer 1986b). On the other hand, Semino and Short (2004) did not find any significant differences between popular and serious fiction in terms of their speech, writing and thought presentation. It could therefore be an interesting direction for future research to investigate the differences between serious and popular fiction in
terms of the frequency and distribution of the different linguistic forms of metaphor.

Although there is clearly a need for further work on metaphor in fiction, both in order to shed more light on some of the specific issues that were raised and to compare the findings of this thesis to those derived from more qualitatively oriented studies, it is hoped that the analyses reported in this thesis have provided a useful contribution to the study of metaphor in fiction and literary texts more generally. This thesis has hopefully shown the value of taking a corpus-based approach to aspects of metaphor in literature, and demonstrated how the adoption of a three-dimensional model of metaphor in combination with explicit identification and analysis methods enables new insights. It should of course be noted that the approach adopted in the Metaphor in Discourse project involved a considerable amount of time and resources and employed a team of analysts, an endeavour which can only be realistically undertaken with sufficient funding. Despite all the time and effort that was devoted to the development of the MIPVU procedure, the annotation protocol and the process of annotation, the corpus inevitably contains mistakes and inconsistencies. As MIPVU is applied to more data from different domains of discourse by different analysts, the discussion of the decisions made in MIPVU and the weaknesses that remain will lead to better alternatives and further improvements in the identification of metaphor in natural discourse.

If there is one thing that has become clear in this thesis it is that metaphor in fiction is a fascinating area of research. The analyses have shown that, contrary to expectations, fiction was not the register that contained the highest incidence of metaphor. However, fiction was characterized by the highest incidence of direct expressions of metaphor as well as a high degree of creative variation. As directly expressed metaphors are usually signalled and therefore more likely to be used deliberately, the analyses do suggest that fiction is characterized by a higher incidence of deliberate and creative metaphor than the other registers, though in terms of absolute frequencies, such deliberate and creative uses of metaphor are rare. The bulk of metaphor in fiction is expressed indirectly and relates to conventional patterns of metaphor in general language use. Quantitative evidence was provided that supports the claims that simile and personification are typical of fiction. It was also argued that many of the direct expressions of metaphor in fiction involve comparisons between people and animals and comparisons between different kinds of people, the latter of which appears to be an under-researched phenomenon.

As is clear from the above suggestions, various theoretical and empirical issues remain that have not yet been investigated or that deserve more attention. Addressing these issues is certainly worthwhile, as it may help to fill gaps in the
theory and suggest improvements in the practice of analysing metaphor in literary texts. Studies of metaphor in literature have predominantly been qualitative and idiographic, focusing on unique uses in specific genres, texts or authors without much attention to the explicitness, reliability and validity of the employed methodology and without providing quantitative support for their claims. It is hoped that this book serves as a useful basis for future studies combining the best of quantitative and qualitative research.
## Appendices

### A. Appendix to Chapter 5: Overview of annotated fiction files from BNC-Baby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File ID</th>
<th>Total number of words in file</th>
<th>Total number of divisions in file</th>
<th>ID number of file division coded</th>
<th>Number of lexical units in data</th>
<th>Number of MRWs in data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB9</td>
<td>42,247</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>555 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>37,662</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>426 (14.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>42,584</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>554 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>37,769</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>371 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8T</td>
<td>41,117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>280 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB5</td>
<td>41,727</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>303 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW*</td>
<td>40,408</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>190 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW*</td>
<td>Id</td>
<td>Id</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>245 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB*</td>
<td>38,169</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>338 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB*</td>
<td>Id</td>
<td>Id</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>277 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAJ</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>297 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FET</td>
<td>35,526</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>537 (12.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPB</td>
<td>41,894</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>449 (11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G0L</td>
<td>43,292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>463 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>484,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>5293 (11.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the analyses, the excerpts from CCW and CDB were taken together. Otherwise the analyses would not only have compared different fiction texts to each other but also fragments from the same or different texts. Considering issues of author style, text unity and sample size, these fragments were therefore combined, yielding a total number of twelve fiction files, representing twelve different novels by twelve different authors.
B. Appendix to Chapter 8: Texts used in the personification recognition experiment

The pre-identified personifications are presented in bold font. The novel personifications in the priming sentences are presented in small caps. Attractor items are presented in italics. The priming sentence containing the novel personifications appeared either towards the beginning of the text (early placement) or towards the end of the text (late placement). Text 2, the filler text, was not manipulated for priming placement. During the experiment the texts were presented without bold font, italics or small caps.

Text 1 with an early placement
He was driving now across the open headland towards the *fringe* of pine trees which *bordered* the North Sea. The only house to his left was the old Victorian rectory, a square, red-brick, *UNCOMPROMISING* building, incongruous behind its *BELLIGERENT* hedge of rhododendron and laurel. To his right the ground *rose gently* towards the southern cliffs and he could see the dark *mouth* of an army shelter, undemolished since the war, and great *stumps* of wave-*battered* concrete, remnants of the old fortifications which *lay* half-submerged in the sand along part of the beach. The road he was on, *veering* left, would eventually *lead* to the station but was, he knew, seldom used since normal traffic and all heavy vehicles *used* the new access road to the north. The headland was empty and almost *bare*. A few *straggling* trees, *distorted* by the wind, *struggled* to *keep* their precarious *hold* in the arid soil. On his previous visits to Larksoken he had seen Martyr's Cottage spread out beneath him from the small top window under the cone of the mill. But he had never been closer to it than the road and now, driving up to it, it *struck* him again that the description ‘cottage’ was hardly appropriate.

Text 1 with a late placement
He was driving now across the open headland towards the *fringe* of pine trees which *bordered* the North Sea. To his right the ground *rose gently* towards the southern cliffs and he could see the dark *mouth* of an army shelter, undemolished since the war, and great *stumps* of wave-*battered* concrete, remnants of the old fortifications which *lay* half-submerged in the sand along part of the beach. The road he was on, *veering* left, would eventually *lead* to the station but was, he knew, seldom used since normal traffic and all heavy vehicles *used* the new access road to the north. The only house to his left was the old Victorian rectory, a square, red-brick, *UNCOMPROMISING* building, incongruous behind its *BELLIGERENT* hedge of rhododendron and laurel. The headland was empty and almost *bare*. A few *straggling* trees, *distorted* by the wind, *struggled* to *keep* their precarious *hold* in the arid soil. On his previous visits to Larksoken he had seen Martyr's Cottage spread out beneath
him from the small top window under the cone of the mill. But he had never been closer to it than the road and now, driving up to it, it struck him again that the description ‘cottage’ was hardly appropriate.

Text 3 with an early placement
Our story starts with a young man, Thomas Fairfax, in military khaki and flying jacket, climbing into his old biplane and taxiing down a runway. He adjusts the flaps, zips up his jacket, pulls down his goggles. The runway is simply a strip of grass, cleared of rocks. The plane lurches into motion and bounces alarmingly as it gathers speed. The plane climbs reluctantly, one set of wings tilting drunkenly. A few Africans, clutching sticks and wearing skins, watch the plane as it turns, pauses, and then accelerates, leaving a cloud of dust. Soon it is passing over the spectacular Rift Valley. There is no sign of civilization, but herds of zebra and wildebeest and clumps of elephants marble the valley floor. Claudia Cohn-Casson is sitting under an enormous African fig tree nearby, at a camp table spread with a Somali cloth. A servant is preparing lunch on a fire. Claudia hears something. She looks up into the sky in the direction of the mountain. She catches sight of a small plane. It dips its wings in acknowledgement of the landing strip, and circles, preparing to land. Claudia stands up and walks towards the makeshift landing strip. The plane is taxiing, pursued by a group of running Masai warriors. Claudia walks over towards the plane.

Text 3 with a late placement
Our story starts with a young man, Thomas Fairfax, in military khaki and flying jacket, climbing into his old biplane and taxiing down a runway. He adjusts the flaps, zips up his jacket, pulls down his goggles. The runway is simply a strip of grass, cleared of rocks. The plane lurches into motion and bounces alarmingly as it gathers speed. A few Africans, clutching sticks and wearing skins, watch the plane as it turns, pauses, and then accelerates, leaving a cloud of dust. Soon it is passing over the spectacular Rift Valley. There is no sign of civilization, but herds of zebra and wildebeest and clumps of elephants marble the valley floor. Claudia Cohn-Casson is sitting under an enormous African fig tree nearby, at a camp table spread with a Somali cloth. A servant is preparing lunch on a fire. Claudia hears something. She looks up into the sky in the direction of the mountain. She catches sight of a small plane. The plane climbs reluctantly, one set of wings tilting drunkenly. It dips its wings in acknowledgement of the landing strip, and circles, preparing to land. Claudia stands up and walks towards the makeshift landing strip. The plane is taxiing, pursued by a group of running Masai warriors. Claudia walks over towards the plane.

Text 2 (filler text)
Madame Mattli was almost exactly as Paula had imagined she would be, a petite perfectly turned out woman with an air of chic that was unmistakably French. Her dark, grey-streaked hair, which she wore in a long bob, had been cut by Vidal Sassoon and she wore a beautifully tailored black suit. In the fitting rooms at Taylors she fussed and fretted over her creations like a mother hen and though Paula was overawed by the great designer she also liked her on sight.

Half way through the day's programme of shows, while the dressers went off to grab a sandwich and the model girls, who would not dare to eat while they were showing, revived themselves with cups of black coffee, Madame Mattli took Paula to one side.

‘Little one, I would like to speak with you.’

Paula’s stomach turned a SOMERSAULT. Had she done something wrong?

‘I have been watching you work,’ Madame Mattli said directly. Her accent reminded Paula of Louise - perhaps that was why she warmed to her in spite of the fact that she was so awe-inspiring.

‘You are exactly right for a couture model. You have all the physical attributes.’

‘Thank you,’ Paula said faintly.

Madame Mattli waved a dismissive hand.

‘Do not thank me. I am not saying this to make your head swell. On the contrary. The fact is that I have a vacancy arising for a couture model. I believe you are exactly what I am looking for. I would like you to come to London to work for me.’
### C. Appendix to Chapter 8: Overview of personifications and attractor items per text used in the personification recognition experiment

#### Table 2 Overview of personifications per text including personification type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2 (filler)</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncompromising (novel)</td>
<td>Turned (default)</td>
<td>Lurches (default)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerent (novel)</td>
<td>Somersault (novel)</td>
<td>Gathers (conventional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (conventional)</td>
<td>Reminded (conventional)</td>
<td>Climbs (conventional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gently (conventional)</td>
<td>Dismissive (metonymy)</td>
<td>Reluctantly (default)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth (default)</td>
<td>Arising (conventional)</td>
<td>Drunkenly (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumps (conventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns (default)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave-battered (conventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pauses (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay (default)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaving (default)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (default)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dips (default)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used (metonymy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgement (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare (default)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing (novel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straggling (conventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggled (novel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep (novel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold (default)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck (conventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3 Overview of attractor items per text including classification based on MIPVU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2 (filler)</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headland (non-MRW)</td>
<td>Mother hen (MRW: direct)</td>
<td>Starts (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (non-MRW)</td>
<td>Swell (MRW: indirect)</td>
<td>Bounces (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordered (non-MRW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tilting (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruous (non-MRW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerates (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-submerged (MRW: indirect)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passing (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veering (MRW: indirect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headland (non-MRW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble (MRW: indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distorted (non-MRW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circles (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precarious (non-MRW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxiing (non-MRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread out (MRW: indirect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Appendix to Chapter 8: Introduction and Instructions used in the personification recognition experiment

Introduction:

In this experiment we will be looking at personifications in fiction. A personification is a special kind of metaphor. A metaphor is a figure of speech in which we understand something in terms of something else. For instance, if we say He shot down my proposal or He defended his thesis, then the words shot down and defended express the metaphor ARGUMENTATION IS WAR.

In the case of personification, we have a metaphor in which something non-human is understood in terms of a person. For example:

His theory explained to me the behaviour of chickens.
Life has cheated me.
His religion tells him that he cannot drink fine French wines.

In these sentences, the verbs explained, cheated and tells are metaphorically used because these words normally apply to human behaviour. As a result, these verbs set up personifications of the concepts theory, life and religion.

Abstract concepts, concrete objects and even living entities can all be personified:

Inflation is our biggest enemy right now.
The toilet stubbornly refused to flush.
Butterflies were dancing all around us.

Instructions

In this experiment you will be given three short text fragments from contemporary fiction. Since we are interested in normal reading behaviour, we ask that you read the fragments in one pass and do the following while you are reading:

(1) Decide whether you think there are any words in the text that set up personifications;

(2) Circle the specific words you think are involved in setting up the personifications. You may circle individual words or combinations of words if you feel they work together in setting up the personification.

(3) Write down your comments on how the personifications you circled work and what they add to your interpretation of the text. Please also note down any words you didn’t know or understand.

!!! Please use a blue pen on your first pass. If at any time you feel you need to go back to change decisions you made earlier in the text, then use a different colour pen. Again, since we are interested in normal reading, you are encouraged to go through the text only once.
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Samenvatting in het Nederlands

Metaforen in Fictie: Taal, Cognitie en Communicatie

Introductie

Bij metaforen denken mensen vaak meteen aan literatuur en poëzie en aan originele, creatieve en complexe beeldspraak met een diepere betekenis en een esthetisch doel. Men gaat er dan van uit dat de schrijver deze metaforen bewust gebruikt heeft om er een bepaald effect mee te bereiken en dat de lezer voldoening haalt uit het ervaren van dit effect. De functies die doorgaans aan literaire metaforen worden toegeschreven, hebben betrekking op het beschrijven van subjectieve gevoelens en ervaringen en het creëren van complexe tekstpatronen. Ook het creëren van nieuwe metaforen en het creatief gebruiken van conventionele metaforen om nieuwe, originele en opvallende opvattingen uit te drukken, worden als functies van literaire metaforen gezien. Dit proefschrift heeft de verschillende vormen, functies en effecten van metaforen in hedendaagse fictie empirisch onderzocht op basis van een expliciete identificatiemethode en een driedimensionale benadering van metaforen in taalgebruik. Daarbij is gekeken in hoeverre de frequenties en distributies van de verschillende vormen van metaforiek in fictie verschillen van die in academische teksten, nieuwsteksten, en spontane conversaties. Tevens is gekeken of er verschillen in metafoorgebruik zijn tussen de dialogen en de narratieve gedeelten binnen fictie. Een casestudy naar de verschillende vormen, functies en effecten van personificaties in fictie illustreert de complexe interactie tussen metaforen in taal, metaforen in denken, en metaforen in communicatie. Het proefschrift laat zien hoe kwantitatief corpusonderzoek een waardevolle bijdrage kan leveren aan onderzoek naar metaforen in de literatuur door bestaande opvattingen empirisch te toetsen op basis van valide en betrouwbare methoden. Bovendien leidt de combinatie van een driedimensionale benadering van metaforiek en een corpuslinguïstische benadering van literaire metaforen tot nieuwe, soms onverwachte inzichten in het gebruik van metaforen in fictie.

Een driedimensionale benadering van metaforen in taalgebruik

Ook door wetenschappers uit verschillende disciplines werden metaforen lange tijd geassocieerd met literatuur, poëzie en retorica. Men ging ervan uit dat metaforen een talig verschijnsel waren en dat ze gebruikt werden om het taalgebruik van literaire teksten te versieren en vanuit esthetisch oogpunt te verrijken. Met de komst van de cognitieve linguïstiek - en in het bijzonder de cognitieve metafoorwetenschappen - kwam een eind aan dit beeld van metaforiek als een talig en decoratief verschijnsel. Cognitieve linguïsten hebben laten zien dat metaforen niet alleen een kwestie van taal zijn, maar ook juist van denken, en dat metaforen een essentieel onderdeel uitmaken van ons conceptuele systeem. Metaforen stellen ons in staat om complexe en abstracte concepten te begrijpen in termen van eenvoudige en concrete concepten, die veelal betrekking hebben op ons lichaam of onze interactie met de fysieke wereld om ons heen. Metaforen komen dan ook niet alleen in literaire teksten voor maar zijn alomtegenwoordig in dagelijks taalgebruik. Bovendien is
aangetoond dat verreweg de meeste metaforen in dagelijks taalgebruik volledig conventioneel en onopvallend zijn, en allerminst origineel, creatief of bedoeld om de aandacht te trekken. Kortom, binnen de cognitieve metafoorwetenschappen verschoof de aandacht van literatuur naar dagelijks taalgebruik, van vernieuwend naar conventioneel, en van opzettelijk en opvallend naar onbewust en onopgemerkt.

Hoewel de conceptuele definitie van metaforiek op dit moment de meest productieve en best uitgewerkte definitie is, is een aantal van de uitgangspunten van de cognitieve metafoorwetenschap in twijfel getrokken door psychologen, psycholinguïsten, corpuslinguïsten en discoursanalisten. Zo hebben experimenten van psychologen en psycholinguïsten laten zien dat niet alle talige en conceptuele metaforen ook metaforisch begrepen worden, dat wil zeggen: metaforen worden vaak niet via processen van vergelijking, maar via processen van categorisatie begrepen. Welk proces plaatsvindt tijdens het begrijpen van een metafoor, hangt grotendeels af van de conventionaliteit van de uitdrukking en of deze de talige vorm heeft van een metafoor (A IS B) of een vergelijking (A IS ALS B).

Corpuslinguïsten hebben op hun beurt laten zien dat het essentieel is om authentieke teksten te gebruiken in plaats van zelfverzonnen voorbeelden of gemanipuleerde materialen. Alleen op basis van authentieke taaldata uit representatieve corpora kan worden vastgesteld welke metaforen daadwerkelijk conventioneel zijn, en in welke vormen en combinaties ze voorkomen in het dagelijks taalgebruik, binnen welke communicatieve context en met welk communicatief doel. Corpusstudies hebben aangetoond dat de vorm en functie van talige metaforen grotendeels bepaald wordt door de gebruikscontext, en dat de collocationele, grammaticale en syntactische patronen van talige metaforen niet voorspeld kunnen worden op basis van conceptuele metaforen. Discoursanalisten hebben bovendien laten zien dat het belangrijk is om te bezien welke metaforen in welke tekstsoorten teksten gebruikt worden en om welke redenen, aangezien discoursfactoren een grote rol spelen in de selectie van de talige metaforen wanneer er vanuit conceptueel oogpunt gezien verschillende mogelijkheden zijn. Daarbij speelt het onderscheid tussen opzettelijke en niet-opzettelijke metaforen een belangrijke rol.

In dit proefschrift worden metaforen conceptueel gedefinieerd: het gaat om niet-letterlijke projecties van een brondomein naar een doeldomein. Tegelijkertijd wordt gebruikgemaakt van een driemensionaal model waarin systematisch onderscheid wordt gemaakt tussen talige vormen (metaforen in taal), conceptuele structuren (metaforen in denken) en communicatieve functies (metaforen in communicatie). Daarnaast wordt onderscheid gemaakt tussen semiotische analyses die gericht zijn op metaforiek als talige tekens (d.w.z. teksten) en gedragsanalyses die gericht zijn op de processen en producten van metaforiek (d.w.z. het begrijpen, interpreteren of waarderen van metaforen en de daaruit resulterende mentale representaties). De centrale vraag in dit proefschrift is dan ook: Wat zijn de belangrijkste talige vormen, conceptuele structuren, communicatieve functies en cognitieve effecten van metaforen in fictie en hoe kunnen deze gerelateerd worden aan de specifieke kenmerken van fictie?

**Een corpuslinguïstische benadering van metaforen in literaire teksten**

Metaforen in literaire teksten worden over het algemeen beschouwd als anders dan metaforen in niet-literaire teksten. Er zijn globaal gezien twee benaderingen van de relatie
tussen literaire en niet-literaire metaforen: de ene benadering ziet de metaforen in literatuur als primair en de metaforen in dagelijks taalgebruik als secundaire afleidingen hiervan; de andere benadering ziet de metaforen in dagelijks taalgebruik als primair en de literaire metaforen als creatieve en originele variaties en uitbreidingen. Beide benaderingen gaan er echter van uit dat metaforen in literaire teksten anders zijn, en dan met name origineler, creatiever en opzettelijker gebruikt dan metaforen in dagelijks taalgebruik. Deze opvatting zou deels het gevolg kunnen zijn van het feit dat studies van literaire metaforen over het algemeen gekeken wordt naar teksten, genres of auteurs die bewust uitgekozen zijn, omdat ze gekenmerkt worden door een bijzonder gebruik van metaforen. Er wordt hierbij vaak slechts één specifiek boek, één specifieke auteur of één specifiek genre bestudeerd. Deze studies bieden daardoor niet noodzakelijk inzicht in wat er over het algemeen gebeurt in literaire fictie. Bovendien zijn de meeste analyses van metaforen in de literatuur sterk kwalitatief georiënteerd en gebaseerd op intuities en voorbeelden uit de eigen leeservaring. Alleen kwantitatieve corpusstudies kunnen echter inzicht bieden in hoe representatief de bevindingen van deze studies zijn en hoe het gevonden metafoorgebruik zich verhoudt tot metafoorgebruik in niet-literaire teksten.

Dit proefschrift richt zich daarom niet op het geven van aantrekkelijke en originele interpretaties van bijzondere metaforen in bijzondere teksten van bijzondere schrijvers. Er is daarentegen geprobeerd om op basis van expliciete identificatie- en analysesmethodes een kwantitatieve en toetsbare beschrijving te geven van de frequentie en distributie van verschillende vormen en functies van metaforen in fictie. De gebruikte tekstfragmenten zijn willekeurig en blind geselecteerd zodat een anoniem corpus van fictieteksten is samengesteld waarbij de literaire status van de teksten en hun auteurs geen invloed uitoeften. In de analyses is bovendien niet alleen gekeken naar de dominante patronen binnen het fictiecorpus, maar ook naar hoe deze patronen zich verhouden tot de dominante patronen in drie andere domeinen (academische teksten, nieuwsteksten en gesproken conversaties). Hierdoor ontstaat een duidelijk beeld van welke vormen en functies kenmerkend zijn voor fictie en welke voortvloeien uit algemene patronen van metaforiek in hedendaags taalgebruik. In de analyses speelt ook het opzettelijk gebruik van metaforen een belangrijke rol, aangezien over het algemeen aangenomen wordt dat literaire teksten meer opzettelijke metaforen bevatten dan andere tekstsoorten, en dat deze opzettelijke metaforen gebruikt worden om de aandacht op het taalgebruik zelf te vestigen.

Registerstudies hebben reeds aangetoond dat literaire teksten zich kenmerken door specifieke lexico-grammaticale eigenschappen. Door metaforiek in fictie op eenzelfde corpuslinguïstische wijze te benaderen, kan worden vastgesteld of metafoorgebruik een lexico-semantische eigenschap is waarmee fictie zich onderscheidt van andere tekstsoorten. Meer kwalitatief georiënteerde analyses kunnen vervolgens inzicht verschaffen in hoe de gevonden patronen gerelateerd kunnen worden aan verschillende communicatieve functies en cognitieve effecten van metaforiek in fictie.

**Analysemethode**

Zowel het gebruik van authentieke teksten als de kwantitatieve corpuslinguïstische benadering van metaforiek in dit proefschrift benadrukken het belang van een betrouwbare en replicaerbare identificatie van de talige vormen van metaforiek in het corpus. Zonder een expliciete en toetsbare methode kunnen de resultaten van verschillende studies niet vergeleken worden, omdat onduidelijk is hoe gedefinieerd is wat als metafoor telt en
bovendien niet vastgesteld kan worden of de analyses de juiste validiteit en betrouwbaarheid hebben.

Hoofdstuk 3 en 4 richten zich daarom op het presenteren en demonstreren van de identificatiemethode die in dit proefschrift gebruikt is om de verschillende talige vormen van metaforen in fictie te identificeren en classificeren. De gebruikte methode is een uitgebreide en aangevulde versie van een bestaande methode, de ‘Metaphor Identification Procedure’ of MIP. De oorspronkelijke MIP kan gebruikt worden voor het identificeren van indirecte metaforen, dat wil zeggen, woorden die in een indirecte betekenis – dus metaforisch – gebruikt zijn. De aangepaste en uitgebreide versie MIPVU (naar MIP, plus de initialen van de Vrije Universiteit) heeft echter tot doel om naast indirecte metaforen ook directe metaforen (metaforen in de vorm van niet-letterlijke vergelijkingen en analogieën) en impliciete metaforen (metaforen uitgedrukt via ellips of substitutie) te kunnen identificeren. Directe en impliciete talige metaforen zijn weliswaar niet zelf metaforisch gebruikt op talig niveau, maar kunnen wel duidelijk gerelateerd worden aan metaforen in de onderliggende conceptuele structuur en zijn daarom wel metafoor-gerelateerd.

Naast het uitgebreidere onderscheid tussen indirecte, directe en impliciete talige metaforen heeft de MIPVU de oorspronkelijk in MIP gebruikte tweedeling tussen wel en niet metaforisch, uitgebreid naar een drieledige onderverdeling in niet metafoor-gerelateerd, duidelijk wel metafoor-gerelateerd, en misschien metafoor-gerelateerd. Deze twijfelcategorie van ‘misschien-metaforen’ bleek goed van pas te komen bij het annoteren van personagebeschrijvingen in fictie die de grens tussen concreet-fysieke en abstract-mentale beschrijvingen vervagen. Ook de speciale categorie voor mogelijke personificaties die zowel metaforisch als metonymisch geïnterpreteerd kunnen worden, bleek uiterst nuttig voor het annoteren van het fictiecopus, met name voor beschrijvingen waarbij handelingen of eigenschappen aan lichaamsdelen in plaats van personages worden toegeschreven.

De gegevens van de betrouwbaarheidstoetsen laten zien dat de toepassing van MIPVU betrouwbare resultaten opleverde voor fictie en de andere tekstsoorten. De methode kan gebruikt worden om op een toetsbare en kwantificeerbaar manier de verschillende talige vormen van metaforiek te identificeren die traditioneel met literaire teksten geassocieerd worden, zoals personificaties en metaforische vergelijkingen. De MIPVU-methode en de daarop gebaseerde analyses in dit proefschrift vormen hiermee een waardevolle aanvulling op intuïtieve en meer kwalitatief georiënteerde analyses van literaire metaforen.

**De talige vormen van metaforen in fictie**

Hoofdstuk 5 en 6 van dit proefschrift geven een gedetailleerde beschrijving van de verschillende talige vormen van metaforiek, hun frequentie en distributie in fictie. In Hoofdstuk 5 worden de frequentie- en distributiepatronen in fictie vergeleken met de patronen in academische teksten, nieuwsteksten en spontane conversaties. In Hoofdstuk 6 worden de patronen binnen fictie nader gespecificeerd door systematisch onderscheid te maken tussen de dialogen en de narratieve gedeelten.

De kwantitatieve analyses in Hoofdstuk 5 laten zien dat het niet zo was dat de fictieteksten heel veel talige metaforen bevatten en dat fictie evenmin het domein was met het hoogste percentage talige metaforen. Met 11.9% metafoor-gerelateerde woorden had fictie een lager percentage dan de academische teksten (18.6%) en de nieuwsteksten (16.4%), maar wel een hoger percentage dan de conversaties (7.7%). In Hoofdstuk 6 bleek verrassend genoeg dat er wat betreft de frequentie van metafoor-gerelateerde woorden in
fictie, verder geen significant verschil was tussen de narratieve gedeelten en de dialogen. De narratieve gedeelten bevatten 11.8% en de dialogen 12.0% metafoor-gerelateerde woorden. De analyses in Hoofdstuk 6 lieten hiermee zien dat het gematigde percentage voor metafoor-gerelateerde woorden in fictie niet het gevolg was van een verschil tussen de narratieve gedeelten en de dialogen.

De analyses in Hoofdstuk 5 toonden tevens aan dat er een significante interactie was tussen tekstsoort, metafoorgebruik en woordklasse. Binnen het fictiecorpus was 75% van de metafoor-gerelateerde woorden een werkwoord (29.4%), voorzetsel (26.7%) of zelfstandig naamwoord (19.2%). De andere woordklassen waren beduidend minder vaak of zelfs zelden metafoor-gerelateerd: bijvoeglijk naamwoorden (10.9%), determinatoren (7.1%), bijwoorden (5.0%), voegwoorden (0.5%) en de restcategorie (1.3%). Hoewel er dus grote verschillen waren tussen de verschillende woordklassen in hoe vaak deze aan metafoorgebruik gerelateerd waren, vertoonden de vier tekstsoorten grotendeels vergelijkbare patronen. Deze ongelijke verdeling van metaforen over de woordklassen is dus niet specifiek kenmerkend voor fictie, maar grotendeels gerelateerd aan algemene patronen van metafoorgebruik in het taalsysteem.

De fictieteksten werden echter wel gekenmerkt door een hoge mate van individuele en unieke variatie in metafoorgebruik, vooral in het geval van de metafoor-gerelateerde bijvoeglijke en zelfstandige naamwoorden. Hoofdstuk 6 laat wederom zien dat de narratieve gedeelten en dialogen in fictie meer op elkaar lijken dan dat de narratieve gedeelten op nieuwsteksten lijken en de dialogen op conversaties. Met name voor de dialogen is dit opvallend, aangezien de analyses laten zien dat de fictieve dialogen niet alleen meer metafoor-gerelateerde woorden bevatten dan de conversaties, maar ook gekenmerkt worden door een veel hogere mate van creatieve en unieke variatie dan verwacht mag worden op basis van de gevonden patronen voor de spontane conversaties. Deze bevindingen sluiten aan bij eerdere studies waarin vastgesteld werd dat dialogen in fictie aanzienlijk informatiever zijn dan spontane conversaties, hetgeen gerelateerd kan worden aan de belangrijke rol die dialogen spelen in karakterontwikkelingen en het voortzetten van de verhaallijn.

Wat de verschillende soorten talige metaforen betreft, laten de analyses in Hoofdstuk 5 zien dat verreweg de meeste metafoor-gerelateerde woorden indirect gebruikt zijn, namelijk 95.9%. Direkte metaforen (3.1%) en impliciete metaforen (1.0%) zijn in het gehele corpus zeldzaam. De distributie van de indirecte en impliciete metaforen volgt eenzelfde patroon met het hoogste percentage in de academische teksten, gevolgd door de nieuwsteksten, dan de fictieteksten en tot slot de conversaties. De directe metaforen daarentegen volgen een geheel eigen patroon. De fictieteksten bevatten verreweg de meeste directe metaforen: 49.1% van alle directe metaforen bevond zich in de fictieteksten, terwijl slechts 20.4% van de indirecte en 18.6% van de impliciete metaforen zich in de fictieteksten bevond. Na fictie hadden de nieuwsteksten de meeste directe metaforen (33.3%), gevolgd door de academische teksten (11.9%) en de conversaties (5.7%). De analyses laten dus zien dat directe metaforen duidelijk een andere rol spelen dan indirecte en impliciete metaforen, en dat directe metaforen kenmerkend zijn voor fictieteksten.

Gezien het feit dat directe metaforen vaker opzettelijk zijn dankzij hun expliciete signaalwoorden, kan dit resultaat beschouwd worden als een empirische bevestiging van de algemene opvatting dat metaforische vergelijkingen een belangrijke rol spelen in literaire teksten. De opvatting dat fictie veel metaforen bevat, zou dus een gevolg kunnen zijn van het feit dat er relatief meer opzettelijke metaforen in fictie voorkomen. Daarbij moet wel
worden opgemerkt dat hoewel directe metaforen vaker voorkomen in fictie dan in de andere tekstsoorten, hun frequentie vergeleken met de indirecte metaforen zeer laag is.

De analyses in Hoofdstuk 6 toonden vervolgens aan dat directe metaforen een kenmerk zijn van de narratieve gedeelten van fictie: 88.5% van alle directe metaforen in fictie kwam voor in de narratieve gedeelten en slechts 11.5% in de dialogen. Verder laten de analyses zien dat de directe metaforen in de narratieve gedeelten doorgaans langer en complexer zijn dan de directe metaforen in de dialogen. De functie van directe metaforen in zowel narratieve gedeelten als dialogen is duidelijk gerelateerd aan het creëren van visuele effecten en de projectie van complexe scènes in plaats van eenvoudige concepten. Veel van de directe metaforen in fictie hadden betrekking op vergelijkingen tussen mensen en dieren of vergelijkingen tussen verschillende soorten mensen, waarbij de verschillen vaak een net zo belangrijke rol speelden als de overeenkomsten.

De kwantitatieve analyses in dit proefschrift laten derhalve zien dat fictie niet de tekstsoort is met de meeste talige metaforen. Ook is kwantitatief vastgesteld dat verreweg de meeste metaforen in fictie indirect zijn, maar dat directe metaforen een typisch kenmerk van fictie zijn, en dan met name in de narratieve gedeelten. Deze relatieve frequentie van directe metaforen in fictie hangt waarschijnlijk samen met hun opzettelijkheid en het feit dat ze door de expliciete signaalwoorden de aandacht vestigen op hun status als metaforen.

Personificaties in fictie: talige vormen, conceptuele structuren, communicatieve functies en cognitieve effecten

Hoofdstuk 7 en 8 vormen samen een casestudie van een frequente en belangrijke soort metafoor in fictie: personificaties. In Hoofdstuk 7 worden de verschillende talige vormen, conceptuele structuren en communicatieve functies van personificaties in fictie systematisch geïnventariseerd en de interacties tussen de verschillende analysesniveaus beschreven. Deze analyses hebben geleid tot de formulering van een classificatiemodel voor vier verschillende soorten personificaties in fictie. Hoofdstuk 8 beschrijft vervolgens een psycholinguïstische studie die de cognitieve relevantie van het voorgestelde model heeft getoetst door te kijken naar de herkenning van de verschillende typen personificaties in fictie door lezers die geen metafoordeskundigen waren.

Hoofdstuk 7 laat zien dat de interactie tussen talige vormen en conceptuele structuren van personificaties vaak complex is. Veel conventionele personificaties zijn wel duidelijk analyseerbaar op het talig niveau terwijl hun realisatie als personificaties op conceptueel niveau onduidelijk is. Andere vormen van personificatie, zoals de personificatie van lichaamsdelen, hebben daarentegen een duidelijke communicatieve functie terwijl hun analyse op talig en conceptueel niveau problematisch is, mede door de complexe interactie tussen metaforiek en metonymie. De rol van selectierestricties, conventionaliteit, opzettelijkheid en metonymie wordt in dit hoofdstuk geïllustreerd en samengenomen in de formulering van een model dat onderscheid maakt tussen vier typen personificaties: nieuwe personificaties, conventionele personificaties, “default” personificaties en metonymische personificaties.

De psycholinguïstische studie in Hoofdstuk 8 laat zien dat er verschillen waren in de herkenbaarheid van de vier voorgestelde typen personificaties en dat deze verschillen in herkenbaarheid gerelateerd kunnen worden aan verschillen in conventionaliteit en de concreetheid van het specifieke brondomein. Nieuwe personificaties werden het vaakst herkend en conventionele personificaties het minst; de metonymische en “default”
personificaties zaten hier tussenin. Dit resultaat is in overeenstemming met eerdere studies die aantoonden dat normaal gesproken alleen nieuwe metaforen genoeg opvallen om bewust herkend te worden als metaforen.

Met betrekking tot de verschillende brondomeinen van de personificaties bleek dat personificaties vaker herkend werden naarmate het brondomein concreter was. Daarbij werden de brondomeinen ‘beweging’ en ‘karaktereigenschappen’ het vaakst herkend, wat gerelateerd kan worden aan theorieën die stellen dat veel metaforen begrepen worden via belichaming, dus via een simulatie van hoe de handeling lichamelijk zou aanvoelen als deze uitgevoerd werd. Deze personificaties bleken een duidelijke rol te spelen in het creëren van visuele metaforen, die juist vanwege de mogelijkheid tot visualisatie wellicht meer opvallen. De proefpersonen hadden ook duidelijke meningen over de functie van de personificaties die herkend waren, en deze functies hadden veelal betrekking op het creëren van visuele effecten, het scheppen van een bepaalde sfeer en het vergroten van de mogelijkheid tot inleving in de beschreven situaties. De proefpersonen bleken daarbij vaak te refereren aan de intenties van de auteur en de esthetische functie van de personificaties. Deze bevinding sluit aan bij eerdere studies waaruit bleek dat literaire leesstrategieën de aandacht voor metaforen vergroot.

Eindconclusie

Dit proefschrift heeft een bijdrage geleverd aan de bestudering van metaforen in literaire teksten door te laten zien wat de voordelen zijn van een driedimensionale benadering van metaforiek, een corpuslinguïstische benadering van literaire metaforen, en het toepassen van expliciete kwantificeerbare en toetsbare identificatie- en analysemethoden. De kwantitatieve resultaten laten allereerst zien dat fictie niet het domein is met het hoogste percentage metafoor-gerelateerde woorden. Daarnaast laten de analyses zien dat het merendeel van de metaforen in fictie indirect is, en dat zowel impliciete als directe metaforen zeldzaam zijn. Hoewel directe metaforen een relatief kleine groep vormen en niet vaak voorkomen, spelen ze wel een belangrijke rol in fictie en zijn ze ook kenmerkend voor het register. Aangezien directe metaforen doorgaans opzettelijk gebruikt worden, biedt dit resultaat een mogelijke verklaring voor het feit dat mensen bij metaforen vaak aan fictie denken. Het is mogelijk dat fictieteksten niet zozeer meer metaforen bevatten dan andere tekstsoorten, maar wel meer opzettelijke metaforen. Deze opzettelijke metaforen vallen eerder op en worden dus vaker bewust door lezers herkend als metaforen.

De casestudy van de personificaties in fictie laat de voordelen zien van een systematisch onderscheid tussen talige vormen, conceptuele structuren, communicatieve functies en cognitieve effecten. De interacties tussen deze niveaus leiden tot verschillende typen personificaties in fictie, en deze typen verschillen ook in hun herkenbaarheid voor lezers. Hoewel er theoretische en empirische kwesties blijven die nader onderzocht dienen te worden, heeft dit proefschrift laten zien dat een kwantitatieve corpuslinguïstische benadering van literaire metaforiek tot nieuwe, soms onverwachte inzichten kan leiden en dat de gebruikte methoden nauwkeurigheid, betrouwbaarheid en validiteit kunnen toevoegen zonder af te doen aan meer kwalitatieve analyses van de verschillende vormen, functies en effecten van metaforen in de literatuur.
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