

# **Metaphor and register variation**

---

The personalization of Dutch news discourse

Printed by: Proefschriftmaken.nl || Printyourthesis.com  
Published by: Uitgeverij BOXPress, Oisterwijk

Cover illustration: Imaginary Constructs | Helene Koopmans

ISBN 978-90-8891-271-9

Copyright © 2011: Trijntje Pasma. All rights reserved.

VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT

**Metaphor and register variation**  
The personalization of Dutch news discourse

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad Doctor aan  
de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,  
op gezag van de rector magnificus  
prof.dr. L.M. Bouter,  
in het openbaar te verdedigen  
ten overstaan van de promotiecommissie  
van de faculteit der Letteren  
op dinsdag 14 juni 2011 om 15.45 uur  
in de aula van de universiteit,  
De Boelelaan 1105

door

Trijntje Pasma

geboren te Menaldumadeel

promotoren: prof.dr. G.J. Steen  
prof.dr. W.P.M.S. Spooren

## Acknowledgements

The final stages of this thesis always felt so far away. Now that they are here, it feels as though I have not only reached the end of my PhD project, but also the end of an era, my VU-era. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who played an important role in making it possible for me to get to the end and in making the era memorable.

First of all, many thanks go out to my supervisors Gerard Steen and Wilbert Spooren. Gerard, thank you for introducing me to the wonderful world of metaphor and for letting me, and our team, be part of the inspiring worlds of Pragglez and RaAM. Your critical view on the work that I did and constructive feedback were always helpful and sometimes much-needed. Wilbert, thank you for keeping a close watch and giving helpful and practical advice about so many things, but particularly about the statistics and the quantitative chapters. Without the help and support from the both of you, this final stage would have taken me so much longer.

I would also like to thank Eric Akkerman, Onno Huber, and Gerben Mulder for their technical assistance and assistance with the statistical analyses. Many parts of the project would not have worked out properly without their help. In that respect, I would also like to thank my student assistant Gudrun Reijnierse for her excellent work on coding the historical news texts and looking critically at my coding work and the Dutch manual.

I was fortunate to be able to spend three months of my research time in Lancaster, England, to work on the qualitative analyses of the metaphor data under the supervision of Elena Semino and Veronika Koller. They have provided me with valuable comments, constructive feedback and encouragements, for which I would like to express my sincere appreciation. Thank you for providing the time and opportunity for me to work with you.

My PhD time at the VU would not have been the same without my colleagues in the department of Language and Communication and the English Department. I would like to thank them for creating such a pleasant working environment. Special thanks go out to my 'promovendi-klasje' colleagues and to Marco Last and Digna van der Woude for making the 'klasje' possible. The final stages would have been so much more difficult without your support and advice.

My fellow Vici and Ster colleagues Tina, Berenike and Kirsten have made working on the project so much easier, more useful and fun. I consider myself lucky for having been able to work on this project in a team with you. Thank you for all the support, for the enjoyable conference visits together and for such a fun and fruitful Vici-Ster cooperation!

Two metaphor 'colleagues' and fellow PhD students deserve a very special thanks. Lettie and Anna, it seems so strange to refer to you as colleagues and

fellow students, since you are so much more than just that. You made the past five years, and all the VU years before that, so much more fun, interesting, easy, and memorable. Thanks so much for the support, for being in it together, for complaining sessions in the Basket, for all the other wine and beer moments, for continuing to quote Obama in difficult times. And for so, so much more! Our joint era at the VU may have come to an end, but I know our friendship hasn't.

Although it was sometimes hard to imagine, there was life outside the VU as well these past five and a half years. My friends and family provided the right and sometimes much-needed distractions from the project, particularly during the past year. I would like to show my thanks to a number of them in particular. First of all, I would like to thank my 'former' VU-buddies Annemieke, Mawgosia and Emmi, for their endless support, their sincere interest, their friendship and for all the good times we had, have, and will have together. A special thanks goes out to Helene, for being such a good friend all these years and for making my cover illustration. I love it!

I would also like to thank all my sports buddies for providing ample opportunity for me to relax and forget about the thesis for a while. Gerlous and Mette deserve special thanks for their friendship and welcoming distractions in any shape or form, and Nienke (aka my 'amanuensis') for the Sunday drinks, the talks, the friendship and the good times! I would also like to thank you three for showing an interesting and for completely understanding when I wasn't able to join you for drinks or boat trips.

Many thanks go out to my family in Friesland for their support from a distance, their questions, and their patience; I have been looking forward to the moment when I could finally show you the end product. I would also like to thank my family in law for the continuous interest and support. My final, very special thanks go out to Bas. Thank you for your support, encouragements, patience, but above all for your love.

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1. Style shifts in the register of news .....</b>	<b>19</b>
1.1 The notions of genre, register, and style.....	19
1.1.1 Genre.....	20
1.1.2 Register .....	21
1.1.3 Style .....	22
1.1.4 Genre, register, and style in the present study.....	23
1.2 Shifts within and between varieties: style changes.....	24
1.2.1 Fairclough’s hypotheses: marketization and informalization.....	24
1.2.2 Biber’s synchronic and diachronic register analyses .....	28
1.2.3 More trends: colloquialization and tabloidization of media discourse .....	31
1.2.4 Summary: trends in genre, register, and style shifts.....	33
1.3 Shifts in style through the semantic element of metaphor .....	34
1.4 Basic research questions: style changes through metaphor .....	37
<b>2. Metaphor in discourse: approaches to metaphor research.....</b>	<b>39</b>
2.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory: the pervasiveness of metaphor.....	39
2.2 Psycholinguistic insights: the processing of metaphor .....	43
2.3 Linguistic metaphor: identification and use .....	46
2.4 Metaphor in discourse: frequencies, forms and functions .....	51
2.5 Metaphor in conversations and news discourse in more detail.....	58
2.5.1 Metaphor in conversational discourse in more detail.....	58
2.5.2 Metaphor in news discourse in more detail.....	61
2.5.3 Preliminary summary .....	64
2.6 Metaphor in communication: deliberate uses of metaphor.....	64
2.7 Conclusion.....	68
<b>3. MIPVU: a manual for identifying metaphor-related words.....</b>	<b>71</b>
3.1 The basic procedure.....	71
3.2 Deciding about words: lexical units .....	72
3.2.1 General guideline for lexical units .....	72
3.2.2 Exceptions.....	73
3.3 Indirect use potentially explained by cross-domain mapping .....	74
3.3.1. Identifying contextual meanings .....	75
3.3.2. Deciding about more basic meanings.....	76
3.3.3 Deciding about sufficient distinctness.....	78
3.3.4 Deciding about the role of similarity .....	79
3.4 Direct use potentially explained by cross-domain mapping .....	80
3.5 Implicit meaning potentially explained by cross-domain mapping.....	80

3.6 Signals of potential cross-domain mappings .....	82
3.7 New-formations and parts that may be potentially explained by cross-domain mapping .....	82
<b>4. MIPVU in practice: its application to Dutch discourse .....</b>	<b>85</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	85
4.2 Corpus materials: Dutch conversations and news texts .....	85
4.3 MIPVU for Dutch: adjustments .....	87
4.3.1 Operational issue 1: the corpus tags .....	87
4.3.2 Operational issue 2: the Van Dale dictionary and its implications .....	88
4.3.3 Lexico-grammatical issue: complex lexical units and their boundaries .....	91
4.4 Identification protocol and metaphor coding .....	97
4.5 MIPVU for Dutch corpus: reliability results .....	103
4.5.1 Reporting reliability .....	103
4.5.2 Method .....	105
4.5.3 Results contemporary part of corpus .....	106
4.5.4 Results historical news part of corpus .....	108
4.6 Conclusion .....	110
<b>5. Metaphor in two registers of contemporary Dutch: distribution and use .....</b>	<b>113</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	113
5.2 Method .....	119
5.2.1 Materials .....	119
5.2.2. Database .....	120
5.3 Results .....	121
5.3.1 Register and word class .....	121
5.3.2 Register, word class and metaphor .....	123
5.4 Detailed analysis of results .....	126
5.4.1 Determiners .....	127
5.4.2 Prepositions .....	131
5.4.3 Verbs .....	136
5.4.4 Nouns .....	140
5.4.5 Word class patterns: conventionality .....	146
5.5 Conclusions .....	146
<b>6. Metaphor in a small diachronic corpus of Dutch news: distribution and use .....</b>	<b>149</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	149
6.2 Method .....	154
6.2.1 Materials .....	154
6.2.2 Database .....	154
6.3 Results .....	155
6.3.1 Word classes in two periods of news discourse .....	156
6.3.2 Time period, word class and metaphor .....	157
6.4 Detailed analysis of results .....	160
6.4.1 Patterns for historical news, current news, and conversation compared .....	162

6.4.2 Nouns .....	164
6.4.3. Prepositions.....	172
6.4.4 Verbs.....	180
6.5 Conclusion.....	185
<b>7. Delexicalised verbs and metaphoricity in Dutch conversation and news discourse</b>	<b>187</b>
7.1 Introduction .....	187
7.2 Verb frequencies and delexicalization.....	188
7.2.1 Verb frequencies in the corpus.....	189
7.2.2 Delexicalised verbs and metaphoricity .....	190
7.3 <i>Krijgen</i> as metaphor-related verb .....	194
7.3.1 <i>Krijgen</i> as metaphor-related verb in historical news.....	195
7.3.2 <i>Krijgen</i> as metaphor-related verb in current news .....	197
7.3.3 <i>Krijgen</i> as metaphor-related in conversation .....	200
7.3.4 Uses of metaphorical <i>krijgen</i> compared.....	202
7.4 <i>Hebben</i> as metaphor-related verb .....	203
7.4.1 <i>Hebben</i> as metaphor-related verb in historical news.....	204
7.4.2 <i>Hebben</i> as a metaphor-related verb in current news .....	207
7.4.3 <i>Hebben</i> as a metaphor-related verb in conversation .....	214
7.4.4 Changes in the use of metaphorical <i>hebben</i> .....	217
7.5 <i>Gaan</i> as metaphor-related verb .....	218
7.5.1 <i>Gaan</i> as metaphor-related verb in historical news.....	219
7.5.2 <i>Gaan</i> as metaphor-related verb in current news .....	222
7.5.3 <i>Gaan</i> as metaphor-related verb in conversation .....	225
7.5.4 Changes in the use of metaphorical <i>gaan</i> .....	227
7.5 Conclusion.....	228
<b>8. Metaphor and deliberateness in Dutch news discourse.....</b>	<b>229</b>
8.1 Introduction .....	229
8.1.1 Metaphor understanding and deliberateness .....	230
8.1.2 How to find deliberate metaphors: operationalisation issues .....	233
8.2 Method .....	235
8.2.1 Markers and signalling devices.....	236
8.2.2 Extended forms of metaphor.....	237
8.3 Similes as deliberate metaphors in news .....	238
8.3.1 Similes in historical news .....	240
8.3.2 Similes in current news .....	246
8.3.3 Conclusion .....	256
8.4 Inverted commas as markers of metaphor in news.....	257
8.4.1 Inverted commas and metaphor in historical news .....	259
8.4.2 Inverted commas and metaphor in current news.....	263
8.4.3 Conclusion .....	270
8.5 Metaphor extension in Dutch news data: a case study .....	271
8.6 General conclusion.....	276

<b>9. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>279</b>
9.1 Introduction .....	279
9.2 Summary of the main findings .....	279
9.2.1 Main research questions .....	279
9.2.2 Metaphor in language, thought, and communication .....	281
9.2.3 Developing and applying a tool for linguistic metaphor identification in Dutch discourse .....	283
9.2.4 Register variation: metaphor forms and frequencies in contemporary Dutch conversation and news .....	284
9.2.5 Diachronic variation: metaphor and the personalization of news language .....	286
9.4 Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research .....	290
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>293</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>295</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>299</b>
<b>Summary in Dutch.....</b>	<b>311</b>

# Introduction

## News media and the language of news

News media are diverse and dynamic in the manner in which they convey news topics to the public. Several decades ago news was published predominantly in written form in newspapers, but the arrival of television and, more recently, internet has produced a vast growth in the number of news providers and the multi-modality of news products. The rise of media other than newspapers seems to have sparked a broad change in the nature of news. Audiences are continuously changing, the relative speed of television and internet in comparison to the printed press has a large impact on the speed of publication of news topics, and the variety in channels influences the variety in the materials used to present news topics, such as photos, videos, use of colour and layout styles. News media have become visually and topically diverse over the course of several decades.

Despite the growing influence of television and internet media, the printed press remains one of the most important channels of providing news to the public. Nonetheless, the printed press has undergone key changes that seem to mirror the characteristics of the new media, such as the increasing importance of visuals in the form of photo materials, the well-considered choices of fonts and layout, and the diversity in types of articles. With regard to the language of the press, there is a widespread belief that it has shifted along with the overall changes occurring in the printed press. From various fields of research, people have commented on the apparent changes occurring in the language of news, changes that are related to the overall shifting nature of news media. They have focused predominantly on the shift towards a more informal style of language and the personalization that has become apparent, also by means of various new subgenres of news articles. Wijfjes (2004) conducted an extensive socio-cultural study of the transformation of Dutch newspapers and journalism in general. He suggests that Dutch newspapers, imitating American and British press, have started to pay considerable attention to various new sub-genres such as background articles, interviews and so on during the past few decades, giving the news a personal touch (Wijfjes, 2004: 334). Discourse-analytical studies of English news language have also suggested that news language in general has altered due to various reasons. Conboy (2007), for instance, states about newspapers that ‘their style of language evolved through history because of the constraints of time, space and market’ (2007: 6). He thus suggests a clear link between changes in the language of news and changes in audiences and time constraints. Within the field of Critical Discourse Analysis, Fairclough also signals a growth in what he calls the conversationalization and informalization of public discourse genres such as news articles, influenced by a focus on conversational language and informal forms of communication.

To get an idea of the various possible alterations in the language of the Dutch news related to the suggestions made by various linguists, below are two excerpts from Dutch news articles (including translation), the first from a newspaper from 1950 and the second from a newspaper from 2002. Both are introductions to an editorial article, the first about the problem of job securities and the second about the appointment of a new state secretary for the Ministry of Family Affairs. Sentence numbers are added in square brackets for ease of reference in the discussion below.

**1950** [1] De bereidheid om personen boven de veertig jaar in dienst te nemen neemt af en de mogelijkheid voor deze mensen om vast werk te vinden moet gering worden geacht. [2] Wel kunnen de Gewestelijke Arbeidsbureaux voor de oudere arbeiders werk van tijdelijke aard vinden omdat de van werkgeverszijde voor vast werk gestelde leeftijdsgrens geen rol speelt bij tijdelijke arbeid. [3] Een en ander concludeert, in zijn Memorie van Antwoord op het hoofdstuk van Sociale Zaken der Rijksbegroting, minister Joekes uit de keiharde cijfers van Gewestelijke Arbeidsbureaux. [4] Deze conclusies zijn waarlijk ontstellend.

*de Volkskrant, editorial, 7 January 1950 (90 words)*

*'[1] The willingness to take on persons over the age of 40 is decreasing and the possibilities for these people to find a regular job has to be deemed limited. [2] It is possible for the 'Gewestelijke Arbeidsbureaux' ('district employment office') to find work of a temporary nature for the older workmen, since the age limit for regular jobs that has been posted by employees does not play a role in temporary work. [3] This is concluded, in his Memorandum in Reply to the chapter by the Social Services of the Budget, by Minister Joekes from the clear statistics of the 'Gewestelijke Arbeidsbureaux'. [4] These conclusions are truly appalling.'*

**2002** [1] De nieuwe aanwinst van het kabinet-Balkenende is een lobbyist die zich jarenlang heeft ingespannen om de alcoholverkoop onder jeugdigen te bevorderen. [2] De man is gezien het toenemende alcoholgebruik van jeugdigen, met de daarmee gepaard gaande verloedering waarover de media uitvoerig berichten, uitstekend in zijn werk geslaagd. [3] Hij wordt staatssecretaris van emancipatie en gezinszaken en zal ongetwijfeld mee gaan huilen met de wolfjes in het bos over 'normen en waarden'. [4] De benoeming van deze Phoa past uitstekend in het beeld van de hypocrisie van de patjepeeër dat het huidige kabinet uitstraalt.

*Trouw, editorial, 7 September 2002 (91 words)*

'[1] *The new accession of the Balkenende administration is a lobbyist who has made an effort for years to promote alcohol sales to youngsters.* [2] *The man has, judging by the increasing alcohol consumption of youngsters, with its attendant degradation about which the media elaborate extensively, succeeded extremely well in his attempt.* [3] *He is appointed state secretary of emancipation and family affairs and will undoubtedly run with the hare and hunt with the hounds about 'norms and values'.* [4] *The appointment of this Phoa [surname] fits perfectly in the image of the hypocrisy of the boor that the present administration emanates.'*

The two excerpts illustrate a few interesting differences in the language that seem to be instantiations of an overall change in the style of the printed press. A number of linguistic differences stand out:

- If we disregard the exceptionally short sentence [4] in the 1950 excerpt, which seems to deviate extensively from the general practices in the excerpt (and the rest of the article), the average length of the sentences in the 1950 excerpt is considerably longer than the average length of the sentences in the 2002 excerpt. Sentences [1] – [3] in the 1950 text are 30, 29, and 26 words long respectively, while sentences [1] – [4] in the 2002 text are 22, 25, 23, and 21 words long respectively. Yet, the phrases and sentences in both excerpts show a relatively equal degree of complexity, both containing complex coordinating and embedded clauses, and both containing a number of complex noun phrases. The differences in length seems predominantly due to the high number of adjectives in the 1950 text, which contains a number of noun phrases with multiple adjectives. As a result, the 1950 excerpt may look more complex in syntactic structure.
- The spelling of a word such as *Arbeidsbureaux* (in [2] and [3] of the 1950 text) looks archaic to the contemporary language user; in contemporary Dutch, the plural of words ending in *-eau* is spelt *-eaus*. In addition, some lexical units may come across as archaic, not being used frequently in contemporary Dutch; an example is the preposition *der* (in [3]) meaning *of*. These issues can give the 1950 excerpt an old-fashioned character.
- Due to the choice of certain words and phrases in each excerpt, the style of the text from 1950 sounds reasonably formal and detached, whereas the style of the 2002 text sounds reasonably informal and popular. Formal expressions in the 1950 excerpts are phrases such as *Memorie van Antwoord* in [3], *gering achten* in [1], and *waarlijk* and *ontstellend* in [4], while informal expressions in the 2002 excerpt are words and phrases such as *patjepeeër* in [4] and diminutive particles such as *-jes* after *wolf* in [3]. The metaphorical idiom in which the diminutive occurs, *mee gaan huilen met de wolfjes in het bos* in [3] as a whole can also be regarded as informal. The use of *deze* in front of the surname of the

state secretary, Phoa in [4], could also be regarded as informal and relatively rude.

- Related to the idea that the 2002 text seems more informal and perhaps more popular is the extensive use of subjective elements that seem to convey the particular opinion of the journalist. Words and phrases in the 2002 excerpt such as *aanwinst* [1], *verloedering* [2], *uitstekend geslaagd* [2], *ongetwijfeld* [3], *past uitstekend* [4], and *patjepeeër* [4], and the use of inverted commas around *normen en waarden* [3] together seem to express a stance that the journalist takes towards the appointment of the person Phoa as state secretary. The excerpt from 1950 also contains a subjective element that presents the general opinion of the journalist, the phrase *jaarlijk ontstellend* in [4], which is prominent too, particularly regarding the formal tone of the preceding sentences. However, the phrase in itself is rather formal in nature, and may as such be regarded as less prominent than the phrases in the 2002 text. In addition, it is relatively isolated and not accompanied by a range of other subjective elements, like in the 2002 text.
- Finally, the choice of the idiomatic expression in sentence [3] in the 2002 excerpt is also used for rhetorical purposes, putting focus on the apparent hypocritical actions on the part of the state secretary. The additional use of the diminutive after *wolf*, which is normally not present in this idiom, enhances the ironic tone that seems to be present throughout the excerpt, also in words such as *aanwinst* and *uitstekend* in relation to negative issues.

This list suggests some examples of linguistic differences that can occur between news texts from 1950 and 2002. Overall, speakers of Dutch would agree that the language of the 2002 excerpt seems more informal, personalized, and subjective than the language of the 1950 excerpt due to different linguistic devices. The use of irony and subjective language in this case seem to convey the negative opinion towards the actions described in the text. Although this is to some extent also true for the last sentence in the 1950 excerpt, the effect is different due to its formality. The journalist from 1950 presents facts in a formal manner first before interpreting them, while the journalist from 2002 inserts subjective and opinioned elements from the beginning. The latter is enhanced by making use of rhetorical devices such as idiomatic expressions; the metaphorical idiom in sentence [3] seems to put focus on the questionable behaviour in past situations of the newly appointed state secretary and the link to possible hypocrisy in the future.

The differences in formality and rhetorical effect between the two excerpts do not seem to be incidental issues. As mentioned above, a number of linguists from various fields of research have suggested that the language of the news seems to have shifted gradually towards a more informal, involved, and colloquial style of language. Fairclough (1994) has suggested that public discourse genres, genres such as news articles, political interviews and so on, gradually contain more informal linguistic features and colloquial vocabulary; the genres show a trend of what he calls conversationalization, indicating that they are modelled upon

conversational practices and conversational language in a broad sense (Fairclough, 1994; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997).

Similar ideas have also been put forward by linguists who studied the frequencies of various linguistic features in a large number of texts from different historical and modern periods. Biber and Finegan (1989, 2001) have shown that press reportage has shifted from a relatively formal language concerned with providing information to a more informal language concerned with showing involvement over the course of several centuries, with a strong shift during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They suggest that news texts have shifted towards a more oral language style, based on a decrease of linguistic features that were characterised as formal, literate features and an increase of linguistic features that were characterised as informal, oral features. They showed that words such as nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and lengthy words in general, which are seen as characteristic of formal, informational language, decreased, while words such as first and second person pronouns, interjections and hedges, and demonstratives, which are seen as characteristic of informal, involved language, increased in the news texts. The trends of increase and decrease of these features seem to make modern news texts more informal and conversational than historical news texts. Their findings then coincide with the general ideas postulated by Fairclough.

The main linguistic features used in the studies by Biber and Finegan are all measurable by counting their occurrence in a text. However, there are also linguistic features that contribute to the increasing shift to informal language in news that are less easy to measure. Elements such as colloquial or subjective vocabulary, occurring in the 2002 excerpt and influencing its style, seem difficult to measure because they deal with the lexical semantics of words. The same applies to the use of idiomatic expressions that are metaphorical, and to metaphorically used words in general. These often create a certain image of the topic of a text, or carry particular connotations; they are used for particular rhetorical purposes and seem to be able to make a text more informal and personalized to the intentions of the journalist. In that respect, linguistic features such as subjective lexis and metaphorically used words and idioms could be an important part of the idea that news texts have become more informal, personalized, and conversationalized.

The lexical semantic elements mentioned above clearly appear in the 2002 excerpt and influence its style, making it subjective and personalised to a considerable degree. However, such elements do not receive much attention as possible features enhancing the conversationalization and personalization in the various studies of the changes in news language. The research conducted in the present thesis focuses on the occurrences and functions of those elements in order to uncover their roles in the general trends of informalization and personalization of news language.

## **Aims of the study and research questions**

The ideas introduced above led to a joint research project focusing on the study of the linguistic aspects of conversationalization of Dutch public discourse, brought together under the header *VU-Ster*. The overall objective of the project is to investigate whether trends of conversationalization can be observed through the phenomena of subjectivity and metaphor. The project consists of two sub-projects, one focusing on the phenomenon of subjectivity and one on the phenomenon of metaphor. They make use of the same corpus especially compiled for the project, consisting of contemporary conversations, contemporary news texts and historical news texts. The first sub-project, on the role of subjectivity in the conversationalization of Dutch public discourse, is carried out by Kirsten Vis, and the results are published in a thesis (Vis, in prep.). The second sub-project, on the role of metaphor in the conversationalization of Dutch public discourse, is presented in the present thesis.

The sub-project on metaphor in conversationalization has not only worked together with the other *VU-Ster* project, but has also collaborated with another large project carried out at VU University Amsterdam during the same period, namely the NWO-Vici project ‘Metaphor in discourse: linguistic forms, conceptual structures, cognitive representations’ (funded by NWO-Vici grant 277-30-001). This project involves five researchers, principal investigator Gerard Steen, and four PhD students, Aletta G. Dorst, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and J. Berenike Herrmann. The project aims to identify and describe the linguistic forms, conceptual structures, and cognitive representations of metaphors in four registers of English, conversation, news, fiction, and academic discourse. It is carried out with the assumption that there is an interaction between register and metaphor forms, meaning that the four registers show differences in the frequencies, forms, and functions of metaphors. The English language project results in four PhD theses, one each on metaphor in conversation (Kaal, in prep.), metaphor in news (Krennmayr, in prep.), metaphor in fiction (Dorst, in prep.) and metaphor in academic discourse (Herrmann, in prep.).

The collaboration between the NWO-Vici project and the *VU-Ster* metaphor project mainly involved the development and testing of a reliable method for linguistic metaphor identification that can be used for a number of languages. This final product of this collaboration, MIPVU, is discussed in more detail in chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis. The main results and application of the developed method can also be found in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010).

Similar to the basic assumptions proposed for the English language project, the Dutch metaphor project posits the idea that there are likely to be differences between contemporary registers in frequencies, forms and functions of metaphor. This means that, when studying the contemporary parts of the corpus, the register of conversation would essentially contain different linguistic forms of metaphors than the register of news, and that they may be used for different purposes and may function in different ways. At the same time metaphorical language may be an

important feature involved in the general trend of conversationalization, which would mean that contemporary news language contains more metaphors that are characteristic of contemporary conversations than historical news language does. Thus, although contemporary news language may look different than contemporary conversations in the occurrence and use of metaphors, they may be closer to conversations than historical news language is with respect to metaphor. The assumptions and ideas above are represented in the two main research questions around which this thesis revolves. These are as follows:

1. In how far do the contemporary registers of conversation and news differ from each other regarding the occurrence and use of metaphorical language? If there are differences, can these be ascribed to the functional differences between the registers in general?
2. In how far do historical news language and contemporary news language differ from each other regarding the occurrence and use of metaphorical expressions? If there are differences, do these contribute significantly to the processes of style shifts in news discourse, that is, can they be seen as part of the general trend of conversationalization?

To be able to give an answer to the question whether news texts have changed in their use of metaphorical expressions, whether these possible changes in metaphorical language are similar to the metaphorical language in conversations, and whether news texts have as such become more informal and personalized, this study takes into account the different frequencies, forms and functions of metaphors in news and conversation.

The thesis will pay attention to metaphor in language and cognition, but also in communication. First of all, the linguistic metaphors in the current news data and conversation data are identified and compared. The conversation data function as a norm for informal language use, and as such will play a role in determining whether there is a trend of conversationalization in news with regard to metaphor. Subsequently, the linguistic metaphors in the historical news data are identified and compared to the findings for current news, and possible differences can be compared to the general patterns of metaphor in conversations to determine if differences point to a cline towards conversational metaphors. The metaphorical patterns of verbs will receive special attention, since this word class has proven frequent in all registers of Dutch language, and frequent as a linguistic metaphor. These quantitative analyses will be followed by a qualitative analysis of deliberately used metaphor in the two news periods in the corpus. A qualitative analysis of deliberate metaphors, and possible differences in how they occur in the two news periods, can shed more light on the workings, functions and possible rhetorical effects of metaphorical language that is intentionally used *as* metaphor. By focusing on different elements of metaphor in contemporary conversations, and current and historical news texts, a complete picture of the workings of metaphors

and their role in the conversationalization of public discourse, and news discourse in particular, may be uncovered.

### **Outline of the thesis**

Chapters 1 and 2 together form the theoretical background of the study. Chapter 1 discusses the notions of register and stylistic shifts, outlining the main ideas behind the conversationalization, informalization, and personalization of public discourse from different fields and traditions of research. Chapter 2 focuses on the study of metaphor in language, cognition and communication, paying attention to Conceptual Metaphor Theory, psycho-linguistic insights into different processing issues, and to discourse-based studies of metaphor in various settings of discourse.

Chapters 3 and 4 are methodological in nature. Chapter 3 presents the metaphor identification procedure developed in collaboration with the researchers of the Vici-project, the MIPVU procedure. Chapter 4 gives an outline of the Dutch corpus materials used in this study, and discusses the application of MIPVU to those materials, presenting problematic issues, adjustments and reliability figures.

In chapters 5 and 6 the quantitative analyses of the metaphor data are presented and discussed; chapter 5 presents the comparison of linguistic metaphor frequencies and patterns between contemporary Dutch conversations and news texts, and chapter 6 presents the comparison of linguistic metaphor frequencies and patterns between historical and current Dutch news texts.

Chapter 7 focuses on one particular word class, namely verbs, and discusses the interesting patterns of metaphor-related delexicalised verbs in the three data sets, paying attention to common conceptual structures and shifts in use. Chapter 8 presents a qualitative analysis of deliberate metaphors occurring in the historical and current news texts. It compares the most interesting uses and patterns occurring in the two news periods, focusing on metaphor in communication. Finally, chapter 9 summarises the main findings, pays attention to some limitations of the study, and proposes ideas for future research.

# **1. Style shifts in the register of news**

This study focuses on the occurrence and use of metaphor in two registers of Dutch, conversation and news language, and in two time periods of news, texts from 1950 and from 2002. The overall objective is to determine on the one hand whether particular differences between conversation and news language occur for the use of metaphor, and on the other hand whether stylistic differences with regard to metaphor have occurred in news language over a period of time. The first objective is based on the idea that different registers vary in their use of various linguistic phenomena, related to situational and functional characteristics. The latter objective is based on previous ideas and studies of diachronic changes in the language of public discourse carried out from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. These studies have all in some way or other suggested that public discourse, and the genre of news reportage in particular, has undergone a shift from a formal, informational style of language use to an informal, involved style of language use, stereotypically represented by the language of conversations and hence described as the notion of conversationalization. An overview and discussion of these studies and the research questions based on them is presented below, but first the most important notions will be defined in more detail.

## **1.1 The notions of genre, register, and style**

The broad objective of the present research project is to examine metaphor in two language varieties of Dutch, those of conversations and news texts, and to determine whether stylistic changes regarding metaphor use have occurred in the latter, news texts, according to the hypothesis that news language shifts towards a more informal, involved style that resembles typical conversational language. Variation in text can be described in numerous ways, but for present purposes the focus will lie on genres, registers, and styles. Genre and register are sometimes used interchangeably to describe the same ideas, but it is important to make a distinction between the two and explain which perspectives can be taken. The phenomenon of style is most notably studied within the field of stylistics. Traditionally, stylistics is the linguistic approach to analysing literature (cf. Freeman, 1970; Leech & Short, 1981; Short, 1996), but the notion of style can also be used to describe the language of various newspapers, the language of news periods, the language of political speeches, the formal or informal language of people in conversations, and so on. Each of the three notions will be described separately below.

### 1.1.1 Genre

The notion of *genre* has been used in various ways within different academic traditions such as linguistics, the social sciences and cognitive science. Many studies refer to genre, but few present a clear definition that incorporates the various dimensions that seem inherent to the notion. Swales (1990) gives an overview of how genre is dealt with in different disciplines such as literary, rhetorical and linguistic studies, and includes a working definition of what genre entails in relation to the applied purposes of his research. In brief, a genre is seen as a class of communicative events which have a shared set of communicative purposes (Swales, 1990: 45, 46). In other views of genre, the focus on the communicative purpose of texts is often paired with other characteristics such as the relationship between participants (e.g., Van Leeuwen, 2008), the variation in modality (e.g., Bateman, 2008), or is said to need integration with text-external factors such as discursive and professional practices in the case of specific professional genres (Bhatia, 1993, 2004, 2008). Biber (1988), in his extensive study of variation across English speech and writing, uses the term genre to refer to text categorizations made on the basis of external criteria, stressing the importance of various situational parameters such as the communicative purpose, relations among users, and processing constraints. At the same time he notes that the genres selected for his study are adopted from the corpora he used and the distinctions they made, which in some cases may have resulted in complex genre categories which consist of various subgenres that Biber would otherwise have separated (1988: 65-70). Biber made use of 23 spoken and written genres to study textual dimensions and relations, such as academic prose, press reportage, conversation, radio broadcast, science fiction, and so on, focusing predominantly on their linguistic variation. In more recent work by Biber and Conrad (2009), a genre is still viewed as a variety that includes various elements such as typical linguistic features, situational characteristics, and textual structures that are related to the functions of that genre, but the description has been narrowed down by putting the focus on unique textual elements. They suggest that conducting a genre analysis includes analysing particularly the unique textual elements of a group of texts, disregarding the pervasive elements. In their description of genre, they seem to oppose it to broad register analysis, something that the present study regards as incomplete; register is seen as a part of genre.

Steen (1999b) proposes a taxonomy of discourse from a cognitive-psychological angle, in which genres of discourse are characterized by various attributes that define contextual, textual, and linguistic elements, such as domain, medium, function, type, form, content. Some of the attributes listed by Steen are contextual aspects, others are related to superstructures of texts and specific text patterns and conventions, others still entail linguistic aspects, focusing on the language and on stylistic and rhetorical aspects of classes of discourse. Similar kinds of prototype categorizations have previously been proposed by Paltridge (1995), who suggests a framework for genre analysis in which stereotypical

properties associated with a genre are uncovered but which also allows texts which lack certain properties to still be assigned to a clear genre.

A more full-blown model of genre from a cognitive-psychological perspective, which incorporates aspects of communication, cognition, and language, is presented by Steen (in press a) as the notion of a *genre event*. The model is based on a multi-level approach to discourse representation and comprehension elaborated by Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983). They distinguished several levels involved in the production and understanding of discourse, such as the context model, the situation model, the text base, and the surface text, of which language users construct and maintain mental representations during discourse comprehension (cf. Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983; Van Dijk, 2008). Steen (in press a) proposes that the various attributes and features identified within linguistic, social and cognitive sciences to define genres can be ordered according to his cognitive-psychological genre model. This genre model sees genres as ‘individual action patterns that involve not just language but also, and crucially, cognition and communication’ (in press a: 7). A simplified version of Van Dijk and Kintsch’s (1983) comprehension model is presented in the form of three elements: the context model refers to the relevant structures and entities outside the text and represents the interaction between language users and the major classes of text and talk; the text model refers to the message that is exchanged and represents various aspects of the text in various types of discourse; and the code model refers to the semiotic means expressing the text and represents various aspects of the language and other modalities. Of each of the three elements, various feature candidates are listed. Important context features are, for instance, participant relations and roles, goals and functions, domain, medium, and situation and settings. Important text features are content, type, form, and structure of the text. Important code features are modality, the language, register, style, and rhetoric. There are ambiguous cases where certain variables can be assigned to more than one element because they are characteristic of more than one element, but essentially the model offers a maximally inclusive framework for genre analysis.

### *1.1.2 Register*

The notion of *register* has been used in various ways to explain language varieties from a functional and situational perspective, in which different aspects of the situational context influence the use and function of language. Important situational elements that determine a register are features such as institutional setting, participants and their relationships, mode or channel of communication, and topic and theme, which have been summarized as the field, tenor and mode of discourse (Halliday 1978; and also cf. Halliday, 1985; Hymes, 1974; Ure, 1971). Following these ideas, Biber and Conrad (2001) describe the term register in a similar manner. As they put it, ‘*register* [is] a cover term for any variety associated with a particular configuration of situational characteristics and purposes’ (Biber &

Conrad, 2001: 175). In earlier work by Biber and some of his colleagues similar situational characteristics are mentioned, such as mode, interactiveness, domain, communicative purpose, and topic (Biber, 1999; Biber et al., 1999).

In more recent work Biber and Conrad (2009) state that the notion of register covers three major components: the situational or contextual characteristics, the linguistic features, and the functional relationships between the two (Biber & Conrad, 2009: 6). They suggest that linguistic features, in particular lexico-grammatical ones, appear in a target register because they are appropriate for the purposes and situational context of that register. A register analysis consequently focuses on the pervasive linguistic features identified in a target register, features that can occur in any variety but occur particularly frequently in the target register because of their connection to its situational context (Biber & Conrad, 2009). However, in their description of register and genre, and the register and genre perspectives that researchers can adopt in their analyses, they seem to view register on the same level as genre. In register analysis, the pervasive linguistic features of a variety are studied, and in genre analysis the unique linguistic elements are studied. In brief, they seem to view register then as a discourse variety, working on the same level as genre.

In the present study, however, register is taken as a variety of language, such as the language of news or the language of conversations, which entails the most pervasive linguistic features present in the variety in question. Within the genre model discussed above, register is a vital element of the code or surface text of a genre. It is thus seen as a separate element in itself in the genre model, and not as operating on a similar level to genre. The analyses of different registers then focus on those pervasive linguistic features of a discourse variety that occur throughout texts, and are characteristic of them, within that variety. It can be said that the register is a language variety that is employed in connection to the context and function of the texts for which it is used, but at the same time there is a certain liberty in employing an appropriate register. As Steen (in press a) describes it within the model of code, register is a generally recognized language variety, such as legalese or journalese, which various genres can use with varying degrees of liberty. It is essentially at the level of register that the present study operates, as will be explained in more detail below.

### *1.1.3 Style*

The notion of style can be described in broad terms as the selection that a language producer makes from the total number of linguistic possibilities (Leech & Short, 1981: 9). It can be applied to a large number of language varieties from different periods of history to explain distinction between formal or informal language use, to explain differences in linguistic choices for rhetorical purposes, or to assess the appropriateness of language use in accordance with particular situations in which it occurs. Style is also often associated with literary language, denoting the linguistic

preferences of, for example, individual writers or particular historical periods to make the language more attractive, serving an artistic function (cf. Leech & Short, 1981). It is, however, also applied to other varieties of language, such as news language and political speeches, analysing the linguistic preferences of journalists, newspaper editors or publishers, politicians or others to make texts informal or formal, or more specifically to personalise the language or to create certain rhetorical effects. The notion of style is related to the notion of register in that it focuses on linguistic features, but should essentially be seen as variation within a register, one that is based on preferences of individuals or groups of producers.

The study of style and stylistic differences between texts then focuses on the linguistic variation that occurs within a register because of the conscious and unconscious choices made by text producers. Such choices of style can focus on formal or informal, or funny or serious language use, for instance. They also often depend on how producers want to express a story or event, where a range of linguistic features can be manipulated in various ways. In relation to the study of literary style, the description of style is sometimes seen as a ‘deviation from the norm’ (Freeman, 1970). This means that the language of literary texts can transmit more than information alone, and that this is achieved by making specific syntactic and lexical choices where there are options to do so (Freeman, 1970: 6). Such choices are not only made in fictional texts, but can also be deployed more or less deliberately in, for instance, academic essays or newspaper articles, or more generally in academic discourse or in news discourse.

A stylistic analysis can be conducted to compare texts within a single register or genre, but with respect to news language, it is also applied to collections of texts from single newspapers or periods. Biber and Finegan’s (1989, 1992, 2001) work, for instance, centres around the analyses of various linguistic features to determine stylistic shifts within registers over a period of time. They found that certain written formal registers gradually moved towards a more oral informal style of language, moving towards the style of conversations to some degree. Their work, discussed in more detail below, can be seen as an important collection of studies on the style and the stylistic shifts of numerous written and spoken registers.

#### *1.1.4 Genre, register, and style in the present study*

In brief, the present study takes into account all three notions of genre, register, and style to a certain degree, but focuses specifically on the registers of news and conversation, and on stylistic variation and shifts within those registers. In total, some 50,000 words of Dutch conversation excerpts and 80,000 words of Dutch newspaper articles were studied for their general linguistic features that function within the respective situational contexts and purposes. In particular, the different analyses focus on the linguistic preferences of the two registers, and for the register of newspaper language on the shifts from a more formal style to a more informal

style of language over a period of time. One linguistic phenomenon which can be exploited for stylistic purposes, the phenomenon of metaphor, will be the main focus of this study. More about the role of metaphor in relation to stylistic shifts is discussed in more detail below.

## **1.2 Shifts within and between varieties: style changes**

Within different linguistic fields of study, it has been proposed that the traditional distinction between some written and spoken registers has become blurred over time, and that a number of conventionally more formal registers such as news and political language move towards more informal registers such as conversations on a number of levels (cf. Biber & Finegan, 1992, 2001; Fairclough, 1995b; Mair, 2006). There are qualitative as well as quantitative studies which focus on different elements of discourse varieties. A collection of these concentrate on diachronic changes affecting the style of various formal genres. In particular, the formal variety of public discourse, and news discourse predominantly, has been an important topic of style shift analyses. In general, the studies take into account various linguistic features that reflect stylistic shifts in language. Public discourse such as news language, political language, and so on increasingly contain language features characterizing involved, spontaneous production, making their style more oral, informal, and personalized, or, in brief, 'conversational'. Different elements of change have been identified, and different labels have been given to the changes observed. Below is an overview of the most prominent studies regarding stylistic shifts in the language of public discourse.

### *1.2.1 Fairclough's hypotheses: marketization and informalization*

Within the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), different studies on the change of formal discourse practices have been conducted. The work by Norman Fairclough on different aspects of change in public language and connected shifts in purposes and power relations of such discourse varieties is particularly significant in this respect (Fairclough, 1992, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1998; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). Fairclough has carried out a number of qualitative studies analysing the language and contexts of formal genres such as news articles, political speeches and interviews, and university correspondence. In these studies, he predominantly focuses on ongoing changes in the diverse situational circumstances such as purposes of texts and participant relationships, and the linguistic shifts that represent such changes. His main claims concern two essential trends, that of the *marketization* and that of the *informalization* of public discourse (Fairclough, 1992, 1994, 1995b; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997; and see Pearce, 2002 for a detailed overview).

Marketization is described as the process whereby social domains and institutions, such as schools, universities, or hospitals, which traditionally are not concerned with producing goods that can be sold in the typical economical fashion, become organized and conceptualized in terms of commodity production, distribution and consumption (Fairclough, 1992: 207). This process is also reflected in the language of such domains and institutions, as shown in a comparison of university prospectuses, which seem to have changed from informational sources to persuasive texts, recommending and selling a university and its courses. This is accomplished, for example, by adjusting the layout of the text, resembling advertisement layouts, and by including linguistic features of persuasion. The process of marketization is thus a combination of changes in the situation of the variety accompanied by changes in the presentation of the message, both visually and linguistically.

For the present study, it is particularly the notion of informalization of public discourse that is of interest. Informalization is divided by Fairclough into two sub-elements, namely *conversationalization* and *personalization*. Conversationalization is in broad terms described as the ‘modelling of public discourse upon the discursive practices of ordinary life, “conversational” practices in a broad sense’ (Fairclough, 1994: 253). It seems to have predominantly affected formal genres such as news (both written and broadcasted forms), political language like speeches and interviews, counselling sessions, educational language, and so on. Fairclough has noted that the boundaries between public and private orders of discourse are shifting and restructured, where public discourse increasingly shows a trend of including features such as simulated dialogue and conversational vocabulary (Fairclough, 1994). This has been illustrated by, for instance, newspaper headlines consisting of typically conversational features such as colloquial vocabulary, shortenings, and pauses in the form of dots (Fairclough, 1994, 1995b), but also by advertising language and counselling sessions, to name but a few of the data examples that Fairclough discusses. According to Fairclough, there are different elements involved in the process of conversationalization, which are most noticeably represented by the spread of linguistic features that are characteristic of conversations into areas of public discourse which are not normally associated with conversations (also cf. Pearce, 2002).

Specific linguistic features that have been identified by Fairclough as evident of the conversationalization process are the use of colloquial vocabulary, phonic and prosodic features of colloquial language, modes of grammatical complexity characteristic of spoken language, and use of conversational narrative (1994: 260). In addition, more straightforward features such as personal pronouns, hedges, emphatic expressions, repetitions, lack of subject-verb congruence, and so on have been found to increase in political language use (Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). But not only linguistic features are listed as markers of conversationalization of public discourse. It also includes ‘a simulation of conversational interaction in for instance institutional interviews or the way in which politicians address public audiences’ (Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997: 91).

There are thus shifts in the frequencies of linguistic features as well as in participant relations that suggest a process of change of public discourse towards conversational practices. The underlying idea is that traditionally formal genres, such as news, political interviews and so on, show a gradual shift towards conversational discourse in their language use related to shifts in certain situational characteristics such as participant relations and goals. Fairclough essentially describes the change in various elements of discourse varieties that are related to contextual and linguistic elements of the varieties. However, he uses as main evidence for those changes the shifts in linguistic features, seeing the change in language and other elements of code in public discourse genres as clear manifestations of overall changes towards conversational practices.

Personalization, the other element of the more general informalization, is the process whereby a personal relationship is constructed between the producers and addressees of public discourse (also see Pearce, 2002). As a basis for this claim, Fairclough puts forward a case study in which one of his data samples, that of academic posts published in *The Times*, constructs a 'personalized relationship between institution and potential applicant' (Fairclough, 1995a: 146). Suggested features of personalization are minimized power differences between producer and receiver through linguistic choices, in the form of different textual markers such as first and second person pronouns, verbs in the imperative mood, and avoiding tendencies of nominalization and passivization. The notion of personalization is described and explained in less detail than that of conversationalization, but predominantly seems to concern the changing relationship between language users and the informal level of communication that goes along with this.

Both conversationalization and personalization are visible through the spread of linguistic features associated with conversational language and personalized language. The differences are not made overtly clear by Fairclough himself, but seem to lie in the fact that with personalization, the crucial element is the shift in power relations between producer and receiver (something Fairclough calls *equalization*) and that for conversationalization, the key element is the overall simulation of conversational practices, visible predominantly in key linguistic changes that represent stylistic shifts. In any case, it is suggested by Fairclough that conversationalization and personalization, together informalization, are clearly manifested as linguistic trends that seem to have as an underlying cause the shift in situational contexts and relations between participants as well as shifting goals and functions of the genres under review.

The main critique towards Fairclough's hypotheses is aimed at the essentially intuitive approach that he adopts (Pearce, 2002, 2005; Steen, 2003). As Pearce (2005: 69) fairly remarks, 'although Fairclough identifies several features which he regards as implicated in assigning levels of formality to a text, nowhere does he give a systematic account of how informality in language might be identified'. Although critical of the intuitively gathered data and lack of systematic analysis in Fairclough's studies, most researchers also acknowledge that the claims made by Fairclough may be intuitively correct. Both Pearce (2002, 2005) and Steen

(2003) have tested the claims empirically by systematically analysing small corpora of particular genres of public discourse for the occurrence of pre-defined features of conversational and informal language use.

Pearce has restructured some of Fairclough's previous ideas more consistently, and lists some of the vital features of informalization in general, and conversationalization and personalization in particular. He has looked at the informalization of British party election broadcasts from 1966 to 1997 by applying a checklist against which the degree of formality or informality of a text may be measured. Pearce has set up his checklist of linguistic markers of conversational and personal language use based on the main outcomes of a detailed corpus-based analysis of the grammar of English spoken and written registers (Biber et al., 1999). Results show that the party-election broadcasts generally grow more informal over time, showing a broad overall increase in informalization over a number of decades through the increasing use of personal and indefinite pronouns, stance adverbs, and questions, and the decreasing use of nominalizations, adjectives, and so on (Pearce, 2005).

The study by Steen (2003) addresses an aspect of conversationalization that focuses on 'patterns of stylistic changes that are involved in the development towards a conversational manner of discourse' for a genre that is traditionally far removed from conversations, namely newspaper editorials (Steen, 2003: 115). Steen has focused on patterns of stylistic changes in editorials of *The Times*, looking specifically at shifts in involved and informational style markers such as first and second person pronouns and nouns, adjectives and prepositions, and at shifts in narrative and persuasive style markers such as verb tense and aspect and modal auxiliaries. The quantitative analysis has been carried out on the basis of Biber's (1988, 1989) multi-feature/multi-dimensional approach to varieties of genres in English. Steen found a significant increase in overall involved style for editorials from 1975 to 1995 in relation to editorials from 1950 to 1970, with particularly pronouns becoming more frequent. Overall, the results by Steen and Pearce are in accordance with the qualitative judgements made by Fairclough, but have at the same time more empirical ground, being based on previous quantitative register analysis carried out by Biber (1988, 1989).

The qualitative and quantitative studies concerned with the ideas of informalization of public discourse are predominantly sociolinguistically oriented. Fairclough's studies raises a number of interesting issues with concern to the informalization, and on a more specific level the conversationalization of public discourse, where genres of more formal discourse such as news articles and political texts and speeches, move towards more informal levels of discourse, particularly in the use of a conversational style of language. Pearce and Steen empirically tested parts of Fairclough's intuitively based hypothesis, both looking at the shifts in use of linguistic features that marked texts as more informal, involved and conversational. Pearce (2005) found that British political party manifestos generally shifted to a more informal style over a period of 30 years, visible in the increase of linguistic features such as personal pronouns and stance

markers. Steen (2003) found that editorials from The Times have shifted to a more involved style due to the increase in personal pronouns as well. The results from these studies, in combination with the case studies discussed by Fairclough, support the initial conversationalization hypothesis postulated by Fairclough that public discourse genres such as news texts and political documents seem to shift gradually towards a conversational style.

### 1.2.2 Biber's synchronic and diachronic register analyses

The claims put forward by Fairclough are based on intuitive judgements, with a handful of examples illustrating the hypotheses of conversationalization and personalization, together informalization. Steen and Pearce have shown that the main ideas can be supported by quantitative evidence, at least for some specific genres, based on corpus-linguistic studies of a number of typical conversational language features. The main starting point of these studies was a number of linguistic features characteristic of conversational discourse derived from studies by Biber and colleagues on the variety of spoken and written discourse (Biber, 1988, 1989; Biber et al., 1999). Biber's analyses are purely quantitative, and are based on corpus research on the features and dimensions of spoken and written English discourse, taking as a basis the linguistic features in texts, and placing situational context in the background.

Biber (1988) developed an approach to the variation of speech and writing (in English) based on the supposition that strong co-occurrence patterns of linguistic features represent underlying functional dimensions. He presents a multi-feature/multi-dimensional analysis of text types in which statistical analysis of the frequencies of various linguistic features can identify the underlying structural-functional dimensions in a set of texts.<sup>1</sup> A factor analysis of a large set of linguistic features distinguished six dimensions along which different genres vary. The six textual dimensions are groups of linguistic features that co-occur in texts because they operate together as a reflection of some common underlying function.

Three dimensions that are distinguished by Biber particularly mark a difference between spoken and written language.<sup>2</sup> Dimension 1, labelled '*Involved versus informational production*,' marks affective, interactional and highly involved text production versus high density and highly informational text production. Among the linguistic features that are representative of involved language are verbs of cognition such as *feel, hear, hope, think, understand*, etc.,

---

<sup>1</sup> In his study, Biber (1988) refers to *genres* to describe the text types used in his corpus. In later studies, he refers to *registers* or *register analysis* to describe similar approaches, such as in Biber et al. (1999) and Biber & Conrad (2009). Here, his earlier notions of genres and texts are used (Biber, 1988).

<sup>2</sup> The other three dimension identified by Biber in his statistical analysis are Dimension 2 (Narrative versus nonnarrative concerns), 4 (Overt expressions of persuasion), and 6 (On-line informational elaboration). A detailed description of all the dimensions identified, and the statistical analysis that forms the basis, can be found in Biber (1988).

first and second person pronouns, demonstratives, contractions and adverbs. The linguistic features that are representative of informational production are nouns, prepositions, and adjectives, word length and type-token ratio (Biber, 1988, 1989). Dimension 3, labelled '*Elaborated versus situation-dependent reference*,' characterizes highly explicit, context-independent reference versus non-specific, situation-dependent reference. Among the linguistic features that are representative of elaborated reference are WH-relative clauses and nominalizations, which typically state the identity of referents within a text. The linguistic features representative of situation-dependent reference are time and place adverbials, which are usually used for text-external reference. Finally, Dimension 5, labelled '*Abstract versus non-abstract style*,' characterizes discourse that has an abstract, technical and formal style. The occurrence of, among other features, agentless passives, past-participial clauses, and conjuncts distinguish informational texts that are highly abstract and formal from other types of discourse (Biber, 1989: 10).

The results of the analysis show that the various discourse varieties included in Biber's corpus score differently on the dimensions discussed above. Press reportage, for instance, has one of the lowest values for Dimension 1, showing its typical informational characteristics. Face-to-face conversations, however, have one of the highest values for Dimension 1 and are thus highly involved (Biber, 1989). Similar differences between the two genres are found for Dimensions 3 and 5, which points towards a clear distinction between the language and functions of news and conversation. The results consequently also show that news and conversations contain different pervasive linguistic features related to the dimension scores. Frequent features in conversations are then first and second person pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, adverbs, hedges and (private) verbs, while frequent features in news are nouns, prepositions, adjectives and high type-token ratio. Moreover, the frequent features of conversations are relatively infrequent in news, while the frequent features of news are relatively infrequent in conversations.

Using this multi-feature/multi-dimensional approach to the study of English discourse, Biber and some of his colleagues also looked at diachronic variation between texts of the same type, studying linguistic changes over time within several discourse genres (Biber & Finegan, 1989, 1992, 2001; Finegan & Biber, 1995). According to Biber and Finegan (1989: 493), it is possible to characterise the various genres they use in their studies as being relatively 'literate' or 'oral', where literate refers to language typical for writing and oral refers to language typical for speaking. These characterisations, however, do not have to correspond to the modalities of speech and writing; literate language can occur as spoken discourse, and oral language as written discourse.

Biber and Finegan (1989) examined corpus data from four centuries, determining the patterns of change in the registers of three written genres, essays, fiction and letters. The three genres were scored on the occurrence of linguistic features representing Dimensions 1, 3 and 5 in Biber's 1988 study. The poles of these dimensions can be characterised as distinguishing between oral and literate

discourse in some sense, but they each define different kinds of relations between the genres (Biber and Finegan 1989: 495). They explored historical shifts in the language of essays, fiction, and letters towards more oral styles characterised by the poles of the three dimensions. The general tendencies of change in the genres were similar for all three dimensions, gradually shifting to the more oral styles, thus having more oral features in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century in comparison to the earlier centuries. The modern texts were usually seen as portraying a more oral style than their 17<sup>th</sup> century counterparts (Biber & Finegan, 1989: 499). Similar patterns of drift were also found for two speech-based genres, dialogue from plays and from fiction (Biber & Finegan, 1992). As with the written genres, the overall patterns of drift in the dialogues from plays and fiction on the whole showed a steady progression towards the oral poles of the dimensions (Biber & Finegan, 1992: 695).

A follow-up study involved a wider range of discourse varieties, including popular written text such as news reportage and specialist expository text such as medical prose, scientific prose and legal prose (Biber & Finegan, 2001). In this study, Biber and Finegan found that for most of the expository written genres (medical, science, and legal prose) the patterns were different from what they found in their earlier studies. The specialist registers followed a gradual development towards more literate styles over the course of four centuries. The popular register of news reportage, however, developed towards a more 'literate' formal style in the earlier centuries, but then reversed this trend in the more recent periods, shifting towards more oral characteristics (Biber & Finegan, 2001: 76). This shift for news reportage, according to Biber and Finegan's findings, did not occur until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, thus relatively recently in comparison to the other popular and speech-based genres studied earlier. The findings reported in Biber and Finegan (2001) seem to be in accordance with the general hypothesis of conversationalization proposed by Fairclough, and add linguistic evidence based on empirical studies of the language of news and other genres.

In light of the findings reported by Biber and Finegan, several other studies focusing on particular news genres yielded similar results (cf. Westin, 2002; Westin & Geisler, 2002). Interestingly, these focused on diachronic changes in news towards an oral style of language over the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, thus on more recent changes. Westin and Geisler's (2002) study of British newspaper editorials concentrated on patterns of change for the first five dimensions from the original variation study by Biber (1988). They found that for Dimension 1, where the poles each reflect a written and an oral style of language, the patterns were irregular and difficult to interpret, probably due to the large variety between the three newspapers in their corpus. For the other two dimensions (Dimensions 3 and 5) where the poles each distinguish between oral and literate language, the patterns showed developments towards oral styles in the period after the Second World War (Westin & Geisler, 2002).

The diachronic studies by Biber and Finegan and by Westin and Geisler base their analyses on the occurrence of linguistic features and lexico-grammatical

patterns, focusing on the surface text, or code, of the varieties they studied. A similar approach based on the multi-feature/multi-dimensional studies of Biber (1988) was adopted by Steen (2003), who found comparable results. They all observed that the language of press reportage, among which editorials, developed towards the poles of Dimensions 1, 3 and 5 that reflect an oral style of language from different perspectives. The linguistic features increasing in frequency over time were elements such as personal pronouns, demonstratives, adverbs, particularly time and place adverbials, hedges, and verbs. Features that decreased were elements such as nouns and nominalisations, adjectives, prepositions and type-token ratios. Some of these features were also suggested in the CDA-based studies by Fairclough and colleagues as important elements that indicate the conversationalization of news, and public discourse in general; results from the corpus-based studies thus seem to support the intuitively formed hypothesis of conversationalization.

### *1.2.3 More trends: colloquialization and tabloidization of media discourse*

A combination of the qualitative critical linguistic approaches and quantitative corpus-based approaches described above has led to various other, sociolinguistic studies that have resulted in similar conclusions about the change of media language as those discussed so far. Hundt and Mair (Hundt & Mair, 1999; Mair, 2006) intend to provide an analytical concept which is needed to integrate the different approaches of historical analysis, critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics (Mair, 2006: 187). They observed a shift in style of journalistic prose towards a more colloquial and involved language, and suggest the term ‘colloquialization’ (Hundt & Mair, 1999: 221). A comparative study of journalistic prose from two periods, the 1960s and the 1990s, and two English standards, British English and American English, showed that there is an increasing trend in the use of contractions and phrasal verbs, as well as personal pronouns, which are suggested indications of a trend towards a more colloquial journalistic style (Hundt & Mair, 1999: 230). Colloquialization predominantly deals with linguistic features and language structures, similar to the other trends discussed so far. As a linguistic term, it covers a significant stylistic shift in twentieth-century English, away from a written norm which is maximally distanced from speech and a high level of formality and towards a written norm that is closer to spoken usage and a level of informality (Mair, 2006: 187).

However, there also seem to be elements involved in the trend of colloquialization that operate on the macro-structural level of texts, that is the overall textual conventions. The increasing use of quotations and stretches of direct speech are examples put forward in Hundt and Mair’s study of journalistic prose (Hundt & Mair, 1999; Mair, 2006). Such quotations can be seen as oral features that bring public discourse (news) closer to personal discourse (conversations). According to Mair, the intended stylistic effect of direct quotations is ‘to make the

texts appear more dramatic, interesting, and accessible and, presumably, also to involve the reader emotionally' (2006: 188). The idea of involvement has also been suggested by Biber as a feature of conversational language, seen in the combinations of linguistic features that determine the positive pole of his Dimension 1. Mair, however, notices the effect of involvement in the structural use of quoted sections. Hundt and Mair are the only ones to distinguish an element of textual structure as a clear feature of change within the shift of news discourse towards a more oral style of language. Use of quotations seems to affect the style of news language considerably, involving linguistic features that can be seen as typically conversational, such as pronouns and private verbs. Quotations thus seem to influence the register of news, but also affect the structure and form of a text as a whole.

Another trend involving textual features of the changes of public discourse, termed 'tabloidization' has been identified by Holly (2008), in particular in relation to specific media genres, and to mass media in general. It involves different elements, but does not put its main focus on linguistic features of change. Rather, it focuses on other modality features such as visual components and aspects of layout. Tabloidization refers to the change of media towards an increasing sensational style of bringing news to the public. The term is related to one traditional form of written media, the tabloids. According to Holly, many people associate certain characteristic such as news presented in a brief and sensationalist form, large bold font sizes in headlines, use of pictures and cartoons, and so on with the boulevard papers or tabloids. News sections that are traditionally reserved for informational purposes, i.e. the so-called 'hard news' sections, have also shown trends of tabloidization, increasingly exhibiting a form of 'infotainment' in which certain linguistic features and visual structures are used to present news in a more sensational form (2008: 322, 323). Holly suggests that the fact that media increasingly communicate in terms of entertainment, including in areas that were hitherto reserved for information, 'may have to do with their increased orientation towards commercial goals' (Holly, 2008: 329). Here, links can be made to the idea of marketization introduced by Fairclough, with a combination of language changes and visual changes such as use of photos, colour, and clearer layout serving a shift towards commercial goals of bringing news.

The trends of colloquialization and tabloidization suggest similar ideas to the processes described in the previous sections. However, the two also focus on slightly different elements of discourse varieties that have not been described thus far. These include shifts in textual conventions influencing the overall structure of texts, such as use of direct quotes, and the change in modalities other than language, such as visuals and layout. With respect to the changes in the frequencies of various linguistic features, one important observation that has been made in relation to the trends of language styles for different written genres, and in particular news, is that they often reflect a shift in preferences of a language style rather than a change in a language system on the whole (cf. Hundt & Mair, 1999; Mair, 2006). Thus, it does not seem to be the case that language in general shifts to

a more informal, oral, or colloquial language, but that certain registers prefer a shift to a more informal, involved language style. The ways in which people make use of the structural and stylistic options that the language makes available to them seem to have changed to a considerable degree (Mair, 2006: 197). Journalists and newspapers seem to opt increasingly for informal, conversational features at the expense of formal, informational features when producing news language. The shifts in the use of certain linguistic features and textual elements in the language of public discourse, and news in particular, seem to cause a general trend of conversationalization, involving the informalization and personalization of the register of news.

#### *1.2.4 Summary: trends in genre, register, and style shifts*

As mentioned before, the various processes described above all entail shifts and trends involving public, more formal discourse and private, more informal discourse, the latter resembling conversations. In general, they all include the idea of formal registers such as the language varieties of news and politics moving towards informal, private registers such as the language variety of conversations. There seem to be subtle as well as clear differences between the analyses from the various fields of research, but at the same there is a large degree of overlap between the processes too. All processes to some degree describe changes in the style of public discourse, but they operate at various levels of language, incorporating different genre, register, or style elements.

The terms and processes described by Fairclough concentrate on forms of change in the actual language or code which seem to correlate with forms of change in parts of the situational context, such as changes in the function of genres and relations between participants. He predominantly sees the shifts in linguistic elements of conversations as the products of the changes in the contextual elements. The labels given to the various processes essentially differentiate between the contextual changes: for instance, *marketization* focuses on the shift towards the function of selling certain public services, whereas *informalization* focuses on the shift towards more informal interaction relations between participants. Pearce's study is strongly related to Fairclough's ideas but empirically tests the hypotheses by selected linguistic features that have been shown to influence the style of a text and studying these from a quantitative perspective before interpreting the possible trends. The same can be said about Steen's study, which highlights a number of specific features that show a change in style of editorials towards more informal uses of the language, thus also focusing on a stylistic shift in the register of editorials.

The studies within the corpus-linguistic traditions focus first and foremost on changes in the frequencies of linguistic features, and suggest possible reasons for change after gaining results from the linguistic analyses. This is in contrast to Fairclough's intuitive approach to changes in the language of news, which is based

on hunches more than tested observations. Biber and Finegan are predominantly concerned with showing register changes, looking at shifts in lexico-grammatical patterns. They conclude that specific stylistic shifts have occurred towards an informal, oral style of language use due to an increase in linguistic features typical for oral registers of language.

Biber and Finegan's processes remain at the level of register analysis, but the trends of colloquialization and tabloidization identified by Hundt & Mair and Holly respectively also distinguish the text element of a genre as a direct feature of change. In the trend of colloquialization, the increasing use of direct quotes changes the structural conventions of news reports in a distinctly colloquial manner. It consequently puts more focus on conversational features in the form of quoted material, and hence changes the textual conventions towards more colloquial conventions. The trend of tabloidization notices a shift in the entertainment value of political news reportage, which is partly represented by multi-modal features associated with the tabloid press. It includes use of visual materials, colours, large bold fonts, and according to Holly is related to the change in function and type of the news reports.

The different trends demonstrated above have a number of things in common. Firstly, they all seem to include linguistic features and their functions within different situational contexts, regardless of the qualitative or quantitative backgrounds of the studies. The changes in frequencies and uses of various linguistic features seem related to changes in certain contextual characteristics, such as relations among participants, production features, rhetorical goals and so on. Secondly, the various studies point to the fact that such changes can be seen as stylistic changes of the relevant register. They establish shifts towards more involved styles of the language varieties in question, predominantly visible in the increasing use of linguistic features that are characteristic first and foremost of conversational language. A third commonality is that the linguistic features of stylistic change refer to lexico-grammatical or syntactic features, such as particular word classes, tenses, or cohesive elements, but leave out of their analyses the semantics of such linguistic elements. The style of a variety, however, is usually not only determined by lexico-grammatical and syntactic elements, but also by lexical semantic features of the linguistic elements.

### **1.3 Shifts in style through the semantic element of metaphor**

The different studies have concentrated on the aspects of stylistic changes of public, formal discourses, using various elements of code and relating some to contextual and textual changes in the different genres, and have labelled surfacing trends accordingly. All processes ultimately describe a change in the style of public discourse where personalized, involved elements surface, and where public discourse seems to shift the linguistic accent by becoming more involved and personalised in language, and possibly affecting addressees by appealing to their

personal views, ideas and feelings. One element that seems to be lacking in all the descriptions of processes is a semantic view on register, and stylistic variation and shifts within registers related to the element of semantics.

Stylistic choices do not only concern lexico-grammatical features, but often also concern the semantics of certain lexical choices: the meanings of words are influential when making linguistic choices and consequently influence the style of a text or a general register. The issue of semantics seems to be lacking in all of the studies on processes of change discussed above. However, general studies in the tradition of stylistics have suggested that certain semantic elements are important features of a style of a text (e.g. Leech & Short, 1981). In principle, many of the lexico-grammatical features mentioned by Biber, Fairclough and others naturally have a semantic element, in the sense that they have meaning in context. However, the studies do not consider this particular quality of the features that have been defined. There are also linguistic elements that are interesting with respect to the style of discourse particularly because of their semantic qualities.

One phenomenon that has a unique semantic quality and that often influences the style of a text is that of figurative language, and more specifically metaphorical language use. A wide range of words, units, or expressions can be used metaphorically in context, that is, they can be used to talk about something in terms of something else. Metaphor is a typical lexical semantic notion, because it commonly pertains to polysemous meanings of words in context. In some cases, these are highly conventional expressions, but in many other cases, metaphorical expressions have specific rhetorical effects and partly determine or influence the style of a variety as well as the effect that the language in context has on addressees.

There exists a large collection of work on the incidence and structures of metaphors in different registers and genres of discourse, which predominantly deals with the frequencies and functions within texts and with the differences occurring between registers and between genres. A great number of discourse-analytic studies on metaphor have suggested that metaphors occur in certain genres in certain forms for certain purposes. Other studies have focused more on the overall frequencies and forms of metaphor in registers of language, such as conversational language or news language. Many of the metaphor studies related to registers and genres will come up in the following chapter, but a selection will be briefly discussed here to introduce the role that metaphor can play in diverse settings.

Semino's (2008) study on metaphor in discourse, for instance, includes the analysis of metaphors in literature, political discourse, and science and education. In each of these domains, metaphorical expressions occur in particular forms, structures, complexities, and so on, that can be linked to the situational contexts of the genres involved. In addition, certain metaphorical expressions are used for specific purposes in certain genres of discourse. This clearly surfaces in, for instance, politics and political discourse, where particular metaphorical expressions in speeches or political news reports are often used to discuss sensitive issues or to

view particular issues in a positive or negative light (e.g. Charteris-Black, 2004, 2005; Semino, 2008). With respect to news discourse, studies also often focus on the use of metaphors in particular subgenres such as financial reports, for instance to express the viewpoints of various subjects in specific financial situations (cf. Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003; Semino, 2002).

On a register level, some metaphor scholars have looked at the occurrence and use of metaphors in various language varieties. The register of conversation, for instance, has been studied extensively for its use of metaphors; the language of reconciliation talk, classroom conversations, and casual conversations has been studied extensively in metaphor-related research (cf. Cameron, 2003, 2007, 2008; Drew & Holt, 1998). With respect to conversational discourse, the purpose of certain conversations can determine the use of metaphorical expressions, and related to that, the style of speech of an individual, a group of people, or a setting. In the case of the language variety of news, metaphors they can partly determine the style of news language in general, and that of users such as individual journalist, newspapers, or sections of news in particular.

The incidence and functions of the semantic phenomenon of metaphor thus seem important elements that co-determine the style of a register such as news language, political language or conversational language. In general, metaphors are often said to have a rhetorical effect when used in certain settings, but also relate to more personalised language use, subjective views, and involved aspects of language. Some instances of metaphor colour the style of texts, genres, or registers. Based on the results of the different linguistically oriented studies discussed above, a shift in the use of metaphors may also be part of the overall change of public discourse towards more involved, personalized language use. A semantic change may partly be measured by the frequencies, forms and functions of metaphorical expressions.

The linguistic level of metaphor may be easiest to analyse: in what forms do metaphorical words occur in which register, and are there significant changes to the forms and frequencies of metaphor between different periods of a registers? Corpus-based studies into the language of metaphor have suggested that certain registers prefer certain word classes in the form of metaphors, whereas other registers prefer other word classes as metaphors (cf. Deignan, 2005; Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). There seem to be register-specific as well as genre-specific and text-specific preferences in the use of metaphors. Shifts could theoretically take place in the register of news discourse from forms and frequencies of metaphors typically associated with formal, written registers to forms and frequencies of metaphor typically associated with a conversational language variety. This particular linguistic element of metaphor may fit into the register model in the same way that the features from Biber and Finegan and from Fairclough do.

But metaphor is complex, and must be analysed on different levels in order to provide a complete picture of its role in various registers. There is also a conceptual and a communicative level to metaphor. Particularly the communicative level is interesting with respect to public and private discourses: which kinds of

metaphors are deliberately *as* metaphors used for which purposes, and are there significant changes between different periods of a single register in the use, function, and effects of deliberate metaphors? To answer this question, more information is needed than simply the frequencies and word classes involved. It is vital to look at the structures and complexity of the different kinds of metaphorical expressions to see in which instances they seem deliberately used to create a rhetorical effect, and what their functions and consequences are in those cases. Deliberately used metaphors are particularly interesting as they seem to try to bring across certain goals and purpose by invoking particular metaphorical images. The semantic value of metaphor relates to the language, style and rhetoric attributes of the element of code, but also concerns function, and sometimes within specific genres rather than in a registers more generally. It can play a role in the general idea of style shifts in public discourse suggested by the diverse studies discussed above.

#### **1.4 Basic research questions: style changes through metaphor**

In the light of the studies on style shifts in the register of news language and the various roles and effects that metaphors can have in different registers and discourse varieties, this thesis formulates two general questions about the role of metaphor in the idea of style shifts in public discourse. These concern the use and role of metaphor in two registers of discourse, conversations and news, and to the uses and possible shifts in use of metaphor in different periods of news discourse, which may be related to the processes of gradual informalization and involvement of public discourse registers such as news. Two questions lie at the basis of the present study:

1. First of all, the differences between the occurrence and use of metaphorical language in two contemporary registers will be considered. One register, spontaneous conversations, falls within the oral end of the language scale and can be used to form the basis of how metaphor apparently occurs in conversational language. The other register, newspaper language, falls within the written end of the language scale. Frequency analyses of the metaphor-related words in each register will determine whether metaphorical language occurs in different forms in conversation and news, and what these differences entail and may accomplish. In short, the questions that will be answered are in what forms metaphorical words occur in which register, and how these forms reflect comparable and distinct functions of style, register, and genre.
2. Second, metaphorical language use in the register of news will be analysed from a diachronic perspective, where style changes due to metaphor are the main topic of analysis. Based on the idea that metaphorical language is a

semantic characteristic of the style of registers, it will be determined whether the occurrence and use of different metaphorical expressions in historical and current news texts differ from each other. In short, the questions that will be answered are whether metaphors are linguistic elements that also contribute significantly to the processes of style shifts in news discourse, that is, whether there are significant changes between different periods of news in the use, function, and effects of metaphors. If so, which kinds contribute to this idea, and how do they contribute?

In order to answer the main questions, a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses of metaphorical language, related to the analysis methods described above, is applied to corpus data consisting of Dutch conversations and historical and current news articles. But first, the complex notion of metaphor is discussed in detail.

## **2. Metaphor in discourse: approaches to metaphor research**

The previous chapter defined and discussed various trends of stylistic changes in the language of public discourse that have been suggested within different corpus-linguistic and sociolinguistic fields of study. The different studies presented dealt with shifts in contextual characteristics such as changes in power relations between participants or expansion of commercial purposes of traditionally non-commercial registers, but their main focus was on the reflection of these contextual processes in lexico-grammatical features and the language styles of public discourse registers. None of the studies, however, have devoted attention to the semantics of language in public discourse. Within the study of stylistic changes in formal registers of discourse, certain inherently lexical semantic elements can play an important role. It was argued at the end of the previous chapter that the phenomenon of metaphor in particular may play an important role in the hypothesis that registers of public discourse shift to more personalized and informalized styles of language use.

The notion of metaphor has been briefly defined in the previous chapter, but will be discussed in detail here. The present chapter will give a broad view of the various theories and aspects of metaphor, its different manifestations, and in particular its uses and functions in various registers of discourse. First, general ideas behind a conceptual theory of metaphor will be discussed, followed by ideas on the understanding processes of metaphorical expressions. Then two sections will focus on linguistic metaphors and the various forms, functions and roles of metaphorical expressions in a range of discourse settings. The final section will pay attention to the differences between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphors, and the purposes of deliberate metaphors as communicating different intentions. Together with the previous chapter, the present chapter provides the theoretical background against which the remainder of the dissertation proceeds.

### **2.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory: the pervasiveness of metaphor**

Until relatively recently, a metaphor was generally seen as a creative linguistic device that people used to express certain ideas that could perhaps also be expressed using literal language. As such, it was seen as a mainly ornamental tool used in, for instance, fictional language to make a piece of writing more interesting and creative, or in politically oriented settings, where it would be used as a rhetorical device. The view of metaphor as a decorative linguistic device changed drastically with the increase of cognitive-linguistic research on metaphor. Ortony's (1979b) original volume on *Metaphor and Thought* included chapters that based their ideas on the creativeness of metaphors, but also included a number of chapters by scholars who emphasised the conventionality of metaphor in language as well as

thought (e.g., Reddy, 1979). With Lakoff and Johnson's publication of *Metaphors we live by* (1980) the idea of Conceptual Metaphor Theory really touched ground, introducing a theory of metaphor based on cognitive linguistic ideas, a theory from which many studies have since departed. Although there is now a wide variety of studies on various aspects of metaphor that refine or even oppose some of the claims made by Lakoff and his followers, the cognitive-linguistics view of metaphor has contributed to some of the new directions taken in psychologically based, discourse-analytic, sociolinguistic and applied linguistic studies of metaphor.

Lakoff and Johnson suggested that people continuously structure their world, their thoughts and their language in terms of conceptual metaphors. As they put it,

... metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 3)

According to Lakoff and Johnson, the basic principle of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT) is that metaphor operates at the level of thinking; it is central to thought, and therefore to language. Similar ideas were previously put forward by Reddy (1979), who stated that metaphor is intrinsic to thought rather than being a purely linguistic device. He discussed what he called the 'conduit metaphor', describing the systematic ways in which people talk about communication in terms of the transference of concrete objects. Expressions such as 'It is very difficult to *put this concept into words*' or 'Try to *get your attitudes across to her* better' illustrated this (Reddy, 1979: 189, 190, my italics). The idea of such systematic metaphors has formed the basis of Lakoff's ideas on conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff, 1993).

The notion of conceptual metaphor is generally described as understanding one conceptual domain, the target domain, in terms of another conceptual domain, the source domain, with systematic sets of correspondences or mappings occurring across the conceptual domains. Generally put, a conceptual domain is 'any coherent organization of experience' (Kövecses, 2002: 4), such as TIME, WAR, LOVE, EMOTIONS, GAMES, and so on. Conceptual metaphors are higher level representations which underlie various structures in language and thought. They are generally presented as A IS B structures, while their linguistic realisations can occur in any linguistic form. A well-known example that Lakoff and Johnson present to illustrate their ideas about conceptual metaphors, and that has been repeated frequently, is the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR<sup>3</sup>, for which the target domain of ARGUMENT is partly structured in terms of the source domain of

---

<sup>3</sup> In the tradition of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Cognitive Linguistics, conceptual metaphors are written in small capitals to differentiate between the CONCEPT and the linguistic representation of the concept. These conventions are followed in this thesis as well.

WAR. They list a number of conventional expressions reflecting this metaphor, for example the following (with linguistic metaphors in italics):

Your claims are *undefensible*. He *attacked every weak point* in my argument. His criticisms were *right on target*. I *demolished* his argument. If you use that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*. He *shot down* all of my arguments. (adopted from Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 4; italics in original)

These expressions can be seen as linguistic evidence for the fact that people conceptually structure the way they think, and subsequently talk, about arguments in terms of war. Language is seen by Lakoff and Johnson as an important source of evidence of how we structure our thoughts, actions, and our world, and is thus used throughout their work to illustrate their propositions. However, they also claim that, in addition to uttering such conceptual structures linguistically, people actually perceive them as such as well. Thus, with regard to the conceptual metaphor of ARGUMENT IS WAR, many of the things we do or act out when arguing are also partly structured in terms of war (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 4).

There are a great number of other conceptual metaphors that have been discussed in detail by Lakoff and others to illustrate that some conceptualizations are metaphorically structured in our minds (e.g. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993; Kövecses, 2002). Long lists of linguistic realizations of conceptual metaphors are presented as illustrations in the literature (e.g., Croft & Cruse, 2004; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002), such as TIME IS SPACE ('We've *entered* the 21<sup>st</sup> century'; 'They worked *through* the night'), THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS ('The theory needs more *support*'; 'We need to *construct* a *strong* argument for that'), LOVE IS A JOURNEY ('We're at a *crossroads*'; 'I don't think this relationship is *going anywhere*'), LIFE IS A JOURNEY ('He had a *head start* in life'; 'He's *gone through* a lot in life').

The essence of CMT is thus understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 5). This applies to how we speak, but also to how we reason and how we behave. Based on the various source and target domain notions that Lakoff and Johnson spell out, it has been suggested that the fundamental basic concepts used to structure abstract notions are primarily highly concrete, human-oriented and experience-based. As Semino (2008) states:

Cognitive metaphor theorists emphasize that target domains typically correspond to areas of experience that are relatively abstract, complex, unfamiliar, subjective or poorly delineated, such as time, emotion, life or death. In contrast, source domains typically correspond to concrete, simple, familiar, physical and well-delineated experiences, such as motion, bodily phenomena, physical objects and so on. (Semino, 2008: 6)

In general, conceptual metaphors seem to be based on concepts such as spatial orientation and relations, ontological concepts, and experiences to express abstract notions (cf. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002). According to Lakoff and

Johnson (1980: 14), spatial orientations seem to arise from the fact that ‘we have bodies of the sort that we have and that they function as they do in our physical environment’. Such metaphorical orientations are not random, but have a clear basis in people’s physical and cultural experiences. Going one step further, people’s experiences of physical objects and substances provide a further basis for understanding, one that goes beyond mere orientation. As Lakoff and Johnson put it,

Understanding our experiences in terms of objects and substances allows us to pick out parts of our experience and treat them as discrete entities or substance of a uniform kind. Once we can identify our experiences as entities or substances, we can refer to them, categorize them, group them, and quantify them – and, by this means, reason about them. (1980: 25)

These concepts can be seen as basic human-oriented and concrete concepts based on concrete orientation and experiences. As shown above, several source domains recur within the concept of spatial orientation, such as SPACE to understand TIME (cf. Boroditsky, 2000), concepts like UP and DOWN to understand EMOTIONS, and so on. The most prominent concept, however, is that of embodiment. In Kövecses’ (2002: 16) words, ‘the “embodiment” meaning is perhaps *the* central idea of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor’ (emphasis in original). Several scholars have emphasised the idea that metaphor is fundamentally grounded in embodied experience (cf. Gibbs, 2005; Gibbs et al., 2004; Kövecses, 2002). This essentially entails that systematic patterns of bodily experience, such as movement, the experience of momentum, bodily functions, etc., serve as the source domains for many cross-linguistic metaphorical mappings (Gibbs et al., 2004). Related to this is the notion of primary metaphors, which according to Grady (1997) are the most basic level of metaphorical mappings, that have a strong correlation in everyday embodied experience.

Similar to there being conceptual domains that frequently function as source concepts, there are also certain conceptual domains frequently taking the role of target concepts. These are generally everyday abstract domains that are experienced in terms of embodied concepts, such as TIME, LOVE, IDEAS, EMOTIONS, and so on. The concept of TIME, for instance, is often expressed in terms of SPACE, and IDEAS are often understood in terms of OBJECTS or FOOD. Different kinds of emotions also seem to be primarily understood by means of conceptual metaphors. As Kövecses suggests, emotion metaphors largely fall under a generic level metaphor of EMOTIONS ARE FORCES, including lower-level concepts such as natural forces or physical forces (Kövecses, 2000, 2002, 2008). Lakoff even claims that as soon as one gets away from concrete physical experience and starts talking about abstractions or emotions, metaphorical understanding is the norm (1993: 205). This indeed seems true for the concept of emotions but may be too bold a statement for abstract concepts in general; not every abstract topic seems to need concrete concepts to explain and reason about it. There is, however, an

abundance of evidence that abstract concepts are indeed often talked and reasoned about in terms of concrete concepts.

The impact of the conceptual view of metaphor on various fields of linguistic research has been profound. This seems mainly due to its focus on the conventionality of metaphor, as Semino (2008) has adequately stated:

The originality of the contribution of CMT lies particularly in its focus on patterns of conventional metaphorical expressions, its emphasis on the embodied nature of many conventional metaphors, and its account of how metaphors can systematically shape our world view. (Semino, 2008: 9, 10)

Many studies on metaphor in discourse have based their accounts of metaphorical language use on the initial ideas put forward by Lakoff and Johnson, and illustrate that many varieties of discourse, not just literary discourse, contain metaphorical language. Where previous studies on metaphorical language seem to focus predominantly on the creativity and novelty of metaphorical expressions, the conceptual theory of metaphor provided the basis for studying the pervasiveness and patterns of metaphorical language in our everyday language use.

## **2.2 Psycholinguistic insights: the processing of metaphor**

The growing interest in and evidence for the conventionality of metaphor in language and thought suggested by the cognitive-linguistic perspective has simultaneously generated an intensification of studies on the comprehension and processing mechanisms of metaphors. There are several views on how metaphors are comprehended, some of the most prominent focusing on the relation between target and source domain. Some scholars claim that all metaphors are understood as cross-domain comparisons in which language users set up correspondences between target and source domains, and others suggest that they are comprehended as categorizations in which language users make use of a superordinate category. There are also models in which a combination of comparisons and categorizations are possible.

Many models of metaphor comprehension underline the role of semantic domains in the comprehension of metaphors. Metaphorical language typically involves concepts from a target domain (or topic or tenor in some studies) and a source domain (or base or vehicle in some studies),<sup>4</sup> between which correspondences can be established. However, as Bowdle and Gentner (2005: 193) acknowledge, ‘(...) despite the widespread acceptance of viewing metaphors as cross-domain mappings, there is little consensus on how these mappings take

---

<sup>4</sup> There are various labels used to refer to the two domains involved in a cross-domain mapping, such as ‘source’, ‘base’ or ‘vehicle’ for the one, and ‘target’, ‘tenor’ or ‘topic’ for the other. In this thesis, the domains are referred to as source and target domains, in line with common practice in cognitive-linguistic studies. However, in describing the different theories and studies of metaphor, the terms used by the references in question will be adopted.

place'. The standard approach to metaphor comprehension sees metaphors as comparisons that focus on similarities between target and source concepts, in particular similarities between features of the concepts (e.g. Miller, 1979; Ortony, 1979a, 1979b; Tversky, 1977). This approach says that when two notions are compared, the features that they have in common are matched, both in literal and metaphorical comparisons. According to Bowdle and Gentner (2005) problems with this approach relate to questions of which properties of the two domains are selected during processing and to the fact that only features are matched and not, for instance, relations between features.

In reply to some of the suggested shortcomings of a comparison view of metaphor, some have proposed that metaphors are not understood as comparisons but rather as categorization statements (e.g. Glucksberg & Keysar, 1990, Glucksberg, 2001). According to Glucksberg and Keysar (1990), the target and base concepts of a metaphor are never placed in direct connection during metaphor comprehension. Rather, the base concept is used to access an abstract metaphoric category of which it is a prototypical member, and the target concept is also assigned to that category. The base term refers simultaneously to a specific literal concept and a general metaphoric category, seeing a metaphor as a class-inclusion statement (Glucksberg, 2008; Glucksberg & Keysar, 1990). To take an example from their work, they see the notions of *jail* and *job* in an expression such as *My job is a jail* as basic level expressions belonging to the superordinate category of *involuntary situations* (1990: 9). This comprehension approach does not only apply to conventional expressions, they claim, but also to ad-hoc or novel metaphorical expressions.

A less radical alternative to the traditional comparison model is a structure-mapping theory proposed by Gentner (1983), based on the idea that metaphor is a kind of analogy. Analogies are characterised by the structural alignment of relations between objects, rather than attributes or features of objects (1983: 168). Gentner and Bowdle (2001), however, state that categorizations are nonetheless still relevant to metaphorical mappings. They argue that 'categorization may come to play an increasing role during comprehension as metaphors are conventionalized' (Bowdle & Gentner, 2005: 197).

Based on the analogy and categorization approaches to metaphor comprehension, Bowdle and Gentner propose that there seems to be a difference between how conventional metaphorical language is understood and how novel or unique metaphorical language is understood. The most encompassing theory of metaphor comprehension is presented by Bowdle and Gentner (2005) as the Career of Metaphor hypothesis. The hypothesis includes a number of assumptions deduced from several experiments. According to Bowdle and Gentner, novel metaphors involve base terms that are not associated with a domain-general category, and are therefore interpreted as comparisons. Conventional metaphors involve base terms that both refer to a literal concept and an associated metaphorical category, and can therefore be interpreted as either comparisons or as categorizations (2005: 199). Evidence from different experiments supports these

ideas on the difference in comprehension between conventional and novel expressions. One experiment focused on the grammatical correspondence of a metaphor to a literal categorization statement (e.g. *pepper is a spice; alcohol is a crutch*) and of simile to a literal comparison (*an encyclopaedia is like a dictionary; faith is like an anchor*). Assuming that form reflects function in figurative language, Bowdle and Gentner expected that when the metaphorical expression was conventional, subjects would prefer the metaphor form (the categorization form), whereas when the expression was novel, they would prefer the simile form (the comparison form). The results indeed showed that as figurative statements become increasingly conventional, there is a shift in preference from the simile form to the metaphor form (2005: 201, 202). Bowdle and Gentner also conducted experiments in which they measured comprehension times as a presumable reflection of the underlying processing shift from comparison to categorization, expecting that comparisons take longer to process than categorizations. The results showed that novel figurative statements took longer to comprehend than conventional figurative statements, because the first are generally comprehended as comparisons, a more complex comprehension than categorization. In addition, novel figurative statements were comprehended faster as similes than as metaphors, simile forms being in grammatical concordance with literal comparison forms (2005: 202, 203).

In general, then, Bowdle and Gentner suggest a career of metaphor from novel to conventional to finally dead metaphors. With respect to comprehension, they state that 'one central claim is that as metaphors are conventionalized, there is a shift in mode of processing from comparison to categorization' (Bowdle & Gentner, 2005: 194). The theory and experiments show that not only conventionality of metaphorical statements influences the comprehension processes and time, but that grammatical form does so too. Several other studies have also pointed to the importance of the grammatical form in which the metaphorical expression occurs, either as simile or as metaphor (Aisenman, 1999; Chiappe et al., 2003; Gentner & Bowdle, 2001).

In response to the suggestions and results presented by Bowdle and Gentner that the processing of metaphor is affected by its degree of conventionality, Steen (2008) has pointed to an alleged paradox of metaphor, namely that it is likely that most metaphor is not processed metaphorically in the sense suggested within cognitive metaphor theory, as cognitively realized cross-domain mappings. Corpus-based research has illustrated that the majority of linguistic metaphorical expressions in naturally occurring language is highly conventional, and thus probably processed as categorizations rather than comparisons. The ideas advanced by Steen related to the paradox of metaphor will return in a later section, in relation to functions of metaphor.

The various theories on the processing of metaphors provide interesting ideas on how metaphorical language is comprehended when encountered in different forms and situations. The differences between metaphor and simile comprehension and the influence of conventionality on the understanding

processes of metaphorical language are vital notions with regard to the present study on metaphorical expressions occurring in the Dutch data used for the present study. Although linguistic analysis alone cannot give answers to the possible processing strategies employed by language users, the forms and frequencies of metaphorical language may predict how language users understand the expressions in question.

### **2.3 Linguistic metaphor: identification and use**

The idea that we structure our thoughts and actions in a metaphorical fashion is illustrated by Lakoff and colleagues by giving examples of metaphorically used language. The lists of expressions are all presumably conventional ways of saying things, but at the same time often include self-invented examples and not naturally observed language data. In addition, there seems to be a discrepancy between the linguistic forms in which conceptual metaphors are presented and the most frequent word forms of linguistic metaphors in natural language data, something that has been suggested as being a misrepresentation of common metaphor theory (cf. Semino, 2008; Cameron, 2003; Deignan, 2005, 2010a; Steen, 2007). The same issues occur for the psycholinguistic experiments conducted to provide evidence in favour of different metaphor processing models. The stimuli presented to the participants of the experiments often have a fixed structure in the form of *A is (like) B* metaphors, in which *A* and *B* are presented as nominalisations. Such invented stimuli are used to control for possible variation in the experiments, but they seem to deviate extensively from how people would naturally produce metaphorical language. Another issue of concern is the absence of context in simple *A is (like) B* presentations; context may often influence the meaning and understanding of metaphorical expressions due to linguistic triggers or accompanying metaphorical or non-metaphorical language (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Low, 2004; Deignan, 2005).

In recent years, a growing number of metaphor researchers have raised objections to the fact that claims about metaphor in language and thought seem to be predominantly based on invented language data, and not on authentic linguistic expressions. In other words, what is said about the way people use metaphors is not based on the way people actually use metaphors, that is, the way metaphors occur in real, naturally produced language. The Pragglejaz Group (2007: 1) adequately sums up the main problem by stating that isolated examples provide important materials for studying the structure and function of metaphor, but that claims about the ubiquity and realistic understanding of metaphors ask for explorations of “metaphor in the wild” as speakers and writers produce it in varying contexts (Pragglejaz Group, 2007: 1). Particularly scholars concerned with the study of different discourse genres and larger bodies of authentic language data have raised objections to the use of invented linguistic expressions in cognitive linguistic and psychological studies (Cameron, 1999, 2003, 2008; Cameron & Low, 1999;

Cameron & Maslen, 2010; Deignan, 2005, 2008; Deignan & Potter, 2004; Low et al., 2010; Semino, 2002; 2008; Steen, 1994, 2007; Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). They stress that the forms in which metaphors occur in authentic data may often differ considerably from the manner in which they are presented in theoretical studies and experiments, and that claims about the use and understanding of metaphors is not based on the way people naturally use and produce metaphorical language.

One important finding from real world studies on metaphor, for instance, is that the classic *A is B* metaphor form in which conceptual metaphors are represented and which are used as stimuli in psycholinguistic experiments, hardly occurs as such in naturally produced language. Structures such as *encyclopaedias are goldmines* or *theories are buildings* are hardly ever used in authentic language settings. In addition, with respect to CMT, applied linguists have commented on the recurring conflation of language and thought, or linguistic and conceptual structures, in their description of metaphor (cf. Cameron, 1999; Deignan, 2005; and Steen, 2007 for a complete overview of this issue).

As a result of the objections mentioned above, different linguists have stressed the need for a systematic way of finding and analysing linguistic metaphors, from which patterns of metaphor use can be derived. A number of procedures that can be used as metaphor identification tools have emerged (cf. Cameron, 2003; Pragglejazz Group, 2007; Steen, Dorst et al., 2010), but what they all share is that they systematically and reliably determine all metaphorical expressions in authentic language data, without necessarily having to identify issues such as conceptual metaphors and mappings simultaneously. The work done within CMT typically takes a top-down approach to metaphor, departing from pre-existing ideas of conceptual metaphor structures and presenting decontextualised linguistic evidence to underpin the ideas. For the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, for instance, various linguistic expressions such as *he won the debate* and *she can't bear to lose an argument* are given as clear linguistic evidence for the existence of ARGUMENT IS WAR, together with many other examples. However, *win* and *lose* can also be seen as elements of the concept of GAMES, a concept that is related to but also vitally different than WAR. A top-down approach may result in the exploitation of many linguistic expressions that essentially do not originate from the source domain in question. When analysing language in context, a bottom-up approach to analysing uses, structures and functions of metaphorical language may give more detailed and useful findings. This can be achieved by pulling apart different stages of metaphor analysis. Linguistic metaphors are identified first, from which possible patterns of metaphorical structures are deduced and possible conceptual metaphors are identified as underlying conceptual structures.

A problem that has occurred with the shift in focus towards identifying metaphorical expressions separately is that researchers differ in their intuitions of what counts as a metaphorical expression. They often do not give criteria for how they identified metaphorical expressions, and regularly focus on different aspects of metaphors without being explicit about decisions. These issues lead to a lack of

common ground, and make it difficult to compare findings on metaphor use in different discourse settings (see e.g. Cameron, 2003; Pragglejaz Group, 2007; Semino, 2008). In response, several people have expressed the need for a systematic approach to metaphor identification in discourse that can be used by all researchers in the field of discourse analysis, and that may provide data outcomes that can be compared to each other. The Pragglejaz Group<sup>5</sup> have catered to the need for a method of systematically identifying linguistic metaphors by creating the so-called MIP, the Metaphor Identification Procedure. MIP is intended to be an explicit, reliable, and flexible method for finding metaphorically used words in naturally occurring discourse, and in doing so pulls apart the linguistic analysis from the conceptual analysis. As Steen (2005: 315) puts it,

One of the interesting and perhaps surprising features of the Pragglejaz approach is that it does not aim to identify the underlying mappings themselves. Even though we have adopted the general idea of underlying mappings for metaphorical expressions in discourse, we have found that it is often unnecessary to specify which cross-domain mapping in particular is involved in a particular instance of metaphorical usage. (...) Our procedure intends to capture metaphorically used words, not the metaphorical concepts or structures that underlie them. (Steen, 2005: 315)

The procedure is thus based on the notion that a metaphor is a cross-domain mapping between source and target domain, but it only intends to identify the metaphorically used words, and not the complex underlying conceptual structures. It is based on the idea that metaphor in language and metaphor in thought are two separate elements that can be found and viewed in separation from each other. MIP is a tool for finding metaphorically used words, producing data which can subsequently be analysed in more detail for possible structures, mappings, systematic uses and functions, for instance. It takes the notion of word, or more precisely lexical unit, as the unit of analysis. The main reasons for analysing lexical units, and not for instance morphemes or phrases, is the fact that a lexical unit can typically be seen as relating to one concept and referent; it activates one concept in memory, and designates one referent in the discourse. In addition, the procedure is based on the notion of ‘indirectness by similarity’ (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010: 13). A metaphorically used word is used indirectly; its contextual meaning contrasts with a more basic meaning which is absent from the context, and it refers indirectly to a referent in the discourse. In addition, the contextual and more basic senses of the word are related by non-literal similarity: the contextual sense can be seen as distinct from the more basic sense, operating in a different domain, but it can also be understood as similar to the more basic sense.

---

<sup>5</sup> The name Pragglejaz stands for the ten scholars involved in the original project, and is formed by the initials of the first names of the members of the group: Peter Crisp, Raymond Gibbs, Alan Cienki, Gerard Steen, Graham Low, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joseph Grady, Alice Deignan and Zoltan Kövecses.

The MIP procedure consists of a number of distinct steps for which the analyst has to make a clear decision, which looks like this (adopted from Praggeljaz Group, 2007):

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 units.
  - 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.

(Praggeljaz Group, 2007: 3)

In addition to a case study in which the four steps are applied, the report on the method also elaborates on decisions made prior to using the method, and on particular linguistic elements that have raised questions in relation to the different steps. One of the decisions made prior to applying the method, for instance, is related to the notion of lexical units. Although the procedure in essence analyses the unit of words, these units are referred to as lexical units to stress that in some cases a combination of more than one word in the orthographic sense should be seen as one lexico-semantic unit. In addition, the report pays attention to the use of tools such as dictionaries to make informed decisions about basic and contextual meanings of lexical units, and stresses the importance of corpus-based dictionaries in particular to base decisions about contemporary language use on (Praggeljaz Group, 2007).

MIP is the systematic method that has formed the basis of a number of different research projects, such as finding metaphor in English discourse (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010), Dutch discourse (Pasma, in press), and French discourse (Reijnierse, 2010), and in many different registers. Some researchers have

proposed alternative methods that either focus on vehicle terms rather than single lexical units (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Maslen, 2010), or also include other forms of metaphorical language use, such as direct metaphors (similes) and implicit metaphor (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). Cameron's alternative is in essence based on the same idea of systematic identification of metaphorical language use, but does not necessarily see the single lexical unit as the only unit of analysis. Cameron has different ideas about what constitutes the unit of meaning in speech as well as writing, marking single words as well as phrases as vehicle terms. She is, at the same time, very explicit in her decisions of what is included in the identification and analysis (Cameron, 2003). The second procedure, reported in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010), is termed MIPVU, and has been adapted to Dutch language data for the present research project. MIPVU not only takes into account indirect language use, but is designed to also find cross-domain mappings realised by direct language use. Cross-domain mappings realised by direct language use often occur in the form of similes. This is a form of a cross-domain mapping which is expressed directly in the language; it directly refers to a source concept and its referent in the discourse, and instructs the addressee to connect this to the target domain of the context. The words in the simile are not used metaphorically themselves, but do need to be understood by a cross-domain mapping in thought (cf. Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). The MIPVU caters to directly used metaphorical language by including instructions on finding local referent and topic shifts, often manifested by lexis which is incongruous in relation to the overall topic of the context. The adjusted MIPVU procedure will be discussed in more detail in chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

Questions have also been raised about the notion of semantic domains and how to get from the linguistic metaphor to the underlying conceptual structures. Steen (1999a; 2009) proposes a five-step method to get from linguistic to conceptual metaphor, intended to constrain the analytical relation between linguistic and conceptual metaphor (1999a: 57). In the first step of the method, the metaphor focus, or the linguistic expression used metaphorically, is identified. In step two, the relationship between the metaphor focus and the 'literal part of the metaphorical idea' (Steen, 1999a: 62) is identified, using a kind of propositional analysis proposed by Bovair and Kieras (1985). In basic terms, the sentence in which the metaphor focus occurs is represented in its corresponding propositions in order to identify the proposition to which the metaphor focus belongs. The third step entails the transformation of the metaphorical proposition identified in step two into a comparative structure, in which the source and target elements are aligned and some slots can remain unfilled. This transformation is highly mechanical, and based on Miller's (1979) classification of comparison statements. In step four any open slots from the comparison are filled in, identifying the implicit source and target elements. Finally, step five involves the identification of the complete non-literal mapping, resulting in a set of cross-domain correspondences such as generally proposed in CMT (Steen, 1999a: 71). The benefit of a method such as this to outline the underlying conceptual structure and

cross-domain mapping of a linguistic metaphor is that it can be applied systematically and that conceptual structures are identified in a constrained manner.

The systematic analysis of linguistic metaphors can subsequently be used for more detailed analysis of local instances of metaphor patterns, either as systematic metaphors, clusters of metaphor or other noteworthy patterns, without necessarily specifying the general conceptual metaphor. The classic conceptual metaphors are generalisations, and when putting different linguistic metaphors under such general conceptual metaphors, there is a tendency of losing detail in the analysis, something which is not favourable in discourse-analytic studies of how metaphors work in context and what their specific functions are in such contexts (see e.g., Cameron, 2003, 2007; Cameron & Maslen, 2010; Semino, 2008). Although not all discourse-based studies on metaphor are as explicit and systematic in their identification and local analysis of metaphor as some of the work discussed above, the trend in metaphor studies in discourse seems to shift gradually towards a more detailed qualitative and quantitative analysis of metaphor in the real world.

## **2.4 Metaphor in discourse: frequencies, forms and functions**

The focus on linguistic metaphorical expressions and detailed patterns of conceptual structures is most significantly represented in studies on metaphor in natural discourse. As discussed above, this tradition takes authentic language data, from different registers of discourse, as its point of departure, and looks at the occurrences, uses, and functions of metaphorical language within the numerous varieties of discourse available to researchers. This particular qualitative analysis of the occurrences and functions of metaphor in discourse has been paired with an increasing focus on corpus-based techniques that can help reveal frequencies and forms of metaphorical language more easily. Studies in this tradition have focused on different discourse genres and settings, such as spoken discourse (Cameron, 2003, 2007, 2008; Drew & Holt, 1998; Holt & Drew, 2005), political discourse (Billig & MacMillan, 2005; Charteris-Black, 2004, 2005; Chilton, 1996, 2004, Lu & Ahrens, 2008; Musolff, 2006; Zinken, 2003), news (Charteris-Black, 2004, 2006; Heywood & Semino, 2007; Kitis & Milapides, 1997; Santa Ana, 1999, 2002; Wallis & Nerlich, 2005), academic and scientific discourse (Darian, 2000; Low, 2005), education settings (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Low, 2004; Low, 2008), business discourse (Koller, 2004) second-language learning (Boers, 1999; Littlemore, 2009; Littlemore & Low, 2006; MacArthur & Littlemore, 2008), fiction and literature (Heywood et al., 2002; Semino, 2008; Steen, 1994), multi-modal data (Cienki & Müller, 2008a, 2008b; Forceville, 2008), and general corpora (Deignan, 2005, 2008; Deignan & Potter, 2004), among many other studies. This section will review and discuss a variety of discourse-related and corpus-based studies on metaphor, focusing on issues of forms and functions of metaphors which can have

specific implications for the two discourse registers used in the present study, namely conversations and news.

Some scholars make use of large general corpora consisting of millions of words of texts (Deignan, 1999, 2005; Moon, 1998). The corpus work on metaphor in discourse conducted by Deignan (1999, 2005, 2006, 2008) is especially interesting in this respect. In her book on *Metaphor and corpus linguistics* (2005), she explains the possibilities that corpus linguistic techniques can offer to metaphor researchers, and discusses the implications that her findings on the forms of metaphorical expressions may have for the different theories of metaphor. Deignan uses large corpora to shed light on the variety of grammatical forms that metaphors can take, something that theories of metaphor in language tend to undervalue at times. The frequent variation of forms of metaphorical expressions shows that the focus on nominal examples in theories of metaphor is 'not representative of the diversity of use in naturally-occurring data' (2005: 147). She also shows that different source domains seem to prefer different parts of speech as metaphors; within the domain of *movement*, for instance, verbal metaphors are most frequent, while the domains of *cleanliness* and *dirt* predominantly include adjectival metaphors. Her findings on frequent grammatical forms of linguistic metaphors have important implications for the conceptual theory of metaphor. As she states:

... both at the linguistic and semantic levels, metaphors operate partly independently of the conceptual mapping that seem to underlie them. This could ultimately make generalizations about metaphorical patterns difficult, at least if Conceptual Metaphor Theory is viewed as the underlying framework. (...) the top-down model of Conceptual Metaphor Theory provides only partial explanations for the data. It may be that we need to redress the balance, and work more directly with the data of individual linguistic metaphors, searching back for theoretical implication, rather than proceeding from theory to find the linguistic examples that we need to support it. (Deignan, 2005: 166, 167)

Corpus studies have been conducted to describe and explain patterns of idiomatic expressions in English, many of which have metaphorical meanings (Moon, 1998). Moon's corpus study on the frequencies of different levels of metaphorical fixed expressions also shows the linguistic forms and frequencies possible for metaphorical expressions. In addition, she has looked at the meanings transparency of various metaphorical idioms; a range of expressions seemed highly transparent in meaning, with the individual elements making clear contributions to the overall meaning of the expression, and other seemed opaque in the sense that their individual elements seemed completely unrelated to the overall meaning of the idiom. Moon's corpus findings contribute important information to the discussion of the processing and understanding of idiomatic expressions as containing different components contributing to the overall meaning of the expressions (see e.g., Everaert et al., 1995; Gibbs, 1994, 1995; Gibbs, Nayak, & Cutting, 1989).

The studies by Deignan and Moon were conducted using large general corpora. Such corpora offer a clear picture of the general patterns of language use

in one language, but usually require the researcher to pre-define ideas and search terms from different domains in order to gain results. A detailed analysis of all words and all possible metaphorical expressions would only be possible if an automatic metaphor tagging programme could be used, something that is under development but not operational yet (cf. Berber-Sardinha, 2008). In cases where researchers want to obtain a more detailed view of all the metaphorical expressions in their data, a more manageable corpus is usually preferred. In fact, the majority of corpus-based metaphor studies make use of considerably smaller corpora, which usually consist of a collection of texts or conversations from a particular discourse genre or register. Most such studies aim to give a full-blown account of the patterns and functions of metaphor in context, and often include a manual analysis of the variety of metaphorical expressions throughout the corpus (Cameron, 2003, 2007; Charteris-Black, 2004; Goatly, 1997).

When the aim of a study is to lay bare patterns of metaphor use and their functions in different genres of a language, it is more useful to work with smaller corpora that make manual analysis more feasible, but that still provide enough authentic material to give representative outcomes. This kind of research often provides a combination of qualitative and quantitative results: the relative sizes of corpora allow for a qualitative analysis of patterns of metaphor use in context, but at the same time generate a relatively high number of observations which can be statistically tested. Examples of such research ranges from studies on data collected by the researchers themselves (in cases of conversational data, for instance), existing forms of texts grouped into different genres, cross-cultural sets of data, or learners' language.

The work by Cameron on conversational data is exemplary of the beneficial combination of quantitative and qualitative metaphor analysis that smaller corpora can offer. Cameron (2003) gives a detailed account of both quantitative and qualitative features of metaphorical language in classroom discourse, subsequent to having manually identified the instances of metaphorical expressions in her data. The data give interesting insights into metaphor density of spoken discourse as well as the phenomenon of metaphor repetition. She also includes a detailed frequency analysis of the different linguistic forms in which metaphors occur. For conversational discourse, for instance, metaphors in the form of prepositions and verbs (both single verbs and phrasal verbs) are most frequent, together accounting for around 70 per cent of all the metaphors, while single noun phrases only account for 5 per cent of the total. Cameron also studied genres of spoken interaction other than classroom talk, and acknowledges the difference between genres of talk with respect to percentages of metaphor forms and metaphor density (Cameron, 2008: 199).

As mentioned above, a corpus approach to metaphor in discourse can provide a useful bottom-up analysis of metaphorical language, starting from the actual linguistic occurrences in discourse and moving to more general source and target domain patterns and possible underlying conceptual metaphors. In general, all studies of metaphor working with naturally produced language data provide

valuable insights into the frequencies and forms of metaphor in the real world. In addition, studies of metaphor in real-world situations and discourse can give well-founded insights on various functions of metaphor in various contexts, such as its ideological function revealing specific ideas about political topics, its role in the construction of ideas and the management of talk, or its usability to explain and discuss abstract or difficult topics in science, education, and therapy, to name but a few of the possible functions (e.g., Cameron, 2007, 2008; Low, 2005; Semino, 2002, 2008, to name but few).

A function of metaphor proposed frequently in discourse studies is evaluation and persuasion, which are often said to be related to metaphor's rhetorical purpose and ideological power. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) posited the idea that metaphor can have persuasive and evaluative power, in particular in political settings, but their views were backed by little evidence from authentic discourse. Deignan (2010b) discusses different ways in which metaphors can be employed in various evaluative and persuasive manners, for instance by making conscious choices regarding the use of expressions originating from favoured source domains, basing her discussion on previous linguistic research performed within the frameworks of CDA. Maalej (2007: 149) remarks that in different settings 'metaphors evaluate by passing on a judgment', which is achieved by positive or negative mappings between source and target domains. The issues raised by Deignan and Maalej are summaries based on the critical analysis of data in a large variety of studies of politically oriented discourse, such as political speeches, party manifestos, and background articles on politics. It seems that it is particularly in the discourse of politics that metaphors evaluate and persuade.

A large number of studies focusing on the language of specific politicians and political situations illustrate the general ideas raised above. Lu and Ahrens (2008) discuss the manifestations and ideological motivations behind two related BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese presidential speeches, that of *retrospective building* metaphors, which focuses on the established groundwork of the country, and that of *reconstruction* metaphors, which focusing on progression of the country. The motivation behind some presidents using the *retrospective building* metaphors, Lu and Ahrens suggest, can be attributed to an ideological preference: the metaphor portrays Taiwan's past history and achievements as cornerstones on which to build further. Presidents concerned with Taiwan becoming independent from China refrained from using such metaphors. As Lu and Ahrens suggest, the metaphors are framed by the presidents in certain ways in discourse to communicate particular implicit political messages (2008: 400).

Charteris-Black (2004) also found clear indications of the ideological and persuasive power of metaphors. He observed uses of BUILDING metaphors in British political party manifestos and American presidential speeches for various purposes. In the British manifestos, BUILDING metaphors were used there to put focus on the stable foundations of the country and on the progressive collaboration between countries and governments, giving a positive evaluation of the intended policies. In a similar manner, they occurred in American presidential speeches for a

range of topics, for example to refer to various concepts of society. Additionally, inaugural presidential speeches contained different source domains that are drawn from familiar everyday experience, such as RELIGION, JOURNEYS, and CONFLICT. According to Charteris-Black, 'they are rhetorically appropriate because the pragmatic aims of an inaugural political speech are both to make intelligible and to persuade the listener of the value of abstract social ideals such as peace, prosperity and justice', as Charteris-Black observes (2004: 109). Domains of everyday experience are often rhetorically deployed to make political matters intelligible, to show ideological positions, but also to address and influence the favour of the public.

Musolff's (2006) data of British and German media reports on European politics and Euro currency issues demonstrate that specific combinations of related domains, or 'scenarios' as Musolff calls them, such as the *Love-Marriage* scenario are used to comment in distinct ways on the political relations between France, Germany and Britain and the role of the EU, showing the differences between British and German viewpoints. In the German press, the relation between France and Germany is seen as a marriage in which difficulties have occurred and in which Britain is an important problem. British media tend to emphasise the possibilities of a divorce between Britain and the EU, whereas the German press tends to suggest a milder form of a prolonged engagement in relation to the Euro currency (2006: 35). Musolff shows that this type of scenario can give a detailed set of options for opposing views, and that they provide a rich conceptual structure for argumentative and rhetorical exploitation (2006: 35).

Semino and Masci (1996) looked at political discourse by the Italian politician Berlusconi, and found that the language Berlusconi uses is interspersed with metaphorical expressions from a range of semantic domains such as FOOTBALL, WAR, and RELIGION. They suggest that Berlusconi uses expressions from these domains 'to create a positive public image for himself and his new political party and to attract particular sections of the electorate' (1996: 243), thus employing the semantic domains for evaluating himself in a positive manner and trying to persuade the public of this positive image. Semino (2008) has also looked at a range of other politically oriented sets of texts, for instance at texts and speeches dealing with the topic of the Middle East peace process. This topic is generally referred to as 'The Road Map' metaphor, used in speeches by President Bush and in related articles, and taken over as a general publicly used metaphor. It includes metaphorical expressions from the domain of JOURNEYS, specifically focusing on issues such as *roads to travel, new paths to take, forks in the road*, and comments on the metaphor in the form of expressions such as the peace process being *a bendy road to an old neighbourhood* and so on. The initial metaphor, Semino remarks, has been used and re-used in various ways to express the different views of politicians as well as different media (Semino, 2008: 109-117).

The various discourse-based studies above all illustrate the evaluative and persuasive characteristics of metaphors and the varieties in which these characteristics surface in politically oriented discourse. As Deignan (2010b: 361-2)

suggests, most of these studies show that discourse participants seem to favour metaphors from a particular source domain ‘as a strategy for aligning themselves with people for whom the source domain is significant’. However, Deignan also points out one thing should be kept in mind with regard to the findings above; the data analysed in CDA-related research (political speeches, background articles, and so on) are carefully constructed texts that are intentionally persuasive. In numerous other discourse genres that may deal with political situations, such as news articles, there is an abundance of metaphorical language that cannot be characterised as functioning in an ideological manner. Although the evaluative and persuasive roles of metaphors are important and significant, the majority of metaphorical expressions in natural discourse does not take on these roles. A large number of metaphorical expressions seem to be used for reasons that are not overtly related to ideologies.

An example of this is the use of metaphorical expressions in situations where the topic of the discourse is scientific, complex and highly abstract. Concrete source domains are then often metaphorically employed to explain scientific, abstract and difficult processes or events to make them easier to understand. Studies that deal with this aspect of metaphor predominantly focus on genres such as academic discourse, popular scientific prose, and educational discourse, both written and spoken. Mayer (1993) discusses in his article on metaphor and students’ understanding of science the possibilities of metaphoric aids applied in different texts on abstract scientific topics. He suggests that the instructive nature of metaphors, which set up analogies between the topic and the metaphor, is important in students’ understanding of the topic, for instance in the example of seeing radar as a bounding pulse (1993: 573, 574). More recently, Nuñez (2008) showed that in technical books and articles about mathematics, highly conventional spatial source domains such as MOTION, ROTATION and OBJECTS IN BOUNDED SPACE are used to talk about complex, abstract mathematical issues such as limits and continuity functions. In addition, some of the gestures made in university-level classes that Nuñez analysed depicted the same ideas; lecturers used their hands to make rotating and spatial movements while explaining the abstract issues. As Nuñez suggests, these gestures reflect the idea that these concepts were also psychologically real for the persons using them.

Darian (2000) studied the role of figurative language in the explanation and teaching of science, and its function in scientific texts. Particularly biology texts, but also chemistry texts contained metaphorical expressions in different forms, either as what Darian calls “one-liners”, single metaphorical expressions such as *factory* in a sentence like *Imagine the many millions of chloroplasts in just one lettuce leaf, each a tiny factory for producing sugars and starches* (2000: 171), or as more extended and recurring forms. The latter particularly occurred with some domains, such as WAR for the explanation of the immune system. The domain of FAMILY RELATIONSHIP was also popular, and personification of different biological elements, such as soils and seeds, also appeared in recurring fashion. Low (2005) looked at animacy and human aspects in texts on geographical concepts, where

human qualities were given to inanimate entities in the form of words animating abstractions or words humanizing simple organisms or cells (Cameron & Low, 2004; Low, 2005, 2008). He suggests that one of the major uses of metaphor in science education is ‘to map relational qualities of familiar entities onto conceptually important science ideas (...)’ (Low, 2005: 145). Cameron and Low (2004: 371) in addition suggest that so-called sub-technical metaphors in lessons on geology act as stepping stones to abstract and more technical language and concepts.

The studies by Low (2005) and Cameron and Low (2004) also show how certain metaphorical words can have an influence on the reading of other possible metaphorical words; the use of *sprint* to describe the speed of evolution also influences the animate interpretation of *creep* in the same sentence (given below), where the last word may not be interpreted as particularly agentive and human if not followed by *sprint* (Low, 2005: 135).

This specialisation *turned the creep* of evolution into a *sprint* as complex creatures *competed to find* ever more *imaginative* ways of *exploiting* the world’s resources. (italics in original)

Cameron (2003) found that groups of metaphors, or clusters, tended to appear close together in explanations of difficult concepts, illustrated by a stretch of talk in which a teacher explains the phenomenon of volcanic lava (2003: 102-107). Concrete metaphorical expressions such as *treacle*, *runny butter* and *a bit like wax* were used by the teacher intentionally and close together to refer to the working of volcanic lava, and were preceded and followed by stretches of talk in which only a few, and highly conventional, metaphors occurred.

In relation to the explanatory function of metaphors in science-related discourse, there is another function of metaphor in educational discourse, in written text books as well as spoken classroom interaction, which has to do with the topic or classroom management. Low (2005: 137) suggests that for at least one of the texts used in his study, the author made use of metaphor to summarize, disengage and evaluate a topic immediately prior to changing the topic. The metaphorical expression there seemed not only used to explain the difficult topic, but also to summarize it more clearly. For spoken classroom interaction, Cameron and Low (2004: 360) show that metaphors can have similar framing functions; they are used in an organisational manner, concerned with the design of the classroom and to negotiate with students about what is going to happen in the lesson or task. Particularly the last issue featured a frequent use of metaphor.

The several uses, functions and patterns of metaphor in different discourse settings discussed above are some of the interesting findings about metaphor in discourse in general. The vast amount of research on metaphorical language patterns conducted in other discourse genres, such as the more creative genres of fictional prose and poetry, or in other modalities such as visual advertisements, music or gesture studies, contribute many more insights into the frequent and varying forms and functions of metaphorical language. What becomes clear from

the large body of research on metaphor in the real world is that metaphor can appear in many linguistic forms, and for many intentional or unintentional reasons. In addition, metaphorical expressions can have the same overall function in various genres of discourse; evaluative and persuasive metaphors occur in political speeches, but also in news articles or in manifestos, and metaphors used to explain complex processes are employed in (popular) scientific writing, but also in classroom talk and in educational texts. Nevertheless, important differences can occur in the frequencies, forms, and functions of metaphorical expressions between different discourse varieties. With respect to the two varieties at the centre of the present study, conversations and news, considerable differences seem to be present when metaphors are analysed in detail.

## **2.5 Metaphor in conversations and news discourse in more detail**

The language varieties of conversation and news differ from each other on various linguistic and situational aspects, as also pointed out in chapter 1. This seems to include metaphorical language as well; some of the forms and functions of metaphor that came up above apply particularly to certain conversational varieties but less clearly to news articles, and vice versa. A more detailed account of the various findings for metaphor in conversational discourse and news discourse is given below.

### *2.5.1 Metaphor in conversational discourse in more detail*

The section above already touched on aspects of metaphor use in conversational discourse in relation to the management of talk. Detailed work on metaphor in conversations has been conducted by Cameron in particular. She has looked at various types of conversation such as classroom conversation, reconciliation talk, and doctor-patient conversation, focusing on all kinds of aspects of metaphors and their systematicity in ongoing talk (Cameron, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2008; Cameron & Deignan, 2003; Cameron & Low, 2004; Cameron & Maslen, 2010). According to Cameron, metaphor in talk is ‘a shifting, dynamic phenomenon that spreads, connects and disconnects with other thoughts and other speakers, starts and re-starts, flows through talk developing, extending, changing’ (Cameron 2008: 197). As Carter (2004) also previously remarked, the development of source domains is the basis for creativity and play with metaphor in talk, which occurs particularly through relexicalizations or expansions of source domain expressions (2004: 202). These notions are linked to the fact that talk, in general, can be seen as a dynamic system, in which participants constantly react and adjust to each other’s words and actions.

Cameron generally conducts both quantitative and qualitative analyses of metaphorical language in conversations. With respect to quantitative analyses, she

has looked at the grammatical form and frequencies of metaphors. Overall frequencies of metaphorically used words in Cameron's data range from roughly 3% of the total number of words for classroom talk to 10% of the total number of words in doctor-patient talk, with reconciliation talk being in between these percentages. The vast majority of metaphors in talk in Cameron's data appear in the form of verbs, comprising around 60% of the total number of metaphors. Prepositions are also frequent, but often occur in combination with delexicalised verbs. Nominal metaphors, in the form of nouns or noun phrases, comprised roughly 20% of the metaphor total (Cameron, 2008). The frequencies for metaphors in talk found by Steen, Dorst et al. (2010) are slightly different, but also show that verbs and prepositions are highly frequent. They found that in English conversation data, roughly 8% of all words in conversation were metaphorically used. This was the lowest of the four registers studied (the other registers being news, fiction, and academic). Although verbs indeed also account for the highest percentage of all the metaphors in their data, the percentage was not as high as Cameron reported for her data. About 30% of all metaphors were verbs, followed by prepositions (23%) and determiners (18%) (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010).

Metaphorical expressions in conversational data tend not to be spread evenly over the utterances, as mentioned already in relation to explaining difficult topics in educational talk. Cameron reports that across three types of spoken discourse that she has studied (educational, reconciliation and doctor-patient), there is considerable variation in metaphor density (2008: 199). Metaphors used deliberately by speakers tend to cluster at certain points in the talk, meaning that they occur more frequently in one particular part in a conversation, and considerably less frequently in other parts. Part of the reason for this clustering is topical, as Cameron (2008) remarks; metaphors occur frequently at points where the topic of the conversation requires additional explanation to make the topic easier to understand, or to bring across a point of argument more clearly. In those cases, multiple instances of the same metaphorical expressions and connected metaphors occur (Cameron, 2008; see also Cameron & Stelma, 2004). Clustering has been shown to occur in various other discourse settings besides conversations, such as business communication (see e.g., Koller, 2003).

With regard to more qualitative studies about the role and functions of metaphors in conversational discourse, several researchers have demonstrated that metaphor can be used to show the speakers' attitudes towards the content, to assist the management of the talk and to guide hearers in their listening process. In her work on reconciliation talk, Cameron observes that metaphors help the speakers by enabling emotionally difficult topics to be talked about indirectly (Cameron, 2007, 2008). Their most common role, however, involves the process and management of the talk. Metaphorical expressions are used to make the process of the talk more explicit, for example in expressions such as 'a question that *comes* to mind...' or 'a question that we've *covered* before...' (from Cameron, 2008: 204, italics in original). In addition, they occur at certain points in classroom talk to assist agenda management, indicating the transition from one topic to another or to terminate a

topic or discussion (Cameron, 2003). Furthermore, metaphors are employed when experts talk to non-experts about a particular topic and negotiate this topic, for example in doctor-patient talk but also in educational settings (Cameron, 2008). Similar functions are found in more informal talk, particularly where idiomatic expressions are used (Drew & Holt, 1995, 1998). Drew and Holt (1995) found that idiomatic expressions in naturally occurring conversations seem to be used predominantly for topic summarizing and topic termination purposes. A recurring pattern in their data is that metaphorical idioms are often produced in places where speakers move from one topic to another (Drew & Holt, 1995: 120). Another recurring function of metaphorical idioms in the informal conversational data they used is that they act as summaries, which are sometimes simultaneously assessments. Metaphorical idiomatic expressions thus similarly assist in the overall management of talk.

Finally, a number of studies on conversational data illustrate the use of tuning devices in combination with deliberate conventional metaphorical expressions (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Deignan, 2003; Goatly, 1997). Cameron and Deignan (2003) suggest that these tuning devices are used to help speakers activate metaphorical interpretations in on-line talk. Cameron found examples in her educational data from teachers who apparently directed listeners to one of several possible interpretations of the expression, preventing inappropriate literal interpretations. The phrase *sort of*, for instance, was used in combination with the metaphorically used word *corruption* in the context where the teacher talked about changes in the spelling of words to direct pupils to the metaphorical interpretation of *corruption* (Cameron & Deignan, 2003: 153). Tuning devices also seem to be used to indicate the nature of the mapping between topic and vehicle expressions. In addition, they can also tone down or mitigate the interpretation of a metaphor; Cameron found that tuning devices like *just* and *kind of* seemed intended to adjust the strength of the metaphorical expression (Cameron, 2008; Cameron & Deignan, 2003).

One point that should be stressed in relation to particularly Cameron's work on metaphor in talk is that the data she has used for her studies are in general goal-directed: each subgenre of conversation that Cameron looked at contained specific goals, either that of reconciling, teaching, making understood, or explaining topics involving a degree of professional expertise. Even though these conversations are relatively spontaneous, in the sense that they are not overtly instructed, they are specific regarding their topics. This specificity is reflected in the kind of metaphors and their functions that Cameron finds and focuses on in her studies. Conversations that seem to be more casual, however, may contain considerably fewer metaphors with specific functions. As Eggins and Slade (1997) suggest, casual conversations generally lack a pragmatic, goal-directed purpose, and may thus also lack such a clear use of metaphorical language that Cameron illustrates in her various studies. This may be a point of interest when analysing metaphorical language use in the conversations used in the present study; these are classified as spontaneous conversations of the casual kind and may thus show

different patterns in the functions of metaphors from what previous studies of metaphor in conversations has shown. In general, however, results from Cameron and others' studies clearly point to the main patterns in which metaphors tend to occur in conversations (such as in the form of verbs and preposition), something that may turn out to be relatively different from what is found in news.

### *2.5.2 Metaphor in news discourse in more detail*

Some of the forms and functions of metaphor that came up in section 2.4, such as its evaluative and persuasive roles, also occur in parts of news discourse. More particularly, press coverage of many topics, for instance in the form of newspapers, is often the source of many metaphorical expressions that seem to evaluate news topics. However, newspaper language is very diverse, since newspapers consist of different sections with various purposes. The use and patterns of metaphor are thus likely to be diverse, ranging from highly persuasive to evaluative in the sense described above, from unique to repetitive, and from highly conventional to novel and extensive forms. Most work conducted on metaphor in news discourse focuses on hot news topics, dealing with how such topics are represented in the press through the usage and shaping of metaphors. Studies of metaphor in the press focus on, for instance, war situations (e.g., Billig & MacMillan, 2005; Lule, 2004), immigration and asylum issues (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2006; Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008; Santa Ana, 1999, 2002), world-wide epidemics (e.g., Koteyko et al., 2008; Wallis & Nerlich, 2005), scientific breakthroughs (Hellsten, 2000; Nerlich et al., 2000), and many more topics. These studies reveal interesting patterns with respect to how public discourse can present and frame news topics that deal with often delicate situations and events. However, it is sometimes difficult to link the specific outcomes of such studies to general characteristics of metaphors in news, because they deal with such individual topics and debates and their individual metaphor patterns. Studies on metaphor in news on a more general level usually involve studies of specific subsections of news, such as sports reports (Charteris-Black, 2004) and financial reports, and regularly have a cross-linguistic focus (Charteris-Black & Ennis, 2001; Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003). It is these more general studies of metaphor in news that will be treated in more detail below, because they reflect the diversity of the news discourse in the corpus used for the present study more closely. In order to get an idea of how metaphors tend to occur and work in news discourse, a broad range of news topics and texts have to be taken into account.

The forms and frequencies for English news discourse found by Steen, Dorst et al. (2010) show that the word class contributing most significantly to the frequency of metaphorical expressions is again the one of verbs (30% of all metaphors). The percentage for prepositions (27%) is slightly higher than what was found in conversations, but nouns in particular are frequent (23%) in relation to conversation. In addition, the percentage of adjective metaphors is considerably

higher in news (11%) than in conversation (6%). With regard to the grammatical forms of metaphors, then, news discourse shows a different pattern from conversational discourse. With regard to the general function of metaphor in news, Charteris-Black and Musolff (2003) state that metaphors play a central role in public discourse by being able to make complex news issues, particularly the politically oriented topics, more concrete. In that respect, metaphors do seem to function similarly in news to what was shown for conversational data, particularly in classroom and education contexts.

The majority of discourse-related studies into metaphor in news discourse relates to financial reporting. In general, the language that is used to describe financial situations and events, such as trade markets and so on, is often pervaded with conventional metaphorical expressions originating from the domains of SPACE and MOVEMENT, such as prices that are *rising* or *going up*, sales that are *going down*, stock markets ending on a *low*, or shares closing a few per cent *higher*. In fact, judging from the language used in financial reports about stocks, the market, and prices, it does not seem possible to refer to these concepts in other ways than by using conventional metaphorical expressions. However, apart from needing conventional source domains to describe conventional concepts, some financial reports contain more interesting cases of metaphorical language use, cases that seem to be used deliberately to describe the situation in question in a particular way and to cause a particular effect.

In the data studied by Charteris-Black (2004), financial reports often draw on animate systems of metaphors to predict economic processes. The economy is represented as a living organism, in which expressions such as *growth*, *decay*, *depression*, *mature*, and *ailing* are used to refer to the state and changing nature of economies in different circumstances (2004: 135). In fact, two thirds of the total number of metaphors identified in the *Economist* corpus used by Charteris-Black are accounted for by expressions related to the ECONOMY IS HUMAN conceptual metaphor (Charteris-Black, 2004: 140). The linguistic patterns originating from this conceptual structure seem endless and highly conventional, focusing on different elements of the human, such as *illness* and *health*, but also *physical conflict*. Charteris-Black also found metaphors from inanimate concepts, such as from the domain of FUNFAIR, where words such as *sling*, *slide*, or *rollercoaster* were used to represent actions in an economic setting.

In a study of metaphors to describe the euro trading in British and German press reports, Charteris-Black and Musolff (2003) found that two main concepts were used to characterise financial reporting in both English and German, namely that of UP/DOWN MOVEMENT and that of HEALTH. Within these domains they found highly conventional expressions, such as *low*, *rise*, *strong*, *recover*, but also less conventional expressions such as *slip*, *slump*, and *ailing* to report on various situations. In addition, English reporting also employed many PHYSICAL COMBAT metaphors in which the euro was seen as an active agent, with expressions such as *hit*, *damage*, and *beleaguered*. German reporting, on the other hand, also

characterised the euro in terms of STABILITY, with words such as *bottom*, *give way*, and *collapse* being used.

In another cross-cultural study by Charteris-Black and Ennis (2001), on British and Spanish reports this time, linguistic and conceptual metaphors in a corpus of English and Spanish financial reports published in newspapers during the October 1997 stock market crash were studied in detail. There was a degree of similarity in the use of metaphors between the two languages, for instance for metaphorical expressions from spatial domains, but there were also some interesting differences. Reports from both languages described the economy as an organism, market movements as physical movements, and sharp downward market movements as natural disasters. In Spanish, there were also metaphors based on psychological moods and personality, while in English there was a higher frequency of nautically based metaphors (Charteris-Black & Ennis, 2001).

Finally, Semino (2002) examined metaphorical representations of the euro in British and Italian newspapers, paying attention to the notion that the first country does not participate in the joined currency while the second does. Her analysis also showed that the most frequent metaphorical patterns were shared between the two languages, drawn from source domains such as BIRTH, JOURNEYS, and CONTAINERS, which were conventionally applied to a wide range of different target domains (Semino, 2002: 107). At the same time, there were also important differences between the Italian and British data, a number of metaphors being specific to the Italian or the English data only. In addition, Semino concluded that the more conventional realizations of dominant metaphors seemed to express the most basic ways in which the euro was conceptualized (e.g., as a container or a moving entity), while the more creative realizations were used to support particular views, whether positive or negative, of monetary union (Semino, 2002: 136). Generally, the studies on metaphors in financial reports show a certain degree in overlap with regard to the common conceptual domains that underlie common linguistic metaphors used in to describe financial situations: human and health concepts and concrete spatial concepts, for instance, seem to return frequently as highly conventional metaphorical expressions.

Some scholars have also focused on metaphors in sports reports as a separate news section. In the same study on the language of financial news, Charteris-Black (2004) also analysed sports reports for their use and employment of metaphorical language. He found that sports reports also frequently make use of metaphors from the domain of CONFLICT, in the form of highly conventional metaphors. He observed some variation in the use of particular words in this lexical domain, but at the same time observed that many of the conflict-related expressions were highly conventional metaphorical expressions in that context. Examples were expressions such as *attack*, *fight*, *kill*, *battle*, *victim*, *hero*, *defeat*, and so on for different kinds of sports (2004: 117). Charteris-Black states that they play a role in the overall cohesion of a press story. Expressions from the conceptual metaphor FOOTBALL IS WAR were found frequently, but *war* and *conflict* lexis was also found to be used for other sports in sports reports. It is suggested that the use of war to

describe sports is actually due to the fact that these domains share a number of common features, such as involving control of a territory, both being more or less rule-based activities, and both requiring physical and mental strength as well as training (Charteris-Black, 2004: 125). As with financial reports, the metaphors in sports reports are generally conventional, meaning they are used frequently in a range of situations to describe relating sports events.

It thus seems that news reporting overall contains a high degree of conventional metaphorical expressions that return in descriptions of various situations. With regard to the grammatical forms of metaphor in news it is interesting to see that, in comparison to conversations, news discourse makes more use of metaphorical nouns and adjectives, something that is also reflected in the results described in studies on financial and sports reports. In general, metaphor forms and underlying conceptual structures are relatively diverse but at the same time conventional in news discourse.

### *2.5.3 Preliminary summary*

All of the above analyses try to uncover the forms, functions and roles of metaphor in conversation and news discourse. One of the important outcomes of these studies is that the majority of the metaphors occurring in conversational and news language are conventionalised uses. A selection of these at the same time can fulfil different functions and roles that can influence the understanding of the expression. In some cases, a topic is evaluated through the deliberate use of expressions from a particular source domain for the target domain. This is visible in studies on the representation of news topics such as immigration issues or war situations. In other cases, metaphors occur to assist in the management of the discourse. This occurs mainly in conversations, where metaphors often seem to be used deliberately at particular moments in a conversation to summarize or change a topic. In some instances, then, even the most conventional metaphors can be used in intentional metaphorical ways.

## **2.6 Metaphor in communication: deliberate uses of metaphor**

The findings from many of the discourse-based studies on metaphor have shown that many metaphorical expressions in naturally occurring discourse are highly conventional. Relating this to the psychologically oriented process studies that found that conventional metaphors are most frequently processed as categorizations, it can be argued that many conventional metaphorical expressions are in fact not processed as metaphors, i.e. as cross-domain mappings between two distinct domains (cf. Steen, 2008, in press b). Thus, many of the original examples that Lakoff and Johnson use as evidence that our minds work in metaphorical systems may be processed as categorizations, not comparisons. Parts of our world

and minds may be originally shaped according to metaphorical structures, as Lakoff and colleagues claim, but our thoughts and language are not necessarily shaped in that way, at least not if we use highly conventional metaphors.

Yet, a number of conventional metaphors seem in some way or other more special or imaginative than most of the conventionally used words. These are expressions that do not seem to be used simply because of their conventional metaphorical meaning, but because the producer intended to invoke a special effect with these words, drawing attention to certain aspects of the metaphorical meaning perhaps. As mentioned above, examples of such expressions include the evaluative and persuasive uses of conventional metaphors, or the uses which assist in the explanation and understanding of difficult scientific processes. There seems to be a contrast between general conventional metaphorical expressions not used deliberately, and conventional metaphors used in intentional ways. The latter seem to be used in essence to communicate a certain intention, idea, or view point, as Steen has suggested (2008, in press b). To illustrate the differences between a deliberate and non-deliberate conventional metaphorical expression, Steen (2008) presents the following example, where one contextual use of *hit* seems to produce two different effects in two contexts.

a) We hit Amsterdam in the early evening

b) We hit Amsterdam like a bulldozer

(Steen, 2008: 229)

Example (b) makes use of a simile, and thereby instructs the reader to establish a comparison between the action of ‘us arriving in Amsterdam’ and the action of ‘a bulldozer hitting an object’. In (a), the meaning of *hit* can be understood by setting up a similar cross-domain mapping, but this expression can also be understood by means of categorization; the indirect use of *hit* is conventional enough to be understood without a cross-domain mapping. The main difference between the two is that the latter instructs the reader to interpret the meaning of *hit* in a specific way by using a simile in which the source domain is explicated in more detail. Steen then suggests that deliberate uses of conventional metaphors should be seen as exemplifying a specific feature of metaphors in communication: they are linguistic metaphorical expressions that are conventional but that are used in particular discourse contexts to deliberately bring across a certain intention, and by doing so draw attention to the metaphorical conceptual structure intended.

Steen (2008, in press b) proposes to extend the distinction between conventional and novel metaphor to a more detailed contrast of metaphor-related words, suggesting a three-dimensional model of metaphor. He includes the idea of deliberate metaphor, which can be novel or conventional, as a form of metaphor that involves the intentional use of a source domain term to review a target domain. Whereas previous frameworks focused predominantly on two dimensions of metaphor, metaphor in language (the linguistic expressions) and metaphor in thought (the conceptual structures), Steen adds the idea of deliberate metaphor as

an indication of metaphor in communication (the function). He explains this approach as a discourse-analytic framework: 'When metaphor is studied as part of actual language use, or events of discourse, it does not only manifest a linguistic form and a conceptual structure, but also a communicative function' (Steen, 2008: 221). A definition of deliberate metaphor in this framework is phrased in the following way:

Deliberate metaphors are those cross-domain mappings that involve the express use, in production and/or reception, of another domain as a source domain for re-viewing the target domain. Deliberate metaphor is a relatively conscious discourse strategy that aims to elicit particular rhetorical effects. (Steen, 2008: 223)

In practice, this would mean that novel metaphorical expressions are always viewed as deliberate metaphors, but that some conventional metaphorical expression, such as in example (b), can also be seen as deliberate metaphors evoking a cross-domain mapping.

The idea of deliberate metaphor has also been discussed in other discourse-analytical studies, but these seem to be less explicit. Charteris-Black and Musolff (2003) distinguish between a semantic definition and a pragmatic definition of metaphor (also see Charteris-Black, 2004). The first is a broad definition of metaphor that seems to correspond to the general idea of linguistic metaphor, where a word shifts in its use in context from one domain to another. The second is a more narrow definition, which is 'more concerned with the less conventional language use, and with the particular emotive and opinion forming effects of metaphor' (Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003: 158). This seems similar to the idea of deliberate metaphor, but the examples used to illustrate both definitions of metaphor do not make a clear distinction between the semantic and pragmatic criteria. In addition, they do not make a clear differentiation between metaphor in language, thought, and particularly in communication.

Cameron and Deignan (2003) also use the term deliberate metaphor, but make a key distinction between 'deliberate metaphors that seemed to be used for a specific, educational, and ideational discourse purpose, and conventionalized metaphors that seemed to be used as part of normal, everyday language resources' (2003: 152). They thus seem to distinguish conventional metaphors and deliberate metaphors, whereas in Steen's approach, conventional metaphors can also be deliberate metaphors. In a different study by Cameron, on metaphor in educational talk, it is stressed that deliberate metaphors are not necessarily novel or creative forms, but are dependent on the context and occur for a particular reason (Cameron, 2003, 2008). The idea of context and purpose as decisive issues for distinguishing between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor is brought forward in her studies as well, but the clear communicative purpose of intentional choices of metaphor seems missing in Cameron's definition.

Müller (2008) uses the term *activation of metaphoricality* to point to similar ideas about how seemingly dead metaphors can be activated by a combination of issues. She suggests that highly conventional metaphorical expressions are

sometimes activated, meaning that attention is drawn to their metaphorical structures, by accompanying gestures or pictures that mimic the source of the metaphor. An extensive analysis of the various states of conventional metaphors is given, including a number various activation devices, both verbal and of other modalities. Müller's analysis of activation of the metaphoricity in predominantly conventional metaphors also overlaps with some of the issues raised by Cameron and Deignan (Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Deignan, 2003) and Steen (2008), but it seems more concerned with the various states of activation that metaphorical expressions can contain, and less with the communicative effects that such expressions may intend or cause. Steen's (2008, in press b) approach to deliberate metaphor as metaphor in communication then seems to be the most detailed, and fits within the overall approach of analysing linguistic metaphors separately from their conceptual structure, and thus also from their possible communicative functions.

For the current corpus study, the approach of focusing on deliberate metaphor can prove useful in showing more detailed patterns of metaphor use in Dutch conversations and news discourse. Particularly for the news corpus used in this study, the notion of deliberate metaphor seems very useful. The present corpus consists of a variety of newspaper texts originating from different sections and dealing with various topics, having a heterogeneous character. It will be difficult to make a comparison between two periods of news when the topics, and thus the possible metaphorical expressions that may be used in relation to these topics, are diverse and may not overlap. The majority of the metaphor studies on news discourse described above focus on one topic (immigration, epidemics) or one section (financial news, sports) and can uncover general patterns of use and function that can be compared cross-linguistically or diachronically. The diversity in the topics in the corpus used for the present study makes it difficult to find clear patterns in the functions and domains of metaphors. However, it will be possible to look at the occurrence, range, and functions of deliberately used metaphor in news discourse in general, in order to get a good idea of how news language seems to make use of metaphorical language to convey intentions and communicate ideas. Even though the two periods used in this study consist of a diverse group of sections and news topics, it may prove useful to look at the use of deliberate metaphors to see if differences occur in how often, and how exactly, the two periods of news make use of deliberate metaphor to communicate personal intentions and views.

The idea that current news discourse is likely to contain more involved, personalised or subjective patterns of language use than news discourse from the 1950s results from the different studies reviewed in chapter 1. It was suggested there that metaphorical language may play an important role in the trend towards a personalization of news discourse. Deliberately used metaphorical expressions are seen to communicate personal intentions, ideas, and viewpoints on news topics that can make news texts more personalised or involved on the part of the journalist or the newspaper. Assuming that deliberate metaphors are used when a journalist

wants to evoke and communicate a specific idea about a topic, this can be interpreted as a way of adding personal and subjective ideas to the news reports. It can hence be assumed that, when the idea of news becoming more personalised and subjective through the use of specific metaphorical images is true, that this is particularly visible in deliberate metaphors that have a specific communicative function.

## 2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the broad field of metaphor research and some of its subfields. Conceptual Metaphor Theory has had an important influence on the way metaphor is perceived; metaphor is not necessarily seen as novel and decorative, but as conventional and pervasive in everyday language and thought. Cognitive-linguistic studies demonstrate that concrete, human-oriented source domains are conventionally used to talk about and understand abstract concepts in the form of cross-domain mappings, and that many of the things we say are manifestations of underlying conceptual metaphors; a concept such as TIME is often understood in terms of SPACE, EMOTIONS are often reasoned about in terms of PHYSICAL or NATURAL FORCES, and THEORIES are often understood in terms of BUILDINGS, to name but a few of the conventional conceptual metaphors.

The conventionality of metaphorical language and thought is demonstrated by many discourse-based studies, in which naturally observed language data are used to uncover frequent patterns in the use of metaphors. Some corpus studies, such as those conducted by Deignan (2005) and Cameron (2003) have illustrated that metaphorical language occurs in different grammatical forms, and that many linguistic metaphors are highly conventional, occurring in different contexts and language settings. Linguistic metaphors can be identified separately from the conceptual structures that seem to underlie them, something that is useful when we want to analyse more local instances and patterns of metaphors use.

In fact, some of the highly conventional metaphorical expressions in language do not always seem to invoke a cross-domain mapping in which language users map features and relations from the source concept onto the target concept. Psycholinguistic studies of conventional and novel metaphor have suggested that as a metaphor becomes increasingly more conventional, it is likely that it is not understood in terms of a comparison between source and target structures, but as a categorization, where a source and target concept are members of the same general category (Bowdle & Gentner, 2005). As Steen (2008) suggests, this would mean that the majority of the linguistic metaphors found in naturally produced language data are not understood as metaphors, that is, as cross-domain mappings. However, some metaphors, including highly conventional ones, do seem to intentionally invite the language user to set up a comparison between two concepts; those are metaphorical expressions that are deliberately used to communicate a certain intention or idea, such as persuading an addressee of an issue or evaluating a topic.

Such deliberate metaphors seem to occur in various contexts, and, even when conventional, invite addressees to set up a metaphorical comparison.

The different ideas brought forward in this chapter about the grammatical forms of metaphors in different varieties of language, the various functions they seem to have in different contexts, and the deliberate intentions they seem to be able to bring across in some circumstances form the basis of the analyses conducted in the present thesis. In a corpus of Dutch conversation and news language, linguistic metaphors will be analysed for their grammatical forms and frequencies and for their various functions, comparing and contrasting the nature of metaphor in contemporary conversations and news. The same will be done for texts from two periods of news to see if metaphors play an important role in the stylistic changes observed for news language by various corpus-based and sociolinguistic studies.

The remainder of the thesis will focus on frequencies, forms, and functions of metaphor in Dutch conversation and news language. Chapter 3 presents the MIPVU procedure for linguistic metaphor identification, an adjusted version of MIP (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) which has been developed during the first stages of the research project. The tool was used to identify all instances of linguistic metaphor in the corpus data used for the present project. Chapter 4 focuses on the application of MIPVU to Dutch language data, presenting difficult operational issues as well as the reliability figures of the procedure for Dutch. Chapters 5 and 6 present the quantitative analysis of the metaphor data from two angles; in chapter 5, the two contemporary registers, conversation and current news, are compared for their frequencies and grammatical forms of the linguistic metaphors, and in chapter 6 the two periods of news, texts from 1950 and from 2002, are compared for their frequencies and grammatical forms of the linguistic metaphors. Chapter 7 focuses on metaphorical verbs in the three corpus sets; verbs are generally a large source of numerous metaphorical expressions, and seem to be important for the two register of news and conversation, and for the two periods of news. In chapter 8 a qualitative analysis of deliberate metaphor in news is presented, focusing on the intentional uses of various metaphorical expressions for different purposes. Finally, chapter 9 presents the main conclusions and implications of the thesis.



### 3. MIPVU: a manual for identifying metaphor-related words<sup>6</sup>

This chapter presents the complete procedure for finding metaphor-related words which has been utilized in the present research. It has been developed together with five fellow researchers from the VU University Amsterdam working on English-language data. The English examples illustrating issues below are taken from that data. The style of the procedure is in the form of a set of instructions. The present chapter is intended to be an independent presentation of the procedure as an autonomous tool, and may be used as a reference manual by anyone who aims to find metaphor-related words in usage.<sup>7</sup> The term ‘metaphor-related word’ is used to suggest that the tool aims to identify all words in discourse that can be taken to be lexical expressions of underlying cross-domain mappings.

#### 3.1 The basic procedure

The goal of finding metaphor in discourse can be achieved in 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.
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.
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.
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.

---

<sup>6</sup> The MIPVU manual has previously been published as chapter 2 in Steen, Dorst, et al. (2010), but has been adjusted to fit the thesis. The sections on BNC-codes and specific use of *Macmillan* in Steen, Dorst et al.’s version has been deleted for the present thesis since they do not apply to the analysis of Dutch discourse.

<sup>7</sup> The manual regularly refers to ‘we’ and ‘you’ throughout the steps and instructions. The ‘we’ refers to the group of analysts, including myself, who developed this procedure and subsequent manual together. The ‘you’ refers to future analysts who may use this manual for their own research purposes. Due to the nature of this manual as a set of instructions developed in collaboration with a number of researchers, the stylistic conventions may deviate from the rest of the thesis.

5. When a word functions as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, mark it as a metaphor flag.
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.

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 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. Each point will now be discussed in more detail.

### **3.2 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 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, described in chapter 2.

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 can be adopted.

#### *3.2.1 General guideline for lexical units*

In general, the information provided by the part-of-speech tags in the data is followed as the principal indicator of the boundaries of lexical units. The Dutch language project makes use of conversations taken from the Corpus Gesproken Nederlands (CGN, Corpus of Spoken Dutch) and news texts selected from Lexis Nexis, which are all tagged with the same part-of-speech tagging programme. In this research, the dependence on these materials means the following:

- All words provided with an independent Part-Of-Speech (POS) tag in the corpus are taken as separate lexical units. For instance, adverbs are tagged as

BW (Dutch ‘bijwoord’), nouns are tagged as N (Dutch ‘substantief’), and so on.

### 3.2.2 Exceptions

There are some exceptions to our overall acceptance of the part-of-speech tags: these concern phrasal verbs, or separable complex verbs in Dutch and some compounds.

*Phrasal verbs* are verbal expressions consisting of more than one word, such as *look up* or *turn on*. The Dutch version of such units, often called Separable Complex Verbs (SCVs), is written as one word when used in its infinitive form (such as *omdraaien* ‘turn around’ or *doorgeven* ‘pass on’), but are separated into a verbal part and a particle when used in other grammatical situations. The different parts of phrasal verbs and SCVs are tagged as independent verbs followed by autonomous adverbial particles in the corpus. We will not follow this practice, however, for phrasal verbs and SCVs function as linguistic units designating one action, process, state or relation in the referential dimension of the discourse. All such verbs are therefore treated 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 are 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.

*Compounds* are single lexical units consisting of two distinct parts, which may cause orthographical problems. These orthographical problems occur predominantly for a language such as English, in which compounds are often spelled as two separate words, but similar issues can occur for other languages, such as Dutch, as well. In general, compounds can be spelled in three ways: as one word, as two hyphenated words, and as two separate words.

1. When a compound noun is spelled 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. When it is spelled as one word, but cannot be found in the dictionary as a conventionalised compound, the two distinct parts are taken as two distinct lexical units. This can occur in the Dutch

corpus, for instance, because compounds in Dutch are predominantly spelled as one orthographic word, also when created ad hoc.

2. When a compound noun is spelled 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*).
3. In the corpus, compound nouns that have been spelled as two separate words are analysed as two independent words by the tagging programme, 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 part-of-speech tags. They are then like phrasal verbs and should be treated as single lexical units, whose parts do not require analysis for potential metaphorical meaning.

Dictionaries can be used to find out whether a combination of two separate words is a conventionalized compound or not. When it is, the combination is usually listed as such as a separate entry in the dictionary, similar to conventionalized compounds spelled as one word (see point 1).

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.

### **3.3 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.
2. Check if there is a more basic meaning of the lexical unit. If there is, establish its identity.
3. Determine whether the more basic meaning of the lexical unit is sufficiently distinct from the contextual meaning.
4. Examine whether the contextual meaning of the lexical unit can be related to the more basic meaning by some form of similarity.

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).

### 3.3.1. 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 dictionary; but it may also be novel, specialized, or highly specific, in which case it cannot be found in a general 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. This problem predominantly occurs for conversational discourse. 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 each be marked as 'Discarded For Metaphor Analysis' ('DFMA').
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 a location, 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 may treat the word as if it was used indirectly and metaphorically, on the basis of the general rule 'When In Doubt, Leave

It In' ('WIDLII'). This rule is applied to situations such as in *a*, *b*, and *c*, where there is a possibility of metaphorical use of a lexical unit, but where due to lack of contextual knowledge it cannot be said with certainty. In order to be maximally inclusive, doubtful cases are kept in, with an additional 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—nontechnical—meaning, we also mark the word as possibly 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 can mark the relevant ambiguous words *furious* and *thinks* as metaphor related words, and add a comment that this is due to a possible personification ('PP').

### 3.3.2. 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 dictionary. A meaning cannot be more basic if it is not included in a contemporary 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 & 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 word form (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, 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. For

example, the noun *suppression* occurs as a derivation of the verb *suppress* in the dictionary. The contextual and basic meanings of *suppression* have thus to be examined with reference to the description of *suppress*.

3. When verbs are described under a single sense 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 non-human, animal origin (basic sense) of the lexical units decides which applications are metaphorical and which are not.

### 3.3.3 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. In general, dictionaries list sufficiently distinct meanings of a lexical unit under separate, numbered sense descriptions within its grammatical category. There are, however, separately numbered sense descriptions of lexical units that are specifications or rather generalisations of another sense description for the same word. For instance, *plaats* 'place' has as the first sense description in *Van Dale* of Dutch 'open, vacant piece of land in front or within the walls of a building', and as the second description a more specific instance of the previous definition, 'square in a town or village, for instance in front of a church'. The second separate description in this

case is not sufficiently distinct from the first, but a more specified example of it. One crucial issue that should be taken into account when looking for sufficiently distinct meanings is the notion of distinct domains: if two sense descriptions originate from clearly distinct domains, they can in general be seen as distinct meanings.

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.

### 3.3.4 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, it can be helpful to check historical information on 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 an etymological dictionary 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.

### **3.4 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 non-literal 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').

### **3.5 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 can 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, we insert a code for implicit metaphor. 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.

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, we insert a code for implicit metaphor. 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.

In general, for implicit metaphor, we need one linguistic element of cohesion (which means substitution or ellipsis, including what Halliday and Hasan (1976) 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). 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 noun phrases or verb phrases. This is why these are not part of cohesion.

In practice, the instructions on finding implicit metaphors have not been followed to such a detailed extent for the Dutch project as they have for the English language project. The main reason for this has been the fact that finding implicit expressions related to metaphor requires a substantial additional step to finding indirectly and directly used words explained by cross-domain mapping, namely the first step mentioned above. Time-wise, it has proven too complex to include this in the data identification. An additional reason for not conducting this part of the procedure has been that the anticipated results would add substantial new information in the light of the research questions for the present study.

However, the part has been kept in the current chapter because it is essentially a useful addition to the MIPVU procedure which may be applied in other situations where time and results are sufficient.

### 3.6 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', standing for metaphor flag.
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.

### 3.7 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 analyzed 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 2.1.

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').
  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').
  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').
  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').

The manual presented above was formed during the process of analysing English language data. It has been presented here in a slightly more general manner than in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010), having omitted specialised reference to the English project data from the BNC. Even so, the version above contains instructions that were difficult to apply to the Dutch language data. The next chapter presents the difficulties encountered when applying the originally English language-based MIPVU procedure to Dutch language material, and slight adjustments made to the detailed procedure. It will also present the reliability results for Dutch, and will show that reliability figures are nonetheless high.



## 4. MIPVU in practice: its application to Dutch discourse<sup>8</sup>

### 4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the entire MIPVU manual developed by the team of metaphor researchers at the VU University. MIPVU is a systematic procedure for linguistic metaphor identification, and can be seen as an extension of MIP developed previously by the Pragglejaz Group (2007). MIPVU differs from MIP in its treatment of other forms of metaphor-related words besides indirectly expressed metaphors, such as directly expressed metaphors, implicit metaphors metaphor, and signals, and is more elaborate and explicit in its instructions.

However, just as MIP, MIPVU was originally developed with English language discourse in mind, and various elaborate instructions deal with English language issues specifically. The present study is concerned with Dutch language material, namely spontaneous conversations and news texts from two periods. Several decisions and language issues inherently related to MIP and MIPVU had to be altered for the procedure to become workable for Dutch discourse. These issues involved the use of specific dictionary tools, but even more so the lexico-grammatical differences between English and Dutch. The particular consequences for Dutch are outlined in the present chapter. Specific problematic tool-related as well as lexico-grammar-related issues are discussed and solutions are presented. The last section of this chapter presents the reliability figures of the application of the procedure to the Dutch corpus materials. But first, a detailed description of the corpus materials and selection procedures will be given.

### 4.2 Corpus materials: Dutch conversations and news texts

As mentioned in chapter 2, corpus-linguistic studies are generally conducted with either a large general corpus consisting of at least a few million words of data, or with smaller more specialised corpora focusing on particular registers, genres or languages. The latter are usually used when studies aim to uncover or compare language patterns in particular registers, or in one register in different languages, to name a few of the many options. The aim of the research conducted within the current project has been to compare patterns of metaphor use in contemporary Dutch conversations and news texts, and to find changes in the patterns of metaphor use in Dutch news texts over a period of time, all with the idea in mind of a change towards a more personalised style of language use in news discourse. In

---

<sup>8</sup> This chapter is partly based on chapters 7 and 8 of Steen, Dorst et al. (2010), and on Pasma (in press).

order to conduct such as study, a corpus of Dutch conversations and news texts from different periods was needed.

Despite the fast rise in availability of various corpora, the large majority of them still consist of English discourse. In the absence of a fully coded corpus of Dutch texts that could cater to our needs, we had to design one ourselves. In total, about 100,000 words of contemporary conversation transcripts and contemporary news texts were needed. Initially, we also aimed to collect 50,000 words of historical news texts, but due to availability, only 30,000 were collected. The conversation section of the corpus consisting of some 50,000 words was taken from the existing CGN corpus (Corpus Gesproken Nederlands [corpus of spoken Dutch]). This corpus was designed at the University of Nijmegen between 1998 and 2004, and consists of nine million words of spoken Dutch in different settings, such as interviews, meetings, television broadcasts and spontaneous speech (Oostdijk, 2000). We randomly selected 29 conversations classified as spontaneous speech, adding up to 50,551 words in total. A detailed overview of the conversations, number of words and metadata is given in Appendix A.

The existing corpora of Dutch news texts do not cover a broad selection of newspapers but predominantly focus on one newspaper or one region, and thus were not suitable for our kind of research. We therefore decided to select roughly 50,000 words of digitally available news texts from 2002, taken from *Lexis Nexis* and collected in a separate database. These spread over five national newspapers, *Algemeen Dagblad*, *NRC Handelsblad*, *De Telegraaf*, *Trouw* and *de Volkskrant*, and eight different newspaper sections, front page, national, international, economics, arts, sports, editorials and science. Of each section from each newspaper, roughly 1250 words in the form of complete texts were selected in order to get a good overview and a general representation of newspaper language. The total number of words in the final selection is 51,587 words. A detailed overview of the number of texts from sections and newspapers from 2002 is given in Appendix A.

As mentioned above, we also aimed at selecting 50,000 words of news texts from an earlier period, around 1950, but due to availability of newspapers in archives, only 32,592 words of text were selected for the final corpus. During the selection stages, we tried to mirror the current newspaper corpus section as much as possible, but had to alter this slightly. There were two main reasons for this. Firstly, the available archives did not contain versions of *Algemeen Dagblad* from the 1950s that were good enough to transfer into digital material. This newspaper thus does not occur in the historical section of the corpus. Of the other newspapers, not every section was as well demarcated yet as in the current newspapers, which resulted in slightly fewer texts and words for some sections for some newspapers. Of those newspapers available to us, we made copies from microfilm as well as paper versions, which were then typed into digital documents either manually or with a conversion programme. A detailed overview of the number of texts from sections and newspapers from 1950 is given in Appendix A as well.

The conversations taken from the CGN corpus already contained different tags for part of speech and lemmas in an XML-format. The contemporary news texts selected from *Lexis Nexis* were transferred from Word format to XML-format, as were the historical news texts. They did not contain additional linguistic information, and were therefore tagged and lemmatised by a tagging programme designed for Dutch language data, *Tadpole* (Van den Bosch et al., 2007). The final versions of tagged texts were then analysed for metaphorical expressions manually, and XML-codes were added to signal different metaphor relations.

### **4.3 MIPVU for Dutch: adjustments**

Many scholars that have done metaphor identification and analysis have stressed the need to be specific about the operationalisation issues and identification decisions (e.g., Cameron, 2003; Semino, 2008; Steen, 2007; Steen, Biernacka et al., 2010; Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). To be able to carry out a systematic analysis for Dutch discourse with MIPVU, the procedure was further specified where necessary in order to be applicable to Dutch as the target language. These specifications did not so much concern the different steps in the procedure, as some of the detailed information on multi-word units and the use of different lexical tools. As a rule, MIPVU can generally be applied to Dutch discourse, but problems cropped up in relation to some of the additional specifications. The procedural problems are related to operational issues, but also deal with language-specific matters, which highlight some of the differences between Dutch and English.

Although the languages of English and Dutch overlap on many fronts, there are also important differences. Crucial grammatical dissimilarities have been reported in contrastive grammars between Dutch and English. Aarts and Wekker (1987), for instance, point to the differences in the occurrence and use of demonstrative pronouns and relative pronouns, and indicate differences between certain prepositions in Dutch and English. Other linguistic issues have been discussed in a number of studies on Dutch constructions, such as Booij's work on constructional idioms (with fixed prepositions) and on separable complex verbs (cf. Booij, 2002a, b; Verhagen, 2005). As the discussions below will show, some of these essential grammatical features of Dutch have also proved to influence the way a method like MIPVU can be applied.

#### *4.3.1 Operational issue 1: the corpus tags*

One concomitant problem with designing the news part of the corpus ourselves was that whereas the conversation transcripts were enriched with additional information such as part-of-speech tags and lemma tags, the newspaper texts at first did not contain this kind of vital information. We therefore had them lemmatised and tagged with the same tagging system used for the CGN corpus to enable

appropriate comparison (Van den Bosch et al., 2007). The final result was a corpus of XML texts enriched with additional codes such as part-of-speech tags and lemma tags.

The CGN tagging system was designed for transcripts of spoken language, but was applied to written discourse in our situation. This inevitably yielded a somewhat less reliable result for part-of-speech and lemma assignment than the conversation transcripts, with incorrect codes on different levels. However, in the majority of the cases, this did not significantly interfere with the metaphor analysis. In cases where part-of-speech tags or lemmas were incorrect and of importance for the identification of metaphor, a comment was added to the word in question. In example (1), for instance, the adverb *geregeld* ‘regularly’ was tagged by the system as the past participle of the verb *regelen* ‘arrange’.

- (1) Winkelwagens en stalen platen tussen de rails zorgen *geregeld* voor levensgevaarlijke situaties.

‘Shopping trolleys and steel plates between the rails *regularly* create life-threatening situations.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, national*)

Although *geregeld* is in some contexts the past participle of the verb *regelen* ‘arrange’, it can also be an adverb or adjective in other contexts. In the case of (1), *geregeld* is the adverb meaning *regularly*. If in this case we followed the information given in the part-of-speech and lemma tags and saw this instance as the past participle of the verb, then it may in principle have been analysed as a metaphorically used word. This is because the verb *regelen* has a more concrete sense (that of physical arrangement of objects) than what is meant in the context of (1). However, the tagging system assigned the wrong part of speech and lemma to the lexical unit, so that we examined the adverb meanings of *geregeld*. As a result, the word was not identified as related to metaphor. In cases like (1), where an incorrectly assigned part-of-speech tag can cause confusion with respect to metaphor analysis, we have added a comment to the word in the XML-file which denotes the correct part of speech and lemma.

#### 4.3.2 Operational issue 2: the Van Dale dictionary and its implications

It is important to clarify the use of the dictionary and its contents in the procedure. We have used the electronic version of the *Van Dale Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* (Den Boom & Geeraerts, 2005) as our reference tool, in particular for finding contextual and basic meanings of lexical units. The *Van Dale Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* (henceforth *Van Dale*) is a historically based reference dictionary. The ideal dictionary for our kind of research would have been a corpus-based dictionary. The original MIP and MIPVU procedures make use of *Macmillan*, a dictionary based on the large World English Corpus.

This dictionary represents British English language as it is used in everyday speech and writing, being based on naturally produced contemporary language which has been collected in the World English Corpus. For Dutch, there is no such thing as a corpus-based dictionary, so we are forced to make use of the best alternative that is available, which in the case of Dutch is the reference dictionary *Van Dale*.

There are some key differences between a corpus-based dictionary like *Macmillan* and the historically-based *Van Dale* reference dictionary with regard to lemma entries. Firstly, *Van Dale* is a dictionary that includes archaic word meanings as well as obscure meanings that are rarely used. Since we do not want to include archaic meanings in our analysis, analysing language from a contemporary point of view, we add an explanation to the Dutch version of MIPVU that all meaning descriptions labelled *verouderd* ('archaic') in *Van Dale* must not be taken into account in our analysis. Rare uses of words that have not been labelled *verouderd*, by contrast, are assumed to be present in the language of the current user, even if they are rare. These have thus been taken into account when looking for possible metaphorical meaning.

In some cases, however, a seemingly basic meaning turns out to be a rarely used meaning. An example of this is the *Van Dale* description of the verb *ontwikkelen* 'develop'. One of the listed meanings is 'ontvouwen, loswikkelen' ('unfold, unwrap'), with the example sentence *de jonge blaadjes ontwikkelen zich* 'the young leaves unfold themselves'. The sense description in itself seems fairly concrete, as is the example sentence. Yet, corpus research will most certainly show that if and when a sentence like *de jonge blaadjes ontwikkelen zich* is used, the apparent concreteness of the definition becomes questionable. Although *ontwikkelen* is a frequently used verb in combination with plants, and other living entities, it is often used in the sense of 'growing' and 'coming into existence', the more general meaning of *ontwikkelen*. So even though the verb *ontwikkelen* appears frequently in the vicinity of *jonge blaadjes* or a word denoting similar parts of plants, the idea that it is then used in a concrete sense of unfolding is quite implausible.

The main difference between a historically based dictionary and a corpus-based dictionary can be illustrated by comparing the description given above of *ontwikkelen* to the description of *develop* in *Macmillan*. For *develop*, the literal action of unfolding a concrete object is not overtly present in either one of the sense descriptions. The first definition, 'if people, animals, or plants develop, they change or grow as they get older' has to do with plants and other living entities, but describes the process in a general manner. Here, it is impossible to see a more basic sense that has to do with plants or leaves that are literally unfolding, although that stage might be involved in the whole process of developing. One reason why *Macmillan* does not overtly distinguish the sense of 'unfold/unwrap' is perhaps that it is not found in such a detailed way in the World English Corpus. In addition, all senses of *develop* in relation to leaves and plants amount to the general meaning of growing from or into something. This meaning of *develop* is similar to Dutch *ontwikkelen*, which in essence appears most frequently in the sense argued above.

Since *Van Dale* is not based on a large corpus, the entries cannot be checked in such a manner. We should therefore take into consideration the possibility that the word *ontwikkelen* has the different meanings described in *Van Dale*, and base our judgement of basic and contextual meanings on these entries.

Another important feature of *Van Dale* that can cause problems when searching for metaphor-related words is the fact that some noun entries have been defined solely by nominalisations. As a consequence, it is hard to decide whether the noun, like the verb, has one clearly basic meaning and several derived, possibly metaphorical, meanings, or if it has simply one general and vague meaning. This can yield problems in finding a clear basic meaning, and has been a reason for disagreement among the analysts in the reliability tests that we carried out. An example of such a vague description is the noun *aanpak* 'approach', where the definition simply is the action of the verb, 'het aanpakken, wijze van aanpakken' ('the approaching, manner of approaching'). Looking up the verb *aanpakken* 'to approach' in the dictionary, we see that it has a clear basic meaning and clear derived, and in some contexts metaphorical, meanings. However, it is difficult to make a decision on the uses and meanings of the noun *aanpak* if it is described in such a general way. It could be said that it clearly derives from the verb, which has both concrete and abstract meanings, and it could be concluded that the same then holds for the noun. However, it is also possible to say that the noun has one general meaning, that it is therefore monosemous, and that it is then not necessary to make a distinction between concrete and abstract uses. If the last option is chosen, some possible metaphorical meanings may be lost.

The reliability tests show that there was not always agreement about how to deal with these nouns. This often has to do with the issue that they are defined as the actions of the verbs they derive from. However, there is another possible explanation, which has to do with the influence of native speaker intuitions. In the case of *aanpak*, for instance, the analysts may follow the one general meaning without going to the verb, because intuitively they judge that the noun is always used in an abstract way. For other nouns, for instance *vervolg* 'continuation' with the definition 'het vervolgen' ('process of continuing/prosecuting'), analysts may say that the noun can be and is used frequently in different concrete and abstract contexts, and it is thus necessary to refer to the verb senses to establish a basic and contextual meaning.

In order to be systematic and to get reliable results from the procedure, we have decided to look only at the definitions of the nouns in instances like *aanpak* and *vervolg*, and not to include the senses of the verbs from which they derive in our metaphor analysis. This decision is in accordance with the system proposed by MIPVU. Even though nominalisations like these can encompass concreteness to some extent, they have been defined by *Van Dale* as including all senses of the verb, and are seen as more or less general or vague. Thus, all instances of *aanpak* and *vervolg* in the corpus have been taken as used in such a general sense.

### 4.3.3 Lexico-grammatical issue: complex lexical units and their boundaries

In addition to coming across operational issues, the application of MIPVU to Dutch discourse also raised linguistic issues. These occurred for a specific group of words in particular, namely compounded or multi-word units. The problems were similar to those described in the reports on MIP (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and MIPVU (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010), but required language-specific solutions that deviated slightly from the procedures suggested for the English language studies. Three kinds of multi-word units raised the most significant problems, namely so-called polywords, Separable Complex Verbs and so-called complex pronominal adverbs. The three issues are described separately below.

*Polywords* There were a number of problems that arose when dealing with the issue of polywords (e.g. *of course* in English, and *met name 'in particular'* or *af en toe 'now and then'* in Dutch) that needed different solutions to how the English-language project dealt with them and how they were treated in the original MIP (see Pragglejaz Group, 2007: 26). The BNC has added a list of fixed multi-word expressions that have to be analysed as one lexical unit, and has coded the elements as such in the BNC corpus, which meant that the analysis of the English data could rely on previously established decisions. The Dutch corpus does not contain such a list and corresponding codes. In addition to the lack of a part-of-speech tag for polywords in the corpus, *Van Dale* does not indicate when a combination should be considered a polyword either. The dictionary does explain the meaning of frequent fixed multi-word expressions such as *met name 'in particular'* under the head word entry (in this case *name*, which is an old inflection of *naam 'name'*), but it does not include separate entries for these frequent polywords. To produce a list for Dutch similar to that in the BNC, based on our own intuitions, lies outside the scope of this research. The MIPVU procedure, together with the dictionary and the part-of-speech tags in the Dutch corpus, therefore requires that we analyse the separate parts of any potential multi-word expressions that may qualify as polywords as separate units. This decision may produce an artificial increase in the overall number of lexical units in the data in comparison with the English materials, but is in accordance with the procedure used.

An additional problem that arises from this decision is that in most cases it is extremely difficult to establish the contextual meaning of some or all parts of the multi-word expressions, due to the grammaticalization of these expressions. If the different steps of the procedure are filled in for both *met* and *name*, it becomes clear that it is difficult to establish a contextual meaning for the separate words when they are used as parts of a polyword-expression. Take for instance *met name* in the following sentence:

- (2) (...) in de vorm van begrotingsoverschrijdingen, *met name* in de zorg.  
 (...) *in the shape of budget overspending, with name in the care.*  
 ‘(...) in the form of overrunning the budget, particularly in the care sector.’  
 (NRC, front page)

We only come across the polyword *met name* as a run-on under the entry of *name*, and not as a main entry with particular meanings in itself. According to the procedure, we then analyse the separate parts individually. For the lexical unit *met*, establishing the meaning in the context above is complicated. This use of *met* is not mentioned in the list of possible meanings under the preposition *met* in *Van Dale*. The closest possible meaning that is listed in the dictionary is the following: ‘ter aanduiding van een begeleidende omstandigheid, van de wijze waarop iets geschiedt, de gezindheid waarmee iets gepaard gaat’ (‘as an indication of an attendant circumstance, the manner in which something occurs, the inclination associated with something’), with examples such as ‘met opzet iets doen’ (‘do something on purpose’). However, this definition does not correspond accurately with *met* in *met name*, apart from being highly abstract as well.

If we assume that *met* displays some abstract meaning in example (2), then determining if it has a more basic contemporary meaning is less difficult, and in fact manifests two possibilities. The basic meaning of *met* is described in the dictionary under the first sense: ‘(ter aanduiding van een vereniging of begeleiding) in gezelschap van’ (‘(as an indication of a joining or an accompaniment) in the company of ’). In addition, the following sense can also be seen as basic: ‘ter aanduiding van het werktuig, het middel waarmee iets geschiedt, door middel van’ (as an indication of the instrument, the tool with which something is done, by means of).

The next step in the procedure is to decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it. Since we cannot find a suitable contextual meaning for *met* in the dictionary, it is impossible to find a contrast as well as a comparison between the basic and the contextual meaning. In that case we cannot safely conclude that *met* in the context in (2) is possibly metaphorically used, and thus would not mark the preposition *met* as metaphorical in this context.

For the lexical unit *name*, both the contextual and the basic meaning are relatively easy to establish. As far as the contextual meaning is concerned, the dictionary lists only one meaning, which is a description of the use in fixed expressions: ‘verbogen vorm van ‘naam’, alleen in vaste verb.’ (‘inflected form of “name”, only in fixed combinations’). The examples in *Van Dale* of the fixed expression in which *name* is used refer to the basic meaning of the uninflected form of the word, *naam*, which is ‘woord waarmee een persoon of zaak wordt aangeduid, hetzij als categorie of als individu’ (‘word that denotes a person or entity, either as a category or as an individual’). For *met name* in particular, the dictionary makes explicit that *name* here refers to the basic meaning of its uninflected form, being used to name the entities to which *met name* refers. The

contextual meaning of *name* should be seen as a specific use of the noun *naam*, the inflected form, and not so much a different sense of the word. The next step of the procedure consequently has a straightforward solution: the basic and contextual meanings are the same in this case, since the word *name* is used only in fixed expressions, with a similar basic meaning as *naam*. Therefore, there is no need to contrast and compare them. And since the lexical unit is only used in fixed expressions such as *met name*, *name* in the context in (2) is not metaphorically used.

The analysis above suggests that the demarcation of lexical units can be problematic when we have to deal with the separate units of polywords such as *met name*. However, since this research project does not have any technical means to recognise two or more words as one polyword, the only systematic solution that we can come up with is to analyse the separate parts as separate units, and to go through the procedure of metaphor identification for each of these units. The clear documentation of polywords in English in the BNC list is of no help here either, since we can assume that polywords and their forms are frequently language-specific. When interpreting the findings, we then have to take into account a small measure of artificial increase in the number of lexical units that has resulted from this treatment.

*Separable Complex Verbs* A Dutch grammatical construction that is relevant to metaphor identification in discourse concerns separable lexical units. In the majority of the cases, Dutch lexical units consist of one word. But there is one important class of cases in Dutch where two words separated from each other by an indefinite number of other lexical units can still form one lexical unit: these are the so-called Separable Complex Verbs. These lexical units require their own treatment in the procedure.

Separable Complex Verbs (henceforth SCVs) consist of two components, a particle and a verb. These components form a single word in the infinitive form, but are separated from each other in certain syntactic contexts. The following sentence contains a separated SCV, which is italicized:

- (3) *ingaan ~ Zondag gaat de dienstregeling in.*  
*in-go ~ Sunday goes the timetable in.*  
 ‘be effective ~ The timetable is effective from Sunday.’  
 (*de Volkskrant*, national)

Note that the particle is preverbal in the infinitive, but postverbal in the finite form. In general terms SCVs are similar to the phenomenon of phrasal verbs in English, and pose similar problems concerning their fixed characteristics and the unit of analysis (cf. Pragglejaz Group, 2007). Although this is true for both syntactic and lexical characteristics (SCVs are also frequently non-transparent in meaning), the fact that the Dutch verbs are written as one word in certain contexts and are

separated in other contexts changes their analysis. The examples below will illustrate this in more detail.

For all SCVs, the corpora do not contain technical indications in the part-of-speech tags and lemmatisation that show that the parts of an SCV, *gaat* and *in* in (3), are part of one lexical unit. The corpus documentation on the CGN tags briefly touches on prepositions functioning as the non-verbal particles of SCVs, but they have not been given a unique tag that could make them easy to recognise. Thus, it is not possible to distinguish an SCV's particle from a preposition solely on the basis of part-of-speech tags. They have to be distinguished, therefore, with reference to dictionary information. *Van Dale* lists common SCVs as one unit. We therefore adopt the dictionary as our prime source, and analyse the parts of *ingaan* in (3) as constituting one lexical unit. This entails that *ingaan* is to be judged as a whole for its possible metaphorical meaning, and that it is taken to relate to one concept and to designate one referent in the discourse.

SCVs can also be distinguished from frequently collocating verbs and prepositions on syntactic grounds. Then arguments and complements can offer clear indications. The non-verbal component is part of an SCV when it is an adposition, and when the verb is transitive. In that case, the particle cannot be a preposition since it does not function as the head of a prepositional phrase. Two invented examples of a combination of *draaien* 'turn' and *om* 'around' will illustrate the major syntactic differences between an SCV and a prepositional verb (frequently occurring combination of a verb and a preposition).

- (4) **SCV *omdraaien*** (around-turn; 'turn')

De man *draait* de knop *om*

*The man turns the switch around*

'The man turns the switch'

- (5) **Prepositional verb *draaien om*** (turn around; 'revolve around')

De aarde *draait* om de zon

*The earth turns around the sun*

'The earth revolves around the sun'

In (4) we are dealing with the transitive verb *omdraaien*, defined in *Van Dale* as 'draaiend bewegen, wenden, van stand doen veranderen' ('move while rotating, turn, change position'). *Draaien* and *om* are separated when the verb is used in a head clause, and together take two arguments, the subject *de man* and the direct object *de knop*. The word *om* should be seen as part of a complex verb (cf. Blom 2005; Booij 2002b). Sentence (5) contains the intransitive verb *draaien*, defined in *Van Dale* as 'zich rond een as of een middelpunt bewegen' ('move around an axis or central point'). It takes one argument in the form of the subject *de aarde*, and is directly followed by the prepositional phrase *om de zon*. In the case of *draait om de zon*, *draaien* and *om* collocate; they co-occur frequently in similar contexts.

However, they are not part of one complex verb; the preposition *om* is the head of the prepositional phrase *om de zon*, with the noun phrase *de zon* as its complement.

The importance of establishing the differences between the two verb forms for metaphor analysis is illustrated by (6).

- (6) Het kost best wat moeite de knop *om* te draaien.  
*It costs quite some effort the switch **around** to **turn**.*

‘It takes quite some effort to flick the switch.’

*(Algemeen Dagblad, sports)*

This sentence from one of the corpus texts occurs in a context in which a goalkeeper talks about switching mentally from one situation to another. It contains the same SCV as in example (4), *omdraaien*, but in a different sense. It is a metaphorically used word, where the abstract target domain of the mind is represented in terms of the concrete source domain of objects. Following our metaphor identification procedure, the SCV *omdraaien* in (6) is analysed as one metaphorically used lexical.

Suppose we took the verb *draaien* as one unit in (6) and the particle *om* as one as well, then this could lead to different (and possibly inaccurate) judgements about metaphorical language use. *Draaien* ‘to turn’ might be coded as metaphorically used, since objects are not literally turned in (6), and *om* ‘around’ as metaphorically used as well, since there are no objects that literally change directions. If the concept of SCVs was disregarded and all separate words were taken as separate units of analysis at all times, this would increase our final set of observed words related to metaphor. Again, there is a clear connection between the instructions on the treatment of phrasal verbs in MIP and MIPVU to what is being discussed here; they are considered in equal measure as one lexical unit when analysed for their metaphorical meaning. Since SVCs are ubiquitous in the Dutch language too, they need to be carefully identified and analysed.

An example of a non-metaphorical SCV can be found in the sentence below:

- (7) Na een week van tegenslag *zat* het Richard Groenendaal (...) eindelijk een keer *mee*.

*After a week of setbacks **sat** it Richard Groenendaal (...) finally once **with**.*

‘After a week of setbacks Richard Groenendaal (...) finally had a bit of luck.’

*(de Volkskrant, sports)*

Example (7) contains the SCV *meezitten*, separated in the head clause into the verbal part *zat* (past tense of *zitten*) and the particle *mee* ‘with’. According to *Van Dale*, *meezitten* is monosemous, and defined as ‘gunstig zitten, goed gaan’ (‘be favourable, go well’). *Zat* and *mee* are here identified as two parts of one complex verb. If they are identified as two separate units of analysis, we could ascribe

possible metaphorical meaning to one or both parts, since they are then not used in their basic sense, but in a more abstract way. However, since they are separate parts combining into one SCV, we do not take the words separately; and since the SCV has one abstract sense in the dictionary, it is not coded as related to metaphor. It is thus important to include information in the procedure on the treatment of SCVs as complex units to keep a consistently analysed data set.

*Complex ‘pronominal’ adverbs* Similar to SCVs in form and separability are words such as *ermee* ‘with it’, *daaover* ‘about that’, *hiervoor* ‘before this’, etc., words which are called ‘voornaamwoordelijke bijwoorden’ (‘pronominal adverbs’) in Dutch, but which do not exist to such an extent in English. They are difficult to classify, but could be described as adverbials with existential elements, with *er* ‘it’ and *daar* ‘there’ being equivalent to the English existential *there*. The other part of these complex words is a particle, often an equivalent of one of the frequent Dutch preposition. An example of how these words occur in context as compounds can be found in (8):

- (8) Tot nu toe kregen zij *hiervoor* juridisch toestemming...  
*Until now on received they here-for judicial consent...*  
 ‘Until now they received judicial consent for this...’  
 (*De Telegraaf, international*)

The same unit can be separated without changing meaning or becoming grammatically incorrect, as is illustrated in a variation of (8) in example (9).

- (9) Tot nu toe kregen zij *hier* juridische toestemming voor...  
*Until now on received they here judicial consent for...*  
 ‘Until now they received judicial consent for this...’

Again, the part of the pronominal adverbs important for metaphor analysis is the particle element in the form of a preposition. When analysing Dutch prepositions for their metaphorical meaning, we can take a similar approach to English prepositions. Research on the meaning of English prepositions has indicated that they are often involved in metaphorical language use, and that a great number of prepositions are used in both concrete and abstract senses (see Lindstromberg, 1998 on the meaning of English prepositions, and Tyler and Evans, 2003 on the semantics of English prepositions from a cognitive linguistic point of view). Some studies on certain Dutch prepositions reveal similar patterns of use (cf. Cuyckens, 1991, 1995), and a quick glance at the meaning definitions in *Van Dale* of some of the most common Dutch prepositions shows that these to a great extent have the same semantic structures as in English. The examples below show that some of the most common prepositions in Dutch, such as *in* ‘in’, are used in similar contexts as their English counterparts (examples are taken from the Dutch corpus used for the research, and from the BNC-baby corpus).

(10) De kleurrijke politicus (...) werd midden *in* een bijzonder spannende verkiezingscampagne doodgeschoten ...

‘The colourful politician (...) was killed *in* the middle of a particularly exciting election campaign...’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, front page*)

(11) Landlords didn’t acknowledge the writ, so *in* January Debbie’s solicitor requested a judgment...

(*ahb-fragment51*)

In examples (10) and (11), the preposition *in* is metaphorically used; it is not used in its basic spatial sense, but designates a temporal referent, referring to a specific point in time during which an event happened. In both Dutch and English, the examples above illustrate one of the most common uses of the preposition *in*, that of a temporal point. They are clear examples of how common prepositions in Dutch and English are employed in similar ways. That is why pronominal adverbs should be analysed as one lexical unit, similar to SCVs.

The relation of particles in the form of prepositions to complex lexical units like pronominal adverbs, SCVs and polywords is important for metaphor analysis. If constituents of complex words in the form of prepositions are not recognised as such, they will be analysed as separate words, and may often be judged as metaphor-related (since prepositions often carry metaphorical meaning, as illustrated in the examples above). To keep the data set consistent and representative – the word is the unit of analysis, also when it is complex - it is important that the analyst recognises different elements of (separable) complex units. As far as SCVs and pronominal adverbs in Dutch are concerned, these can be found in the dictionary as lemma entries, with meaning definitions of the units as a whole.

#### **4.4 Identification protocol and metaphor coding**

During the initial stage of the metaphor identification, a coding protocol for the Dutch material was used. Together with the MIPVU manual, these documents were constantly adjusted in accordance with new issues arising during the analysis. These included issues such as mentioned above, related to the dictionary contents and to specific lexico-grammatical problems typical for the Dutch language, but also included the general application of the various codes in the XML-files. Decisions about difficult or arbitrary cases of metaphor analysis were recorded and saved in a database for future reference. These also included decisions on contextual meanings and metaphor relations of highly frequent, recurring words such as delexicalised verbs, prepositions and some frequent nouns. For the preposition *in* ‘*in*’, for instance, it was recorded that the dictionary sense of ‘(van

plaats) zich bevinden, zich bewegen of komen binnen een besloten ruimte, een stof of een stoffelijke uitgestrektheid' ('(of place) to find oneself, to move or enter a closed space or a physical dimension') was taken as the most basic sense, but that uses in the sense of 'ter aanduiding van een zich bevinden op een niet specifiek afgesloten locatie zoals een stad, land, provincie etc.' ('as an indication of finding oneself on a non-closed location like a city, country, province etc.') were also taken as non-metaphorical, being a generalisation of the basic sense. Decisions on complex cases involving specific contextual meanings were also added where necessary, such as the example of *licht* 'light' meaning 'van geringe zwaarte' ('of limited weight'), for which use referring to 'weinig betekend, onbeduidend' ('little meaning, insignificant') was recorded as metaphor-related. The database was consulted at later stages to make sure that recurring words in particular contexts and general decisions about certain words were always treated and coded in the same way throughout the corpus.

The initial stage of analysis and coding of the contemporary parts of the corpus, the conversation data and the current news data, was mainly carried out by myself, two other analysts and a supervisor, and included a first round of coding of part of the corpus texts. During this stage the coding also included separate comments explaining the difficulties encountered for certain cases, which were dealt with in the various discussion sessions. Those sessions also included the discussion of cases in which one or more analysts disagreed with the other analysts about the metaphor status of certain words. These cases included various issues, either dealing with rare and complex words or highly frequent words with many possible senses (see Steen, Dorst et al., 2010 for a more extensive discussion of disagreement cases for Dutch). Such cases of disagreement were resolved and subsequent decisions recorded in the database for future reference.

The decisions resulting from the initial stage were taken as a guideline, together with the version of MIPVU with comments regarding operational and language-specific issues for Dutch. After this stage, I analysed the majority of the contemporary data. Following the metaphor identification process of the complete corpus, I performed an extensive round of trouble shooting; large groups of frequent words and metaphor-related units were checked for their consistent coding to enhance the consistency of the identification process. There may still be a slight error margin in the consistency of the metaphor coding due to some errors in lemmatising and part-of-speech tagging, and due to the fact that not every single lexical unit was checked in the trouble shooting stage. However, the materials used in the analyses that follow are very reliable, as section 4.5 will also show.

The same protocol and coding stages were applied to the analysis of the historical news texts, which were analysed at a later stage by an assistant. The assistant was familiar with the general ideas behind the original MIP manual and received instructions regarding MIPVU and the adjustments for Dutch. In addition, the general protocol of coding and trouble shooting, and dictionary and database use were explained before analysis. Initially, the assistant analysed several texts individually, which were subsequently checked. Difficult issues and inconsistent

interpretations were discussed, adjusted, and recorded for future reference. Similar to the analysis of the contemporary corpus set, the analysis of the historical news set included a final round of trouble shooting, in which the most frequent and difficult cases were checked for their consistent coding.

We used the same *Van Dale* edition for metaphor identification in the historical news texts as for the contemporary data. We explored possibilities of using a version of the dictionary published around the same time as the historical texts (1950), but concluded that this was impractical due to there being only paper editions available at archives that were location-bound. We thus opted for practicality over reliability. This decision could potentially mean that certain senses of words that were present in the language in 1950 but no longer in use as a possible sense after 2002 would be missed in the analysis of the 1950 texts. However, the fact that *Van Dale* is essentially historically based was experienced as an advantage in this case, since senses that had become archaic after 1950 would still be entered as such in the current version of the dictionary. Potentially, in the rare cases that a meaning of a word in the 1950 data would then be encountered as archaic, it could be checked for its status in the 1950 version of the dictionary. In reality, the analyst encountered only a handful of words in which the contemporary senses of a word had shifted to such an extent that it may possibly influence the relation to metaphor. In those cases, a comment was added and the meanings present in the language user from 1950 (so meanings listed in the historical version of the dictionary) were taken as the basis for analysis. Some seemingly arbitrary uses of formal words that were initially unknown to the analyst (also only a handful) predominantly turned out to still appear with different senses in the contemporary version of the dictionary, and thus in hindsight posed no problems for meaning analysis.

For both the contemporary and historical data analysis, the complete identification stage in essence entailed coding the possible metaphor relations of all the words in the complete corpus. During this stage, the XML-files of the corpus texts were used. There were four main codes that could be assigned to a word:

- When a word was judged as being used in its literal, most basic sense, and when that word did not function as a signal for a metaphorical comparison, it received zero code for metaphor relation;
- When a word was judged as being metaphorically used, that is being used in an indirect way, it received the XML-code <MRW-indirect>, standing for Metaphor-Related Word – indirect metaphor;
- When the word was judged as metaphorically used but in a direct way, that is as a comparison (simile), it received the code <MRW-direct>, standing for Metaphor-Related Word – direct metaphor;
- When the word was judged as signalling a metaphorical comparison (such as the Dutch *zoals* and the English *like*), it received the code Mflag, standing for metaphor flag.

In addition to these main codes, it was possible to add a particular status to the codes. These included DFMA (Discard For Metaphor Analysis), WIDLII (When In Doubt Leave It In), and PP (Possible Personification). A word received the additional status of DFMA when the context was unintelligible or could not be properly established, or when the word could not be identified for metaphorical use due to complete lack of context. This mainly occurred in conversations. A word received the additional status of WIDLII in cases where there was a possibility of metaphorical use of a lexical unit, but where due to lack of contextual knowledge it could not be said with certainty. In order to be maximally inclusive, such doubtful cases were kept in. Finally, a word received the additional status of PP when it could be interpreted as either a personification or a metonymy and when we wanted to keep the possible personification interpretation in to be maximally inclusive (also see the MIPVU manual in chapter 2).

The codes for similes and their signals (MRW-direct and Mflag respectively) and the statuses of WIDLII and PP were added to the procedure as unique elements in order to compare their frequencies on a statistical basis with the other main codes, the one for indirect metaphors (MRW-indirect) and the zero code. However, after the identification was completed, it turned out that the frequencies of the MRW-direct and Mflag codes and the additional status of WIDLII and PP either deviated too much between corpus parts or were too infrequent for some categories to do statistical analysis with. Therefore, their frequencies are briefly discussed here and disregarded in the following two chapters where more detailed statistical analyses are reported.

A word was coded as WIDLII when it was unclear whether the contextual meaning and its basic meaning could be compared in terms of a cross-domain mapping, but where there did seem to be possibilities of metaphorical use involved. In those cases, it proved difficult to make a binary decision; there sometimes seems to be the possibility that a word can be in between non-metaphorically used and metaphorically used. One word that has been coded as WIDLII very frequently is the noun *keer* 'time, occasion', in contexts such as *het was de eerste keer* 'it was the first time'. *Van Dale* gives several meanings under the same noun lemma *keer*, of which 'omwendend' ('turn') and 'beweging in tegengestelde richting' ('movement in opposite direction') seem to be basic because they describe a movement towards a direction in space. The contextual meaning of *keer* in the context above is the occasion in time during which something happens. It could be said that the two meanings can be compared and contrasted, the source domain of SPACE standing for the target domain of TIME. However, the focus of the basic meaning of *keer* lies in the change of direction which takes place, while this element is not present in the contextual meaning of *occasion*. So although it is possible to compare time with space here, the idea that the contextual meaning of *keer* is compared to a change in direction seems nonsensical. This is the main reason why uses of *keer* in similar contexts to the one above have been coded as WIDLII.

In the conversations, current and historical news texts a total of 901 cases of metaphor-related words have received the status WIDLII, the code used for doubtful cases of metaphor. 541 of these (60% of the WIDLIIs) were assigned to words in the conversation subset (1.1% of the total words in that set), 327 of these (36.3% of the WIDLIIs) were assigned to words in the current news subset (0.6% of the total words in that set), and only 33 cases (3.7% of the WIDLIIs) were assigned to words in the historical news part of the corpus (0.1% of the total words in that set). There thus is a large discrepancy between the figures for the contemporary data sets, conversation and current news, and the historical news data. The main reason for this seems to be the fact that the two analysts responsible for most of the coding did not have the same preference regarding binary metaphor coding and in-between options. The final decision of assigning the status is made by the particular analyst, and can be influenced by a personal preference; some analysts tend to make binary decisions between metaphor and non-metaphor, and others use the in-between options more often.

However, part of the reason for the frequency discrepancy also seems to lie in the nature of the words coded as WIDLII, with a small group of lemmas accounting for the large portion of the total number of WIDLIIs in the contemporary data. In conversations, nearly 100 different lemmas have at some stage received a WIDLII code, but four specific lemmas account for 294 of the 541 WIDLIIs, thus more than half of the cases. Since the figures for WIDLII are fairly low overall, and are considerably different in the three subsets of the corpus, they have been disregarded as a separate value in the statistical analyses in chapters 5 and 6, but have instead been added to the group of indirect metaphor-related words (MRW-indirect) to be maximally inclusive.

A similar case holds for the status of PP, Possible Personification. This status was included in the procedure along the way to allow for the automatic detection of words that could possibly be interpreted as personifications, but could also be seen metonymically used. These entailed verbs in expressions such as the following from the corpus:

- (12) Uit afgeluisterde telefoongesprekken *concludeert*<PP> justitie dat de betrokkenheid van de twee ambtenaren bij de xtc-smokkel verder ging dan alleen de verhuur van de garage.

‘From monitored phone calls the court of justice *concludes* that the involvement of the two civil servants in the xtc smuggling went further than solely letting the garage.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, national*)

The verb form *concludeert* ‘conclude’ is seen as a metaphorically used word if *justitie* ‘court of justice’ is interpreted as one institution and not as a metonymic expression for the people working in the institution. There are arguments in favour of seeing *justitie* as the institution, namely if the focus is intended on the place and its service as a whole and not on the individuals working there. In that case

*concludeert* can be seen as a metaphor in the form of a personification, because an institution is relatively abstract and as a whole cannot perform human actions such as concluding something. Such interpretations of the example are possible, but are dependent on the focus that is intended (also cf. Low, 1999). However, since expressions like *justitie* in this context can also readily be interpreted as metonymic, in which case *concludeert* is not metaphorically used, the status of PP has been added to the metaphor code to indicate that it depends on how the subject of the verb is read whether *concluderen* can be seen as a metaphor.

The status of PP seems not to have been assigned in a reliable manner in the corpus as a whole. This seems partly due to the fact that idea of adding the status was suggested half way through the identification process, and to the fact that the metaphor identification focused predominantly on the main codes for metaphor, and not so much on the additional statuses. Moreover, PPs occur quite frequently in the current news texts, but have been assigned only rarely in the conversations and the historical news texts. In general, it seems that the different additional statuses seem to have been added unreliably. Thus, statistical analysis of the frequencies of metaphor is not possible for the different statuses, but only for the binary classification of metaphor-related and non-metaphor-related words.

Some lexical units have received the codes of MRW-direct or Mflag. The metaphor-related words that have received the code for direct metaphor are used in a direct way in the text, as a metaphorical comparison or simile. Words that have been coded as Mflag, for instance *als* in Dutch (*like* in English) signal a simile. Words of the type MRW-direct occur only 31 times in the contemporary corpus; in conversation, nine words are related to a simile; in current news, 22 words are related to a simile. Additionally, the code Mflag linked to it only occurs five times in conversation and 14 times in current news. In historical news, direct metaphors occurred even less frequently, with only four words coded as MRW-direct and also four words coded as Mflag.

An example of how the two codes can co-occur in the corpus can be seen in the following sentence from one of the news texts:

- (13) Cameraploegen stortten zich *als*<mflag> *sprinkhanen*<mrw-direct> op de politieke goudhaan.

‘Camera crews threw themselves *like*<mflag> *grasshoppers*<mrw-direct> on the political golden boy.’

(*De Telegraaf, national*)

This example contains one word coded as Mflag, the word *als* ‘*like*’ that can be seen as a marker for the simile, and one word coded as MRW-direct, *sprinkhanen* ‘*grasshoppers*’, a direct metaphor. In total, the contemporary data contained 19 words coded as Mflags and 31 words coded as directly used metaphorical words, which means that there are 19 expressions that can be seen as similes and that these consist of on average 1.6 words. In the historical data, there are four words of each code, which means that each simile consists of one word. Since the figures for

MRW-direct-codes and Mflag-codes are low overall, it is not possible to do statistical tests with them. The cases which have initially been coded as metaphorically used in a direct way have therefore been grouped together with the other metaphor-related words for all the analyses below. Similarly, the cases which have initially been coded as metaphor signals have been grouped together with the non-metaphor-related words, since the words in themselves are not metaphorical.

In conclusion, then, the MIPVU manual and the coding protocol described above were followed by all analysts during the metaphor identification stage in a highly similar manner. However, statuses additional to the main codes, such as WIDLII and PP, were not applied to the various corpus data similarly by the main analysts, either due to differences in preference, occurrence of register-specific words that accounted for half of the codes in conversation, or the fact that the statuses were added to the protocol at a later stage in the analysis. Due to the discrepancies in their frequencies, the statuses of WIDLII and PP are left out of the main statistical analyses. A similar case holds for the codes referring to directly used metaphor-related words, which were too infrequent to be included in statistical tests. The figures in the following two chapters have been compared on the basis of the binary distinction between non-metaphor-related used words and metaphor-related used words. In general, the results from the reliability tests for the Dutch data show that the MIPVU procedure is reliable in identifying metaphor-related and non-metaphor-related words.

## **4.5 MIPVU for Dutch corpus: reliability results**

### *4.5.1 Reporting reliability*

The reliability results from the original MIP reported by the Pragglejazz Group (2007) include two statistical tests that can show the extent to which the analysts agree about the status of the individual words in a text. The same tests have been carried out for the application of MIPVU to English discourse, reported extensively in chapter 8 of Steen, Dorst et al. (2010). They have also been applied to several studies testing the reliability of the application of MIPVU to Dutch discourse, which is also partly discussed in the same publication. The prerequisites and results are repeated here, and results for the application to historical news are added.

The extent to which a number of analysts agree in making repeated binary 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 researchers. It measures the total number of cases (i.e., lexical units) that analysts have marked as related to metaphor, and then compares 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, the analysis is not

seen as 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 between the analysts.

One problem with this first type of reliability measurement, however, is that it does not look at lexical units that are potentially metaphorical as individual cases. Even if there were a statistically significant difference between individual researchers in terms of the total numbers of cases that they identify as related to metaphor, it could still be possible for all or most researchers to agree about a core group of cases 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. There are several variants, the most important of which, traditionally, are Cohen's Kappa and Fleiss' Kappa (e.g., Artstein & Poesio, 2008). 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.

One problem with kappa is its interpretation. Kappas range between -1 and +1, -1 suggesting that analysts perform below the level of chance. The problem lies with the range of positive values, for it is unclear which magnitude of a kappa should be accepted as adequate. Cut off points have been suggested at various points, the most frequently used of which are 0.66 and 0.80. However, the meaning of these cut off points in empirical terms is unclear. That is why we will simply assume a pragmatic position: we report our kappas and, together with our set of instructions and protocol of analysis, offer this approach as one way of doing metaphor identification. If other researchers wish to test our findings or emulate them in new research, they then at least know the target of reliability that has been set in the current project.

Given the prime interest in a reliable description of the nature of the linguistic items and not in the performance of the human analysts, most linguistic studies that assess agreement across individual analysts on some research topic

have adopted the second method. For instance, Markert and Nissim (2003) have reported Cohen's Kappa for assessing the reliability of their method of metonymy identification. However, we believe that the first type of analysis by means of Cochran's Q also provides critical information, and so report both types below for comparison purposes.

In all of these considerations, it should also be pointed out that these reliability tests examine agreement between individual analysts before discussion. In all of the tests below, analysts were given a set of materials that they had to analyse on their own. This procedure was followed to carry out a methodological test which checks the extent to which individual performance on the basis of MIPVU for Dutch leads to comparable results. In our empirical work for the overall research project, however, individual analysis is only the first step of a more elaborate protocol, in which additional checks and discussions are held to reduce the inevitable degree of error that is part and parcel of this type of research.

#### *4.5.2 Method*

All tests reported below were set up in the same manner. One or more excerpts were selected from the same set of text files that were annotated for the main research project. The length of the files was chosen in such a way that text excerpts could offer a sufficiently broad range of cases that had to be classified. For the contemporary language tests, the range of materials was also related to the different registers that the analysts had to deal with. The application of the procedure may raise different problems in different domains, and one of the questions was whether it was equally reliable in conversation and news.

All analysts were instructed to annotate the excerpts according to the procedure. They had to do this by using the Word file version of the excerpt, which did not exhibit the additional information that is part of the files in the XML-versions. Analysts hence worked on clean text files and had to attach a relevant code at the end of a lexical unit in the Word document. In terms of our standard methodology this is also different than what happens during the real annotation process, which is dependent on special software that contains drop-down menus for the insertion of various codes. The reliability tests can therefore be seen as a stripped version of the genuine annotation process, with fewer distracters but also with less help, for instance in the form of part-of-speech tags. If tags were needed, analysts could consult the XML-texts for more information.

The texts were transformed into an SPSS database, with every lexical unit in a separate row, and with separate columns for individual analysts. Whenever a lexical unit had received a code for being related to metaphor, this was entered into the database as a 1 (one). All other lexical units automatically received a 0 (zero). This database was then used to compute Cochran's Q (with SPSS 15) and Fleiss kappa (with an on-line programme developed by Philippe Bonnardel, at [http://kappa.chez-alice.fr/kappa\\_intro.htm](http://kappa.chez-alice.fr/kappa_intro.htm)).

The classification of the data into simple binary codes for statistical purposes raises a number of issues. The first issue concerns the unit of analysis. Since the procedure requires checking of phrasal verbs and compounds, these may have to be marked up as such in the reliability test as well. However, since these issues occurred very seldom in the test materials, and since they can be decided on the basis of fairly objective criteria, they were not included in the reliability test as an issue for statistical evaluation. In the day-to-day practice of our empirical research, all of these issues were monitored fairly systematically and part of the general protocol.

A similar story holds for the identification of MFlags. Even though they are theoretically equally important to the two main categories of words related or not related to metaphor, they hardly ever occurred in the data used for the tests. Moreover, they hardly raise controversy in the general identification analysis of the rest of the corpus. For this reason their role was ignored in the statistical analysis of the reliability tests. The same also holds for the annotation of cases as WIDLII. Since their occurrence is relatively infrequent, it is easier to leave them outside consideration.

The following reliability tests are therefore based on simple sets of binary judgements, whether a lexical unit is or is not related to metaphor. The judgements come from two or three independent judges. All other issues in their protocols are disregarded for the reasons set out above. The tests hence focus on the reliability of metaphor identification in its simplest possible form, on the basis of the extensive set of instructions reported in chapter 3.

#### *4.5.3 Results contemporary part of corpus*

The tests took place on three different occasions during the period of annotation and were spread over one year (April 2006, December 2006, and March 2007). They were carried out by three analysts, all of whom were native speakers of Dutch, including myself and two analysts involved in the English language research project. For each test samples of roughly 500 words of news and 500 words of conversation were individually analysed by the researchers. The materials can be characterized as follows:

##### Conversations

- Test 1: Sample from spontaneous conversation fn000259 (CGN corpus), duration unknown; 2 interlocutors, parent-child relation (aged 25-34 and over 55).
- Test 2: Sample from spontaneous conversation fn000745 (CGN corpus), duration unknown; 2 interlocutors, colleagues (both aged over 55).
- Test 3: Sample from spontaneous conversation fn008413 (CGN corpus), duration unknown; 2 interlocutors, friends (both aged over 55).

## News

- Test 1: *Algemeen Dagblad: the national news section, 3 May 2002* (Lexis Nexis). One complete news text containing 521 words; the topic is a drug smuggling affair.
- Test 2: *NRC Handelsblad: frontpage, 3 July 2002* (Lexis Nexis). One complete news text containing 508 words; the topic is the formation of a new government.
- Test 3: *De Telegraaf: frontpage, 4 March 2002* (Lexis Nexis). One complete news text containing 498 words; the topic is a shooting incident in Amsterdam.

The results of the tests are presented in tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

*Table 4.1 Test 1: reliability test across three independent analysts*

File type	Number lexical units	Percentage unanimous			Fleiss' $\kappa$	Min MRWs	Max MRWs	Cochran's Q (df=2)
		Not MRW	MRW	Total				
Conv.	559	82.8	10.2 (n=57)	92.9	0.80	67	83	11.13*
News	521	81.0	10.2 (n=53)	91.2	0.77	76	79	0.30
Total	1080	81.9	10.2 (n=110)	92.1	0.79	143	162	7.08**

\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.05$

*Table 4.2 Test 2: reliability test across three independent analysts*

File type	Number lexical units	Percentage unanimous			Fleiss' $\kappa$	Min MRWs	Max MRWs	Cochran's Q (df=2)
		Not MRW	MRW	Total				
Conv.	549	84.0	7.7 (n=42)	91.7	0.74	56	69	10.30*
News	508	70.3	21.5 (n=109)	91.8	0.86	126	133	1.76
Total	1057	77.4	14.3 (n=151)	91.7	0.82	182	206	10.18*

\*  $p < 0.01$

Table 4.3 Test 3: reliability test across three independent analysts

File type	Number lexical units	Percentage unanimous			Fleiss' $\kappa$	Min MRWs	Max MRWs	Cochran's Q (df=2)
		Not MRW	MRW	Total				
Conv.	523	83.7	8.1 (n=43)	91.8	0.78	45	77	50.74***
News	498	77.4	15.4 (n=77)	92.8	0.86	90	101	5.52
Total	1021	80.7	11.7 (n=120)	92.4	0.83	140	176	29.66***

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

On average, 79.9% of all the lexical units were unanimously judged as non-metaphorical, and 12.2% was unanimously judged as possibly metaphorical. This means that there was an overall lack of agreement on the metaphorical status of lexical units for 7.9% of the total number of cases. Judging solely from the figures, we can see that the percentages of the total unanimously scored units are extremely similar for news and conversation, for all three reliability tests: the lowest total unanimous score is 91.2% (test 1, news) and the highest is 92.9 (test 1, conversation). These figures are extremely homogeneous.

Analyst bias displays an interestingly consistent pattern. In all three news texts, the data are apparently so clear that no differences between the analysts can emerge. In the conversations, however, there is a systematic effect of analyst bias on the metaphor identification data. The average findings between the two registers then turn out to be influenced by analyst bias.

Kappas are high: their mean is above 0.80. They are in the same regions as in the English language tests. On average, news texts demonstrate a slightly higher degree of agreement than conversation, which, again, is comparable to the English language materials reported in chapter 8 of Steen, Dorst et al. (2010).

On the whole, the Dutch-language results may be said to mirror the English-language tests. Reliability is high, solid, and consistent across the three tests. That this is the case for a different language, with a different dictionary, is rewarding. The efforts we have put into the development of the procedure and its methodological test appear to have paid off.

#### 4.5.4 Results historical news part of corpus

Two similar tests were performed for the historical news texts in the corpus. The tests took place on two different occasions during the period of annotation, in December 2008 and April 2009. They were carried out by two analysts, both of whom were native speakers of Dutch, including myself and the assistant annotating the majority of the historical data. For each test roughly 500 words of historical

news were individually analysed by the researchers in the same way as described above. The materials can be characterized as follows:

Historical news

- Test 1: Consisting of two text excerpts: a) *de Volksrant: scientific section, 5 January 1950*. One complete news text containing 311 words; the topic is a governmental discussion of the organisation of scientific research; b) *Trouw: economic section, 8 August 1950*. An excerpt containing 208 words; the topic is economic monetary precautions taken in Sweden.
- Test 2: *Trouw: front page, 7 August 1950*. One complete news text containing 608 words; the topic is a battle in the Naktong river between North and South Korea.

The results of the tests are presented in tables 4.4 and 4.5.

*Table 4.4 Test 1: reliability test across three independent analysts*

File type	Number lexical units	Percentage unanimous			Fleiss' κ	Min MRWs	Max MRWs	Cochran's Q (df=1)
		Not MRW	MRW	Total				
News	519	72.0	20.8 (n=108)	92.8	0.81	126	127	0.03

*Table 4.5 Test 2: reliability test across three independent analysts*

File type	Number lexical units	Percentage unanimous			Fleiss' κ	Min MRWs	Max MRWs	Cochran's Q (df=1)
		Not MRW	MRW	Total				
News	608	75.3	16.3 (n=99)	91.6	0.74	108	141	21.353***

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

On average, 73.7% of all the lexical units were unanimously judged as non-metaphorical, and 18.6% was unanimously judged as possibly metaphorical. This means that there was an overall lack of agreement on the metaphorical status of lexical units for 7.7% of the total number of cases. The overall percentages of agreement and disagreement for historical data tests are thus highly similar to the percentages of the contemporary data tests.

Analyst bias only occurred for the second test, with a difference of 33 cases of metaphor-related judgements between the two analysts. A closer look at the coding in the texts demonstrates that the differences between the two analysts are

mainly due to two prepositions that recur several times in the same expression, and which the one analyst consistently coded as non-metaphorical and the other analyst consistently coded as metaphorical. The empirical nature of the research project, however, can reduce this analyst bias: the following stages of discussion and troubleshooting can resolve cases such as these.

Fleiss's Kappas are slightly lower than for the contemporary language tests, but still show reliable results, being above the threshold of 0.80 in the first test and just below the threshold for the second test. The reasons for the kappa being slightly lower in the second test may also be accounted for by the recurrence of one expression with two prepositions in the text. In addition, the overall results may be influenced by the historical nature of the texts.

One the whole, though, results for the historical data analysis show that MIPVU does not only work for contemporary discourse in different languages, but can also be reliably applied to historical data, at least for Dutch. In addition, they show that analysts can be trained within a short period of time to apply the procedure consistently, as the assistant analysing the historical data has demonstrated. The reliability for historical news demonstrates the flexibility and applicability of MIPVU for metaphor identification in various registers, languages, and language periods.

## **4.6 Conclusion**

This chapter provided an overall description of the applicability of MIPVU to the Dutch materials, including a description of the overall protocol. Attention was paid to the language-specific issues that occurred while doing the metaphor identification, such as the use of a historically-based dictionary, possible faults in part-of-speech coding, and lexico-grammatical issues. It was noted that MIPVU needed additional information on the treatment of those issues.

The application of the main codes for metaphor relations and additional statuses were also briefly touched on, particularly in relation to frequency issues regarding the statuses of WIDLII and PP and the codes of MRW-direct and Mflag. It turned out that frequencies for these individual codes and statuses were too low to be included in statistical analysis. Both the reliability tests and the main metaphor frequency analyses reported in the following chapters were carried out on the basis of the binary distinction between non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words.

The reliability results demonstrate that the procedure works in a consistently reliable manner for Dutch contemporary language data and Dutch historical language data, similar to its reliability for English language data reported in previous publications. On the whole, the Dutch-language results may be said to mirror the English-language tests. Reliability is high, solid, and consistent across the five tests. That this is the case for a different language and different periods, and with a different dictionary and different combinations of analysts, is rewarding.

The efforts we have put into the development of the procedure and its methodological test appear to have paid off.

The MIPVU manual and the protocol discussed in the present chapter have been used to conduct metaphor identification for the complete corpus of Dutch conversations, historical and current news texts. The frequency results for metaphor-related words in the three separate corpus sets will be the topic of the next two chapters. Chapter 5 will present the frequencies of metaphor-related words in two contemporary registers of Dutch, conversation and news language, and will discuss the differences in grammatical patterns of metaphors as well as discuss lexical patterns.



## **5. Metaphor in two registers of contemporary Dutch: distribution and use**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents and discusses the quantitative analysis of metaphor-related words in two registers of contemporary Dutch, conversation and news language. It focuses on the distribution and use of metaphor-related words in the two registers by comparing the metaphor data resulting from the identification stage. The quantitative results form the basis for a discussion of the differences between the registers of conversation and news in the manner in which they use metaphorical language in different word classes. The question that is central in this chapter is whether there are differences in the forms and frequencies of metaphor-related words for the two registers. The frequencies, forms, and detailed metaphor patterns discussed in this chapter together provide a detailed picture of the nature of metaphorical language use in the registers of conversation and news separately, but also form the basis for answering one of the main research questions, namely whether the register of news portrays a diachronic shift in the patterns of metaphor-related language that can be linked to the notions of informalization, personalization and conversationalization of public discourse.

Previous corpus-based studies on register and genre variation in English discourse have shown that certain linguistic features not only define certain dimensions of language use but are also characteristic of certain types of text (cf. Biber, 1988, 1989; Chafe, 1982; Conrad & Biber, 2001). Such studies illustrate interesting linguistic differences between speech and writing, but at the same time point to the fact that there seems to be a cline from prototypical spoken language to prototypical written language. Chafe (1982) argued that differences in the processes of speaking and writing, that speaking is faster than writing and that speakers interact directly with their audience and writers do not, lead to specific linguistic differences in the two products, spoken and written language (Chafe, 1982: 36). At the same time, he noted that spoken and written language can both be informal or formal in style, where formal spoken genres such as university lectures have characteristics in common with formal written genres such as academic textbooks, and where informal spoken genres such as face-to-face conversations share characteristics with informal written genres such as personal letters.

In general, Chafe (1982) showed that spoken and written language differ on two levels, which are related to the distinct processes of language production that are involved in the two modes of language use. Spoken language is fragmented to a large degree, which shows in the way information in idea units is strung together without connectives, resulting in separate utterances for idea units. Written language, however, has an integrated quality, which shows in the way information is typically packed in nominalizations, conjoined phrases, prepositional phrases

and combined clauses. Chafe suggested that these differences in fragmentation and integration of information are a consequence of differences in the way that time is utilized in speaking and writing (Chafe, 1982). Additionally, he noted that spoken language is typically involved, which shows in the incidence of linguistic features such as first person references, monitoring expressions such as *you know* and *I mean*, emphatic particles and hedges. These features typically reflect the involvement of the speaker with his or her audience. Written language has a more detached quality, which manifests itself in linguistic devices that show distancing, such as the passive voice and nominalizations. These features typically reflect detachment from the audience that is typical for a writer (Chafe, 1982). Chafe also firmly noted, however, that the differences between spoken and written language that he found apply to the end points on a continuum:

The figures I have given are from maximally differentiated samples: spontaneous conversational language on the one hand and formal academic prose on the other. There are other styles of speaking which are more in the direction of writing, and other styles of writing which are more like speech. (1982: 49)

Biber's (1988) extensive study of variation in English speech and writing presents similar analyses of text types. Texts have often been considered as related to particular situational or functional factors, such as formal or informal language, interactive or non-interactive qualities, literary or colloquial style, and so on. According to Biber (1988), however, these factors should be seen as continuous parameters rather than simple dichotomies (1988: 12). He assumes that there are 'few, if any, absolute differences between speech and writing, and that there is no single parameter of linguistic variation that distinguishes among spoken and written genres' (1988: 55). This idea ties in with Chafe's observations of a continuum along which informal and formal spoken and written discourse genres can be placed. Texts can be placed on such a continuum by looking at functional or situational dimensions, but it is also possible to distinguish between dimensions from a linguistic perspective. Biber (1988, 1989) hence presents a multi-feature/multi-dimensional analysis of texts, in which a macroscopic analysis of linguistic features is presented:

(...) macroscopic analyses are needed to identify the underlying textual dimensions in a set of texts, enabling an overall account of linguistic variation among those texts and providing a framework for discussion of the similarities and differences among particular texts and genres. (1988: 62).

The macroscopic analysis attempts to define the overall dimensions of variation in a language (1988: 61). Subsequently, microscopic analyses of individual linguistic features can be used to interpret the textual dimensions in functional terms (1988: 63).

On the basis of a factor analysis of a large set of linguistic features, Biber (1988; 1989) has distinguished between five dimensions along which different

genres of text and talk may vary (see also section 1.2.2 above). Dimensions are ‘bundles of linguistic features that co-occur in texts because they work together to mark some common underlying function’ (1988: 55). Each dimension consists of a group of co-occurring linguistic features, some of which have positive weights and others negative ones. A genre with a high score on one of the dimensions is then characterized as having a high incidence of the features with positive weights together with an infrequent occurrence of the features with negative weights. With regard to spoken and written language, three dimensions that are distinguished by Biber can mark some kind of difference. They will be briefly mentioned and explained below.

*Dimension 1: ‘Involved versus informational production’*

This dimension underlies the marking of affective, interactional and highly involved text production (the positive features) versus high density and highly informational text production (the negative features) (Biber, 1989: 10). Among the linguistic features that are representative of involved language are private verbs, such as *feel, hear, hope, think, understand*, etc. (verbs of cognition), and present-tense verbs, first and second person pronouns, demonstratives, contractions and adverbs. The linguistic features that are representative of informational production are nouns, prepositions, adjectives, word length and type-token ratio.

*Dimension 3: Elaborated versus situation-dependent reference*

This dimension characterizes highly explicit, context-independent reference (the positive features) versus non-specific, situation-dependent reference (the negative features) (Biber, 1989: 10). Among the linguistic features that are representative of elaborated reference are WH-relative clauses and nominalizations, which typically specify the identity of referents within a text. The linguistic features representative of situation-dependent reference are time and place adverbials, which are usually used for text-external reference.

*Dimension 5: Abstract versus non-abstract style*

This dimension characterizes discourse that has an abstract, technical and formal style. There are only positive features for this dimension; the occurrence of, among other features, agentless passives, past-participial clauses, and conjuncts distinguish informational texts that are highly abstract and formal from other types of discourse. (Biber, 1989: 10)

For Dimension 1, face-to-face conversations have one of the highest values, since they are marked by a high presence of the involved features such as verbs, adverbs, first and second pronouns, and demonstrative pronouns, and a correlated low presence of the informational features. Face-to-face conversations can thus be seen as typically involved production. Among the genres with the lowest score on Dimension 1 are press reportage and press reviews, marked by a

low presence of the involved features and a correlated high presence of the informational features, such as nouns, prepositions, adjectives and a high type-token ratio. Press reportage can thus be seen as typically informational.

For Dimension 3, press reviews have a relatively high score: they are marked by a high presence of the elaborate features such as nominalizations and WH-relative clauses, and a correlated low presence of the situation-dependent features such as time and place adverbials. Press reportage seems to have a relatively equal presence of both sets of features. Face-to-face conversations, however, have a relatively low score on this dimension, marked by a low presence of elaborated features and a correlated high presence of situation-dependent features such as time and place adverbials. In face-to-face conversations, these features are used to identify the intended place and time referents in the actual physical context of the discourse (Biber, 1989: 10).

For Dimension 5, press reviews and press reportage have a slightly positive score, which means that they are marked with a relatively high presence of abstract features such as conjuncts, agentless passives and past-participial clauses. They can thus be seen as having a relatively abstract, formal style. Face-to-face conversations have a very low score, suggesting that they are marked by a very low presence of the abstract features, not being abstract in style.

Overall, English conversations and news texts (press reviews and press reportage together) differ extensively on the three dimensions discussed above. There are hence significant differences in the occurrence of specific linguistic features that characterize the dimensions. Generally speaking, conversations seem to contain more verbs (particularly, the verbs of cognition such as *think*, *feel*, etc.), personal pronouns (particularly first and second person), demonstratives, adverbs and hedges, whereas news texts seem to contain more nouns, adjective, prepositions, WH-relative clauses and passives (also cf. Biber et al., 1999). The differences between the two registers in the frequencies of various linguistic features is likely to be of importance in answering the question whether the registers differ in the patterns of forms and frequencies of metaphor-related words.

There are a number of studies that have tried to apply Biber's multi-feature/multi-dimensional framework to languages other than English to see if similar results are found for registers in other languages. As far as Dutch discourse is concerned, extensive register studies such as Biber's do not exist, but some smaller studies have been conducted along the same lines. A corpus-based study of interjections in Dutch discourse (Schelfhout et al., 2003), for instance, has shown that interjections, units that can reflect opinion (like *nou* 'well' and 'so what') or feeling (like *au* 'ouch' or *goddank* 'thank god') etc. and that are not part of the syntactic structure of a clause, occur significantly more often in conversational discourse than in written text. Another comparative study of the linguistic properties of written and spoken Dutch versus the new language of digital chat situations, carried out with the same approach as Biber's study of variation in English discourse, also revealed specific patterns for distinct genres (Evertse, 2005). One particularly interesting finding here is that spoken telephone

conversations and written emails differed from each other on the dimension similar to Biber's Dimension 1: telephone conversation contained more interjections, characteristic of involved language use, while emails contained more nouns, prepositions and articles, characteristic of an informational style. Digital chats scored in between these two genres, which reflects the characteristic elements of chat language: it allows more time than conversations to formulate utterances, but still requires fast interaction between participants. The study also revealed other results that were similar to some of the results from studies on English discourse, such as the fact that the written genre scored high on the dimension of elaborated language, and that conversations showed a more fragmented style while emails showed a more integrated style (Evertse, 2005). Even though the above-mentioned studies on Dutch discourse are not as extensive as some of the work done on English, they do give some insight into the distribution of various linguistic features in different discourse genres for Dutch.

The above-mentioned studies on English and Dutch look at the register and function of various text types on the basis of a large number of linguistic features. One element that is not given much space is lexical semantics; the studies focus on the occurrence of particular lexico-grammatical features, but do not take into account how words are used to describe referents in the text worlds. Metaphor constitutes one way of integrating such a lexical semantic element.

As noted in chapter 2, metaphor has been studied extensively within a corpus-based framework in the past few years, in studies where metaphor scholars looked at the occurrences and functions of metaphorical expressions in different genres of discourse. Previous corpus-based studies into metaphor have shown that metaphorical language occurs in conversations and news discourse in different ways, and seems to have particular functions related to the overall functions of the genres (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2004; Cameron, 2003, 2008; Deignan, 2005, 2008). In addition, metaphorical expressions occur in the form of particular word classes, but seem to do so in different ways for different genres of spoken and written discourse. Cameron (2003) has noted, for instance, that in her spoken educational discourse data (classroom talk), metaphors most commonly occur as prepositions and verbs (2003: 88). She gives a detailed account of the exact grammatical forms in which they occur in her classroom data (2003: 90-96). With regard to the frequencies of various metaphor forms, Cameron notes that general frequencies can vary greatly between different genres of spoken discourse, such as classroom talk or reconciliation talk (Cameron, 2008: 199).

As far as metaphor in news discourse is concerned, most studies have focused on particular topics within different news sections. Some of the findings show that, in certain news topics, metaphorical expressions often occur in the form of nouns and verbs, but also as adjectives (cf. Charteris-Black & Ennis, 2001; Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003). Some studies on metaphors in particular news topics have focused on lexical word classes that typically carry content more than on functional word classes such as prepositions, but others include a wide range of word classes and combinations as part of their focus (e.g. Semino, 2002). In

general, metaphor in news discourse is prominent in slightly different word classes when compared to Cameron's results for conversation discourse.

In general, corpus-based metaphor studies have frequently noted the relation between word class and metaphor. It has, for instance, been stated that some word classes tend to be used metaphorically more often than other word classes (cf. Cameron, 1999, 2003; Deignan, 2005), and that metaphors behave in different ways in, for instance, verbs, nouns or adjectives (Cameron, 2003: 72). Cameron (1999) has noted that when identifying metaphors, certain word classes provide more challenges than other classes because of, for instance, valency restrictions:

While it is uncontroversial and straightforward to postulate incongruity between two conceptual domains underlying highly specific Noun Phrases (...) where lexical items are unarguably drawn from domains distinct to the producer, verbal metaphoricity needs to rely on judgements made about collocated Noun Phrases and their domains. (Cameron, 1999: 120)

Goatly (1997) has remarked that all main word classes in natural language exhibit metaphorical use, but he has also argued that noun metaphors are more striking than others because of their clear incongruity between the conventional reference (the basic meaning) and the unconventional reference when used as a metaphor (1997: 83). In line with Cameron's view on verb metaphors, Goatly also comments that verbs can only be recognised as metaphorical when the complements are known (1997: 86).

Although nouns and verbs are the most frequent objects of study, functional word classes such as prepositions have also been studied in detail with regard to their metaphorical meanings and uses in different languages (Cuyckens, 1991, 1993; Lindstromberg, 1998; Tyler & Evans, 2003). These have illustrated that many productive prepositions have a basic meaning that is related to space, direction or movement. A general but detailed account of metaphor and word class is given by Deignan (2005) in an extensive corpus-based study on metaphor. Her overall conclusion is that 'there seem to be quantitative and qualitative differences in the way that different parts of speech behave metaphorically' (2005: 147).

The above-mentioned studies on variation in spoken and written discourse and variation in metaphors can be combined so that an analysis of variation in registers does not only take into account the function of lexico-grammatical features but also a lexical-semantic element. The present study looks at the occurrence of metaphorical expressions in eight word classes in two registers of Dutch that are typical of either spoken or written discourse, namely conversation and news. Two expectations were formulated and investigated:

1. First of all, it was expected that the two Dutch registers overall show similar patterns of linguistic variation as found in Biber's study, namely that news contains many nouns, prepositions and adjectives, and that conversation contains many pronouns, adverbs and verbs. Since the meta-information

concerning syntactic elements and grammatical role for the words in the corpus used for this study was not as detailed as Biber's list of linguistic features, we restricted ourselves to eight main word classes that were compared. Consequently, the segmentation of linguistic features was not as refined as Biber's list, but the eight word classes correspond to some of the most important features that Biber found were characteristic of Dimensions 1, 3 and 5. Although the restriction certainly influenced the analysis, the results still give a good idea of differences between the two registers.

2. It was subsequently expected that the two registers of conversation and news showed different frequencies for metaphor-related words in the different word classes, based on Biber's results and the findings in the metaphor studies discussed above. Conversation is expected to contain a higher frequency of metaphor-related determiners and verbs in various patterns, whereas news is expected to contain a higher frequency of metaphor-related nouns and prepositions. Based on the different functions of conversation and news, it is expected that patterns of metaphor-related lemmas for the various word classes also differ.

What follows now is a brief account of the materials and database used for the register analysis. Then the results of the quantitative analyses and a brief discussion of the results are given. The chapter concludes with a more detailed discussion of the most important findings and the implications for a qualitative analysis of the metaphor data in the corpus.

## 5.2 Method

### 5.2.1 Materials

The materials used for this study comprise a set of 29 face-to-face conversations taken from the CGN corpus (*Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*, or the corpus of spoken Dutch), with a total of roughly 51,000 words, and a set of 99 current newspaper texts from 2002, taken from different sections of five national Dutch newspapers (*Algemeen Dagblad*, *NRC Handelsblad*, *de Telegraaf*, *Trouw* and *de Volkskrant*), with a total of roughly 52,000 words. The conversations were hand-selected from the large CGN (Oostdijk, 2000) to allow for an even spread of age, sex, background and regional varieties of the speakers. The newspaper texts were randomly selected from eight newspaper sections (front page, national, international, economy, art, sports, science and editorials) with the help of a large public database, Lexis Nexis, and were tagged for part of speech types and lemmas.<sup>9</sup> The separately tagged texts were converted to XML-texts and combined

---

<sup>9</sup> The news texts have been tagged by the Tadpole tagger, a memory-based morpho-syntactic tagger and parser (Van den Bosch, et al., 2007).

into one corpus. More specific details on the corpus materials are given in Appendix A.

All words in the 128 texts were analysed for metaphor during the metaphor identification stage (described in chapter 4). The words that were analysed as related to metaphor received additional tags in the XML-texts indicating the type and status of the metaphor relation. Subsequent to finalising the metaphor identification stage, the XML-files including the annotation for metaphor-related words were converted to an SPSS database.

### 5.2.2. Database

Final changes were made to some of the variables in the SPSS database to be able to compare frequency figures and carry out statistical analyses. The initial twelve word categories distinguished by the tagging programme were merged into eight main word categories.<sup>10</sup> For example, categories such as interjections (*ach*, *hè* and *uh*) and articles (*de* ‘the’, *het* ‘the – neuter’, *een* ‘a/an’) were put together in the remainder category, while the initially separate classes of nouns and proper nouns were combined into the new category of nouns. The original word class of determiners contained, among other things, the subclasses of personal pronouns, relative pronouns and determiners such as demonstratives. The subclasses of personal and relative pronouns were transferred to the remainder category, since they are not determiners, and the separate class of articles was added to the category of determiners. The main word class variable with which the statistical analyses were carried out hence included the values of *adjective*, *adverb*, *determiner*, *noun*, *preposition*, *verb*, *conjunction* and the *remainder category*.

The original XML-files also contained punctuation marks (in the case of news), which were automatically converted to separate cases in the SPSS database. However, punctuation marks should not be counted in the overall word count. In the final dataset and the analyses below, all cases of punctuation were thus deselected in SPSS. In addition, words that were marked as ‘DFMA’, being unintelligible and therefore discarded for metaphor analysis (see the identification protocol in chapter 4 for details) were also deselected. The total number of words that remain, and with which the analyses below have been carried out, was 102,138: 50,551 words of conversation and 51,587 words of current news.

The next sections present the results of the quantitative analysis of the data. First, the frequencies of the word classes in the two registers, conversation and news, were compared. This comparison tested whether the Dutch corpus data in general corresponds to English conversations and news texts on the level of typical main word classes, based on Biber’s variation analyses. Then the notion of

---

<sup>10</sup> The tagging programme actually distinguished 211 different part-of-speech types, including information for inflected forms of verbs, nouns and adjectives. However, each tag received a main code representing the particular word class, and these included twelve different options.

metaphor was added to the analysis as the lexical-semantic element of interest. A loglinear analysis was used to test the interaction between the three variables of register, word class and metaphor. A loglinear analysis calculates the options that the distributions are due to chance alone, or that the figures of each variable are dependent on the levels of another variable. A detailed description of loglinear analysis is given in Field (2005). Subsequent chi-square tests were used to break down interaction effects. For some cases, standardized residuals were then compared to find out which elements contributed most significantly to the interaction effects that were found.

### 5.3 Results

A number of research questions were formed on the basis of previous corpus-based studies on the language of spoken and written discourse. First of all, it was expected that there are differences between the registers of spontaneous conversations and news articles in the distribution of the main word classes for Dutch, similar to the differences found for English discourse (Biber, 1988). We expected that conversations contained proportionally more determiners and verbs, and fewer nouns, adjectives and prepositions than news as a reflection of the main register differences between two registers. Second, it was expected that metaphor-related words behaved differently in the two registers and in the different word classes, based on Biber's results and previous corpus-based studies into the uses of metaphors (cf. Cameron, 2003; Deignan, 2005). We expected that conversations contained more metaphor-related verbs and determiners, and fewer metaphor-related nouns and prepositions than news.

#### 5.3.1 Register and word class

Based on the findings from previous studies of linguistic variation in English, we expect there to be significant differences in the frequencies of the eight main word classes between the registers of conversation and news for Dutch as well. A chi-square analysis shows that there is a significant interaction between register and word class ( $\chi^2(7) = 11,400, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .33$ ). Table 5.1 contains the frequencies and percentages of the word classes per register.

The registers of conversation and news differ extensively in their distributions of the main word classes. Adverbs are more frequent in conversation (6827, 13.5%) than in news (3084, 6.0%). Similarly, the remainder category is more frequent in conversation (12,200, 24.3%) than in news (3146, 6.1%). This is mainly due to the fact that the remainder category also contains personal pronouns.

*Table 5.1 Word class frequencies in conversation and current news*

	Conversation		News	
	n	% of total n	n	% of total n
Adjective	2897	5.7	4119	8.0
Adverb	6827	13.5	3084	6.0
Determiner	6160	12.2	8309	16.1
Noun	7727	15.3	14,724	28.5
Preposition	3286	6.5	7692	14.9
Verb	8396	16.6	8223	15.9
Conjunction	2959	5.9	2290	4.4
Remainder	12,299	24.3	3146	6.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,551</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>51,587</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The differences in frequencies for adverbs and the remainder category, including the personal pronouns, in the two registers are similar to what was found in Biber's corpus-based analysis of English discourse, where conversations scored high and news genres scored low on the dimensions that included personal pronouns and adverbs as a characteristic feature (the positive pole of Dimension 1, involved production, and the negative pole of Dimension 3, situation-dependent reference).

Nouns are the most frequent word class in news (14,724, 28.5%), making up more than a quarter of the total number of words in that register. Even though nouns are also relatively frequent in conversations (7727, 15.3%), they occur much less frequently in comparison to news. Additionally, prepositions are much more frequent in news (7692, 14.9%) than in conversations (3286, 6.5%). Determiners are also very frequent in news (8309, 16.1%) in comparison to conversation (6160, 12.2%). This is partly influenced by the articles in this category, which are related to the frequent nouns in news. The differences between news and conversations regarding the frequencies for nouns and prepositions also seem to be in accordance with what was found by Biber for English news and conversation, where news scored high and conversations scored low on the dimensions that included adjectives, nouns and prepositions as characteristic features (mainly the negative pole of Dimension 1, informational production).

Although verbs are slightly more frequent in conversation, the percentages for conversations and news are comparable (conversation: 8396 (16.6%); news: 8223 (15.9%)). This does not seem to be in accordance with the results from Biber's studies on English discourse, which showed that verbs occurred considerably less frequently in press reportage than in conversations. A more detailed analysis of the verbs in the corpus will be presented later in this chapter (section 5.4.3).

The patterns found in the Dutch conversations and news texts are on the whole in agreement with the patterns found in Biber's studies of English discourse. The percentages per word class show that the two registers differ significantly from each other on the level of word classes; conversation contains significantly more adverbs and pronouns, and news contains significantly more adjectives, nouns and

prepositions. The analysis below takes into account the variable of metaphor-related words.

### 5.3.2 Register, word class and metaphor

Based on the results from corpus-based studies on the language and grammar of metaphor in various discourse genres, such as conducted by Cameron (2003, 2008), Deignan (2005) and Charteris-Black (2004), we want to include in the analysis the lexical-semantic element of metaphor. It has been shown that the English registers of news and conversation contain different linguistic forms of metaphor in various frequencies, so the grammar of metaphor is an important element of variation in the registers. We expect there to be a significant interaction between register, word class and metaphor for Dutch as well.

A loglinear analysis showed a significant three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor ( $\chi^2(7) = 2,291.83, p < .001$ ). Separate chi-square analyses on the level of word class showed that there is a significant association between register and metaphor for seven of the eight word classes: adjectives ( $\chi^2(1) = 14.13, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .05$ ), adverbs ( $\chi^2(1) = 41.53, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .07$ ), determiners ( $\chi^2(1) = 1,303.00, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .30$ ), nouns ( $\chi^2(1) = 136.04, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .08$ ), prepositions ( $\chi^2(1) = 305.08, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .17$ ), verbs ( $\chi^2(1) = 596.18, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .19$ ) and the remainder category ( $\chi^2(1) = 50.25, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .06$ ). The word class of conjunction did not show significant differences on the distribution of metaphor between the two registers ( $\chi^2(1) = 0.11, p = .74$ , Cramer's  $V = .01$ ). Table 5.2 contains the frequencies and percentages per word class for the non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words in each of the word classes in the two registers.

The significant chi-square results show that conversations and news texts differ in the way that the separate word classes (apart from conjunctions) are used metaphorically. Table 5.2 displays the percentages of non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words per word class per register, making it possible to compare the proportion of metaphor-related words per word class for the two registers. Adjectives, for instance, are more often metaphorical in news (22.0% of the total number of adjectives in that register) than in conversations (18.3% of the total number of adjectives in that register).

The most noteworthy differences occur for determiners, prepositions, verbs, and to some extent nouns. While 28.8% (1771) of the determiners in conversations have been coded as metaphor-related, only 6.5% (541) of the determiners in news are metaphor-related. This is partly due to the different subclasses within the word class of determiners, which will be discussed in more detail in section 5.4.

Table 5.2 Word class frequencies and percentages (in brackets) per metaphor relation per register

	non-metaphor	metaphor	all
<b>Conversation</b>			
Adjective	2367 (81.7%)	530 (18.3%)	2897 (100%)
Adverb	6769 (99.2%)	58 (0.8%)	6827 (100%)
Determiner	4389 (71.2%)	1771 (28.8%)	6160 (100%)
Noun	7170 (92.8%)	557 (7.2%)	7727 (100%)
Preposition	1530 (46.6%)	1756 (53.4%)	3286 (100%)
Verb	7098 (84.5%)	1298 (15.5%)	8396 (100%)
Conjunction	2949 (99.7%)	10 (0.3%)	2959 (100%)
Remainder	12,288 (99.9%)	11 (0.1%)	12,299 (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>44,560 (88.1%)</b>	<b>5991 (11.9%)</b>	<b>50,551 (100%)</b>
<b>News</b>			
Adjective	3214 (78.0%)	905 (22.0%)	4119 (100%)
Adverb	3008 (97.5%)	76 (2.5%)	3084 (100%)
Determiner	7786 (93.5%)	541 (6.5%)	8309 (100%)
Noun	12,923 (87.8%)	1801 (12.2%)	14,724 (100%)
Preposition	2251 (29.3%)	5441 (70.7%)	7692 (100%)
Verb	5633 (68.5%)	2590 (31.5%)	8223 (100%)
Conjunction	2281 (99.6%)	9 (0.4%)	2290 (100%)
Remainder	3122 (99.2%)	24 (0.8%)	3146 (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,200 (77.9%)</b>	<b>11,387 (22.1%)</b>	<b>51,587 (100%)</b>

With respect to prepositions, they are often metaphor-related in general, but much more so in news (70.7%, 5441) than in conversations (53.4%, 1756). This difference seems partly due to the frequent occurrence of a few prepositions that are semantically complex, such as Dutch *van*. A detailed account of metaphor-related prepositions will be given in section 5.4.2.

Relatively speaking, verbs occur nearly as often in conversation as in news (16.6% in conversation and 15.9% in news, see table 5.1), but the proportion of non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related verbs is different in the two registers. Of all the verbs in conversations, 15.5% was coded as metaphor-related, while of all the verbs in news, 31.5% was coded as metaphor-related. This means that verbs are metaphor-related twice as often in news, something that will be examined in more detail in section 5.4 as well.

Lastly, the word class of nouns also shows different frequencies for metaphor-related words for conversations and news. In conversations, 7.2% was coded as metaphor-related, while in news 12.2% was coded as metaphor-related. More concrete patterns will be discussed in section 5.4.

The chi-square analyses above tested the differences between the two registers on proportions of metaphor-related words within each of the eight word classes. The results showed that for seven of the eight word classes, the proportion of metaphor-related words within the individual word classes were different for conversations and news. These word classes were significantly more often

metaphorical in one of the two registers; determiners were more often metaphorical in conversations, but adjectives, adverbs, nouns, prepositions, verbs and the remainder category were all more often metaphorical in news, which consequently results in a higher overall percentage of metaphors in news.

Another question resulting from the significant three-way interaction is whether there are differences between the two registers in the distribution of metaphors over the eight main word classes. Table 5.3 shows the same frequencies as table 5.2, but this time includes the percentages per column, offering an indication of how the non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words are distributed over the word classes for each register. Separate chi-square analyses on the level of register show that there is a significant association between metaphor and word class for the two registers, conversation ( $\chi^2(7) = 10,300, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .45$ ) and news ( $\chi^2(1) = 15,160, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .54$ ).

*Table 5.3 Metaphor relation frequencies and percentages (in brackets) per word class per register*

	Conversation		News	
	non-metaphor	metaphor	non-metaphor	metaphor
Adjective	2367 (5.3%)	530 (8.8%)	3214 (8.0%)	905 (7.9%)
Adverb	6769 (15.2%)	58 (1.0%)	3008 (7.5%)	76 (0.7%)
Determiner	4389 (9.8%)	1771 (29.6%)	7768 (19.3%)	541 (4.8%)
Noun	7170 (16.1%)	557 (9.3%)	12,923 (32.1%)	1801 (15.8%)
Preposition	1530 (3.4%)	1756 (29.3%)	2251 (5.6%)	5441 (47.8%)
Verb	7098 (15.9%)	1298 (21.7%)	5633 (14.0%)	2590 (22.7%)
Conjunction	2949 (6.6%)	10 (0.2%)	2281 (5.7%)	9 (0.1%)
Remainder	12,288 (26.0%)	11 (0.2%)	3122 (6.4%)	24 (0.2%)
Total	44,560 (100%)	5991 (100%)	40,200 (100%)	11,387 (100%)

For conversations, metaphor-related words are not divided proportionately over the eight main word classes. First of all, the class of conjunctions and the remainder category together account for only 0.4% of all the metaphor-related words. This is not surprising, knowing that conjunctions and the subclasses in the remainder category are all function words and typically do not have much semantic content which could make a contrast between a basic and contextual sense possible. Determiners (29.6%, 1771) and prepositions (29.3%, 1756) each account for nearly one third of the total number of metaphor-related words, and verbs (21.7%, 1298) are the third most frequent word class for metaphor-related words. Nouns (9.3%) and adjectives (8.8%) both account for some of the metaphor-related words, but these frequencies are considerably lower than for the three highest word classes. In other words, the metaphor-related words in conversations predominantly occur in the form of determiners, prepositions and verbs.

For news, metaphor-related words are not divided proportionately over the eight main word classes either. Here too, the class of conjunctions and the remainder category account for only 0.3% of all the metaphor-related words, for similar reasons that were mentioned above. Prepositions (47.8%, 5441) account for

nearly half of all the metaphor-related word. Verbs (22.7%, 2590) and nouns (15.8%, 1801) are the second and third most frequent word classes for the metaphor-related words. The word classes of adjectives and determiners account for some of the metaphor-related words, but these frequencies are considerably lower than those for prepositions, verbs and nouns. In other words, the metaphor-related words in news predominantly occur in the form of prepositions, and frequently in the form of nouns and verbs.

There are hence a few interesting differences between the two registers of conversations and news in the way the metaphors are divided over the word classes. Explanations of these, and other, differences will be discussed in detail in section 5.4. To sum up for now, there is a three-way interaction between the variables of metaphor, word class and register. According to the chi-square analyses for the separate word classes, all but the class of conjunctions contribute to the significance of the interaction. In addition, there are significant interactions between the variables of word class and metaphor for each of the registers separately. These significant results represent the differences that can be observed between the frequency tendencies shown in tables 5.2 and 5.3. Section 5.4 will discuss the patterns of metaphor in the eight word classes and two registers in more detail.

#### **5.4 Detailed analysis of results**

The main patterns of metaphor-related words will be discussed below to find out which factors, word class, lexical unit, and so on, influence the results most noticeably. It will become clear that for some word classes certain lemmas influence the figures per register, and that specific lexical items account for a large portion of the total number of metaphor-related word within a word class. Additionally, there appear to be register-related characteristics related to Biber's findings that can explain some of the main results. These include the different roles and functions that certain linguistic features, such as nouns, prepositions, and determiners, can have in different registers.

Table 5.1 showed that Dutch conversation and news differ significantly in the way in which the eight main word classes are distributed across the registers, in agreement with Biber's results for English conversations and news texts. The lexical-semantic variable of metaphor was added to make these analyses more fine-grained, showing differences between the two registers for their use of metaphor. Overall, the three variables of register, word class and metaphor significantly interacted with each other.

In general, there are more metaphor-related words in the news texts of the corpus. This is partly due to the fact that news contains more content words; words

such as adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs and prepositions<sup>11</sup> carry full lexical-semantic meaning, and are thus possible candidates for also carrying metaphorical meaning by polysemy. These word classes account for a total of 73.3% of all the words in news, and only 57.6% of all the words in conversation. The figure for metaphor-related words in conversation is compensated to some extent by the metaphor-related determiners: demonstrative determiners such as *die* 'that' and *dit* 'this' occur relatively often in conversation and are in some contexts seen as metaphor-related as well.

Overall 24.3% of all words in conversation are part of the remainder category. This high percentage is due to the fact that this category contains the subclasses of personal pronouns, such as *ik* 'I', *jij* 'you', *hij* 'he', *zij* 'she', *wij* 'we' and *jullie* 'you', and interjections such as *uhm* 'uhm' and *tsjonge* 'jeez'. As Biber's studies on English discourse have demonstrated, it is especially first and second person pronouns and interjections that are characteristic of involved discourse, of which the register of spontaneous conversation is the typical example. Eleven words in the remainder category in the conversations were coded as metaphor-related, which can be accounted for by the relative pronoun *die* 'that', which in those cases were incorrectly seen as demonstratives and coded as metaphor-related. The other cases are non-metaphor-related, something which can be expected because of the grammatical nature of the words in this category. Of all the words in news, 6.1% are part of the remainder category. These also include personal pronouns, predominantly the third person pronouns *hij* 'he' and *zij* 'she/they', but do not include interjections. The words in the remainder category that were seen as metaphor-related (24 in total) were also incorrectly analysed relative pronouns in the form of *die* 'that'.

The findings showed that the differences between the two registers with respect to metaphor-related words are predominantly influenced by determiners, prepositions, verbs and nouns. A detailed account of the patterns of metaphor-related words in these word classes can shed more light on the variation between the registers and may find particular reasons for variation. For each of the four word classes, patterns for the most frequent lemmas overall and for the most frequent lemmas within the metaphor-related words will be discussed below.

#### 5.4.1 Determiners

The word class of determiners consists of a number of subclasses that each influence the frequencies per register and the percentage of metaphor-related words within the word class. The first important subclass of determiners is the article, Dutch *de*, *het* and *een* (*the* and *a*). These are particularly frequent in news, since they relate to the high frequency of nouns, and are the main reason why the word

---

<sup>11</sup> Although prepositions are commonly seen as function words, previous research based in cognitive linguistics has shown that most prepositions show semantic relationships between concepts that are based on spatial and concrete aspects (cf. Lindstromberg, 1998; Tyler and Evans, 2003).

class of determiners is frequent in news. The other important subclass within determiners is that of the demonstratives, Dutch *die*, *deze*, *dat* and *dit* (*those*, *these*, *that* and *this*). The demonstratives mainly account for the relatively high percentage of determiners in conversations. Table 5.4 lists the ten most frequent lemmas for determiners in the two registers.

Table 5.4 Most frequent determiners in conversation and news

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of det. (n=6160)	lemma	n	% of det. (n=8309)
<i>dat</i>	1100	17.9	<i>de</i>	3551	42.7
<i>een</i>	959	15.9	<i>een</i>	1325	15.9
<i>de</i>	803	13.0	<i>het</i>	1191	14.3
<i>die</i>	735	11.9	<i>zijn</i>	281	3.4
<i>er</i>	366	5.9	<i>er</i>	248	3.0
<i>daar</i>	321	5.2	<i>dat</i>	201	2.4
<i>het</i>	298	4.8	<i>dit</i>	154	1.9
<i>wat</i>	262	4.3	<i>die</i>	125	1.5
<i>veel</i>	227	3.7	<i>geen</i>	124	1.5
<i>hier</i>	127	2.1	<i>deze</i>	113	1.4

The frequencies for the determiner lemmas show that in news the three articles, *de*, *het* and *een*, are considerably more frequent than the other determiners. In conversations, the demonstratives *dat* and *die* are more frequent than the demonstratives in news. At the same time, the articles *een* and *de* are also frequent in conversation. This is also linked to the number of nouns, a word class that is generally frequent in all registers of discourse.

Whereas there are relatively more cases of the word class of determiners in news, determiners are much more frequently seen as metaphor-related in conversations. Of all the determiners in conversations, 28.8% was coded as metaphor-related, while only 6.5% of all the determiners in news were coded as metaphor-related. Additionally, of all metaphors in conversations, 29.6% (1771) is accounted for by determiners. In news, by contrast, only 4.8% (541) is accounted for by determiners. A list of all the metaphor-related determiners in conversation and news shows that the vast majority of the metaphor codes occur in the demonstratives, and in *dat* and *die* in particular. The table above shows that demonstratives *dat* and *die* are far more frequent in conversations, hence the high proportion of determiner metaphors in conversation. Since the articles, which are most frequent in news, are never metaphorical, the proportion of metaphor-related determiners in news is much smaller than in conversation. Table 5.5 shows the different frequencies for the four demonstratives in the two registers.

Table 5.5 Frequencies and percentages for metaphorical demonstratives

Conversation			News		
lemma	n met	% of met determiners	lemma	n met	% of met determiners
<i>dat</i>	1029	58.1	<i>dat</i>	169	31.2
<i>die</i>	643	36.3	<i>dit</i>	153	28.3
<i>dit</i>	72	4.1	<i>deze</i>	109	20.6
<i>deze</i>	19	1.1	<i>die</i>	96	17.7

Two demonstratives are very frequent in conversations: *dat* and *die*. They are also the two most frequent metaphor-related determiners in conversations. Although demonstratives can be seen as grammatical words, and thus do not carry full lexical-semantic meaning themselves, they have a basic use and several derived uses. According to *Van Dale*, the demonstrative *dat* has the following basic meaning: ‘wijst iets aan dat zich niet in de onmiddellijke nabijheid van de spreker bevindt’ (‘points to something that is not located in the immediate vicinity of the speaker’). Thus, *dat* in its basic meaning seems to be used in a concrete manner, when it refers to an object that is removed in space from the speaker.

Another sense, listed separately in *Van Dale*, can be interpreted as a more abstract, derived use: ‘ter aanduiding van iets dat tevoren genoemd is’ (‘as an indication of something that was named before’). This sense describes the use of *dat* in a more discourse-oriented manner, where the demonstrative is used to refer to an aspect of a previous utterance. This use of *dat* seems metaphorically derived from the basic use in such a way that what is talked about, the discourse, is seen as a space in which something occurs. In this case, discourse is seen as space and the utterance to which the demonstrative refers is seen as the object that is situated in a certain space.

Similar related meanings and uses were found for the other demonstratives, with basic meanings overtly indicating that the demonstratives point to objects close to (*dit*, *deze*) or removed from (*die*, *dat*) the speaker in space, and abstract meanings relating to discourse actions or abstract entities. For the demonstrative *die*, the basic meaning stated in *Van Dale* is the same as for *dat*, but the dictionary also lists another more abstract use, in which *die* places emphasis on the noun that follows without the referent of the noun being present or visible. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate these uses of demonstratives in conversation, and (3) illustrates this in news.

- (1) - dan gaat ze dingen zitten opeten terwijl ze eigenlijk helemaal geen trek meer heeft om het maar niet weg te hoeven gooien.  
 - *dat* vind ik zo zo krom.  
 - ‘then she continues to eat stuff while she is actually not hungry anymore just so she doesn’t have to throw it out.’  
 - ‘I find *that* so so strange.’ (CGN – fn000259)

- (2) - wordt er met vuurwerk gegooid dan hè wordt uw sk kind geschorst van school  
 - maar dat is ook al weer zoveel jaar geleden.  
 - *die* regels die worden elk jaar ...  
 - 'if fireworks are thrown then eh will your child be suspended from school'  
 - 'but that is also already so many years ago.'  
 - 'those rules they are [changed] every year...'

(CGN – fn000723)

- (3) Daarnaast staan er naar de mening van Van Wel te veel producten van derden in de Amerikaanse winkels. *Dat* kost Numico winstmarge.

'Besides, there are in Van Wel's opinion too many products of third parties in the American stores. *That* will cost Numico their profit margin.'

(*De Telegraaf, economics*)

In accordance with the procedure used to identify metaphors, the demonstratives that were used to refer to abstract situations were coded as metaphor-related.

Table 5.5 shows that *dat* and *die* are considerably more frequent in conversations than *dit* and *deze*, and thus also account for the majority of the metaphor-related words in this register. Although there are fewer demonstratives in news, the four examples are more evenly distributed, and so are the metaphor-related demonstratives. The occurrence of metaphor-related demonstratives in conversation is predominantly due to the nature of this register; participants interact with each other and often refer back to (aspects of) previous utterances using demonstratives. In addition, repetition is common in conversation, either by participants repeating themselves or other participants repeating the previous speaker. This may push the frequencies of these words upwards. News is more often descriptive in the sense that reports refer to concrete events and actions that occurred in specific places. The demonstratives that are used to refer to these events and actions are thus more often concrete. Demonstrative *dat* 'that' and *dit* 'this' do occur in cases where quotes from sources are introduced: in those cases, the words are also seen as metaphor-related based on the idea that they are used to introduce a discourse situation. In general, it can be concluded that the frequencies for metaphor-related determiners are influenced most predominantly by four demonstratives, and two in particular. The occurrence of metaphor-related demonstratives, in turn, seems to be dependent on the register.

### 5.4.2 Prepositions

Of all words in conversation, 6.5% are prepositions. Of all words in news, 14.9% are prepositions. The higher frequency of prepositions in news seems to be related to the higher frequency of nouns in this register; since prepositions are by default followed by nouns, their frequencies should correlate to some extent. Additionally, since prepositions are important devices for packaging large amounts of information, they occur more frequently in informational registers such as news (Biber, 1988). The percentage of prepositions within the total number of metaphor-related words in conversation is 29.3%, while in news it is 47.8%. The fact that the metaphor-related prepositions are relatively more frequent in news is hence partly explained by the fact that the overall proportion of preposition is higher in news.

Yet the proportions of non-metaphor-related words and metaphor-related words for prepositions are considerably different for the two registers: in conversations, 53.4% of the prepositions are coded as metaphor-related, while in news, no fewer than 70.7% are coded as such. Prepositions are thus more often seen as metaphor-related in news than in conversation. This could be due to a number of factors: it may be related to the kind of prepositions that occur in each of the registers, or it may be related to the fact that the same prepositions are used in different contexts in news in comparison to conversation that either make them related to metaphor or not. The tables and examples below shed more light on the specific usage patterns of metaphor-related and non-metaphor-related prepositions.

Table 5.6 lists the ten most frequent prepositions in both registers. Nine of the ten prepositions in the table are the same for conversation and news, albeit in different orders of frequency. The prepositions *van* ‘*off/for*’ and *in* ‘*in*’ are the two most frequent prepositions in both registers, but they are considerably more frequent in news than in conversation.

*Table 5.6 Most frequent prepositions in conversation and news*

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of prep. (n=3286)	lemma	n	% of prep. (n=7692)
<i>van</i>	437	13.3	<i>van</i>	1712	22.3
<i>in</i>	432	13.2	<i>in</i>	1195	15.6
<i>met</i>	339	10.3	<i>op</i>	612	8.0
<i>op</i>	312	9.5	<i>te</i>	578	7.5
<i>voor</i>	229	7.0	<i>voor</i>	487	6.3
<i>bij</i>	209	6.5	<i>met</i>	440	5.7
<i>aan</i>	197	6.0	<i>aan</i>	294	3.8
<i>te</i>	160	4.9	<i>om</i>	258	3.4
<i>naar</i>	143	4.4	<i>bij</i>	255	3.3
<i>om</i>	125	3.8	<i>uit</i>	222	2.9

The preposition *van* is by far the most frequent preposition in news, and one of the most frequent words in general in this register. It can be used in many meanings and uses, which is illustrated by the vast number of sense descriptions for this word in *Van Dale* (55 for the preposition *van*).

The list of metaphor-related prepositions in conversation and news contains some of the most frequently used prepositions in the Dutch language. Table 5.7 lists the ten most frequent metaphor-related prepositions, including general frequencies and the frequencies for the non-metaphor and metaphor-related cases. As is shown by table 5.7, the most frequent prepositions overall are also very frequently related to metaphor. In news, *van* accounts for nearly one third of all metaphor-related prepositions, and thus influences the figures extensively. The high frequency of metaphor-related cases of *van* is due to the complexity of the preposition. This is illustrated by a brief overview of how *van* behaves in different contexts in news.

*Table 5.7 Frequencies and percentages (of all metaphorical prepositions) for metaphorical prepositions*

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of met	lemma	n	% of met
	met	prepositions		met	prepositions
<i>van</i>	381	21.7	<i>van</i>	1574	28.9
<i>voor</i>	212	12.1	<i>in</i>	716	13.2
<i>op</i>	202	11.5	<i>op</i>	483	8.9
<i>in</i>	193	11.0	<i>voor</i>	477	8.8
<i>aan</i>	148	8.4	<i>met</i>	334	6.1
<i>met</i>	140	8.0	<i>aan</i>	246	4.5
<i>bij</i>	91	5.2	<i>door</i>	201	3.7
<i>over</i>	77	4.4	<i>bij</i>	200	3.7
<i>om</i>	38	2.2	<i>over</i>	164	3.0
<i>af</i>	32	1.8	<i>uit</i>	152	2.8

### *Preposition van in Dutch*

The Dutch preposition *van* can be used in many different meanings, constructions and grammatical uses. There seems to be a cline from a basic spatial meaning of the word, through some clearly derived metaphorical meanings, to vague but possibly derived meanings, to the more grammatical and functional uses of the preposition. *Van Dale* lists as the first meaning of *van* the following definition: ‘ter aanduiding van een zaak, persoon of plaats waarvandaan iemand of iets komt of zich verwijderd, of waarvandaan men iets verwijderd, wegneemt enz.’ (‘to indicate the thing, person or place from which someone or something comes or moves away from, or from where someone removes, takes away something, etc’). This definition can be seen as the most basic meaning of *van*, indicating a movement in

space from one place to another. Example (4) from one of the news texts contains a case of *van* in this context:

- (4) ... de sneltrein die met 115 passagiers onderweg was *van* Londen King Cross naar het noordelijke King's Lynn in Norfolk.  
'... the fast train with 115 passengers that was on its way *from* London King Cross to the northern King's Lynn in Norfolk.'  
(*Algemeen Dagblad, international*)

Some contextual uses of *van* in the corpus seem to be clearly derived metaphorical senses of the basic meaning shown in example (4). In those cases, *van* describes an abstract movement in time. This sense is also described in the dictionary as a separate definition: 'ter aanduiding van een punt in de tijd, waarop een werking of toestand begint: sedert, sinds, vanaf' ('as an indication of a point in time, during which a situation starts: since, from'). These uses of *van* seem to be linguistic realisations of the well-known conceptual metaphor TIME IS SPACE, where the moment in time during which something starts is seen as the point in space from which something or someone moves. Example (5) contains an instance of *van* in this context:

- (5) *Van* 27 tot en met 29 september zijn de bolides te bewonderen op het duinencircuit ...  
'*From* 27 until 29 September there are racing cars to admire on the dune track ...'  
(*De Telegraaf, sports*)

In this example, *van* is meant to refer to a time period that commences and not to a spatial starting point from which an object starts to move.

Examples (4) and (5) contain instances of *van* in which the preposition has some degree of semantic meaning in the different contexts. However, there are also instances of *van* which seem to have lost the original meaning and which are used in a more grammatical sense. One of the most frequent uses of *van* is that of a genitive marker, used to indicate possession. Example (6) contains an instance of *van* in such a genitive context:

- (6) ... ze schrijft dat opvoeding zonder enige bestraffing waarschijnlijk antisociaal gedrag *van* de kinderen sterk bevordert.  
'... she writes that upbringing without punishing probably strongly encourages anti-social behaviour *of* children.'  
(*NRC, science*)

In this context it is difficult to compare the meaning, or use, of the contextual sense of *van*, indicating grammatical genitive, to the basic meaning of *van* formulated above, that of indicating movement in space. *Van* here indicates that *antisociaal*

*gedrag* ‘anti-social behaviour’ is a particular quality or personal trait of the children, and could be seen as indicating a personal control over a quality similar to possessing that quality. There still seems to be some degree of comparison possible between this contextual meaning of *van* and the basic meaning; although it seems farfetched, the abstractness of control could be contrasted to the concreteness of a point in space where *van* departs from. A comparison of a particular quality in the human mind versus a particular point in space, or a higher level comparison of abstractness versus concreteness can possibly underlie this use of *van*. Therefore, these instances are seen as possible metaphor-related.

The corpus texts also include instances of *van* where it is well-nigh impossible to ascribe meaning to the preposition in that particular context. In those cases, *van* should be seen as a grammatical word, something which is also confirmed by a number of sense descriptions in *Van Dale*. One sense description, for instance, indicates the grammaticality of some contextual uses of *van*: ‘als verbindende tussen twee zelfstandige naamwoorden waarvan het eerste een meer algemeen begrip aanduidt en het tweede een nadere bepaling of het concrete voorbeeld is’ (‘as link between two nouns of which the first denotes a more general concept and the second is a specific restriction or a concrete example’). In some of those cases, it seems that the preposition is part of a fixed construction and does not have any semantic meaning or a specific function such as marking possession. Example (7) contains an instance of *van* in such a context:

- (7) Bovendien versierde de aanvaller een strafbal en maakte hij een pracht *van* een goal na een snoeiharde uithaal ...

‘Furthermore, the striker managed to get a penalty and made a beauty of a goal after a really hard shot ...’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, sports*)

Expression such as *een pracht van een goal* (literally *a beauty of a goal*) have previously been described in Dutch linguistic studies by Paardekooper (1956) and have often been termed abstract constructions (cf. Foolen, 2004; Verhagen, 2005). Expressions such as these are seen as grammatical constructions rather than idiomatic expressions because of the fact that there are fewer lexical elements involved (Verhagen, 2005). The only fixed element in this construction is the preposition *van*, but in semantic terms the original meaning of *van* is lost.

The examples of *van* in context illustrate the linguistic cline along which the preposition moves, having a clear semantic meaning as a spatial preposition, then a vaguer functional use as a genitive marker, and finally displaying a completely functional use in fixed constructions. Because of this cline, it is difficult to draw a line between contextual meanings and uses of *van* that seem to have some semantic content and which could be seen as metaphorically derived from a more basic spatial meaning, on the one hand, and those instances that seem to be purely constructional in use and do not have semantic content, on the other. In the metaphor identification stage, we first decided to take all abstract meanings and

uses of *van* as derived from the basic spatial meaning. This, however, turned out to be difficult to implement transparently; it was sometimes difficult to decide whether a use of *van* still contained some semantic meaning, whether it was part of an idiom, or whether perhaps it should be seen as part of a construction, as in example (7).

The difficulty with this particular preposition can be made even clearer by comparing it to its English equivalents. As the translations of the examples above have already partly indicated, *van* in English is either translated by *from* or by *of*. The examples in which Dutch *van* would translate into English *from* are those examples in which *van* has semantic content, either referring to a spatial situation or temporal situation as in (4) and (5). The contexts in which Dutch *van* would translate into English *of* are those in which *van* is more functional, for instance as a genitive marker in example (6), or where it seems to be part of a construction like example (7). The English preposition *of* is usually seen as a purely functional preposition that has lost its meaning, and has in similar corpus-based studies on metaphor in English discourse been taken as literally used at all times. For Dutch, it would have been useful to be able to make similar decisions, but the fact that the preposition *van* encompasses both semantic and functional uses made it difficult to create clear subcategories.

The fact remains that the many abstract contextual senses and functional uses of *van* in both the conversations and the news texts have greatly influenced the high frequency of metaphor-related prepositions. This also holds for another Dutch preposition, *voor* combining the senses expressed by English *in front* and *for*. It is complex in similar ways because it has a number of seemingly unrelated meanings, such as the spatial meaning that denotes an object being in front of another object (*de boom voor het huis* ‘the tree in front of the house’) and the benefit relation that the preposition can denote (*ik heb een kadootje voor je* ‘I have a present for you’). The first is a clearly concrete use of *voor* and the second is much more abstract, but the comparison between the two may be difficult to see, something that is reflected in the English translations. However, since we encounter the same difficulties with drawing a line between the various meanings and uses of *voor*, similar to *van*, seemingly abstract uses such as *ik heb een kadootje voor je* ‘I have a present for you’ have also frequently been coded as possibly related to metaphor to reflect the distinction between concrete and abstract uses.

If the metaphor codes for *van* and *voor* would be disregarded (similar to *of* and *for* in the English, for instance), the percentages of metaphor-related words in the word class of prepositions would be considerably lower for both conversation and news. For the prepositions in conversations, the portion of non-metaphor-related would then be 64.6% and the portion of metaphor-related would be 35.4%. For the prepositions in news, the portion of non-metaphor-related would then be 55.9% and the portion of metaphor-related would be 44.1%. These percentages also come close to the percentages for metaphor-related prepositions in similar English corpus studies on metaphor (cf. Steen, Dorst et al., 2010).

The high frequencies of metaphor-related prepositions in the two registers are thus partly due to the inherent characteristics of prepositions. The most frequent prepositions have basic meanings that denote spatial relations, but are also often used to denote temporal relationships or other abstract connections between entities. Findings from different studies on English as well as Dutch frequent prepositions have shown that they can be used in metaphorically derived contexts in different registers and genres (Cuyckens, 1991; Lindstromberg, 1998; Tyler & Evans, 2003). The discussion above has also pointed to the fact that, to some extent, a few very complex prepositions account for the high frequency of metaphor-related prepositions in news. The prepositions *van*, *in* and *voor*, which are very productive in news, account for a large portion of the metaphor-related prepositions in this register.

### 5.4.3 Verbs

Interesting issues also appear in the distribution of metaphor in verbs. Overall, 16.3% of the words in the corpus are verbs. The distribution for news and conversation is approximately the same; 16.6% of the lexical units in conversation are verbs, against 15.9% in news. For both registers, too, the verbs take nearly equal shares of the total number of all the metaphor-related words, 21.7% in conversation and 22.7% in news. However, since the percentage of metaphor-related words is much higher in news, the number of metaphor-related words within the word class of verbs must also be higher in news. Table 5.2 showed that this is indeed the case; of all verbs in conversation, 15.5% have been coded as related to metaphor. Of all verbs in news, 31.5% have been coded as metaphor-related. This means that verbs are related to metaphor twice as often in news than in conversation.

A comparison of the metaphor-related verb lemmas and their frequencies in the two registers could shed more light on this difference. Table 5.8 shows the ten most frequent verbs overall in the two registers. Both registers contain a large number of verbs that can also function as auxiliaries, such as *zijn*, *worden*, *hebben* and *kunnen* (*be*, *become*, *have* and *can*). Interestingly, the verbs in each of the top ten lists are much more frequent in conversations than in news; in conversations, they amount to 4779 tokens (57% of the total number of verbs), and in news they amount to 3057 tokens (37% of the total number of verbs).

The list of the most frequent metaphor-related verbs in conversation and news contains some of the same verbs as the list in table 5.8, but excludes the auxiliary uses of verbs. The auxiliary verbs (and copular *zijn* ‘be’) have been analysed separately from the main verbs, so auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’ has been analysed separately from *hebben* as a main verb. This is because auxiliaries are seen as a separate instance of a verb, and is a grammatical item that does not contain lexical content, similar to words such as articles.

Table 5.8 Most frequent verbs in conversation and news

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of verb (n=8396)	lemma	n	% of verb (n=8223)
<i>zijn</i>	1688	20.1	<i>zijn</i>	1181	14.4
<i>hebben</i>	919	10.9	<i>hebben</i>	492	6.0
<i>gaan</i>	382	4.5	<i>worden</i>	421	5.1
<i>moeten</i>	354	4.2	<i>zullen</i>	203	2.5
<i>kunnen</i>	344	4.1	<i>kunnen</i>	193	2.3
<i>zeggen</i>	289	3.4	<i>moeten</i>	169	2.1
<i>doen</i>	271	3.2	<i>gaan</i>	160	1.9
<i>weten</i>	206	2.5	<i>maken</i>	122	1.5
<i>denken</i>	163	1.9	<i>komen</i>	119	1.4
<i>willen</i>	162	1.9	<i>zeggen</i>	96	1.2

Table 5.9 contains the ten most frequent metaphor-related verbs in each register. *Hebben* ‘have’ is the most frequent metaphor-related verb in both registers. It occurs as a metaphor considerably more frequently in conversations than in news, which can partly be explained by the higher overall frequency of *hebben* in conversations.

Table 5.9 Frequencies and percentages (of all metaphorical verbs) for metaphorical verbs

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of met verbs	lemma	n	% of met verbs
<i>hebben</i>	277	21.3	<i>hebben</i>	119	4.6
<i>vinden</i>	135	10.4	<i>gaan</i>	93	3.6
<i>zitten</i>	83	6.4	<i>maken</i>	89	3.4
<i>gaan</i>	71	5.5	<i>komen</i>	77	3.0
<i>staan</i>	70	5.4	<i>staan</i>	68	2.6
<i>komen</i>	59	4.5	<i>krijgen</i>	65	2.5
<i>kijken</i>	48	3.7	<i>geven</i>	63	2.4
<i>krijgen</i>	41	3.2	<i>vinden</i>	44	1.7
<i>zetten</i>	33	2.5	<i>houden</i>	41	1.6
<i>nemen</i>	25	1.9	<i>stellen</i>	30	1.2

The most frequent verb overall, *zijn* ‘to be’, and the second most frequent verb in news, *worden* ‘become’, do not occur in the list of most frequent metaphor-related verbs. They were never coded as metaphor-related, neither as auxiliaries nor as main verbs, because their basic meanings are very general and multifunctional. *Zijn* is described in *Van Dale* as ‘existeren’, meaning *to exist*, and *worden* is described as ‘beginnen te zijn’, coming into existence. Both relate to the

very basics of our world and being, and are taken to include any concept that exists in our world. Both verbs are universal in this manner, and thus basic in all uses.

Table 5.9 also shows that some of the verbs that are frequent in general occur much more frequently in one register than the other. The verb *vinden* 'find', for instance, which is nearly always analysed as metaphor-related, occurs three times more in conversations than in news. In most cases, *vinden* as a metaphor-related verb occurs in contexts where the verb has the following dictionary meaning: 'tot zeker oordeel of een mening komen; oordelen, van mening zijn dat het gezegde zo is' ('reach a certain judgement or opinion; judge, be of the opinion that what is said is true'). This contextual use of *vinden* is taken as metaphorically derived from the more basic meaning of *vinden*, which is described in *Van Dale* as follows: 'al gaande of al doende aantreffen' ('find, come across while moving or doing'). The basic meaning of *vinden* entails a concrete object which is present in space, albeit hidden in some cases. The more abstract meaning described above entails abstract ideas and opinions that occur in people's minds. The notion of forming ideas in the mind is then metaphorically compared to the notion of finding concrete objects in space. Example (8) shows a sequence of utterances of two speakers in which *vinden* is used in the metaphorical sense.

- (8) - en douchen in het bad vind je niet handig?  
- nee, dat vind ik echt niet handig.  
- 'and showering in the bath you don't find handy?'  
- 'no, I don't find that handy.'  
(CGN – fn000259)

This example of *vinden* is characteristic of how it occurs in conversations; the verb is nearly always used in the abstract sense of forming an opinion. Additionally, it is often uttered by one speaker in a question or statement and uttered by another speaker in a response by repeating the exact same wording as the question or statement. The fact that full repetition often occurs in spontaneous speech, and the fact that *vinden* in this context has a personal, subjective meaning are both reasons for the high frequency of the verb in conversation. *Vinden* also occurs as a metaphor in news, but to a considerably lesser degree. It can occur as an introduction of a source in the same sense as when used in conversations to represent the opinion of an important participant in a news event. However, this occurs on a smaller frequency scale than in conversations due to the fact that news articles are built up of other elements besides quoted sources. In addition, the element repetition is absent in news language, whereas it seems to play an important part in conversational interaction and metaphorical language in conversation.

Table 5.9 illustrates that the higher proportion of metaphor-related verbs in news is not caused by the frequencies for the ten most used verb lemmas. The top ten metaphor-related verbs for news does not contain significantly more cases than the top ten list of metaphor-related verbs for conversation. This would mean that the difference between the proportions of non-metaphor-related and metaphor-

related verbs for the two registers (15.5% metaphor-related in conversations versus 31.5% metaphor-related in news) is due to other reasons. By calculating type-token ratios, it is possible to see whether the variation of lemmas within the word class may be of influence. The type-token ratios<sup>12</sup> are considerably different for both the overall numbers of verbs and for the metaphor-related verbs only.

For the conversations, the type-token ratio for verbs is 0.07 (616 types, 8396 tokens) and for news it is 0.17 (1425 types, 8223 tokens). Thus, there is more lexical variation in news for the verb lemmas. These figures are in accordance with expectations about the difference in word variation between conversation and news that can be derived from Biber's (1988) variation study. One of the main features that influences the level of informational production (under Dimension 1) are type-token ratios; high type-token ratios are a feature of informational production and the lack of a high ratio (thus a low ratio) is a feature of involved production. The ratios here are calculated for separate word classes, but reflect the manner in which Biber applies it in his study.

The type-token ratios for metaphor-related verbs show a similar pattern. For the conversations, the type-token ratio is 0.15 (190 types, 1298 tokens) and that for news is 0.29 (751 types, 2590 tokens). Again, there is more variation in news in the metaphor-related verb lemmas. Both these type-token ratios are higher than the ratios for the verbs as a whole, though. This reflects the fact that there are relatively many unique metaphor-related verbs in both registers, more so than there are unique verbs overall. It is then likely that many verbs in the data have at least one basic use and one metaphor-related use in each register.

The list of verb lemmas that occur infrequently as metaphors may be arbitrarily operationalised as those that occur at most once per 10,000 words (so with a maximum frequency of five). This list is much longer for news than for conversations. In news, 646 lemmas occur as a metaphor-related verb from one to five times. In conversations, there are only 164 lemmas that occur in the same bandwidth. An important reason why verbs in news were coded as metaphor-related twice as often as the verbs in conversation is hence the great variety of verb lemmas in news and the resulting variety for possibilities in relation to metaphor. This seems associated with the nature of the news register. News texts often deal with a large variety of topics that describe newsworthy events from all parts life, and they may thus call for a large variety of verbs to denote relevant abstract, social and other referents that require metaphorical expression.

The tables and ratios above seem to suggest that particular verb lemmas that are frequent behave metaphorically in similar ways in conversation and news, but that news contains a much wider variety of verb lemmas and thus has more options for verbs to be metaphorical. The frequent metaphor-related verbs that occur in both registers are those verbs that are generally frequent in the Dutch language. Verbs such as *hebben*, *gaan* and *komen* (*have*, *go* and *come*), for instance, have basic meanings that either refer to concrete actions and objects or to

---

<sup>12</sup> In this case, and all cases of type-token ratios below, types refer to lemmas. So for a verb such as *have*, the different verb forms *have*, *has*, *had*, etc. are all counted as one lemma.

spatial situations and actions of motion. These verbs occur frequently in more abstract contexts in conversation, news, or other registers because they are characteristic of the Dutch language and not so much of one register. There are also verbs, however, which can have metaphor-related meanings that are more characteristic of particular situations and thus can occur in certain registers more often than in other ones. An example of such a verb is *vinden* as a metaphor in conversation, as the discussion above pointed out. At the same time, the nature of the register can also influence the frequencies of metaphor-related verbs. News texts, for instance, typically describe various topics and events, and thus call for various lexical items to give content to those topics. To sum up, there are both language-specific and register-specific reasons that can explain the frequencies of metaphor-related verbs in general, and the differences in those frequencies between the two registers. The register-specific issues relate to the notion that news has a high degree of variation of both verbs in general, and metaphor-related verbs in particular. The variation in topics and the notion that news language is used to refer to specific actions, events, people, places, and dates require news language to contain words that can describe and denote these affairs.

#### 5.4.4 Nouns

Nouns are characteristic of informational and formal discourse, such as news texts. Table 5.1 showed that 28.5% (14,724) of all lexical units in the news part of the corpus are nouns, and that only 15.3% (7727) of all lexical units in the conversation part are nouns. Additionally, 15.8% (1801) of all the metaphor-related words in news are nouns and only 9.3% (557) of all the metaphor-related words in conversation are nouns (see table 5.3). The difference in the portion of nouns in metaphor-related words between the two registers is partly due to the differences in the overall frequencies for nouns; there are considerably more nouns in news than in conversation, so the chances of more metaphorical nouns in news than in conversation are quite large. However, the distributions of metaphor-related and non-metaphor related nouns per register are also considerably different. Whereas 7.2% of all the nouns in conversations are metaphor-related, 12.2% of all the nouns in news are metaphor-related (see table 5.2). In short, then, nouns are not only more frequent in news than in conversation, but are also relatively more often metaphorically used in news.

Table 5.10 lists the fifteen most frequent nouns in the corpus for conversations and news. The nouns in the two lists reveal some of the interesting differences between conversations and news. The topics which are typically discussed in spontaneous conversations are different from the topics which are typical of news discourse. Conversations contain nouns that denote vague entities, such as *keer* 'instance', *beetje* 'a bit' and *ding* 'thing'. In addition, most of the nouns fit within topics that deal with everyday life, such as *dag* 'day', *week* 'week', *uur* 'hour', *school* 'school' and *jongen* 'boy'. Nouns that are most frequent in news

denote more specific entities, and seem to belong to topics that are typically newsworthy. The frequency of *partij* ‘party’, for instance, is an indication that a large number of texts deal with the topic of politics and political parties. The nouns *bedrijf* ‘company’, *procent* ‘percent’, *euro* ‘euro’ and *miljoen* ‘million’ are indicators of economic topics, and nouns like *plaats* ‘place’ and *tijd* ‘time’ are indicators of topics that deal with current issues and events that occur at a certain time and place.

Table 5.10 Most frequent nouns in conversation and news

Conversation			News		
lemma	n	% of noun (n=7727)	lemma	n	% of noun (n=14,724)
<i>keer</i>	102	1.3	<i>jaar</i>	150	1.0
<i>jaar</i>	80	1.0	<i>partij</i>	62	0.4
<i>beetje</i>	76	1.0	<i>mens</i>	59	0.4
<i>ding</i>	73	0.9	<i>vrouw</i>	58	0.4
<i>dag</i>	63	0.8	<i>bedrijf</i>	54	0.4
<i>mens</i>	59	0.8	<i>land</i>	54	0.4
<i>week</i>	54	0.7	<i>week</i>	51	0.3
<i>man</i>	45	0.6	<i>procent</i>	50	0.3
<i>tijd</i>	45	0.6	<i>euro</i>	49	0.3
<i>uur</i>	39	0.5	<i>tijd</i>	48	0.3
<i>gulden</i>	33	0.4	<i>dag</i>	47	0.3
<i>school</i>	33	0.4	<i>miljoen</i>	47	0.3
<i>jongen</i>	31	0.4	<i>maand</i>	41	0.3
<i>stuk</i>	31	0.4	<i>minister</i>	39	0.3
<i>foto</i>	27	0.3	<i>plaats</i>	38	0.3

The percentages of the most frequent nouns in news quickly drop in comparison to conversation, but remain on practically the same level. What this table does not show is that news has considerably more nouns that occur only once: there are considerably more unique noun lemmas in news than in conversation. In addition, a large variety of noun lemmas in news occurs more than 15 times, whereas in conversations only the top nouns are very frequent and the other lemmas occur infrequently. These statements are backed by the type-token ratios for nouns in the conversation and news data. The type-token ratio for nouns in conversation is 0.22 (1700 types/7727 tokens), and for news is 0.33 (4924 types/14,724 tokens): the variation in noun lemmas is thus higher in news than in conversation. Again, this is in agreement with Biber’s results. Together with the variation in verb lemmas in news this tells us that the language of news is more diverse than the language of conversation, something that is linked to the idea that there is more variation in topics in news, as noted above.

With respect to metaphor, a similar picture occurs. Table 5.11 shows the most frequent metaphor-related nouns in the two registers. The type-token ratios

again differ between the registers: for news, the ratio is 0.47 (852 types/1801 tokens) and for conversation, the ratio is 0.34 (197 types/557 tokens). The type-token ratios for metaphor-related nouns are slightly higher in both registers than the ratios for the nouns overall.

Table 5.11 Frequencies and percentages (of all met. nouns) for metaphorical nouns

Conversation			News		
lemma	n met	% of met nouns	lemma	n met	% of met nouns
<i>keer</i>	101	18.1	<i>partij</i>	62	3.4
<i>beetje</i>	68	12.2	<i>keer</i>	34	1.9
<i>ding</i>	35	6.3	<i>slachtoffer</i>	27	1.5
<i>zin</i>	11	2.0	<i>hand</i>	23	1.3
<i>punt</i>	9	1.6	<i>aanslag</i>	18	1.0
<i>groep</i>	8	1.4	<i>gevolg</i>	18	1.0
<i>opleiding</i>	8	1.4	<i>plaats</i>	18	1.0
<i>rest</i>	8	1.4	<i>punt</i>	18	1.0
<i>stuk</i>	7	1.3	<i>deel</i>	17	0.9
<i>hoop</i>	7	1.3	<i>eind</i>	16	0.9

The same tendencies per register seem to occur with regard to frequencies for metaphor-related nouns as for all nouns together. The nouns that are most often metaphor-related in conversations are relatively much more frequent than the rest of the metaphor-related nouns in conversations. The noun *keer*, for instance, comprises nearly a fifth of all the metaphor-related nouns. It also occurs as a metaphor in news, but to a much lesser degree. Moreover, the most frequent metaphor-related nouns are rather vague in meaning; *keer*, *beetje* and *ding* have all been coded as metaphor-related on the bases of the comparison between concrete objects and abstract entities, but they refer to vague concepts. For *ding* ‘thing’, for example, *Van Dale* lists the following basic, concrete meaning: ‘iets wat buiten de mens een zelfstandig bestaan heeft, ook wel zaak, voorwerp, object’ (‘something that, apart from the human being, has an independent existence, also case, object’). An example of *ding* from the corpus where it is used in the sense mentioned above would be the following utterance:

- (9) - ... en die had een auto van een half miljoen. (...)  
 - en daar reed ie mee over de boulevard in Scheveningen.  
 - zodat uh iedereen ‘m kon zien want dan reed ie twintig.  
 - en dan ging ’t er niet om dat dat dat *ding* driehonderd kon.  
 - ‘... and he had a car of half a million (...)  
 - ‘and he drove over the boulevard in Scheveningen with that’  
 - ‘so that ehm everyone could see it because he drove twenty’  
 - ‘and then it wasn’t about that that *thing* could do three hundred.’

(CGN – fn000616)

Here, *ding* refers to a concrete object that the speakers can identify, namely a friend's car that they have been talking about.

However, *ding* can also be used in more abstract contexts, where it has the following meaning, as stated in *Van Dale*: '(bij uitbreiding) abstracte zaak, aangelegenheid, omstandigheid' ('(extended) abstract case, affair, circumstance'). In the following example, *ding* seems refers to an abstract entity, being used in the context mentioned above, and not to a concrete object.

- (10) - toen ik zestig werd en in de VUT kwam 'k heb uh je je d'r ooit van verteld heb ik uh De Herinneringen Van Een Zestigjarige geschreven.  
- dat waren mijn herinneringen en maar toch daar wil 'k wil ik nog even wat over zeggen.  
- toen heb ik ook uh van jaar tot jaar bijna geschreven en dat is toch allemaal positief en de negatieve *dingen* ben ik ook niet uit de weg gegaan.  
- 'when I turned sixty and retired I had uh told you once I have uh written The Memomories Of A Sixty-year Old.'  
- 'those were my memories and but still I want I want to say something about that.'  
- 'then I uh wrote from year to year almost, and that is all positive and I did not avoid the negative *things*.'

(CGN - fn007848)

In the context of (10), *ding* is used to refer to an abstract entity, in this case certain memories or certain situations that exist as memories.

In both examples, (9) and (10), the noun *ding* remains vague. It is used to be able to refrain from naming something particular, similar to how the noun *thing* is used in English. Situations in which speakers refrain from giving detailed referents, either because they have to communicate on-line and do not have the time to come up with a more specific wording, or because they intentionally want to remain vague, are characteristic of conversations such as the ones occurring in the corpus. Such nouns with unspecified meaning hardly occur in news discourse, predominantly because news discourse is intended to give specific information about events, situations and referents.

With regard to the metaphor-related nouns in news, *partij* 'party' is the most frequent word. All instances of *partij* in news were seen as metaphor-related, which is why the frequencies in table 5.10 and 5.11 are the same. This is because all instances of *partij* in the news part of the corpus refer to a political party or to part of a group of people, and not to the basic part of a concrete object. An example of *partij* in the context of politics is given below:

- (11) PvdA-lijsttrekker (en wethouder) mevrouw E. Kuijpers gaf met veel drama toe, dat haar *partij* nooit had gerekend op zo veel winst voor Leefbaar Rotterdam.

‘PvdA party leader (and alderman) Mrs E. Kuijpers admitted with a lot of drama, that her *party* had never counted on such a victory for Leefbaar Rotterdam.’

(*De Telegraaf, national*)

The contextual meaning of *partij* in (11) corresponds to the following sense of *partij* in *Van Dale*: ‘groep personen die zich verenigd hebben om op te komen voor hun beginselen, hun belangen, vooral op staatkundig gebied’ (‘a group of people who united themselves in order to stand up for their principles, their concerns, especially in the area of politics’). The use of *partij* in the definition above has been regarded as metaphorically derived in context from the more basic meaning of *partij*, which is described in *Van Dale* as follows: ‘deel, gedeelte of stuk, onderdeel van iets dat nog één geheel is’ (‘part, section or piece, part of something that is still one whole’). The basic meaning of *partij* refers to concrete objects that are either divided into pieces or of which the *partij* is a part of. An example of *partij* in such a context from the dictionary is *een partij aardewerk, pieces of pottery, earthenware*. Although the corpus does not contain a similar basic use of *partij*, the fact that it is given in the dictionary is sufficient reason to follow this idea.

The contextual, more abstract sense in example (11) is compared and contrasted to the more basic sense described in the definition above. Whereas the basic sense entails a concrete object that can be split into parts, the contextual sense in (11) defines a groups of people that are divided from the rest of the people (in a country for instance) on the basis of political principles. It is not necessary, however, for that group of people to be close together; they can be spread out in different places and still be referred to as the same *partij*. In fact, in many cases *partij* in the political sense refers to the abstract notion of the political party itself without implying that people are involved. However, there can be a form of metonymic meaning involved in the sense when *partij* meaning political party denotes a more abstract entity that involves different people, whereas *partij* in the basic sense refers to specific concrete objects split into parts. Therefore, *partij* in the contexts found in the corpus has in all cases been seen as metaphor-related.

The ten most frequent metaphor-related nouns in Dutch news are all relatively frequent in comparison to those in conversation. Looking at the kinds of nouns that are in the list, it should be noted that some of them are typical of news discourse (such as *slachtoffer* ‘victim’) and nearly always occur in a metaphorical context in news. Thus, the nature of the news topics seems to influence the number of metaphor-related nouns for some particular lemmas. The complete list of metaphor-related nouns in news also contains a vast number of lemmas that occur as metaphor-related (and perhaps in general) only once. This group is much larger than in conversations, and also shows that the topics that are dealt with in news

texts are much more varied than the topics that are dealt with in the conversations in the corpus.

Table 5.11 also shows that the overall frequency for nouns in news that are metaphor-related is not so much influenced by a few very frequent metaphorical nouns, but by many infrequent metaphorical nouns. This is also reflected by the type-token ratio for news. Since there are so many of them, it is difficult to describe in detail what happens, but an elaborate scan through the metaphor-related noun data can give some indications. Of the total of 1801 metaphor-related nouns in news, 603 are unique lemmas which each occur as a metaphor only once (the remaining 1198 metaphor-related nouns are divided over 249 lemmas). Many of them are very concrete nouns, denoting objects, parts of objects or human elements, which are used to describe more abstract entities in their respective contexts (such as *vleugel* ‘wing’, which is conventionally used to describe particular political sides). Another part of those infrequent metaphor-related nouns in their basic meanings denote specific situations or events, such as *wapenstilstand* ‘truce, cease-fire’, but are sometimes contextually used to describe different situations that belong to different domains. The noun *wapenstilstand*, for instance, can also be used in a metaphorical sense. The following sentence from a news text was preceded by an account of the heated discussions between de Democrats and Republicans about the economic policies and tax issues in the United States prior to and subsequent to the attacks on September 11.

- (12) Na 11 september heerste er tijdelijk een *wapenstilstand* in Washington, maar politicoloog Ross Baker van Rutgers Universiteit vergelijkt het met het Kerstbestand uit 1914.

‘After September 11 there was a temporary *truce* in Washington, but political scientist Ross Baker from the Rutgers University compares it to the Christmas truce from 1914.’

(*de Volkskrant, international*)

The actual comparison between a political truce in discussions about the economical situation and an actual truce during a war situation is explicitly stated by mentioning a well-known temporary historical truce in war time.

It seems that the most important reason for there being more metaphor-related nouns in news than in conversation is that news discourse typically reports on a large variety of topics, situations and events, and has a need for a large variety of nouns to describe these topics. Many of those topics deal with abstract or complex situations which can be explained by using more concrete nouns that relate to human experience and behaviour. It seems that due to the variety in topics in news there is more demand for metaphorical nouns that can denote and describe the topics in concrete terms.

#### *5.4.5 Word class patterns: conventionality*

What most of the metaphor-related lemmas seem to have in common is that they are used in conventional metaphorical contexts. This is true for most of the metaphor-related words in the corpus, including verbs, prepositions, nouns, and determiners. The most frequent prepositions and verbs, for instance, are used in many contexts where they can mean different things. They are often related to metaphor in a particular way, and are conventionally used to refer to various abstract concepts. The fact that they occur frequently in similar metaphor-related contexts is proof in itself that they can be interpreted as highly conventional. The same can be said about a large number of nouns; many nouns originate from one conceptual domain, such as BOUNDED SPACE, and are used to refer to the same abstract domain, such as TIME.

The fact that this detailed discussion focussed on the lemmas that contributed most significantly to the various frequency patterns for both conversation and news language seems to enhance the idea that most metaphor in conversation and news are conventional. It may be that the lemmas that were uniquely coded as metaphor-related in either of the two registers can counterbalance the idea that metaphorical language in news and conversational is predominantly conventional. However, many examples of lemmas from different word classes that occurred as a metaphor only once seem to be conventional in the sense that they originate from a conventionally used source domain and are used to refer to abstract domains that are conventionally referred to in terms of metaphorical language.

The data set used for this study is of a sufficient size to bring conventional patterns of metaphorical language use to the surface, and to show important differences in the use of metaphor within word classes for the registers of news and language. However, in order to really filter out unique unconventional metaphorical expressions, those that occur once in a unique comparison, different research techniques may be needed. Qualitative metaphor analysis may filter out possible unconventional or novel metaphorically used expressions, which may be checked for their uniqueness and novelty in larger corpora of Dutch. For the present study, however, it is particularly the difference in the use of conventional metaphors between the two registers that we are interested in.

### **5.5 Conclusions**

The main results of the quantitative analyses of metaphor in conversation and news show that the variables of register, word class and metaphor interact significantly, which means that the way in which non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words are divided over the registers is dependent on the word classes that appear in each register. The frequencies for eight word classes in two registers show that Dutch news and conversation are similar to their English counterparts: Dutch

conversations contain significantly more adverbs and pronouns (as part of the remainder category) than Dutch news, while news contains significantly more nouns, adjectives and prepositions. These results are in accordance with the findings from Biber's (1988) study on variation in English, and illustrate that Dutch conversational discourse would score high on the 'involvement' pole of the first dimension distinguishing involved from informational language, and that Dutch news would score high on the 'informational' pole of the same dimension.

With respect to metaphor, there are some main differences between the two registers in the distribution of metaphor-related cases over the word classes. Conversations contain more metaphor-related determiners, whereas news contains more metaphor-related prepositions and nouns. More importantly though, some word classes behave differently on a metaphorical level depending on the register they occur in. Again, determiners are more often metaphorically used in conversation than in news, but nouns, prepositions and verbs are more frequently used metaphorically in news. As the discussion of the frequent lemmas for the four word classes of determiners, nouns, prepositions, and verbs showed, this has partly to do with the functional nature of each of the two registers. Conversations often deal with situation-dependent references in which demonstratives often occur, and when used in a context in which abstract notions such as the topic of conversation is referred to, demonstratives can be seen as being used in a metaphorical manner. This is generally different in news texts, which are rather specific in their reference to details when describing news events. In addition, the casual nature of the conversations in our data consequently influences the number of nouns, adjectives and prepositions, and hence their metaphor numbers. With news, the diversity of the topics enhances the diversity of the metaphor patterns.

What the metaphor data in the two registers demonstrates most of all is the conventional nature of the majority of the linguistic metaphors in conversation as well as news. Many lemmas occur as a metaphor more than once in the various word classes, and many are used in conventional manners to refer to abstract entities within abstract domains. Within those conventional patterns, specific news and conversation patterns for a number of lemmas stand out. The question that will be answered next is whether news from a few decades ago shows the same patterns of metaphor in word classes and specific lemmas as current news, or whether they exhibit different frequencies and uses of metaphorical expressions. By comparing the metaphor frequencies for eight word classes in current news with those in historical news, interesting patterns of metaphor change may come up. The comparison of historical and current news will be the main topic of chapter 6.



## 6. Metaphor in a small diachronic corpus of Dutch news: distribution and use

### 6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses the quantitative analysis of metaphor-related words in a diachronic corpus of Dutch news texts. It focuses on the distribution and use of metaphor-related words in two sets of Dutch news texts, one with texts from 1950 and one with texts from 2002, by comparing the metaphor data resulting from the metaphor identification stage. It forms the basis for a discussion of possible differences in the use of metaphorical language between news articles from 1950 and 2002, differences that we might be able to link to the overall idea that more formal public discourse, such as news discourse, moves towards a more informal and oral language style. The questions that are central in this chapter are whether there are differences between historical news texts and current news texts in the frequency of metaphor-related words, where these words occur exactly, and if they can be linked to a shift towards a more involved, oral style of language.

Several corpus-based studies have looked at ways in which different text types in English have changed linguistically over a long period of time. Using the encompassing multi-feature/multi-dimensional framework for the study of English text types (Biber, 1988), Biber and some of his colleagues also looked at diachronic variation between texts of the same type, studying linguistic changes over time within several discourse registers and genres (Biber & Finegan, 1989, 1992, 2001; Finegan & Biber, 1995). Biber and Finegan (1989) applied the framework developed by Biber (1988) to corpus data from four centuries, trying to outline the patterns of evolution of English style for three written genres, essays, fiction and letters. The three genres were scored on the occurrence of linguistic features representing three dimensions: Informational versus involved production (Dimensions A), Elaborated versus situation-dependent reference (Dimension B), and Abstract versus nonabstract style (Dimension C). These are the same as Dimensions 1, 3 and 5 in Biber (1988) and their respective literate and oral poles represent typical literate and oral discourse<sup>13</sup> (Biber and Finegan 1989: 495). The general tendencies of change in the genres of essays, fiction and letters were similar for the three dimensions; the data from the 17<sup>th</sup> century could be placed in between the literate and oral poles of the dimensions, then moved towards the literate poles in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, but gradually shifted to more oral features in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. The modern texts were seen as portraying more oral styles

---

<sup>13</sup> The term *literate* is taken over from Biber and Finegan's (1989) work. They use the term 'literate' to refer to language produced in situations that are typical for writing, and 'oral' to refer to language produced in situations that are typical of speaking (1989: 493). The term should not be confused with 'literary', a general term for describing fictional texts, or with 'literal' as in non-metaphorical language.

than their 17<sup>th</sup> century counterparts (Biber & Finegan, 1989: 499). The data thus reflected a steady progression from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards towards more oral styles of language.

Similar patterns of drift towards more oral styles were found for two speech-based genres, dialogue from plays and from fiction (Biber & Finegan, 1992). As with the written genres, the overall patterns of drift in the dialogues from plays and fiction showed a temporary interruption in the 18th century, where the genres seemed to development towards more literate styles, but on the whole there was a steady progression towards more oral styles of language (Biber & Finegan, 1992: 695). The speech-based genres differed from the written genres, however, in the fact that they were closer to the oral poles of the dimensions than the written genres in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and they remained closer to modern face-to-face conversations than the written genres on all three dimensions.

A follow-up study involved a wider range of discourse genres, including popular written genres such as news reportage and specialist expository genres such as medical prose, scientific prose and legal prose (Biber & Finegan, 2001). In this study, Biber & Finegan found that for most of the expository written registers (medical, science, and legal prose) the patterns were different from what they had found in their earlier studies. The specialist registers followed a gradual development towards more literate styles over the course of four centuries. The popular register of news reportage, however, developed towards a more 'literate' style in the earlier centuries, but then reversed this trend in the more recent periods, shifting towards more oral characteristics (Biber & Finegan, 2001: 76). This shift for news reportage, according to Biber & Finegan's findings, did not occur until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, thus relatively recently in comparison to the other popular and speech-based genres studied earlier.

In light of the findings reported by Biber and Finegan, several other studies focusing on particular news genres yielded similar results (cf. Steen, 2003; Westin & Geisler, 2002). Interestingly, these focused on diachronic changes towards an oral style of language over the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, thus on more recent changes. Westin and Geisler's (2002) study of British newspaper editorials focused on patterns for the five dimensions from the original variation study by Biber (1988). They found that for Dimension 1, where the poles reflected the literate and oral style, the patterns were irregular and difficult to interpret, which was probably due to the large variety between the three newspapers in their corpus. For the other two dimensions that reflect the literate versus oral style distinction (Dimensions 3 and 5), the patterns did show developments towards more informal language, or oral styles, in the period after the Second World War (Westin & Geisler, 2002). In a similar study on stylistic changes in the editorials of *The Times*, Steen (2003) found that the editorials from 1975 to 1995 showed a more involved style than the editorials from 1950 to 1970. In addition, editorials from the later period contained relatively fewer markers of narrative style and more markers of persuasive style (features of Dimensions 2 and 4 respectively from Biber 1988). Thus, the specific

newspaper genre of editorials seems to have moved towards a more oral style in relatively similar manners as news reportage in general has.

Hundt and Mair (1999) also observed a shift in the style of journalistic prose towards a more colloquial and involved language, and suggest the term 'colloquialization' for the patterns they found in their comparative study of journalistic prose from two periods, the 1960s and the 1990s, and two English standards, British English and American English (1999: 230). Some of the explanations of this colloquialization could be found in the increasing use of first and second person pronouns, which 'is probably linked to an increase in the use of direct quotations in newspapers' (Hundt & Mair, 1999: 226). The quotations, in turn, could be seen as "oral" features that 'narrow the gap between bureaucratic and personal discourse' (1999: 227). One important observation that has been made in relation to the trends of language styles for different written register, and in particular news, is that the trends often reflect a shift in preferences of language style rather than a change in a language system on the whole (cf. Hundt & Mair, 1999; Mair, 2006). Thus, it does not seem to be the case that language in general shifts to a more informal, oral, or colloquial language, but that certain registers seem to shift to a more informal language style.

Observations within other fields of research such as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and studies based on this tradition suggest that the trend of informalization reported in the above-mentioned studies continued for genres of public discourse during the 1980s and 1990s (Fairclough, 1994; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997; Pearce, 2005). Some of the studies conducted within the framework of CDA have observed changes in for example the general style and interaction patterns in different formal genres such as political interviews and university prospectuses, but they have also reported changes in lexical semantic features of, for instance, news discourse. Fairclough (1994: 261), for instance, gives an example of the change towards colloquial vocabulary in news headlines, which could point to informalization, or in the words of Fairclough, to conversationalization of public discourse. The observations within a CDA-framework, however, are predominantly based on intuitive perspectives and not on a systematic study of a clear set of discourse features. By contrast, the studies by Biber and his colleagues are much more systematic, taking into account a large number of lexico-grammatical features on which to base observations.

In the case of Biber's methods, however, specific lexical semantic characteristics that could influence the language styles of different registers such as metaphor are not taken into account. A great number of metaphor scholars have analysed the use, form and function of linguistic and conceptual metaphors in diverging genres such as political speeches and political texts, conversational discourse, fiction, news reports, academic discourse and so on. In many of these studies, metaphorical words are considered as having particular stylistic and rhetorical functions within the register they occur in. In rare cases, metaphor scholars have also looked at diachronic shifts in metaphorical language use on the basis of their corpus data. Charteris-Black (2004) includes a small case study on

diachronic metaphor shifts in post-war British political party manifestos (2004: 79), and finds that the notion of historical experience is a factor for the use and the role of particular metaphorical expressions and general conceptual metaphors. The domains of *defending* and *building*, for instance, occurred more often as source domains of metaphorical expressions in the manifestos directly following the Second World War, which, Charteris-Black suggests, is linked to the fact that these notions were more prominent in the experience of the people at that time than in more recent history.

The examples from Charteris-Black illustrate that shifts over time in the use of lexical semantic features may occur in certain genres. Very few studies, however, have focused on possible shifts over periods of time in the occurrences and functions of metaphors, particularly from a stylistic viewpoint. The above-mentioned studies by Biber and colleagues have shown that the style of a popular written register such as news has shifted from a formal, more literate language to an informal, more oral language. These findings were based on linguistic features that did not take into account the semantic meaning of lexical items in texts, but the changes in style might also include changes in metaphorical expressions, metaphor being one component of particular registers and styles of texts.

There are interesting differences between the ways that metaphor-related words occur in two distinct spoken and written registers, conversations and news articles, as chapter 5 has also shown. Some of the most noteworthy results related to the differences between conversations and current news in metaphor distribution for determiners, prepositions, verbs and nouns. For example, determiners were relatively more often seen as metaphor-related in conversation than in news. The opposite was true for prepositions; these were in general more often metaphorical in news. The variation in metaphorical verbs and nouns, additionally, was considerably higher in news than in conversations, shown by higher type-token ratios. The results from chapter 5 showed that there was a clear distinction between the patterns of metaphor in conversations, typical oral language, and those patterns in news, typical literate language. If the idea that the register of news reportage in general moved towards a more oral, informal, and involved production of language is also true for Dutch news, we would expect that this shift is also visible in the presence and patterns of lexical semantic features such as metaphorical expressions; we would expect to find that the historical news texts in our corpus are even more formal and further removed from conversations than the current news texts.

The above-mentioned studies of diachronic shifts of style in popular written registers such as news discourse and of the role of metaphorical expressions in the language of different registers have been taken as a basis for the present study. The following expectation and question were formulated and investigated:

1. First of all, based on the shift in news reportage towards more oral characteristics observed in corpus-based diachronic studies of English discourse, it was expected that the current news texts in the Dutch corpus

exhibit more features that are part of the poles associated with oral discourse in comparison to historical news texts in the corpus, and include fewer features representing the poles associated with literate discourse (cf. Biber & Finegan, 1989, 2001). In other words, we expect current news reports to contain more private verbs, pronouns, general emphatics, modals, determiners, and more time and place adverbials, and fewer nouns, prepositions, adjectives, relative clauses, nominalizations, passives and past participial clauses. It should be mentioned that the linguistic features in the Dutch corpus were not divided in exactly the same detailed lexicogrammatical categories as used by Biber: we categorised the words into eight main word classes (also see chapter 5). These correspond to some of the most important features that were characteristic for Biber's Dimensions 1, 3 and 5 (those distinguishing oral from literate discourse), namely verbs, adverbs, pronouns and determiners for the oral pole, and nouns, adjectives and prepositions for the literate pole. A comparison of the frequencies of the eight word classes in our data can therefore show whether our expectations about changes in news texts are met.

2. Secondly, based on the idea that metaphorical language in certain registers can be seen as a semantic characteristic of that register's style, we aim to examine whether the change towards a more oral style generally found by Biber also becomes visible in the occurrence and use of different metaphorical expressions in historical and current news texts. If the drift towards a more oral style of language in news is also visible in metaphorical expressions, then the historical news texts would be even further removed from the conversation data investigated in chapter 5 than the current news texts are. This would mean, for instance, that the metaphorical uses of typical oral word classes such as determiners occur more frequently in current news than in historical news, and that the variation in current news of metaphor-related lemmas within different word classes would resemble the metaphor data in conversations, more so than the metaphorical data in historical news does.

The next section presents a brief account of the materials and database used for the diachronic analyses in which historical news is compared to current news. Then the results of the quantitative analyses and brief discussions of the results are given. The chapter concludes with a more detailed discussion of the most important findings, and will propose issues for further more qualitative analyses of the data.

## 6.2 Method

### 6.2.1 Materials

The materials used for this study comprise a set of 50 news texts dating from 1950, with a total of roughly 33,000 words, and a set of 99 news texts dating from 2002, with a total of roughly 52,000 words. The articles from 1950 originate from four national Dutch newspapers (*NRC*, *De Telegraaf*, *Trouw* and *de Volkskrant*).<sup>14</sup> They were drawn from microfilm and paper editions, and were digitised by typing and scanning procedures. The set from 2002 is the same set used for the comparison of metaphor in two contemporary registers of Dutch, discussed in chapter 5. It consists of texts taken from five national newspapers (*Algemeen Dagblad*, *NRC*, *De Telegraaf*, *Trouw* and *de Volkskrant*) which were selected from the Lexis Nexis database. Although we have tried to balance the two news sets as much as possible, drawing similarly-sized texts from similar newspaper sections, it was not possible to make the sets identical. Because it was sometimes difficult to find enough suitable articles for particular newspaper sections for the 1950 newspapers, and because there were no microfilm or copied paper editions available for the *Algemeen Dagblad* from 1950, the historical news set is smaller in size.

Both sets have been tagged for part of speech types and lemmas.<sup>15</sup> The words in the 99 current news texts were analysed for metaphor during the initial metaphor identification stage, and the 50 historical news texts were analysed for metaphor during a later stage, by a different analyst. Details about these two separate stages were discussed in chapter 4. The words that were analysed as metaphor-related received additional tags in the XML-texts which indicated the type and status of the relation to metaphor. Subsequent to finalising the metaphor identification stage, the XML-files including the annotation for metaphor-related words were converted to an SPSS database and combined into a separate corpus of Dutch news texts. More specific details on the corpus materials are given in Appendix A.

### 6.2.2 Database

As described in section 5.2 as well, final changes were made to some of the variables in the SPSS database that enabled comparisons of different frequency figures and specific statistical tests. The changes from the initial twelve word categories distinguished by the tagging programme to the eight main word classes that were made for conversation and current news were also carried out for

---

<sup>14</sup> Archive material for the *Algemeen Dagblad* was unavailable on microfilm at the time of compilation of the corpus. The old paper editions that existed in different libraries were not available for copying, etc., which forced us to leave *Algemeen Dagblad* texts out of the historic news texts set.

<sup>15</sup> The news texts have been tagged by the Tadpole tagger, a memory-based morphosyntactic tagger and parser (Van den Bosch et al., 2007).

historical news. This included merging several categories such as interjections and numerals into the remainder category, moving the pronouns from the category of determiners to the remainder category, and adding the articles to the word class of determiners. The main word class variable with which the statistical analyses were carried out included the values of *adjective*, *adverb*, *determiner*, *noun*, *preposition*, *verb*, *conjunction* and the *remainder category*.

The original XML-files contained the punctuation marks which were automatically converted to the SPSS database. However, these marks should not be counted in the overall word count. In the final dataset and the analyses below, all cases of punctuation were thus deselected in SPSS. The total number of words that remain, and with which the analyses below have been carried out, was 84,179: 32,592 words of historical news and 51,587 words of current news.

The next sections present the results of the quantitative analysis of the data. First, a comparison was made between the frequencies of the word classes in the two time periods of news, the 1950 set and the 2002 set. This comparison tested whether the two sets have remained the same or show differences in frequencies on the level of the eight main word classes, similar to the shifts found by Biber and Finegan (2001). Then the notion of metaphor was added to the analysis as the lexical-semantic element of interest. A loglinear analysis was used to test the interaction between the three variables of news period, word class and metaphor. A loglinear analysis calculates the options that the distributions are due to chance alone, or that the figures of each variable are dependent on the levels of another variable. A more detailed description of the loglinear analysis is given in Field (2005). Subsequent chi-square tests were used to break down interaction effects. For some cases, standardized residuals were then compared to find out which elements contributed most significantly to the interaction effects that were found.

### **6.3 Results**

A number of research questions were formed on the basis of previous corpus-based studies on the changes in the language style of different registers, of which news language was one focus point. Firstly, it was expected that there are differences in the frequencies for the eight main word classes, similar to those found in Biber and Finegan's (2001) study. We expected that current news texts contained more determiners and verbs, and fewer nouns, adjectives and prepositions than historical news texts, as a reflection of a shift towards a more oral style of language. Secondly, we wanted to answer the question whether metaphor-related words behaved differently in the two news sets, based on the idea that the stylistic changes in news towards a more oral style would also be visible in the occurrence of a lexical-semantic phenomenon such as metaphor, which is often linked to the style of a text or register.

### 6.3.1 Word classes in two periods of news discourse

Based on the general findings for English mentioned in the previous sections, we expect differences between the frequencies for a number of word classes between the historical and current Dutch news texts. The frequencies and percentages of the words per word class in both news sets are given in table 6.1. A chi-square analysis shows that there is a significant interaction between the time periods for news and word class ( $\chi^2(7) = 51.08, p < .001$ ; Cramer's  $V = .03$ ).

Table 6.1 Word class frequencies in historical news and current news

	Historical news		Current news	
	n	% of total n	n	% of total n
Adjective	2687	8.2	4119	8.0
Adverb	1936	5.9	3084	6.0
Determiner	5406	16.6	8309	16.1
Noun	8650	26.5	14,724	28.5
Preposition	4897	15.0	7692	14.9
Verb	5408	16.6	8223	15.9
Conjunction	1621	5.0	2290	4.4
Remainder	1987	6.1	3146	6.1
Total	32,592	100	51,587	100.0

The differences in the percentages per word class between the two news periods are rather small. When the standardized residuals are compared to find which cells contribute significantly to the interaction between the two variables, the only significant difference occurs for the word class of nouns; there are relatively fewer nouns in historical news (8650, 26.5%; std res. = -4.2) than in current news (14724, 28.5%; std res. = 3.3). The difference between conjunctions is also significant if we set the alpha level at .05; there are relatively more conjunctions in historical news (1621, 5.0%; std res. = 2.7) than in current news (2290, 4.4%; std res. = -2.2). The word classes of nouns and conjunctions thus contribute to the significant chi-square result. The other word classes do not show significant deviations from what might be expected by chance. There are two more word classes that differ to some extent, namely determiners and verbs, but these differences were not significant. Determiners are relatively more frequent in historical news (5406, 16.6%; std res. = 1.3) in comparison to current news (8309, 16.1%; std res. = -1.0). The same holds for verbs, with 5408 (16.6%; std res. = 1.8) in historical news and 8223 (15.9%; std res. = -1.4) in current news.

The patterns for word class frequencies in Dutch historical and current news are different from what was found by Biber and colleagues. They concluded that news discourse had shifted towards a more oral style in the last century on the basis of the occurrence of a number of linguistic features. More recent news texts contained significantly more linguistic features that were characteristic of involved (oral, informal) language use, such as verbs, determiners and adverbs, and considerably fewer linguistic features that were characteristic of informational

(literate, formal) language use, such as nouns, adjectives and prepositions. As shown above, Dutch current news texts contain fewer determiners and fewer verbs (although this is not significant), and significantly more nouns than Dutch historical news texts. With respect to adjectives, adverbs and prepositions, the differences in frequencies for the two news sets are minimal, and not significant. It is thus possible to conclude that, on the basis of the eight main word classes, the current Dutch news texts seem not to have moved towards a more oral style.

Although the analysis above is by far not as refined as Biber's multi-feature approach, the results could be seen as an indication that, at least on the level of main word classes, current news articles do not display more oral features than the news texts written more than 50 years ago. In fact, the contrary seems to be true: current news texts contain more informational features such as nouns and fewer involved features such as determiners and verbs, and thus seem to have become more informational and formal. This is an interesting deviation from the pattern revealed in previous research on diachronic change within registers and genres for English discourse.

### *6.3.2 Time period, word class and metaphor*

Against the background of stylistic differences for English discourse between historical news texts and current news texts, we now want to include in the analysis the lexical-semantic element of metaphor, which is related to stylistic issues of language. In more detail, we want to know whether the distribution of metaphor-related words is different between the two time periods for news, on the level of the word classes. Table 6.2 contains the frequencies and percentages for the non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words in each of the word classes in the two news periods. A loglinear analysis showed a significant three-way interaction between news period, word class and metaphor ( $\chi^2(7) = 62.39, p < 0.001$ ). Separate chi-square analyses on the level of news period show that there is a significant association between metaphor and word class for the two time periods, historical news ( $\chi^2(7) = 10,273.60, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .56$ ) and current news ( $\chi^2(7) = 15,158.70, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .54$ ).

In both sets of news, the metaphor-related words are not divided equally over the eight main word classes. In historical news, half of the metaphor-related words in the set are prepositions (50.4%). Verbs and nouns also account for a relatively large portion of the metaphor-related words, with 20.1% and 15.9% of the metaphor words respectively. Adjectives and determiners are considerably less frequent in this respect (7.7% and 5.2% respectively), and the word classes of adverbs, conjunctions and the remainder category hardly even occur in the group of metaphor-related words in historical news.

Table 6.2 Metaphor relation frequencies and percentages (in brackets) per word class per period

	Historical news		Current news	
	non-metaphor	metaphor	non-metaphor	metaphor
Adjective	2139 (8.4%)	548 (7.7%)	3214 (8.0%)	905 (7.9%)
Adverb	1904 (7.5%)	32 (0.4%)	3008 (7.5%)	76 (0.7%)
Determiner	5035 (19.8%)	371 (5.2%)	7768 (19.3%)	541 (4.8%)
Noun	7512 (29.5%)	1138 (15.9%)	12,923 (32.1%)	1801 (15.8%)
Preposition	1287 (5.1%)	3610 (50.4%)	2251 (5.6%)	5441 (47.8%)
Verb	3968 (15.6%)	1440 (20.1%)	5633 (14.0%)	2590 (22.7%)
Conjunction	1618 (6.4%)	3 (0.0%)	2281 (5.7%)	9 (0.1%)
Remainder	1972 (7.8%)	15 (0.2%)	3122 (6.4%)	24 (0.2%)
Total	25,435 (100%)	7157 (100%)	40,200 (100%)	11,387 (100%)

Similar patterns are found in the current news set. Here too, nearly half of the metaphor-related words occur in the form of prepositions (47.8%). Two other large groups of metaphor-related words are verbs (22.7%) and nouns (15.8%). Adjectives and determiners occur considerably less frequent in the group of metaphorical words (7.9% and 4.8% respectively), and adverbs, conjunctions and the remainder category are extremely rare in this group.

When comparing the two time periods of news regarding the distribution of metaphor-related words over the word classes, we notice that the two periods have nearly the same distribution. However, the percentages in table 6.2 show that there are great differences in the metaphor-related distribution of the word classes for each of the news periods. Thus, whereas the metaphor-related words are unequally distributed over the word classes within each time period, both periods of news show the same kind of unequal distribution.

However, this is not to say that there are no differences between the two news periods. Table 6.3 shows the same absolute frequencies as table 6.2, but this time includes the percentages per row as an indication of how the non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words are proportioned within each word class in each news period. Separate chi-square analyses on the level of word class show that there is a significant association between metaphor and period for prepositions ( $\chi^2(1) = 13.17, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .03$ ) and for verbs ( $\chi^2(1) = 37.15, p < .001$ , Cramer's  $V = .05$ ). The chi-square analyses did not show a significant interaction between metaphor and time period of news for the word classes of adjectives ( $\chi^2(1) = 2.4, p = .12$ , Cramer's  $V = .02$ ), adverbs ( $\chi^2(1) = 3.72, p = .05$ , Cramer's  $V = .03$ ), determiners ( $\chi^2(1) = .65, p = .42$ , Cramer's  $V = .01$ ), nouns ( $\chi^2(1) = 4.23, p = .04$ , Cramer's  $V = .01$ ), conjunctions ( $\chi^2(1) = 1.34, p = .25$ , Cramer's  $V = .02$ ) and the remainder-category ( $\chi^2(1) = 0.01, p = .97$ , Cramer's  $V = .00$ ).

The distribution of non-metaphor-related words and metaphor-related words for the prepositions is different for historical news in comparison to current news. In historical news, 73.7% of the total number of prepositions were coded as metaphor-related, while in current news, 70.7% of the total number of prepositions were coded as metaphor-related. So although prepositions overall occur equally

frequent in the two sets (see section 6.3.1), their metaphorical use is more frequent in historical news.

*Table 6.3 Word class frequencies and percentages (in brackets) per metaphor relation per period*

	non-metaphors	metaphors	all
<b>Historical news</b>			
Adjective	2139 (79.6%)	548 (20.4%)	2687 (100%)
Adverb	1904 (98.3%)	32 (1.7%)	1936 (100%)
Determiner	5035 (93.1%)	371 (6.9%)	5406 (100%)
Noun	7512 (86.8%)	1138 (13.2%)	8650 (100%)
Preposition	1287 (26.3%)	3610 (73.7%)	4897 (100%)
Verb	3968 (73.4%)	1440 (26.6%)	5408 (100%)
Conjunction	1618 (99.8%)	3 (0.2%)	1621 (100%)
Remainder	1975 (99.2%)	15 (0.8%)	1987 (100%)
Total	25,435 (78.0%)	7157 (22.0%)	32,592 (100%)
<b>Current news</b>			
Adjective	3214 (78.0%)	905 (22.0%)	4119 (100%)
Adverb	3008 (97.5%)	76 (2.5%)	3084 (100%)
Determiner	7768 (93.5%)	541 (6.5%)	8309 (100%)
Noun	12,923 (87.8%)	1801 (12.2%)	14,724 (100%)
Preposition	2251 (29.3%)	5441 (70.7%)	7694 (100%)
Verb	5633 (68.5%)	2590 (31.5%)	8223 (100%)
Conjunction	2281 (99.6%)	9 (0.4%)	2290 (100%)
Remainder	3122 (99.2%)	24 (0.8%)	3146 (100%)
Total	40,200 (77.9%)	11,387 (22.1%)	51,587 (100%)

Of all the verbs in historical news, 26.6% (1440) were coded as metaphor-related, against 31.5% (2590) metaphor-related verbs in current news. So although verbs overall occur more frequently in historical news (see section 6.3.1), they are used metaphorically more often in current news. A more detailed account of what seems to happen with metaphorical verbs is given in section 6.4.

Although the overall frequencies of nouns and conjunctions changed considerably, and those of determiners also changed to some extent, these word classes display roughly the same patterns of distribution of metaphor-related words in historical and current news. With regard to determiners, 371 (6.9%) of the total number in historical news are metaphor-related, and 541 (6.5%) of the total number in current news are metaphor-related. In the case of nouns, 1138 (13.2%) of the total number in historical news are metaphor-related, and 1801 (12.2%) of the total number in current news is metaphor related. The small differences for nouns and determiners are not significant. Since conjunctions are hardly ever metaphor-related (only three in historical news, and nine in current news), the values of non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words do not differ for the two sets of news. Finally, the word classes of adjectives and adverbs and the remainder

category did not show significant differences in frequencies for the two news periods, and additionally did not show significant differences in the metaphor-related word between the two news periods.

To sum up, there is a three-way interaction between period, word class and metaphor. The results from the chi-square analyses show interesting differences between the two periods, historical news texts and current news texts, in particular with regard to the general frequencies for nouns (current news contain relatively more than historical news), and the differences in the distribution of metaphor-related cases for prepositions and verbs (prepositions are more often metaphorical in historical news and verbs are more often metaphorical in current news). Explanations of these findings will be discussed in detail in the next section, by looking at the patterns of metaphor in the word classes of nouns, prepositions and verbs.

#### **6.4 Detailed analysis of results**

The predominant patterns of metaphor-related words in historical and current news will be discussed in more detail below, to find out which factors and which particular lexical units, if any, seem to influence the results most noticeably. The results from the previous section illustrate that there are only a few significant deviations in the patterns of metaphor-related words between historical and current news. On average, the two news periods contain the same number of metaphor-related words; 22.0% of all the words in historical news have been coded as metaphor-related, and 22.1% of all the words in current news have been coded as metaphor-related. Thus, the overall frequencies of metaphor-related words are practically the same for the two news periods. Of all the metaphors coded in the historical news part, 50.4% occurs in the prepositions. That is to say, over half of the metaphors in historical news are prepositions. Verbs and nouns are also frequent within the metaphor-related cases, taking up 20.1% and 15.9% respectively. The percentages of metaphor-related cases in the current news texts are comparable. Of all the metaphors coded in the current news part, 47.8% occurs in the prepositions, so in this set nearly half of the metaphors are prepositions. Similarly, verbs and nouns are frequent, taking up 22.7% and 15.8% of the metaphors respectively.

These results show that there did not occur any changes in the metaphor frequencies overall. There were, however, a few significant differences between the metaphor distributions for the word classes of prepositions and verbs between historical and current news. Within the word class of prepositions, there were more metaphor-related cases in historical news in comparison to current news. The opposite was the case within the word class of verbs; there were more metaphor-related cases in this word class in current news in comparison to historical news.

The following summaries are presented on the basis of the results from the quantitative comparison of metaphor-related words per word class in historical and current news.

- There were significantly more conjunctions in the historical news texts, but the patterns for non-metaphorical and metaphorical conjunctions did not show any discrepancies between the two news periods. This is mainly due to the fact that conjunctions are hardly ever used metaphorically, regardless of the language period or register in which they occur. Hence, conjunctions do not show a clearly different relation to metaphor in news texts from different periods.
- There were slightly more determiners in historical news, but the differences between the two news periods were not significant. Determiners also behaved more or less identically in the two sets with respect to metaphor-related cases. Although previous studies into changes in news language towards oral styles would suggest different patterns for determiners, this is not the case for our Dutch news materials.
- There were significantly more nouns in the current news texts, but they seemed equally metaphorically used in the two news periods. The proportion of metaphor-related cases in the word class of nouns was nearly equal in historical and current news (15.9% and 15.8% of the nouns respectively). The fact that there were more nouns overall in the current news texts, though, also led to an increase in the absolute numbers of metaphor-related nouns in current news.
- Although prepositions exhibited similar relative frequencies overall for the historical and current news texts, the proportions of metaphorical and non-metaphorical cases were significantly different between the two news periods. The portion of metaphorical cases within the word class of prepositions was significantly larger in historical news in comparison with current news. Of the total number of prepositions in the current texts, 70.7% were coded as metaphorical, whereas of the total number of prepositions in the historical texts, 73.7% were coded as metaphorical. So even though the relative number of prepositions is the same in each set of texts, the distribution of non-metaphorical and metaphorical prepositions is different between the historical and current news texts.
- Verbs were slightly more frequent in historical news, but the differences between the two periods were not significant. However, there were more metaphor-related verbs in the current news texts; 31.5% of the verbs in the current texts were metaphorical, whereas 26.6% of the verbs in the historical texts were metaphorical. Thus, there is a slight decrease in verbs in the

current news texts, but there is a relative increase in the metaphor-related verbs in that same period.

In other words, the patterns for nouns, prepositions and verbs in historical news deviate to some extent from the patterns for those word classes in current news. A detailed account of the patterns in the non-metaphor and metaphor-related lemmas for these word classes can shed more light on the variation between the registers and may find particular reasons for variation. Additionally, the patterns for historical and current news will be compared to the findings for conversations reported in chapter 5. The comparison of conversations and current news also yielded interesting patterns for nouns, prepositions and verbs, some of which could perhaps be brought into connection with patterns found in the current diachronic analysis. The remainder of this section is divided into two subsections; first of all, the frequencies for metaphor-related words within the main word classes in the three corpus parts, historical news, current news and conversations, will be compared; secondly, the three word classes of nouns, prepositions and verbs will be discussed in more detail, having come out of the diachronic quantitative analysis as the most interesting cases.

#### *6.4.1 Patterns for historical news, current news, and conversation compared*

We saw in chapter 5 that a quantitative analysis of metaphor-related words in two contemporary Dutch registers, conversation and news, yielded interesting patterns of metaphorical language use in different words classes, illustrating the main differences in those patterns between the two registers. The current news texts and contemporary conversations are considerably different on the level of word class use in general and metaphorical language use within different word classes in particular. In addition, the lexico-grammatical corpus-based studies discussed in section 6.1 demonstrated that news language has moved towards a more oral style of language use. We therefore posed the question whether the same shift towards a more oral style would be visible in the occurrence of metaphorical language in news. If that were the case, the historical news texts in our corpus are even further removed from the contemporary conversations than the current news texts. In order to discover if this is indeed true, the general frequency tables can be compared. In addition, specific patterns in certain lexical units for those word classes that showed significant changes can be brought together.

Tables 5.1 and 6.1 are combined into table 6.4, containing the percentages per word class for each of the corpus parts. Those word classes that changed significantly between the two news periods by becoming more frequent in current news, nouns and conjunction, are considerably less frequent in conversations. This ties in with the observations made in section 6.3 that the Dutch news data show only a few diachronic shifts, and move in the opposite direction to what Biber and colleagues found for English news texts.

*Table 6.4 Frequencies for the word classes in the three corpus sets*

	Historical news	Current news	Conversation	Shift tendencies for news periods
Adjective	8.2%	8.0%	5.7%	more conversational
Adverb	5.9%	6.0%	13.5%	similar
Determiner	16.6%	16.1%	12.2%	more conversational
Noun	26.5%	28.5%	15.3%	less conversational
Preposition	15.0%	14.9%	6.5%	similar
Verb	16.6%	15.9%	16.6%	similar
Conjunction	5.0%	4.4%	5.9%	less conversational
Remainder	6.1%	6.1%	24.3%	similar
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Those word classes where a slight gradual decline is visible, adjectives and determiners, did not show significant differences in the statistical tests carried out. The decline has been marked as ‘slight’ to show the contrast to word classes staying equally frequent, but they only indicate a tendency that may be looked at further but that cannot be seen as a definite change towards conversation for this material.

The comparison of percentages of metaphor-related cases in the different word classes shows that two word classes demonstrate a gradual increase or decrease from historical news to conversation, which can be seen in table 6.5. The proportion of nouns that are metaphor-related is largest in historical news (13.2%), has become slightly smaller in current news (12.2%) and is considerably lower in conversation (7.2%). Thus, with regard to the metaphorical use of nouns, it seems that news discourse has moved towards conversations if we only take into account the proportions per word class. A more detailed account of lexical units within the sets of news and conversation, presented in section 6.4.2, may make this tendency

*Table 6.5 Direction of shifts for metaphor-related word classes in the three sets*

	Historical news		Current news		Conversation		Shift <sup>16</sup>
	non-met	met	non-met	met	non-met	met	
Adjective	79.6%	20.4 %	78.0%	22.0%	81.7%	18.3%	opposite
Adverb	98.3%	1.7%	97.5%	2.5%	99.2%	0.8%	opposite
Determiner	93.1%	6.9%	93.5%	6.5%	71.2%	28.8%	opposite
Noun	86.8%	13.2%	87.8%	12.2%	92.8%	7.2%	decrease
Preposition	26.3%	73.7%	29.3%	70.7%	46.6%	53.4%	decrease
Verb	73.4%	26.6%	68.5%	31.5%	84.5%	15.5%	opposite
Conjunction	99.8%	0.2%	99.6%	0.4%	99.7%	0.3%	similar
Remainder	99.2%	0.8%	99.2%	0.8%	99.9%	0.1%	similar
Total	78.0%	22.0%	77.9%	22.1%	88.1%	11.9%	similar

<sup>16</sup> The shift indicates whether the register of news has shifted towards the register of conversation. The implicit expectation is that historical news differs most from conversations (with respect to metaphor frequencies) and that current news is in between the other two.

more intelligible. The proportion of prepositions that are metaphor-related is also largest in historical news (73.7%). The prepositions in current news are less frequently seen as metaphor-related (70.7%), and the portion of metaphor-related preposition in conversation is the smallest of the three (54.4%). Thus, with regard to the metaphorical use of preposition, it also seems that news discourse has moved towards conversations if we only take into account the proportions per word class. Section 6.4.3 will go into detail by looking at patterns of specific prepositions in the two news periods and comparing those with what was found for conversations.

#### 6.4.2 Nouns

The most important finding for nouns was that their proportion increases significantly in number in the current news texts in comparison to the historical news texts. As we mentioned above, this is different to earlier findings for English news discourse. The degree of lexical variation within the word classes differs for the two periods as well. Type-token ratios for nouns in each news set show that, given the rise in frequency for nouns in current news, the variation of nouns is lower in the current news texts. In historical news, there are 3326 noun types and 8650 tokens, resulting in a type-token ratio of 0.38. In current news, there are 4924 types and 14,724 tokens, resulting in a type-token ratio of 0.33.

Table 6.6 shows the fifteen most frequent noun lemmas in historical and current news, including percentages of the nouns overall. One important observation from this table is the fact that for current news, the most frequent noun (*jaar* 'year') is considerably more frequent than the rest of the nouns in current news and more frequent than the nouns in historical news. Although *jaar* is also the most frequent noun in historical news, it occurs considerably less frequently in that news period. Additionally, the gap between the most frequent noun and the second, third and so on most frequent nouns is considerably smaller for historical news than for current news. These facts partly reflect the larger variety of nouns in historical news expressed by the type-token ratios.

The nouns that occur in the frequency lists give a general idea of the differences in topic of the texts between the two news sets. For instance, the frequent occurrence of nouns that are related to the domain of economy and economic news in the current news set, such as *bedrijf* 'company', *procent* 'percent', *euro* 'euro' and *miljoen* 'million', demonstrates the frequent occurrence of news topics related to economic news and business. Comparing this to the lack of nouns from the same domain in historical news, we could say that economic topics have become more frequent over the years, or at least have occurred in full reports over the years.

In relation to the variation found for the nouns in the conversations, we could say that that some form of informalization can be noticed. There are 7727 noun tokens in the conversation set, and 1699 types, resulting in a type-token ratio of 0.22.

Table 6.6 Most frequent nouns in historical news and current news

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n	% of noun (n=8650)	lemma	n	% of noun (n=14,724)
<i>jaar</i>	62	0.7	<i>jaar</i>	150	1.0
<i>land</i>	45	0.5	<i>partij</i>	62	0.4
<i>werk</i>	40	0.5	<i>mens</i>	59	0.4
<i>plaats</i>	38	0.4	<i>vrouw</i>	58	0.4
<i>dag</i>	35	0.4	<i>bedrijf</i>	54	0.4
<i>regering</i>	32	0.4	<i>land</i>	54	0.4
<i>zaak</i>	28	0.3	<i>week</i>	51	0.3
<i>arbeider</i>	27	0.3	<i>procent</i>	50	0.3
<i>tijd</i>	26	0.3	<i>euro</i>	49	0.3
<i>man</i>	25	0.3	<i>tijd</i>	48	0.3
<i>aantal</i>	22	0.3	<i>dag</i>	47	0.3
<i>uur</i>	22	0.3	<i>miljoen</i>	47	0.3
<i>geval</i>	20	0.2	<i>maand</i>	41	0.3
<i>commissie</i>	19	0.2	<i>minister</i>	39	0.3
<i>heer</i>	18	0.2	<i>plaats</i>	38	0.3

This is considerably lower than any of the two ratios for the news periods, but at the same time closest to the ratio found for current news. This is consistent with the proposition that news discourse seems to have moved towards conversation over time.

The proportions of metaphorical nouns and non-metaphorical nouns are practically the same for historical news and current news, irrespective of the differences in the overall frequencies. In historical news, 13.2% of all the nouns were coded as metaphor-related, while in current news, 12.2% of all the nouns were coded as metaphor-related. Since we have seen that the variation in noun lemmas overall is slightly lower for current news, it is interesting to see what the difference in variation is if we only take into account the metaphor related nouns. In historical news, there are 569 noun lemmas that have been coded as metaphor-related at least once. The total number of metaphor-related nouns in this news period is 1138, which yields a type-token ratio of 0.5 exactly. In current news, there are 852 noun lemmas that have been coded as metaphor-related at least once. The total number of metaphor-related nouns in this news period is 1801, which yields a type-token ratio of 0.47. The ratio for current news is thus slightly lower than that for historical news, similar to what was found for the nouns overall.

In general, it would be valuable to get an idea of frequencies of the different kinds of source and target domains that occur in the metaphor-related nouns, in order to compare the metaphorical references in the two news periods. However, it has proven difficult to define in more precise numbers the kind of source domains that can be deduced from the linguistic metaphor realisations for nouns and to which target domain items they refer, due to the large set of

metaphor-related noun data. The isolated noun lemmas in the database can only give a general idea of the kind of source domains that seem to be frequent in the use of metaphor-related nouns. For instance, if only those nouns that occur as metaphor-related at least once per 10,000 words are taken into account, it is possible to get a general idea of the frequent source domains used to describe abstract notion in both news periods, and to make a general comparison between the two periods.

For the metaphor-related nouns that occur at least once per 10,000 words in historical news (so those coded as a metaphor at least three times), we see that nouns most often come from the source domains of bounded space, motion and direction within a bounded space, and from the source domain of concrete objects, their shapes and their uses. For instance, nouns such as *plaats* 'place', *doel* 'target', *punt* 'point', *weg* 'road', *diepte* 'depth', *gebied* 'area' and *hoogte* 'height' are only a few examples of the frequent metaphor-related nouns that belong to the source domain of a bounded space and the direction within or movement in a bounded space. With respect to the source domain of concrete objects, frequent metaphor-related nouns in historical news coming from this source domain are *boog* 'arch', *vorm* 'shape', *motief* 'motive', *zijde* 'side', *deel* 'part', *steun* 'support' and *kant* 'side'. The human body, human aspects, and human emotions are also popular source domains from which metaphor-related nouns are taken, such as *lid* 'limb', *hoofd* 'head', *hand* 'hand', *karakter* 'character' and *schuld* 'guilt'.

If we look at the source domains from which the metaphor-related nouns originate that occur at least once in 10,000 words in current news (so coded as a metaphor at least five times), they are very similar to the ones in historical news. For instance, the domains of bounded space, concrete objects, and the human body and emotions are popular as sources to describe abstract entities in the form of nouns. So nouns such as *hand* 'hand', *plaats* 'place', *deel* 'part', *niveau* 'level', *kant* 'side', *stem* 'voice', *weg* 'road', *richting* 'direction', *positie* 'position' and *hart* 'heart' are only a few examples of expressions that come from the same most frequent source domains. Overall, the source domains that underlie the metaphorical nouns are thus very similar for historical news and current news. We have, however, only looked at the source domains to which the most frequent metaphorical nouns belong, but have not yet looked at the target domains that they describe, or the cross-domain mappings that underlie the different examples. It could be the case that some of the source domain expressions are used differently in the two news periods to describe a variation of target domain expressions, so that there is a wide variety of cross-domain mappings. The amount of data for metaphor-related nouns, however, is too extensive to manually define the vast number of different cross-domain mappings. Therefore, only tendencies are discussed in this chapter.

Table 6.7 lists the fifteen most frequent metaphor-related noun lemmas in the two news periods. There is some overlap between the two lists with regard to the noun lemmas, but in most cases where one lemma occurs in both lists, the relative portions of the total number of metaphor-related nouns in the respective

news periods still differ extensively. For instance, *plan* ‘*plan*’ frequently occurs as a metaphor-related noun in historical news as well as in current news, twelve and fifteen times respectively. However, *plan* in historical news makes up 1.05% of all the metaphor-related nouns in that news period (1138 in total), but *plan* in current news only makes up 0.83% of all the metaphor-related nouns in that news period (1801 in total). Thus, although there is some overlap in the lemmas that are frequently seen as metaphor-related, there are also considerable differences between their relative frequencies.

Table 6.7 Frequencies and percentages (of all metaphorical nouns) for metaphorical nouns

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n met	% of met nouns	lemma	n met	% of met nouns
<i>plaats</i>	23	2.0	<i>partij</i>	62	3.4
<i>einde</i>	15	1.3	<i>keer</i>	34	1.9
<i>rol</i>	14	1.2	<i>slachtoffer</i>	27	1.5
<i>lid</i>	13	1.1	<i>hand</i>	23	1.3
<i>gevolg</i>	12	1.1	<i>aanslag</i>	18	1.0
<i>plan</i>	12	1.1	<i>gevolg</i>	18	1.0
<i>spanning</i>	11	1.0	<i>plaats</i>	18	1.0
<i>weg</i>	11	1.0	<i>punt</i>	18	1.0
<i>doel</i>	10	0.9	<i>deel</i>	17	0.9
<i>ontwikkeling</i>	10	0.9	<i>eind</i>	16	0.9

In the historical news texts, the most frequent metaphorically coded noun is *plaats* ‘*place*’, which has been coded as metaphor-related 23 times. In the instances where *plaats* is seen as metaphor-related, the word in context is not used to refer to its basic meaning of a bounded region, but to some other more abstract meaning and domain. An example of *plaats* as a metaphor-related word in historical news is given in example (1).

- (1) Mr. J.C. van Panthaleon baron van Eck trad na een ruim 40-jarige dienstperiode onder dankzegging van bestuur en vergadering als commissaris af. In zijn *plaats* werd benoemd mr. M.P.L. Steenberghe.

‘Mr J.C. van Panthaleon baron van Eck resigned as commissioner with thanks from the board and assembly after a 40-year service period. In his *place* Mr M.P.L. Steenberghen was appointed.’

(NRC-historical, economics)

In this example, *plaats* does not refer to its basic meaning of a bounded space or area, but to an official post or office in an organisation or company, related to a specific job, in which someone is replaced by someone else. It is then seen as

metaphorically used, because the contextual meaning of an abstract job post is seen in terms of a more concrete bounded space.

The noun *plaats* occurs less frequently as a metaphor-related noun in current news. This is partly due to the fact that the noun occurs relatively less frequently in current news in general. However, there seems to be another factor involved that may explain the differences in metaphor-related frequencies for the two news periods. Of all the metaphor-related nouns that occur in both lists (such as *einde* ‘end’, *lid* ‘member’, *punt* ‘point’) *plaats* has a clearly deviating distribution of non-metaphor and metaphor-related cases for the two news periods. In historical news, 23 cases of *plaats* were coded as metaphorical and 15 cases were coded as non-metaphorical. In current news, there were 18 cases that were coded as metaphorical and 20 cases that were coded as non-metaphorical. Thus, the portion of metaphorical cases of *plaats* is considerably larger in historical news, while current news has more non-metaphorical cases than metaphorical ones.

A search of *plaats* as a metaphor-related noun in each of the two news periods generates a possible reason for these differences. There seems to be less variation in the target domains of the metaphorical instances of *plaats* in current news than in historical news. That is to say, the instances of *plaats* as metaphor-related in current news often refer to expressions from the same target domain, whereas the instances of *plaats* as metaphor-related in historical news are used to refer to concepts and references from a number of different target domains. The majority of the metaphor-related uses of *plaats* in current news are used in similar contexts as the ones in the following examples:

- (2) Schalken is de tweede Nederlandse tennisser die zich een *plaats* heeft verworven in de halve finales van de US Open.

‘Schalken is the second Dutch tennis player who has obtained a place in the semifinals of the US Open.’

(*Trouw, sports*)

- (3) Turkije vierde zaterdag de zege op gastland Zuid-Korea (3-2) in de strijd om de derde *plaats* van het wereldkampioenschap voetbal als een hoofdprijs.

‘Turkey celebrated the victory over host country South Korea (3-2) as a first prize last Saturday in the match for the third *place* of the world championship football.’

(*NRC, sports*)

Examples (2) and (3) both use *plaats* in the context of an order of ranking in sports-related events, and there are nine other examples of *plaats* which are placed in the same kind of context of a sporting event. A large part of the remaining metaphorical uses of *plaats* occur in combination with two very frequent

prepositions, in the fixed expression *in plaats van* ‘instead of’, which is mostly used to indicate that an abstract notion is replaced by a different abstract notion.

In historical news, the use of *plaats* as a metaphor-related word in the fixed expression *in plaats van* is also frequent. However, the other metaphorical uses of *plaats* show a more varied pattern of describing different target domains. Example (1) already showed that the noun can be used to describe a professional position that a person can hold or take over. The concordance results show that *plaats* has also been used to describe an abstract position of importance that either people or products can take up. This use is different to examples (2) and (3), as example (4) shows.

- (4) Het is voor ons muzikleven absoluut noodzakelijk, dan men zich bewust wordt, dat Diepenbrock een unieke *plaats* inneemt naast Bruckner, Franck, Faur en Debussy.

‘It is absolutely necessary for our musical life, that we become aware of the fact that Diepenbrock holds a unique *position* besides Bruckner, Franck, Faur and Debussy.’

(de Volkskrant-historical, arts)

Although *plaats* here could also be seen as representing a position in a rank order such as in (2) or (3), its meaning seems to refer more to a position within a virtual world consisting of very specific people, events and hierarchies. In the case above, the virtual world is a world of composers and musicians, and specific people occupy specific places in that world, according to their importance. Another example from the historical news texts uses *plaats* in a similar manner, where the virtual world that is described is that of economic trade, with certain countries and their economies occupying certain places within that virtual world. In addition to this contextual meaning of *plaats*, the historical news texts also contain instances where the noun refers to a point in a discussion, argumentation, or text with a specific argumentation, as in example (5):

- (5) Het is hier niet de *plaats* voor een grondige analyse. Ik moet dus volstaan met de vermelding van enkele wetenswaardigheden.

‘This is not the *place* for a thorough analysis. I will thus have to suffice by mentioning a few interesting points.’

(de Volkskrant-historical, arts)

Here, the noun *plaats* refers to the actual news texts in which an argument is given, but which lacks space to discuss certain issues with relation to the topic of the text, and at the same time is unsuitable as a medium to convey those issues about the topic.

There were a number of uses of *plaats* in the historical texts that all referred to slightly different target domains, more so than in the current news texts. In general, the historical news texts showed more variation of target domains for

one expression from the source domain of space than the current news texts did. In those texts, most of the metaphor-related cases of *plaats* referred to the same target domain of a rank order in a sporting event, or were used in the fixed expression *in plaats van*. Consequently, current news showed a great deal of repetition of source domain/target domain combinations. This general repetition and lack of variety seems to be related to the way in which certain metaphorical expressions are used in conversational settings as well. Although we did not specifically look at metaphor-related uses of *plaats* in the previous chapter, the patterns for metaphor-related nouns in conversations showed that this register lacked variety and used a lot of repetition of the same metaphor-related words. Hence, the differences in variety that seems to occur for some of the metaphor-related nouns in the two news periods could be a reflection of current news language becoming more repetitious like conversations, and thus moving towards informal, or oral, style that generally occurs in conversations.

The list of metaphor-related noun lemmas from the current news texts contains a few lemmas that neither occur in the list of most frequent metaphor-related noun lemmas from the historical news texts, nor in the list of most frequent nouns overall. The three most frequent examples of such nouns are *partij* ‘party’, *keer* ‘instance’ and *slachtoffer* ‘victim’. As far as *partij* and *slachtoffer* are concerned, their metaphorical status has been discussed in more detail in the previous chapter (section 5.4.4). They occur high in the list of metaphor-related nouns because they are always coded as metaphor-related in the current news data in our corpus. Their appearance in the list for current news and absence in the two lists for historical news illustrates some interesting differences between topics that are discussed in the different news periods. The news topics in current news seem to deal with political situations and criminal events more often than the topics in historical news.

The noun *keer* which occurs as metaphor-related relatively frequently in current news, but is absent in historical news, is a particularly vague noun that is rather general in meaning. As was mentioned in chapter 5 (section 5.4.4), the metaphor-related use of *keer* was particularly characteristic of the conversations in the corpus. The fact that it has been coded as metaphor-related in practically all instances of the word in both the conversations and the current news texts has partly to do with how the procedure for metaphor identification was applied. The meaning of *keer* in *Van Dale* that has been taken as the basic meaning is that one which sees *keer* in terms of a concrete movement in space: ‘wending, omwendig, beweging in tegengestelde richting’ (‘turn, swerve, movement in opposite direction’).

Nearly all uses in the different contexts in conversations and news texts, however, use *keer* as meaning a repeated event, occurrence or happening. Those instances have been coded as metaphorically used, since a happening during a period of time is understood in terms of a movement in an enclosed space. Thus, in the following example from one of the current news texts, *keer* was coded as metaphor-related.

- (6) De automatiseerder was ook de grootste verliezer in de AEX nadat de Britse branchegenoot Logica voor de derde *keer* in vijf maanden zijn prognoses verlaagde (...).

‘The computer firm was also the big loser in the AEX after the British fellow branch company Logica lowered their prognoses for the third *time* in five months (...).’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, economics*)

The fact that occurrences of *keer* such as in (6) are absent in historical news texts, but frequent in current news and even more so in conversations could also be interpreted as a form of informalization of news language. It is not so much the metaphorical structure of the contextual uses of *keer* that is striking, but more so the fact that there has been a switch from a lack of *keer* in historical news to a relatively frequent use of *keer* in current news texts. The fact that current news texts contain a number of instances of such a rather vague noun that has shown to be particularly characteristic for conversations could point to the idea that current news texts tend to use more fuzzy linguistic expressions and lack specificity with respect to, for instance, time references. The choice of a vague time reference such as *keer* above a more elaborated and descriptive time reference in which the particular time period is explained could point to the idea that news texts have moved towards a style of situation-dependent reference that also occurs in conversational language. As discussed in the introduction, one dimension identified by Biber that tends to show major differences between literate and oral language style is the dimension that differentiates between elaborated reference to time and place and situation-dependent reference. The lack of a vague expression such as *keer* in historical news and the preference of this expression to a more detailed reference in current news could point to a shift towards a more oral, situation-dependent style of language in news.

The examples above of metaphor-related nouns in context in the two news periods have not only illustrated which nouns frequently occur in which contexts, but have also pointed to some of the important differences between the two periods. Although each of the two lists of metaphor-related nouns include a variety of different lemmas, and the overall proportions of metaphor-related cases are not significantly different between the two periods, a more detailed look at particular patterns of some of the more frequent metaphor-related nouns has demonstrated possible features of informalization of current news texts. The comparison of some of the nouns in current news with their counterparts in conversation discussed in the previous chapters, and their absence in historical news such as with *keer* ‘*time*’, have revealed a possible overlap in language style with respect to the use of nouns the registers of conversation and news.

### 6.4.3. Prepositions

Prepositions are equally frequent in the historical news texts and the current news texts. In addition, the kinds of prepositions that are frequent are also very similar for the two sets. Since there is a limited number of preposition lemmas that can occur in any discourse setting – they are a *closed word class* – type-token ratios would not give a reliable idea of the variety in this word class between the two news periods.<sup>17</sup> In addition, they could not be compared to ratios for other word classes such as nouns, verbs or adjectives, because the variety of lemmas for prepositions is limited and the ratios are consequently very small.

Table 6.8 shows the ten most frequent prepositions in both news periods. The lists illustrate that both news periods make use of very similar sets of the most popular prepositions. The first seven prepositions are exactly the same in the two sets, with only *te* ‘at’/‘in’ and *op* ‘on’ having switched places. The percentages per lemma of the total number of prepositions in each news period show that, overall, prepositions are equally frequent, but that a few specific prepositions have slightly different frequencies for the two periods, for example *te* and *aan* ‘on’.

There is more variation visible when the prepositions are divided into non-metaphorical and metaphorical cases. The results in section 6.3.2 reported that the word class of prepositions showed an interaction between the news periods and relation to metaphor. The percentages in table 6.3 showed that the proportion of metaphor-related words within the prepositions in historical news was significantly larger than the proportion of metaphor-related cases within prepositions in current news.

Table 6.8 Most frequent prepositions in historical and current news

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n	% of prep. (n=4897)	lemma	n	% of prep. (n=7693)
<i>van</i>	1140	23.3	<i>van</i>	1712	22.3
<i>in</i>	720	14.7	<i>in</i>	1195	15.6
<i>te</i>	501	10.2	<i>op</i>	612	8.0
<i>op</i>	358	7.3	<i>te</i>	578	7.5
<i>voor</i>	296	6.0	<i>voor</i>	487	6.3
<i>met</i>	259	5.3	<i>met</i>	440	5.7
<i>aan</i>	219	4.5	<i>aan</i>	294	3.8
<i>door</i>	160	3.3	<i>om</i>	258	3.4
<i>bij</i>	134	2.7	<i>bij</i>	255	3.3
<i>tot</i>	129	2.6	<i>uit</i>	222	2.9

<sup>17</sup> If, for example, we assume that there are a maximum of 80 different prepositions, and we know that 15% of all the words in the two news periods are prepositions, then the variation naturally decreases when the number of words increases. The different sizes of the two corpus sets will thus influence the ratios strongly.

Since the general frequencies were the same for the two news periods, the higher frequency of metaphorically used prepositions for historical news is due more directly to the ways that certain prepositions are used. We shall therefore now examine these data more closely.

Table 6.9 shows the ten most frequent metaphorically used prepositions in both historical and current news. The seven most frequent metaphor-related prepositions are exactly the same in the two news sets and appear in the same order. In fact, each list contains only one preposition that does not occur in the other list; for historical news, this is *tot* 'until', and for current news this is *bij* 'near'. *Van* ('of' or 'from') is the most frequent metaphor-related preposition in both the historical news texts and the current news texts.

Table 6.9 lists both the absolute frequencies of the different lemmas and the percentages that each lemma takes up of the total number of metaphor-related prepositions in each news period. For instance, of the 3610 metaphorical prepositions in historical news, 30.6% occur in the form of *van* 'of'/'from', and 14.1% in the form of *in* 'in'. The numbers are slightly different for current news. Of the 5541 metaphorical prepositions in current news, 28.9% occur in the form of *van*, and 13.2% in the form of *in*. These percentages show that *van* and *in* occur as metaphors relatively more often in historical news than in current news. Similar differences are visible for *met* 'with', *aan* 'on' and *door* 'through'/'by'. There are also a few prepositions for which the frequencies occur in opposite direction, such as *voor* 'for'/'in front of', which takes up 8.8% of the metaphorical prepositions in current news, while it only adds up to 7.8% of the metaphorical prepositions in historical news.

*Table 6.9 Frequencies and percentages (of all metaphorical prepositions) for metaphorical prepositions*

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n met	% of met prepositions	lemma	n met	% of met prepositions
<i>van</i>	1105	30.6	<i>van</i>	1574	28.9
<i>in</i>	509	14.1	<i>in</i>	716	13.2
<i>op</i>	312	8.6	<i>op</i>	483	8.9
<i>voor</i>	280	7.8	<i>voor</i>	477	8.8
<i>met</i>	241	6.7	<i>met</i>	334	6.1
<i>aan</i>	193	5.3	<i>aan</i>	246	4.5
<i>door</i>	156	4.3	<i>door</i>	201	3.7
<i>tot</i>	120	3.3	<i>bij</i>	200	3.7
<i>bij</i>	113	3.1	<i>over</i>	164	3.0
<i>over</i>	100	2.8	<i>uit</i>	152	2.8

Despite these occasional higher frequencies in current news, however, there are

overall significantly more metaphorically used prepositions and consequently significant fewer non-metaphorically used prepositions in historical news.

To gain a better understanding of the possible factors and reasons for the differences in the non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related preposition frequencies, the contextual patterns of some of the most deviating prepositions in historical and current news will be compared in more detail. The question that arises is which elements cause the proportions of metaphorical and non-metaphorical prepositions to be significantly different in the two news periods. If we know that the overall frequencies of prepositions remained the same in current news in comparison to historical news, but that the portion of metaphorical preposition is smaller in current news, there could be two reasons. Firstly, it is possible that some prepositions, and perhaps a few prepositions in particular, are less often metaphorical in current news. Secondly, it could also be that not so much the metaphorical prepositions became less frequent, but that prepositions are used more often in literal situations in current news, in contexts where the typical spatial sense of prepositions is clearly present. The following detailed accounts of the prepositions *in* 'in' and *aan* 'on' will illustrate what factors could be involved; the preposition *van* is even more complicated but has been discussed in detail in the previous chapter.

#### *Preposition in*

The most basic meaning that was defined for *in* as a preposition is the following description in *Van Dale*: 'ter aanduiding van een zich bevinden, zich bewegen of een komen binnen een besloten ruimte, een stof of een stoffelijke uitgestrektheid' ('as an indication of being situated, moving or entering a bounded space, a substance or a substantial extent'). To put it more generally, *in* is seen as literally used here when it describes a relationship of being inside, moving into or entering a space or area that is bounded or marked. With regard to the metaphorical instances of *in*, the most frequent context in which it is seen as metaphorically used is that of temporal reference. These instances occurred frequently in both historical and current news, of which (7) and (8) are clear examples.

- (7) Hij kondigde aan, dat *in* 1950 een derde deel van de nog bestaande particuliere winkels en restaurants naar de HO zal overgaan.

'He announced, that *in* 1950 a third part of the still existing private shops and restaurants will be passed on to HO.'

(*de Volkskrant-historical, international*)

- (8) J. Plasman, advocaat van Bakker, verzocht *in* december om nader onderzoek (...).

'J. Plasman, lawyer of Bakker, *in* December requested further investigations (...).'

(*de Volkskrant, national*)

In (7) and (8), *in* is used in combination with a specific time indication. It has been coded as metaphorically used based on the mapping between the source domain of a bounded space and the target domain of a time period. This use of *in* is one of the most conventional expressions in Dutch which reflects the conceptual metaphor of TIME IS SPACE. In fact, studies from English-language data show that the English equivalent *in* conventionally reflects the idea of TIME IS SPACE (cf. Lindstromberg, 1998; Tyler & Evans, 2003).

Both news periods also contain contextual metaphorical uses of *in* where the preposition is used in combination with nouns denoting written or spoken interaction. In those cases, the preposition is used to illustrate the relation of a specific topic or utterance to the text or talk in which it is presented. To illustrate this, here are two examples, one from the historical texts and one from the current texts.

- (9) K. heeft voorts *in* zijn verweerschrift gezegd, dat alle of bijna alle dagbladdirecties medegewerkt hebben met de Duitsers.

‘K. has also said *in* his written defence, that all or almost all newspaper directorates cooperated with the Germans.’

(*De Telegraaf*-historical, national)

- (10) *In* zijn brief zegt Prodi dat de EU geen andere keuze heeft dan te reageren als Bush zijn plannen doorzet.

‘*In* his letter Prodi says that the EU has no other options than to react if Bush goes through with his plan.’

(*De Telegraaf*, economics)

In these examples, the sources in which certain utterances can be found (a *written defence* and a *letter* respectively) could be seen as concrete objects, but are not examples of spaces or areas that are clearly marked. They can be viewed as tangible products of discourse actions, which contain specific thoughts in the form of utterances in an abstract sense. In that case, *in* expresses the metaphorical relationship of the utterance being put into written text.

A large number of instances of *in* combined with a noun phrase describing a situation or event during which something takes place or in which people find themselves. Due to the large number of examples it proves difficult to filter these examples more precisely, but the larger patterns show that *in* in such contexts occurs frequently in both news periods. Example (11) is taken from a historical news text, and describes a situation that applies to certain people. Example (12) is taken from a current news text, and describes a particular situation in which certain issues are changing.

- (11) De vijf bewoners wisten zich *in* veiligheid te stellen, maar de boerderij brandde tot de grond to af.

‘The five residents could bring themselves *into* safety, but the farm was burnt to the ground.’

(*NCR-historical, front page*)

- (12) PvdA, lange tijd koploper *in* deze harde verkiezingsstrijd, zag in een van de laatste opiniepeilingen het CDA met 32 zetels langs zij komen.

‘PvdA, for a long time leader *in* this tough election battle, saw CDA come alongside with 32 seats in one of the last opinion polls.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, national*)

In example (11), *veiligheid* ‘safety’ is a situation or state which the residents of the burnt-down farm have been able to achieve after first having faced a dangerous situation. In this context, a safe state is seen as a kind of bounded spaces to which people can move or in which people can keep away from danger. Example (12) describes a political battle (*verkiezingsstrijd* ‘election battle’) and the positions that different political parties take in that battle. Here, the political battle is an event that lasts for a certain period of time, which can be understood in terms of an area of which the sides are clearly marked and in which certain entities take certain positions but can also move around.

The patterns discussed above illustrate that many of the metaphorically used cases of *in* in the historical and current news texts have the same structures linguistically, but also conceptually in terms of source and target domain mappings. Thus, it seems that for *in*, current news makes use of the same metaphorical structures, and uses them equally frequently. The difference between the proportion of metaphor-related and non-metaphor-related prepositions for historical and current news is not due to clearly distinct uses of the metaphor-related cases of *in*, but a more reliable statement about this would require additional quantitative comparison. If this were correct, there should be differences in the occurrences of non-metaphorical prepositions, which should be able to account for the larger portion of this group in current news.

A comparison of the kind of contexts in which the preposition *in* was seen as literally used shows that current news seems to make more extensive use of one particular context with literal *in*, which is illustrated by the example below:

- (13) De spoorweg loopt *in* Enschede langs de door drugsoverlast geteisterde achterstandswijk Velve-Lindenhof, het plaatselijke woonwagencamp en industrieterrein Euregio.

‘The train track runs *in* Enschede past the by drug-related problem afflicted area Velve-Lindenhof, the local caravan park and the industrial estate Euregio.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, national*)

We have taken uses of *in* in combination with streets, cities, countries and regions as literal, basic uses of the preposition. Although it could be argued that cities or countries do not have clearly marked-off boundaries or walls to qualify as a bounded space or container, we have prioritized the general spatial characteristics of geographical places and have taken these to be general extensions of the more restricted idea of a bounded space. The same notion of *in* in such contexts was applied when analysing the historical news texts. The patterns deduced from concordances of *in* show that for current news nearly 300 out of the 1195 instances of *in* occur in a combination with a geographical place name. This amounts to nearly 25% of all the occurrences of *in* in that news period. For historical news, 130 out of the 720 instances of *in* occur in the same kind of combination. This amounts to roughly 18% of all the occurrences of *in* in that news period. These frequencies show that there is indeed a difference in the way certain combinations of *in* in its basic sense are used in current news in comparison to historical news.

It seems that the increase of combinations of *in* with geographical place names in current news in comparison to historical news points to a more elaborated reference to time and place in current news, something that is seen by Biber and colleagues as characteristic of literate language. Hence, the patterns of *in* would thus suggest that current news moves away from the oral pole with respect to preposition use. However, the examples of *keer* above show that at certain points current news can also be seen as becoming more situation-dependent in its reference to place and time. It thus seems that different increasing metaphor-related words in current news point to different interpretations of the trends regarding the elaborated versus situation-dependent reference. This may have to do with the diverse nature of news reports and thus news language in general; in certain sections of news, reports introduce a news topic and require elaborate referents to place and time of the news event, while in other section, background reports on the news events assume basic information of place and time to be known already. The patterns of basic uses of the preposition *in* and metaphor-related uses of the noun *keer* make it difficult to put forward a unequivocal claim about shifts in the elaborated versus situation-dependent reference in news language.

### *Preposition aan*

The preposition *aan* 'on' is proportionally more frequent in historical news than in current news (see table 6.9). Additionally, the portion of metaphor-related cases of *aan* is also relatively larger in historical news than in current news. The figures in table 6.9 show that the distribution of metaphorical and non-metaphorical cases of *aan* in historical news is 193 cases (88.1%) against 26 cases (11.9%) respectively. The distribution of metaphorical and non-metaphorical cases of *aan* in current news is 246 cases (83.9%) against 48 cases (16.1%) respectively. Thus, *aan* is used metaphorically more often in historical news, and non-metaphorically more often in current news.

The concordance patterns for *aan* from both news periods show that, unlike the findings for *in*, there are indeed interesting differences between the two news

periods in the metaphorically used cases. Two prominent frequency differences come up after ordering the data according to their metaphorical structures. Firstly, the use of *aan* in combination with a noun denoting a kind of quantity or distribution, such as *gebrek* 'lack' or *minimum* 'minimum', is relatively more frequent in historical news than in current news. Two examples from texts in the historical news set illustrate this structure.

- (14) ... men zal ongetwijfeld altijd bij het bekijken van het geheel de gedachte krijgen dat in deze brug een vreemd stuk zit. Te meer zal het gebrek *aan* gaafheid natuurlijk in het oog vallen, omdat slechts enkele honderden meters verderop de Waal wordt overspannen door een sierlijke verkeersbrug ...

'... people will undoubtedly always get the idea when looking at the entity that there exists a strange piece in the bridge. More so the lack of flawlessness will strike people, because the river Waal is spanned by an elegant traffic bridge a few hundred meters further on ...'

(*NRC-historical, national*)

- (15) De Gooi-speler viel ook nu weer op door zijn teveel *aan* techniek en zijn ontstellend slechte schot.

'The Gooi player stood out once more because of his excess of technique and his incredibly bad shot.'

(*de Volkskrant-historical, sports*)

The noun occurring in front of the preposition *aan*, *gebrek* 'lack' in (14) and *teveel* 'surplus' in (15), gives an indication of quantity or quality of the noun following the preposition, *gaafheid* 'flawlessness' in (14) and *techniek* 'technique' in (15). This contextual use of the preposition *aan* is described in *Van Dale* as expressing a distribution of some kind of object or characteristic, which can be either concrete or abstract. *Aan*, then, is seen as metaphorically used in the contexts of (14) and (15) in comparison to its more basic meaning, expressing concrete contact between two objects. Similar examples occurred in some of the current news texts as well, but were considerably less frequent than in the historical texts.

The second prominent pattern of metaphorically used instances of *aan* which was considerably more frequent in historical news was the use of *aan* in combination with a person, institute or official body that could be seen as a recipient. This general pattern can be divided into different sub-patterns according to the kind of subjects of the general giving and the kind of objects that were received, but in all cases it concerned abstract entities. Example (16) illustrates this metaphorical use of *aan*.

- (16) De aanklager Urvalek had tevoren in een fel requisitoir (...) de doodstraf gevraagd voor Louwers, op grond van economische spionage en het verschaffen van hulp *aan* Tsjechen, die het land wilden ontvluchten.

‘The prosecutor Urvalek had asked the death penalty for Louwers in a fierce requisitory, on the grounds of economic espionage and giving help *to* Czechs who wanted to flee the country.’

(*Trouw-historical, front page*)

In contexts such as (16), *aan* is seen as indicating a kind of abstract contact or connection, in which the person or institute that is given something and the entity that is given are connected on an abstract level. Thus, in (16) *aan* expresses the abstract contact between a *Czech person* and *help* that can be understood in terms of concrete contact. Patterns of *aan* such as in (16) also occur in current news, but again the frequencies are considerably lower than in the historical news texts.

It is difficult to pinpoint why exactly the two prominent metaphorical patterns of *aan* described in examples (14), (15) and (16) are considerably more frequent in historical news. In general terms, they deal with abstract relations or connections between people, institutes or official political bodies and abstract entities or more concrete notions which have a specific quantity. As the examples have shown, these can be abstract notions such as *help* or *technique*, but also more concrete objects such as food or presents. It thus seems that the texts from the historical periods focus more on these abstract connections between people and things, and on the giving and receiving of different entities.

The results from the statistical tests showed that there were significant differences between the two news periods in the proportion of metaphorically used prepositions. As the examples of two highly frequent prepositions have shown, there seem to be two reasons for the discrepancies between the two news periods in the frequencies of metaphor-related cases. Firstly, some prepositions show differences in the way that metaphorically used cases occur in the two news periods. For *aan*, for instance, two prominent metaphorical structures occurred more frequently in historical news than in current news, resulting in a higher portion of metaphorically used cases of *aan* in historical news. Secondly, some prepositions do not so much show a distinct use of metaphorical cases in historical news, but show a more frequent use of specific literal cases in current news, influencing the different proportions. This was a pattern found for the preposition *in*, for instance, where the combination of the preposition with a geographical term occurred more frequently in current news. For *in*, then, this resulted in a higher portion of non-metaphorically used cases in that news period in relation to historical news. In general, these findings contribute to an explanation of the significant differences in the frequencies for metaphorical and non-metaphorical prepositions. The data for prepositions have additionally shown that this word class occurs highly frequently as metaphors in both news periods, and often consist of complex metaphorical structures and mappings.

#### 6.4.4 Verbs

The results in section 6.3 showed that there were no significant differences between the overall verb frequency in historical news (16.6%) and the verb frequency in current news (15.9%). There are differences, however, between the levels of variation within the word class of verbs. The type-token ratio for historical news is 0.21 (1160 types, 5408 tokens) and the ratio for current news is 0.17 (1427 types, 8223 tokens). This means that there are relatively more unique verb lemmas in historical news, which would make historical news more informational and less involved, and current news less informational and more involved. Verbs would hence contribute to a trend towards informalization in news.

Table 6.10 lists the ten most frequent verb lemmas in the two news sets, including percentages per total number of verbs in the respective news sets. Both lists contain the exact same lemmas, albeit in slightly different order. *Zijn* ‘be’ is by far the most frequent verb in both sets, and *hebben* ‘have’ and *worden* ‘become’ also stand out. These three verbs are the most important auxiliaries in Dutch, but also occur frequently as main verb or copular verb, hence their high overall frequencies. Some of the verbs in the list seem to have little semantic content, and can be used very productively in certain grammatical constructions. Verbs such as *maken* ‘make’, *gaan* ‘go’ and *hebben* ‘have’ (in its main verb sense) are all examples of productive verbs that are used in constructions such as *te maken hebben met* ‘have to do with’, *gaan om* ‘be about’ and *nodig hebben* ‘need’.

With regard to the distribution of metaphor-related cases in verbs, there were significant differences between the two periods. In historical news, 73.4% of the cases were non-metaphorical and 26.6% of the cases were metaphorical. In current news, only 68.5% of the cases were non-metaphorical, and 31.5% were metaphorical.

Table 6.10 Most frequent verbs in historical and current news

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n	% of verb (n=5408)	lemma	n	% of verb (n=8223)
<i>zijn</i>	685	12.7	<i>zijn</i>	1181	14.4
<i>worden</i>	344	6.4	<i>hebben</i>	492	6.0
<i>hebben</i>	331	6.1	<i>worden</i>	421	5.1
<i>zullen</i>	228	4.2	<i>zullen</i>	203	2.5
<i>kunnen</i>	144	2.7	<i>kunnen</i>	193	2.3
<i>moeten</i>	102	1.9	<i>moeten</i>	169	2.1
<i>komen</i>	69	1.3	<i>gaan</i>	160	1.9
<i>maken</i>	66	1.2	<i>maken</i>	122	1.5
<i>gaan</i>	61	1.1	<i>komen</i>	119	1.4
<i>zeggen</i>	60	1.1	<i>zeggen</i>	96	1.2

Thus, a quarter of the verbs in historical news were metaphorical, whereas a third of the verbs in current news were metaphorical, making the portion of metaphorical cases within the word class of verbs significantly larger for current news. If only the metaphor-related verbs are taken into account, the level of variation in lemmas is again higher in historical news. The type-token ratio for the group of metaphor-related verbs in the historical texts is 0.33 (481 types/1440 token), whereas the ratio in the current texts is 0.29 (751 types/2590 tokens). Metaphorical use of verbs is consistent with the slight trend from informational to involved production that was noted above.

The number of verb types that occur as a metaphor-related word at least once per 10,000 words in each subset (so at least three times in the historical set and at least five times in the current set) was considerably higher in the historical texts, even when looking at absolute figures: 120 lemmas in historical news against 105 lemmas in current news. Additionally, the number of verbs that occurred as metaphor-related only once in each subset was slightly higher for historical news, taking into account the sizes of the two subsets. 292 verb lemmas in historical news were coded as metaphor-related only once, taking up 20.3% of the total number of verb metaphors in that period. In contrast, 439 verb lemmas in current news were coded as metaphor-related only once, taking up 17.0% of the total number of verb metaphors in that period. These frequencies show how the variation in metaphor verb types is indeed greater in historical news than in current news. It can be concluded that the rise in number of metaphor-related verbs in the current texts is not so much due to there being more unique lemmas coded as metaphor-related, but to the fact that the most frequent metaphor-related verbs are relatively more frequent in current news than in historical news. A closer look at the verb lemmas that are frequently coded as metaphor-related in the two news sets may be able to reveal an explanation for the rise in frequent metaphor-related verbs in current news.

Table 6.11 lists the ten most frequent metaphor-related verb lemmas for the historical and current news texts, including the percentages per lemma of the total number of verbs in each corpus. Whereas the lists of most frequent verbs overall (table 6.10) contained the same set of verbs, the two frequency lists for metaphor-related verbs show more variation in the types of lemmas; this is mainly due to the fact that (modal) auxiliary verbs are generally frequent, but do not occur as metaphor-related instances due to their purely grammatical role. In addition, the percentages show that the most frequent metaphor-related verbs in current news show a relatively higher frequency than the most frequent metaphor-related verbs in historical news. So the most frequent metaphor-related verb in current news, *hebben* 'have', occurs considerably more often than the most frequent metaphor-related verb in historical news, *maken* 'make'. The percentages also show that the frequencies in historical news go down more gradually than the frequencies in current news, where larger differences are visible, for instance between the first and the second most frequent metaphor-related verb (*hebben* and *gaan*), and the

sixth and the seventh most frequent ones (*krijgen* and *geven*), hence the lower type-token ratio and variation.

*Table 6.11 Frequencies and percentages (of all metaphorical verbs) for metaphorical verbs*

Historical news			Current news		
lemma	n met	% of met verbs	lemma	n met	% of met verbs
<i>maken</i>	49	3.4	<i>hebben</i>	119	4.6
<i>hebben</i>	49	3.4	<i>gaan</i>	93	3.6
<i>komen</i>	46	3.2	<i>maken</i>	89	3.4
<i>geven</i>	43	3.0	<i>komen</i>	77	3.0
<i>nemen</i>	37	2.6	<i>staan</i>	68	2.6
<i>gaan</i>	35	2.4	<i>krijgen</i>	68	2.6
<i>stellen</i>	35	2.4	<i>geven</i>	63	2.4
<i>brengen</i>	32	2.2	<i>vinden</i>	44	1.7
<i>staan</i>	27	1.9	<i>houden</i>	41	1.6
<i>liggen</i>	25	1.7	<i>stellen</i>	30	1.2

There are verbs that often occur as metaphor-related in current news, but that are absent in the list of most frequent metaphor-related verbs in historical news, namely *krijgen* ‘get’, *vinden* ‘find’ and *houden* ‘keep’. The patterns for *krijgen* and *houden* will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, in relation to the notion of delexicalised verbs. For the current section, the patterns for *vinden* will be looked at in more detail, and can be compared to what we saw in the previous chapter with respect to the patterns for *vinden* in conversation.

As was discussed in section 6.4, *vinden* could be seen as a metaphor-related verb that typically occurs in conversations, in contexts where speakers give opinions about topics, events or other issues. Example (9) from chapter 5 is repeated here as example (17) to illustrate this use.

- (17) - en douchen in het bad *vind* je niet handig?  
 - nee, dat *vind* ik echt niet handig.  
 - ‘and showering in the bath you don’t *find* handy?’  
 - ‘no, I don’t *find* that handy.’

(CGN – fn000259)

It was also noted before that *vinden* in this metaphorical sense occurs less frequently in news, since that register traditionally does not mark the input of more subjective contexts in the same ways as conversations do. This is indeed true to some extent, but when the frequency list of metaphor-related verbs for current news is compared to the one for historical news, it can be noticed that *vinden* as a metaphor-related verb has become more frequent over time. A more detailed account of the different patterns in which metaphor-related *vinden* occurs are

metaphor-related in the two news sets shows that the differences between the two news sets can be found in the contexts where opinions are given in some form.

There are roughly 20 cases of *vinden* in the historical news texts where the verb has been coded as metaphor-related. Of these cases, a number occur as the introduction of direct or indirect quotes from sources, and are used in the news texts as evidence, explanation, elaboration, or verification. In those cases, the verb is used in the contextual sense of having or forming a certain opinion or judgement about a topic or utterance. An example of *vinden* from a historical news text, where it is used the context mentioned above and combined with a quote, can be found in (18).

- (18) Een hele, lange ochtend besteedden de rechters eraan om te weten te komen wat er dan eigenlijk wel gebeurd zou kunnen zijn. Ruzie, zei mr. Rompu. Omdat Haien Sjang Lin genoeg had van de dominee, die telkens weer bij hem over de vloer kwam. (...) Mr. Meihuizen *vond*, dat al deze dingen niet ter zake deden ...

‘A very, long morning did the judges spend to finding out what else did happen then. A dispute, said Mr Rompu. Because Haien Sjang Lin had enough of the reverend, who constantly came in and out of the house. (...) Mr Meihuizen *found* that all these things were irrelevant ...’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, national*)

The news text from which this excerpt was taken reports on a court case where one person (*Haien Sjang Lin*) is accused of trying to threaten another person (*the reverend*) with a knife. Reasons are given for the incident, but are judged by the official judge as unimportant, a judgement which is introduced by a form of *vinden* (past tense *vond* ‘*found*’).

In the example above, the kind of judgement given by the judge is not so much an opinion, but more an objective conclusion. Although the writer of the news report has introduced the conclusion by saying that *Mr. Meihuizen vond*..., it should not directly be seen as a subjective opinion. In addition, the representation of someone else’s words in (18) is not included as evidence for a statement or an elaboration made by the writer of the report, but is part of the report on the court case, in which the final decision by the judge is an important element. The other instances of *vinden* in the sense of ‘forming a judgement’ in the historical texts are all similarly part of the objective reporting.

A different case seems to hold for the instances of *vinden* that are found in the current news texts. In more than half of those, *vinden* is used in the sense of having or forming a certain opinion or judgement about a topic or utterance. In contrast to what occurred in the historical texts, there are many examples in which the actual opinion or judgements of sources are used to support or illustrate the ideas and topics in the report. These instances sometimes occur as direct quotes, but are most often cases of indirect quotations. The following two examples illustrate the typical use of *vinden* as a metaphor-related verb in current news.

- (19) Burgemeester mr. I. Opstelten sprak van een ‘enorme politieke shock.’ Hij *vond* dat Leefbaar Rotterdam als grootste fractie nu snel het voortouw moet nemen in de komende coalitieonderhandelingen voor een nieuw college van B en W. De voormalige Rotterdamse burgemeester Peper *vindt* het begrijpelijk dat Fortuyn een spectaculair succes boekt. ‘De daadkracht van Rotterdam is weg. In dat gat is Fortuyn gesprongen,’ aldus Peper.

‘Mayor I. Opstelten called it an ‘enormous political shock.’ He *found* that Leefbaar Rotterdam, as the largest party, should now take the lead quickly in the coming coalition negotiations for a new city council. De former mayor of Rotterdam Peper *finds* it understandable that Fortuyn reached a spectacular success. ‘The strenght of Rotterdam is gone. Fortuyn jumped into that hole,’ says Peper.

(*De Telegraaf, national*)

- (20) De winnares van het Eurovisie Songfestival, zangeres Dana, *vindt* dat abortus in alle gevallen verboden dient te worden.

‘The winner of the Eurovision Song Contest, singer Dana, *finds* that abortion should be illicit in all instances.’

(*De Telegraaf, international*)

Example (19) contains two instances of *vinden* where the verb is used in the sense described above. In the first instance, the verb is used to describe that the then mayor of Rotterdam has a certain idea about how the political party that won the local elections should act in the very near future. In the second instance, the verb is used to describe the opinion of the former mayor. The two instances of *vinden* in (19) are accompanied by direct quotes, but are themselves used to describe the opinions of the two sources in an indirect way. In example (20), *vinden* works in a similar way; it introduces the opinion of a specific person about the topic of the report. In this case, the topic is controversial, and different sides are reported on by listing a number of personal opinions and actions carried out by well-known people.

What the two examples have in common, and what many of the other instances of *vinden* in the current news texts also show, is that the verb is used in combination with specific names that can formally be seen as the agents of the verb. This combination of a specific person, a form of the verb *vinden* and an opinion or judgement often occur in the current news texts, much more so than in the historical ones. The use of sources and of opinions of different people as part of the report on important events seems to have become much more common in news reporting, affecting the level of human interest and personalization in the language. In particular, it often suggests that certain claims, ideas or simple observations put forward in the report are not so much the idea of the writer, but more of the actors in the event, the sources of the news. In that way it seems that a sense of distance is created by reporting opinions of other people, and a sense of objectivity by the

writer is maintained. However, some people have suggested that the growing use of sources, and direct and indirect quoting of the utterances and opinions of the sources, can also be used to put forward a more subjective view of the event; writers can choose certain opinions that fit their report and its formal point of view, and omit other quotes and opinions that may not support the direction in which they want to write their report. The question whether such a use of direct and indirect quotes may be of influence, however, can only really be answered with more data than present in the current corpus.

The patterns of *vinden* in historical and current news make clear that current news texts seem to make more use of direct and indirect quotations from different kinds of sources. The comparison of conversations with the current news texts illustrated that conversations contained significantly more instances of *vinden* where the verb expressed the opinion of the speaker. It was suggested that one reason why *vinden* did not occur equally frequent in current news was that the register of news does not allow for the insertion of personal opinions. The instances of *vinden* in current news that were discussed above, however, show that, although *vinden* is indeed hardly ever used in combination with a personal opinion of the writer, it is frequently used in combination with the opinions of different news sources. A comparison with what happens in historical news also shows that this kind of use of opinions from other people is more frequent in the current news texts in relation to news reports from 1950. Consequently, the rise in metaphorical instances of *vinden* in news reports seems to be related to the rise of quotations from different sources and their opinions in the reports. Although these opinions are not formed by the writer, as in the case of conversations and speakers, they do support the idea that current news looks more like conversations and their structures than historical news.

The patterns of *vinden* in the two news periods have shown that an important reason why verbs are proportionally more often metaphor-related in current news than in historical news is that certain metaphor-related contextual senses of some verbs occur more frequently in current news. In chapter 8 a detailed account will be given of some important and noteworthy differences between various metaphorical structures of frequently used verbs.

## 6.5 Conclusion

Previous diachronic studies on English text genres have shown that, among other things, the register of news shows a shift over time from a formal informational language style to a more informal, involved style of language. The quantitative diachronic analysis of the occurrence of eight main word classes in Dutch news texts, reported in section 6.3, shows that such a shift is not visible for Dutch news texts. The current news texts contained more nouns, characteristic of an informational language style, and fewer determiners and verbs, characteristic of an

oral language style. On the level of word class, the register of news has thus not become more informal and conversational.

The picture changes slightly when a division is made on the basis of a lexical semantic element; there are differences in the distribution of metaphor-related words within the word classes of prepositions and verbs that can point to a shift towards a more informal, conversation-oriented style of language. The patterns of certain metaphor-related words as well as non-metaphor-related words have shown that these differences are rather subtle. It seems that it is not so much the case that nouns, prepositions and verbs are used in new metaphor-related structures, but more so that certain metaphorical contexts, as in the case of *vinden*, for example, occur more frequently in current news. These patterns form an important reason for the change in metaphor proportions in some of the most frequent word classes in news discourse. They show that, when looking at metaphor-related words within the frequent word classes of news, subtle tendencies towards a more conversational style seem to occur.

One element that can partly explain the similarities in the use of metaphorical language in the two news periods is the fact that most of the metaphorical expressions in the corpus are very conventional and seem to have been part of the language for a long time. Prepositions are a good example of the high level of conventionality of certain linguistic metaphors, and so are some of the most frequently used metaphor-related verbs and nouns. For this analysis we have predominantly looked at the frequencies of metaphors in the corpus and their linguistic realisations, and not so much at the conceptual structures of the metaphors that we identified. In the following chapter, a more detailed qualitative study of various metaphorical patterns for some of the most frequent verbs in the different corpus materials may be able to shed more light on the subtle differences that the quantitative study picked up on already. This will then be followed by another qualitative comparison between historical and current news of the use of so-called deliberate metaphors, conventional or novel metaphorical structures that seem to communicate a certain intention or idea. This analysis extends the qualitative comparison of linguistic metaphor by not only looking at their linguistic form, but also by looking at their conceptual structures and communicative functions.

## 7. Delexicalised verbs and metaphoricity in Dutch conversation and news discourse

### 7.1 Introduction

One important conclusion from the previous two chapters is that metaphor-related words occur relatively frequently in certain word classes such as prepositions, nouns and verbs, but relatively infrequently in other word classes such as adverbs and conjunctions. In addition, the frequencies of the metaphor-related words in the word classes seems dependent on the registers in which they occur; in the language of conversation, determiners and adverbs are more metaphor-related in comparison to news language, whereas in the language of news, verbs, prepositions and nouns are more often metaphor-related in comparison to conversation language. With respect to news language, the time periods only marginally differ from each other in metaphor-related word class frequencies, but show more consistent differences in specific metaphor patterns within word classes.

A detailed look at the patterns of frequent metaphor-related lemmas within eight main word classes gave important indications of the differences between conversations and current news language (chapter 5) and between historical news language and current news language (chapter 6). For determiners, for instance, there were differences between the frequencies and uses of metaphorical determiners *die* 'that' and *dat* 'that' in conversations and news which were partly due to the difference in structure and context of the two registers, conversational language containing more reference to abstract entities. The patterns for metaphorically used nouns showed interesting tendencies for nouns that are vague in meaning, such as *ding* 'thing' and *keer* 'instance'; these occurred only occasionally in historical news, but appeared relatively frequently in current news and much more frequently in conversations.

The word class of verbs was frequent in all three subsets, but showed differences in metaphor-frequencies between the two contemporary registers. The frequency and variation patterns for metaphor put focus on specific verb lemmas that are common in and important for all subsets of the corpus, such as so-called 'delexicalised' verbs. Overall, the word class of verbs is the only class of content words that occurs equally frequently in conversations and in both periods of news in the Dutch corpus material. A detailed look at the patterns of metaphor-related verbs in the three subsets shows interesting differences, particularly in relation to specific frequent metaphor-related verb lemmas. The present chapter will focus on various patterns of metaphor-related verb lemmas, not only outlining how they work in the three subsets but also focusing on the gradual increase of delexicalised patterns of verbs in contemporary language use. The sections below will discuss the notions of delexicalised verbs and will compare the patterns of a selection of

lemmas in the three corpus sets, making a contrast between the two periods of news language as well as between the two contemporary registers.

## 7.2 Verb frequencies and delexicalization

In general, the results from the previous chapters demonstrate that verbs and metaphoricity often go together. Roughly one fifth of all the metaphor-related words found in the complete corpus are verbs, only exceeded in number by prepositions. Additionally, a large percentage of all verbs in the three separate corpus sets were seen as related to metaphor in some way. Verbs thus are important words to investigate when looking at metaphor use in different registers of Dutch and at possible shifts in metaphor use occurring over time. This is strengthened by the fact that of all the words that could be metaphorical in any given context, verb metaphors are often more complex than other metaphors due to the arguments that define the meaning of verbs in context. Many frequent verbs can take numerous complementation patterns, and can thus be concrete, metaphorical or highly abstract in use in numerous ways. The fact that the most frequent metaphor-related verbs are often so-called delexicalised verbs, productive verbs that usually take abstract or complex constructional complementation patterns, is important in this respect.

Despite the fact that metaphor-related verbs are generally frequent in all three corpus sets, the differences in numbers of the various verb lemmas related to metaphor suggest that there may be important differences in metaphor patterns between conversations, historical news and current news separately. Judging from the frequencies of metaphor in the word class of verbs, it is important to uncover some of the most frequent metaphorical verb patterns to get a more detailed idea of metaphor patterns and uses in historical and current news and in contemporary informal conversations, and learn the important distinctions and links between the periods and the registers. In particular, the frequencies for delexicalised verbs and the general results for *vinden* 'find' demonstrated in the previous two chapters lead to the expectation that it may be for delexicalised verbs particularly that differences in metaphoricity occur between historical news, current news, and conversation. The wide variety of concrete and abstract complementation patterns that delexicalised verbs can take may give a more structured insight into the concrete and abstract metaphor patterns in different periods of Dutch news, and in different contemporary registers. Before describing and discussing the various usage patterns of verbs in the corpus, detailed frequency figures are summed up to see which verbs seem to influence the patterns most prominently, and some ideas on delexicalised verbs in combination with metaphoricity are discussed.

### 7.2.1 Verb frequencies in the corpus

The general frequencies in chapters 5 and 6 showed that 16.6% (n=8396) of all the words in conversation are verbs, 15.9% (n=8223) of all the words in current news and 16.6% (n=5408) of all the words in historical news are verbs. Regarding metaphor, 15.5% (n=1298) of the verbs in conversations are metaphor-related, 31.5% (n=2590) in current news and 26.6% (n=1440) in historical news are metaphor-related. So although there are roughly the same proportions of verbs in each corpus set, metaphors are not distributed over the verbs in equal manner for the three sets.

The most frequent metaphor-related verb lemmas in the three data sets are highly similar; most of them can be classified as ‘delexicalised’ verbs. The ten most frequent metaphor-related verb lemmas in historical and current news and conversations are displayed in table 7.1 below.

Table 7.1 Most frequent metaphor-related verb lemmas in three corpus sets

Historical news				Current news				Conversation			
lemma	n	per % of	lemma	n	per % of	lemma	n	per % of	lemma	n	per % of
		10,000 met-			10,000 met-			10,000 met-			10,000 met-
		w verb			w verb			w verb			w verb
hebben	49	15.0	3.4	hebben	119	23.1	4.6	hebben	277	54,8	21.3
maken	49	15.0	3.4	gaan	93	18.0	3.6	vinden	135	26,7	10.4
komen	46	14.1	3.2	maken	89	17.3	3.4	zitten	83	16,4	6.4
geven	43	13.2	3.0	komen	77	14.9	3.0	gaan	71	14,0	5.5
nemen	37	11.4	2.6	staan	68	13.2	2.6	staan	70	13,8	5.4
brenge	35	10.7	2.4	krijgen	68	13.2	2.6	komen	59	11,7	4.5
gaan	35	10.7	2.4	geven	63	12.2	2.4	kijken	48	9,5	3.7
stellen	32	9.8	2.2	vinden	44	8.5	1.7	krijgen	41	8,1	3.2
staan	27	8.3	1.9	houden	41	7.9	1.6	zetten	33	6,5	2.5
liggen	25	7.7	1.7	stellen	30	5.8	1.2	rennen	25	4,9	1.9
<i>total</i>				<i>total</i>				<i>total</i>			
<i>verbs</i>	5408	1069	-	<i>verbs</i>	8223	1626	-	<i>verbs</i>	8396	1660	-
<i>total</i>				<i>total</i>				<i>total</i>			
<i>met-verbs</i>	1440	442	100	<i>met-verbs</i>	2590	502	100	<i>met-verbs</i>	1298	257	100

There is overlap in the lemmas that are most frequently metaphor related, with common verbs such as *hebben* ‘have’, *gaan* ‘go’, and *komen* ‘come’ occurring in each of the three lists. There is, however, a degree of variety in the general number of cases and in the frequencies of some verbs in particular. *Hebben*, for instance, is frequent in all three sets, but considerably more frequent in current news and conversations, and *maken* ‘make’ is frequent in both historical news and current news, but infrequent in conversations. A brief reconsideration of the type-token ratios for metaphorical verbs shows that, despite some of the similarities in table 7.1, there are in fact substantial differences in lemma variation. The type-

token ratio for metaphorically used verbs for historical news is 0.33 (481 types/1440 token); for current texts, 0.29 (751 types/2590 tokens); and for conversations, 0.15 (190 types/1298 tokens). The variation in verb lemmas is thus highest in the historical texts, slightly lower in current news and lowest in conversations. This is also reflected in the portions per 10,000 words given in table 7.1.

Taking into account the total number of metaphorical verbs, the figures for the most frequent ones and the variation ratios, it can be concluded that the rise in number of metaphorical verbs for the current news texts is predominantly due to the relatively high rise of the most frequent verbs in comparison to historical news. For conversations, the relatively low type-token ratio for metaphor-related verbs is partly reflected in the high number of occurrences of a small number of verb lemmas, *hebben* 'have' and *vinden* 'find' in particular. In addition, the table shows that it is predominantly the delexicalised verbs that make up the most frequent verbs in all three data sets, and it is also those verbs too that have generally risen in frequency between historical and current news. Overall, delexicalised verbs seem to be prominent in metaphorical verb patterns and possible frequency shifts. They may indeed be one of the crucial elements in the changes of metaphor patterns between the periods of news, particularly in comparison to their frequent occurrence in conversations as well.

### 7.2.2 Delexicalised verbs and metaphoricity

Delexicalised verbs are often classified as verbs that seem to have lost most of their intrinsic meaning and have gained many potential meanings and particular uses (Cameron, 1999; Sinclair, 1991). They are verbs that are productively used in various contexts, constructions and expressions, and as such often generally have an unclear independent meaning. Examples from Dutch would be *hebben* 'have', *nemen* 'take', *krijgen* 'get', *geven* 'give', *gaan* 'go', *komen* 'come', *vinden* 'find', and *maken* 'make'. The notion of delexicalised words was discussed extensively in relation to corpus-linguistic studies of the English language carried out by Sinclair (1990, 1991). Sinclair noticed when studying English in naturally occurring settings that some words often occur together as some kind of pre-constructed phrases. In this light, he noted that frequent words showed particular tendencies in various contexts:

There is a broad general tendency for frequent words, or frequent senses of words, to have less of a clear and independent meaning than less frequent words or senses. These meanings of frequent words are difficult to identify and explain; and, with the very frequent words, we are reduced to talking about uses rather than meanings. The tendency can be seen as a progressive delexicalization, or reduction of the distinctive contribution made by that word to the meaning. (Sinclair, 1991: 113)

According to Sinclair, delexicalization can thus occur with any possible word class. It seems strongest for common verbs, occurring with a variety of collocation patterns; they are often used with a nominalisation as their object in order to indicate that someone performs an action, such as the example 'take a look at this' given by Sinclair (1991: 112). A typical characteristic of the delexicalization of verbs is that it usually applies to transitive verbs, and that these often 'carry particular nouns or adjectives which can in most cases themselves be transitive verbs' or that they make 'useful structures or [contribute] to familiar idiomatic phrases' (Sinclair & Renouf, 1998: 153). In brief, delexicalised verbs thus do not so much contribute semantic meaning to the phrases or expressions as function as a means to indicate that some kind of action is carried out.

The notion of delexicalised verbs has occurred in a great number of corpus-linguistic studies in which the meaning of words is a key issue. Particular uses of delexicalised verbs are often the topic of studies on second language learning (e.g., Philip, 2007, 2010). In those studies, a great deal of attention is given to the use of verbs in phraseological language use, where chunks of words and fixed expressions with delexicalised verbs can cause problems for learners of English. In relation to metaphor studies, Cameron (e.g. 1999, 2003) has discussed the issue of delexicalised verbs most notably in her work on spoken language data. According to Cameron, 'delexicalised verbs (...) seem to have very little intrinsic meaning, but very many potential meanings or, at least, possible uses' (Cameron, 1999: 121). She also suggests that the exact meaning of all verbs in use is determined in relations to the complements of the verb, such as collocating noun phrases, or the subject or objects of the verbs implied by the context (1999: 121). This relates to what Sinclair notes about the importance of the noun phrases in giving meaning to the expressions as wholes, but in Cameron's view this also applies to delexicalised verbs, which can be complemented by various concrete or abstract complements. The frequent presence of delexicalised verbs in English spoken data led Cameron to specify how to deal with these words in relation to metaphor identification (2003: 72). In her conversation data, the verbs seemed to have many potential meanings depending on the different collocated subject and object phrases, some of which were clearly more concrete and human-oriented, and others more abstract. For every delexicalised verb, then, a primary sense was selected that was the most concrete, physical sense of the verb. Abstract uses of the verbs combined with subject and object complements that were also abstract could then be identified as possibly metaphorical in use.

The notion of delexicalised verbs in the work of Sinclair and his colleagues does not seem to include the fact that most delexicalised verbs have meanings and uses that are particularly physically oriented and concrete, thus having semantic content that surpasses the idea of having mere grammatical uses. When describing such verbs as *take*, *make* and *have* as delexicalised verbs, Sinclair seems to ignore the fact that when combined with certain physical or concrete complementation patterns, they also have a more significant meaning in some contexts than simply indicating that an action is performed. The verb *make*, for instance, is used in a

concrete sense when describing the action of producing something from several parts, such as in the sentence ‘they *made* dolls with heads of unglazed porcelain’ (taken from Deignan, 2005: 51). Deignan shows that, in the case of *make*, the uses of the verb seem to move from clearly concrete and literal to increasingly abstract to highly abstract uses. Corpus data from various studies thus show that the verbs that are often classified as delexicalised do not solely occur in delexicalised forms. It is therefore possible to establish semantic content and a basic meaning for these kinds of verbs. Simultaneously, there does seem to be a cline from uses that have clear semantic content to uses that seem purely functional or abstract.

The above-mentioned ideas do not only apply to English delexicalised verbs. In the Dutch corpus, the most common delexicalised verbs are used at least once in a basic, concrete sense. The frequent delexicalised verb *gaan* ‘go’, for example, has a basic meaning described in *Van Dale* as ‘zich te voet voortbewegen, zich voortbewegen en zo van plaats veranderen’ (‘move by foot, move and in that way changing place’), and is used in this meaning in the following sentence from the corpus:

- (1) Voordat de minderjarigen toestemming kregen naar Groot-Brittannië *te gaan* voor een abortus moesten zij door een wettelijk mijnenveld.

‘Before the minors got consent *to go* to Great Britain for an abortion, they had to go through a legal mine field.’

(*De Telegraaf, international*)

This use of *gaan* does not only imply a performance of an action, but also implies the manner in which the action takes place. Here, *gaan* is used in its basic lexical meaning, describing that a person moves in the direction of a certain place. The complement in the form of a prepositional phrase indicates the direction in which the person moves (in this case, to Great Britain), but the actual manner of the action is completely contained in the verb meaning. There are also uses of *gaan* which are less concrete, but which still contain a semantic meaning, uses where the direction or destination referred to by the prepositional phrase is an abstract destination, and in which the verb then expresses progression in reaching that abstract destination. The politician Pim Fortuyn, for instance, is quoted in one of the news texts in the corpus (*De Telegraaf, national*) as having said *We zijn er voor gegaan* ‘We went for it’ as a response to his historical local election victory. In this utterance, *er* ‘it’ refers to the victory which was seen as the ultimate goal of Fortuyn and his party, and *er voor gaan* ‘go for it’ refers to the idea that they aimed to complete the task of victory. In this expression, *gaan* refers to the concept of aiming for the abstract destination.

In analysing Dutch delexicalised verbs for metaphorical meaning, a similar approach as described by Cameron (2003: 72, 73) was adopted with respect to finding metaphor-related verbs. The different instances of delexicalised verbs that have been found in the corpus show gradations of meaning, some of which are concrete and some of which are more abstract but seem to be related to metaphor.

The data contains at least one concrete basic use of each of the verbs classified as delexicalised. Therefore it seems impossible to ignore these verbs altogether when identifying metaphorical language. A basic concrete meaning was defined for each verb, related to the domains of physical entities or space and direction, to which uses of the verbs with abstract combinations of subject or object complements can be compared.

However, since some uses are more abstract than others, the analysis of these verbs posed some challenges and disagreements in the coding stages, something which was also noted by Cameron for her English data (2003: 65, 66). The verbs generally show a cline from basic uses to metaphorically related uses, and finally to typical delexicalised uses, those instances where the verb does not contribute semantic meaning to the expression or where it is used in constructional expressions. In addition, drawing a clear line between an instance of a verb that seems to have semantic content and an instance of the same verb that seems purely grammatical proves very difficult to do. Although intuitively it seems possible to distinguish between concrete basic uses, abstract uses and uses within constructions that are purely functional, in practice drawing a line between lexical and functional uses of delexicalised verbs is extremely difficult. As Deignan also points out when discussing delexicalised verbs and preposition uses, ‘there is no simple answer to the question as to whether any, some or all non-concrete uses of delexicalised verbs should be considered to be metaphorical’ (2005: 51). A more detailed analysis of the various occurrences of such frequent verbs is required to gain a better understanding of the uses and meaning clines involved. This is something that returns in the following sections.

The incidence of delexicalised verbs in the Dutch corpus gives rise to the following ideas:

1. The more abstract and constructional occurrences of delexicalised verbs seem to be typical for conversations.
2. There are likely to be differences in complementation and collocation patterns of the productive verbs between historical and current news, based on the differences in frequencies of metaphor-related verbs.
3. These differences in metaphor-related verb patterns may point to a progressive form of delexicalization of frequent verbs in Dutch, and may be an indication that the register of news shows a shift in style towards a conversational, informal language use.

These ideas on the uses and patterns of metaphor-related delexicalised verbs will be explored and tested in the sections below. On the basis of three very frequent verbs that have a number of typical delexicalised forms and uses, this chapter illustrates how they work in historical news, current news and conversation, and how uses of delexicalised verbs with metaphorical meanings have become more frequent in current news and seem to grow more similar to conversations when compared to historical news. Section 7.3 focuses on *krijgen*

'*get*'; this verb is very frequently used in current news and conversations, but much less frequently in historical news. Section 7.4 focuses on *hebben* 'have': this verb is extremely frequent as a metaphor in all three subsets, but also complex in its combination with abstract constructions. Section 7.5 focuses on *gaan* 'go', a verb that often occurs in its basic sense as well as in fixed constructions in the three corpus sets. General patterns of frequent delexicalised verbs in the three corpus sets will be deduced, and links between verb patterns and the idea of a style shift in the register of news will be discussed.

### 7.3 *Krijgen* as metaphor-related verb

The most basic meaning of the transitive verb *krijgen* 'get' is described in *Van Dale* as follows: 'door eigen inspanning of moeite eigenaar, bezitter of meester worden van, het gebruik gaan hebben van, in het bezit gesteld worden van' ('becoming owner, possessor or master through own effort, or being made owner of'). The Dutch verb *krijgen* seems to be the equivalent of the English verb *get*, both in meaning and in the semantic criteria for its grammatical arguments. In context, the verb is used in its basic sense when it refers to receiving a concrete object: the grammatical subject of the verb is the recipient and the grammatical object is a concrete tangible entity that is received. The verb is used in its basic sense only rarely in the news texts from the corpus, but relatively often in the conversations. An example of *krijgen* used in its basic sense in one of the conversations is given in (2).

- (2) - ik heb een pizzasnijder *gekregen* voor m'n verjaardag  
- 'I got a pizza cutter for my birthday'

(CGN – fn007961)

This example shows the necessary elements for *krijgen* in its basic meaning: the subject of the verb is a person (*ik* 'I'), the object is a tangible entity (*pizzasnijder* 'pizza cutter') and the action described by the verb represents being made the owner of the received object. The verb partly implies that the giver of the object is also a person, but since this indirect object is often left out, this criterion is less strict. The fact that this concrete basic meaning of *krijgen* is used and described as such in *Van Dale* suggests that it is present in the language, and that hence not all instances of the verb are necessarily delexicalised. The concordance results actually show that there seems to be a cline from the verb having clear lexical meanings to it having highly grammatical uses.

*Krijgen* occurs frequently in conversation and current news, but is relatively infrequent in historical news. In total, 84 forms of *krijgen* occur in the conversation part of the corpus, with 41 instances having been coded as metaphor-related. The current news part contains 70 forms of *krijgen*, with 68 having been coded as metaphor-related. Finally, the historical news part contains only 24 forms

of *krijgen*, with 19 instances having been coded as metaphor-related. In general then, the portion of metaphor-related cases of the verb in the corpus sets differ from each other: in current news, nearly all instances are metaphor-related, in historical news, roughly 80% are metaphor-related, and in conversation about 50% is metaphor-related. The concordance results of the verb in context for each set demonstrate the various patterns of use, particularly with regard to the metaphor-related cases, and enable comparisons and contrasts between the three corpus sets, which will now be discussed in more detail.

### 7.3.1 *Krijgen as metaphor-related verb in historical news*

A concordance search of the lemma *krijgen* in the historical news set shows how the verb is used in different contexts. There are 24 occurrences of the verb, of which only five are used in their basic sense. These are expressions where *krijgen* is combined with a concrete and tangible object, such as in example (3), where a group of boy and girl scouts visit the Dutch princes on her eleventh birthday offering several presents.

- (3) De Indianen *kregen* als tegenprestatie een glas limonade ...  
'The Indians *got* a glass of lemonade in return ...'  
(*Trouw-historical, front page*)

In this case, *krijgen* is used in its basic sense, with the subject being human, the object concrete and the action of the verb denoting the receiving of a tangible object. However, there are considerably more examples where the verb is combined with abstract entities.

The majority of the instances show a use of *krijgen* with a clear human subject but an abstract object; nine instances take this form. Such abstract objects often seem to denote beneficial situations, such as *gelegenheid* 'opportunity' or *rust* 'rest', as in (4).

- (4) (...) dan klinkt het bericht, dat Faas Wilkes een maand rust heeft *gekregen*, alleszins geloofwaardig.  
'(...) then the message that Faas Wilkes *received* rest for a month sounds completely plausible.'  
(*De Telegraaf-historical, sports*)

The past participle of *krijgen* in (4) is regarded as metaphorically used: the subject, football player Faas Wilkes, does not literally receive a tangible object, but is provided with the benefit of having a month's worth of rest. The notion of a player being allowed a month of rest is seen in terms of receiving a concrete object. Both the act of receiving and the entity that is received are perceived as abstract in (4), and as such contrast with the basic use of *krijgen*, but can also be compared with it.

A number of other cases of *krijgen* in historical news are interpreted as metaphorical in context because they combine with a subject that is non-human; five instances take this form. One of the necessary selection restrictions is violated when the subject of the verb, the recipient, is non-human, as in example (5).

- (5) De stopzetting van het verkeer in Parijs, vanmorgen vroeg vrijwel algeheel, kreeg in de loop van de dag een slapper karakter toen de leden ...  
'The discontinuation of the traffic in Paris, almost universal early this morning, got a weaker character in the course of the day when members ...'

(*De Telegraaf-historical, front page*)

In this example, all three elements that define the meaning of *krijgen*, the subject, the object and the action expressed by the verb, are abstract and deviate from the basic elements of *krijgen*. The subject denotes a situation, a traffic obstruction, the object denotes an abstract characteristic, its weakness, and the action of the verb denotes a gradual change of the situation towards its weak character. None of the elements are concrete, but the situation is indeed compared to a concrete form of receiving: the situation is adopting an abstract shape. The meaning contained in the verb is already slightly weaker than in example (4), referring to a change of state only, but the idea of transferring something makes it meaningful to some extent.

The results from the concordance also include three examples that use a form of *krijgen* in a construction that seems rather fixed and where it is difficult to establish a clear contextual meaning for the verb. In (6), for instance, the verb occurs in its infinitive form in a more or less fixed expression.

- (6) De patiënten zijn er dientengevolge moeilijk toe te krijgen de voorschriften van de arts trouw op te volgen (...)  
'The patients are consequently difficult to get into action to precisely follow the instructions of the doctor (...)

(*De Volkskrant-historical, science*)

The expression *iemand ergens toe krijgen*, freely translated into 'to get someone into action', can be interpreted as a construction that is to some degree grammaticalised, and for which it is difficult to ascribe meaning to the separate words involved. Whereas *krijgen* in the previous examples could variously be interpreted as carrying a specific meaning in context, which could be contrasted to the basic meaning of the verb, the use in (6) seems a delexicalised use of *krijgen*. It relates to some of the more grammatical uses described in *Van Dale*, even if this construction is not mentioned as an option. Although delexicalised and thus vague in meaning, these instances were still coded as metaphor-related. The idea of an abstract form of action that is still present in the expression is related to the concrete action inherently present in the basic meaning, so a higher-level

comparison between the derived abstract use and the basic concrete use is still potentially present.

The various metaphorical uses of *krijgen* dominate the concordance results for historical news over the basic uses of the verb. There are a number of general patterns visible in the metaphorically used instances of *krijgen*, such as the reference to experiencing situations or events, but the small number of uses makes it difficult to extract definitive patterns. It can be concluded that most of the instances contain some degree of semantic meaning and variety, despite a small number of cases in which the verb is delexicalised in constructions.

### 7.3.2 *Krijgen as metaphor-related verb in current news*

A concordance search of *krijgen* in the current news texts shows that the number of appearances is considerably higher than in historical news, also when taking into account the different sizes of the sub-corpora. There are 70 instances of *krijgen*, of which only a two are clearly used in the basic sense. Again, these are expressions where a person receives a tangible object, or, in the case of (7), where the opposite is the case.

- (7) Rond halftien drong de dader het huis binnen en vroeg om geld en drugs. Toen hij dit niet *kreeg*, schoot hij op de vrouw.  
'Around half past nine the suspect entered the house and asked for money and drugs. When he did not *get* this, he shot at the woman.'  
(*Trouw*, front page)

In (7) the actual action of receiving is not carried out, but this does not influence the contextual meaning of the verb, nor the judgement that it should be understood as used in its basic meaning.

The other cases of *krijgen* in context were coded as metaphor-related. The patterns that are deduced from the concordance results are similar to those found for historical news but at the same time clearer due to the higher number of cases. One of the main patterns is similar to the predominant pattern found in historical news, and consists of a use of *krijgen* that can be described as a human subject gaining something abstract but beneficial, or where the human subject is in the position of gaining from a beneficial situation but fails to do so. There are 34 instances in which a beneficial situation is the object of the verb, and which contains a human subject or a subject that stands metonymically for a group of people. Examples (8) and (9) contain different beneficial entities, but both fit within the larger patterns of personal gain and benefit.

- (8) Er zijn maar heel weinig baby's in creches en die er wel zitten, *krijgen* meer dan voldoende aandacht van de leidsters.

'There are not a lot of babies in day nurseries and those who are there *get* more than enough attention from the carers.'

(*De Telegraaf, editorial*)

- (9) Volgens LPF-bestuurslid P. Langendam *krijgen* vijf kandidaten die op de Lijst Pim Fortuyn staan extra beveiliging (...). Ook Langendam zelf heeft bewaking *gekregen*.

'According to LPF-member P. Langendam five candidates on the List Pim Fortuyn *get* extra protection (...). Langendam himself has also *received* extra protection.'

(*Algemeen Dagblad, front page*)

The direct opposite of experiencing a beneficial situation also occurs, in examples where a subject fails to gain from a beneficial experience such as *niet de beloofde hulp krijgen* 'not getting the promised help' or *geen beveiliging krijgen* 'not getting protection', or where the subject experiences a harmful situation such as *klappen krijgen* 'getting hit' or *de doodstraf krijgen* 'get the death penalty'. In these instances, *krijgen* is used in a similar contextual meaning like in (8) or (9).

The general pattern of gaining or missing a beneficial entity or positive possibilities contains a sub-pattern of *krijgen* with a specific beneficial situation. This denotes particular possibilities such as *kansen* 'chances' or *mogelijkheid* 'possibilities'. The eight instances of this form are most prominent in sports reports, such as in examples (10) and (11):

- (10) Halverwege de eerste set *kreeg* de servicevolleyspecialist Henman kansen tegen de baseliner Hewitt.

'Half way through the first set service volley specialist Henman *got* changes against baseliner Hewitt.'

(*NRC, sports*)

- (11) Pas in de eindfase van de eerste helft *kreeg* Arsenal de eerste mogelijkheden via Henry en Wiltord.

'Only in the final stages of the first half did Arsenal *get* the first opportunities via Henry and Wiltord.'

(*De Telegraaf, sports*)

The sub-pattern within the larger pattern described above is mainly due to the fact that there is a large variety of topics within the set of current news texts, but can also be ascribed to the fact that *krijgen* occurs much more frequently as a metaphor in current news. The development of a clearer pattern and a sub-pattern in current news for *krijgen* seems also due to a shift in focus to topics related to personal gain

or loss. Half of the metaphorical uses of *krijgen* in current news seem to contain either the idea of a personal beneficial situation or the opposite of that. There is also a number of uses where *krijgen* occurs with a non-human subject or a subject referring to a group of people metonymically, but where the same idea of benefit and gain is present. Those examples are instances such as (11), but also contexts where the subject is either a country or a political party who gains *votes*, *priority*, *help*, or some other kind of benefit.

The above uses of *krijgen* that are metaphorical in meaning are rather clear, but the current news texts also contain a few examples where the verb is part of a more complex or abstract construction. In three cases, the verb is combined with an adverb, as in example (12).

- (12) Hij leefde in grote armoede, schilderde aanvankelijk op karton, maar *kreeg* het langzaam beter nadat hij onder contract kwam ...

‘He lived in great poverty, initially painted on cardboard, but slowly *got* a better living after he received a contract ...’

(*Algemeen Dagblad*, arts)

In these instances, the verb is not used in its general transitive pattern combined with a direct object. However, it is still possible to assign meaning to *krijgen* in a context such as in (12). The adverbs generally combined with *krijgen* in these constructions seem to denote a change in the situation which is subsequently experienced by the subjects of the verb; similar to some of the uses described above, there is a sense of experience of which the subject can make, or may make use. Despite the change in construction and the abstractness of the verb, instances of *krijgen* with an adverb can often still be seen as metaphor-related.

Five cases of *krijgen* occur in highly abstract contexts, in which the verb indeed seems generally delexicalised in meaning. In (13), *krijgen* seems to have no clear contextual meaning, and is used together with another productive verb, *maken* ‘*make*’.

- (13) ... dat er een kwade kans is dat we op 15 mei met een slechte uitslag te maken *krijgen*...

‘... that there is a bad chance that we will *get* to do with a bad result on 15 May ...’

(*De Telegraaf*, front page)

The expression *te maken krijgen met* ‘*get to do with/have to deal with*’ is a clear example of a construction in which different elements that separately have basic meanings, are now used in a more or less grammatical form for which the meaning is not deducible from the words included in the construction. In this context, *krijgen* (but also *maken*) is delexicalised to the extent that it does not have semantic content. In examples such as (13) the verb forms could indeed be classified as delexicalised.

Similar to historical news, the instances of *krijgen* in constructions such as (12) and (13) were seen as potentially metaphor-related, even though they show a degree of delexicalization and are thus vague in meaning. The highest-level comparison between the abstract contextual use and the concrete basic use of the verb is potentially still present, even if it only refers to a general experience of a situation. However, it should be noted that the contextual use of *krijgen* in (13) seems more delexicalised and grammatical in comparison to the abstract constructional use of *krijgen* in example (6) from historical news. In addition, current news texts contain a wider variety of uses of the verb in abstract construction. These issues may point to a slightly more delexicalised trend of *krijgen* in current news.

### 7.3.3 *Krijgen as metaphor-related in conversation*

The occurrences of metaphor-related uses of *krijgen* in the conversation data can be divided into a few general usage patterns. Of the 84 instances of the verb, nearly half of them have received a code for metaphor relation. The literal uses of *krijgen* occur in a wide variety of contexts, some clearly concrete as in example (2) above, others more arbitrary but still concrete, as in (14) below.

- (14) - bewaren ze dat vuurwerk dan nog nog van xxx of zo?  
- vorig jaar joh  
- weet ik veel  
- want 't is nou toch nog niet te *krijgen* in de winkels?  
- 'do they stock that fireworks for so long than xxx or something?  
- 'last year yeah'  
- 'I don't know'  
- 'because you can't yet *get* it in the shops now right?'

(CGN – fn000723)

Here, the subject is implicit but can be referred back to *ze* 'they', and the object is *vuurwerk* 'firework'. There is also a sense of receiving involved, but there are some elements implicit in this context that make the action less clear than in, for example, (2). Here, money is needed to obtain the object. However, the elements and action involved in this context are highly similar to the elements necessarily involved in the basic meaning of *krijgen*, and this instance can thus be seen as a slightly deviating use of the basic meaning.

With regard to the metaphor-related uses, one major pattern with several sub-patterns surface from the concordance results. The predominant pattern consists of uses where the action of the verb relates to the experience of events or results. There are 30 instances in which this contextual meaning is present. This use seems similar to the prominent uses in the news data, with contexts denoting the experience or gain of beneficial situations, but at the same time includes more

cases. The sense description from *Van Dale* that best fits the contextual meaning of the main conversation pattern would be the rather general description of ‘gaan ondervinden’ (‘go experience’), which can include many uses. The following two are examples of metaphorical uses in such contexts.

- (15) - dan ben 'k echt heel bang dat je dan een ongeluk *krijgt* met een auto en dat ze dan uh dat je d dan bewusteloos bent  
 - ‘then I’m really afraid that you will then *get* an accident with a car and that they then ehm that you are then unconscious’

(CGN – fn000249)

- (16) - net als toen uh toen dat schip ontplofte toen wij nog in de polder woonden in xxx. - dakraampke zat er zo en xxx zo dat ging los dicht.  
 - zo'n drukgolf *krijg* je dan. 't bed ging gewoon boem zo.  
 - ‘like when uhm when that ship exploded when we still lived in the polder in xxx.’  
 - ‘roof window sat there like and xxx like that went lose closed.’  
 - ‘you *get* such a blast wave then. the bed just went boom like that.’

(CGN – fn007824)

In all instances similar to (15) the verb refers to experiencing an entity as receiving it, and all instances are seen as metaphorical. The objects of such general ‘experiences’ that occur in the conversations are rather diverse, varying from entities such as ‘assignments’ or ‘swimming lessons’ to ‘work interruptions’ or ‘blame’. In all instances similar to (16), the experience seems more abstract, being the result of actions which seem more uncontrollable and natural. It can then be said that the main pattern of abstract experience can be divided into these two sub-patterns. The first, represented by (15), is similar to some of the patterns of experience described above for historical and current news, but includes a wider range of situations, including other entities than solely beneficial situations. The sub-pattern represented by (16) is also part of the idea that *krijgen* can refer to experience, but seems to contain a reduced sense of control that is inherent in the verb; the entities combined with *krijgen* in examples such as (16) are uncontrollable forces that seem to occur without human interference.

In addition to the uses such as in (15) and (16), the conversations also include uses of *krijgen* complemented by adverbs, such as *open krijgen* ‘*get open*’ or *doormidden krijgen* ‘*get in half*’. There are eight instances in which this occurs. This use is defined in *Van Dale* as the meaning of ‘in een toestand brengen (‘bringing in a condition’), where *krijgen* shows that the result of the adverb is achieved. Although the meaning of *krijgen* remains vague in expressions with adverbs and can in such instances be interpreted as delexicalised to some degree, it is still possible to see this as a metaphorical derivation of the basic meaning, with the ‘effort’ that is important in the basic meaning being still visible here. This use

is similar to the combination of verb and adverb described for current news. All uses, even the abstract ones, to some extent have semantic content, and have been taken as possibly metaphor-related.

#### 7.3.4 *Uses of metaphorical krijgen compared*

The verb *krijgen* is used relatively frequently in current news and conversation in comparison to historical news. The conversations have the highest frequency of cases where the verb is used in its basic sense, whereas both news sets together only contain a handful of basically used forms of *krijgen*. The conversations mainly contain metaphor-related uses of *krijgen* where the verb refers to experiencing a situation or event, but also shows instances where the verb refers to a result of an action. The patterns of metaphorical uses that occur in the two news sets overlap to some extent, showing similar tendencies of meaning. There are relatively more instances of *krijgen* in a metaphorical meaning in current news, which influences the distinction of the different patterns and sub-patterns. The metaphor-related uses of *krijgen* in conversations demonstrate a general pattern of contexts in which various entities and situations are experiences, but has slightly different sub-patterns from the news data. Firstly, the notion of gaining benefits is a not as prominent in conversations as it is in current news. Secondly, the conversations show a pattern denoting experiences that are uncontrolled, unlike the uses occurring in historical and current news. With regard to the more abstract, delexicalised forms of *krijgen*, all three sets contain only a handful, with the patterns being the most prominent in current news and conversations. These data sets contained a number of examples in which the verb was used in a construction different from the basic use, being combined with adverbs to denote the result of the adverb. In this respect, *krijgen* in itself is highly abstract, and can be seen as a delexicalised form.

The frequencies and examples in the current news data show how many of the combinations of *krijgen* and abstract object complements in the current texts reflect strong personal gain or loss, something that is used to a much smaller degree in the historic texts. The current news texts more often focus on beneficial situations where people gain personal benefits, or on the opposite situation, where people actually lose such benefits. The change in focus to benefits or losses in the current texts may be a reflection of a change in how newspapers write about events or news-worthy affairs, and perhaps in how society in general is focused on personal benefit or loss. There does not seem to be a clear move towards the uses in conversations, which only showed general patterns and some abstract uses, but no clear focus on specific beneficial situations or gains.

The change in the use of *krijgen* may reflect the way in which newspapers write about events, but reasons for this can be numerous. First of all, the topics of the different reports in both subsets can tell us something about the events that are reported in the newspapers of 1950 and 2002; it may be that the idea of personal

benefit or loss initiated by the metaphorical uses of *krijgen* are due partly to the change in topics that papers report about. Second, the sections that are reported on could also be of influence: some sections of the news, for instance art reviews and sports reports, seem to have received more space over time, and in particular sports reports appear to contain instances of *krijgen* that strengthen the pattern of the verb denoting the gain and experience of benefits. In any case, it is striking that *krijgen* in a metaphorical manner, denoting the experience of abstract beneficial situations or harmful situations, has become much more frequent in current news texts.

#### 7.4 *Hebben* as metaphor-related verb

The verb *hebben* ‘have’ can function as an auxiliary as well as a main verb. The instances in the data where a form of *hebben* is used as an auxiliary were disregarded for possible metaphoricity in the coding stage, since auxiliaries can be seen as purely grammatical and do not have semantic content that could function as a basis for metaphorical use. In total, 346 of the 919 cases (38%) in conversation were auxiliary uses, 339 of the 492 cases (69%) in current news were auxiliary uses, and 249 of the 313 cases (80%) in historical news were auxiliary uses.

With regard to the main verb, *Van Dale* distinguishes 21 distinct senses for *hebben* as a transitive verb. The basic meaning of *hebben* is described as ‘bezitten’ (‘possess’) or ‘voorzien zijn van’ (‘be provided with’). This is a general definition, but in essence it contains a number of elements that the verb and its arguments in context have to apply to. The grammatical subject has to be either human, animate, or a concrete element; the grammatical object also has to be a concrete entity; and the verb meaning itself denotes physical possession of concrete objects or a physical relationship between parts. Example (17) below originates from one of the conversations, and illustrates a typical basic use of *hebben* as a main verb.

- (17) - nee wij *hebben* geen caravan maar met een tent. en we *hebben* zo'n hele grote tent  
- ‘no we don’t *have* a caravan but a tent. and we *have* such a really big tent’  
(CGN – fn000319)

The subject of the verb is the pronoun *wij/we* ‘we’, referring to the persons speaking, and the object of the verb is *caravan* ‘caravan’ in the first part and *grote tent* ‘big tent’ in the latter.

*Hebben* as a main verb is the most frequent source of metaphor-related verbs in all three sets of data: in conversations 277 (48.3%) of the 573 main forms are coded as metaphor-related, in current news 119 (77.8%) of the 153 main forms are, and in historical news 49 (76.6%) of the 64 main forms are coded as metaphor-related. The proportions of metaphor-related verbs are thus nearly equal in the two news sets, which in turn are considerably larger than the proportion of metaphor-related *hebben* in conversation. The concordance results of the verb forms of

*hebben* in context for each set demonstrate the various patterns of use of metaphor-related cases, and point to some interesting comparisons and contrasts between the three corpus sets.

#### 7.4.1 *Hebben as metaphor-related verb in historical news*

*Hebben* is one of the most frequent main verbs in historical news, and occurs in different basic and metaphorical contexts. Only five instances occur as the basic use of the verb, such as in example (18) in which a situation is described of bringing along presents to a birthday party.

- (18) ... wanneer zij niet de enorme taart bij zich hadden gehad waarop een reusachtig Gloster Meteor van marsepein zweefde.

‘...when they had not *had* the enormous cake with them on which an enormous Gloster Meteor of marzipan hovered.’

(*Trouw-historical, front page*)

This instance of *hebben* deals with children possessing a concrete object, a *taart* ‘cake’. The verb is accompanied by the prepositional phrase *bij zich* ‘with them’, which emphasises the fact that at the time of reference, the subjects were indeed personally holding the objects. It suggests that *hebben* here not only implies general possession, but physical carrying of the object too. This is not necessarily part of the general basic meaning, but is often implied.

There are 49 instances of the lemma that have been coded as metaphor-related in the historical news set, considerably fewer in number than conversations and current news, but similar in proportion to current news and one of the two most frequent metaphor-related verbs in historical news (along with *maken* ‘make’). The metaphorical cases can be grouped into different usage patterns according to prominent combinations with various abstract arguments. Instances of *hebben* combined with a non-concrete or non-physical object, for instance, are often metaphorical. Within this group distinctions can be made between various kinds of abstract entities.

One of the more prominent patterns of metaphorical *hebben* includes a form of the verb combined with abstracts objects that denote different kinds of human characteristics or feelings. Eleven instances can be classified as such, of which (19) and (20) are two examples.

- (19) Het staat echter vast, dat hij oprecht berouw heeft.

‘It is clear though, that he *has* honest remorse.’

(*De Telegraaf-historical, national*)

(20) Wij *hebben* vertrouwen in de toestand op Korea.

‘We *have* faith in the situation on Korea.’

(*Trouw-historical, international*)

In the case of (19), *berouw hebben* ‘*feel remorse*’ expresses the personal experience of a feeling, that of remorse. In (20) *vertrouwen hebben* ‘*have faith*’ also expresses a kind of personal experience, that of feeling a sense of faith in a situation. In these examples, the use of *hebben* contrasts with but can also be compared to its basic meaning; there seems to be some sense of personally having control over something, having the experience of a particular feeling or emotion. The data show that different kinds of typical emotions also accompany the verb *hebben*: example (21) illustrates a more basic human emotion that is experienced.

(21) In Rotterdam blijven de meeste schepen nog liggen, omdat men de hoop *heeft*, dat het conflict nog wel op korte termijn zal kunnen worden geregeld.

‘In Rotterdam most of the ships kept stationed, because the people *have* the hope that the conflict will be solved within a short period of time.’

(*Trouw-historical, national*)

The objects in the examples above all denote particular cognitive activities that are typical of human processes: experiencing emotions, feelings, ideas, or thoughts. These are all abstract entities that are not tangible, but are usually seen as basic human characteristics. Because of their human origin, they could be interpreted as inherently part of a person’s nature. However, they are abstract entities, and although present in a person’s mind, not tangible and thus not literally able to ‘have’. In contexts such as (19), (20) and (21), the verb refers to *experiencing* and not *possessing*.

Of a slightly different pattern is example (22), in which the verb is combined with what could generically be described as an activity.

(22) In een gesprek, dat ik dezer dagen *had* met een vooraanstaand Amerikaans regeringsadviseur ...

‘In a conversation, that I recently *had* with an acclaimed American governmental advisor ...’

(*NRC-historical, economics*)

Carrying out the activity of a conversation is seen here in terms of possessing a concrete object. Although there are again human-oriented elements involved in a conversation between people, the reference deals with an activity, something intangible, resulting in a metaphorical use of *hebben*. Other abstract activity-related objects of *hebben* occurring in the historical data are *tijd hebben* ‘*have time*’, *een voorsprong hebben* ‘*have a lead*’ or *een taak hebben* ‘*have a task*’, for instance. The concordance data contained eight examples that fitted this pattern.

The third main pattern is formed by cases where *hebben* is not only combined with an abstract object, but also with an abstract subject. It is then thus not only the entity that is ‘possessed’ that deviates from the basic patterns, but also the subject that ‘carries out the possessing’. There are eleven examples of this in the historical news texts. These abstract objects can take all kinds of characteristics, of which the following two are typical examples.

- (23) Voetbal *heeft* in Spanje de brede populariteit van het stierengevecht.  
‘Football *has* the same broad popularity like bull fighting.’  
(*de Volkskrant-historical, sports*)
- (24) Cijfers *hebben* echter bij dergelijke ontmoetingen ook zo weinig waarde.  
‘However, figures *have* little value during these kinds of meetings.’  
(*Trouw-historical, sports*)

In example (23), something that can be seen as some sort of tradition or institutional activity is described as having different characteristics or some kind of benefit. In example (24), the subject describes the meaning of a score, which is an intangible entity. In both cases the meaning of *hebben* is described in *Van Dale* as ‘having a quality’, but occurs in (23) and (24) with a non-human subject. There is no sense of physically possessing something, because the subjects do not have human traits. They are personified as having different abstract characteristics.

Judgements about the metaphoricality of *hebben* become more complicated when the structure in which *hebben* occurs is deviant from its typical subject-verb-object structure. The examples found in the concordance results demonstrate that structures with *hebben* can take a wider range of word classes than shown so far. Difficulties in analysing the meaning of the verb occur in expressions where it is combined with an adverb only, as in example (25):

- (25) In dit opzicht *heeft* de Berliner Zeitung volkomen gelijk.  
‘In this respect the Berliner Zeitung *has* [it] completely right.’  
(*de Volkskrant-historical, international*)

The expression *gelijk hebben* ‘*be right*’ is quite common in Dutch, as are other combinations of *hebben* plus an adverb (for instance, *nodig hebben*). *Hebben* has been coded as metaphor-related, predominantly because this use of *hebben* contrasts with the basic use and meaning of *hebben* in such a way that example (22) denotes an abstract state. *Hebben* can then indeed be seen as metaphorical; the situation of being right is an abstract situation, and *hebben* in this case points to the fact that the person in question finds himself in that situation. It is difficult to pinpoint which elements of the basic meaning of the verb and of its typical basic objects are compared here, but the idea of the person being in a more abstract state makes the verb potentially metaphorically used. Six instances can be seen as being relatively abstract and containing less semantic meaning.

Finally, there are nine cases of the verb occurring in a highly abstract form that seems even more delexicalised than the *hebben*-adverb combination. These include fixed idiomatic expressions or constructions, such as in example (26).

(26) ... wij *hebben* er wel voor te zorgen dat verkoudheidspillen veilig buiten het bereik van kinderhandjes blijven.

‘... we *have* to make sure that pills against colds stay safe out of reach of little children’s hands.’

(*De Telegraaf, science*)

In the construction *ergens voor te zorgen hebben* ‘to have to take care of something’ the verb *hebben* seems to have a grammatical function more so than a lexical function, even if it is a main verb. The grammaticality of the expression makes it difficult to assign meaning to the verb that contributes lexical weight to the expression. Still, *hebben* in this context has been taken as a metaphor-related instance. This is due to the fact that it is possible to paraphrase this as ‘having a responsibility’, which then indicates that the use and meaning of *hebben* here can also be seen as a form of indicating personal experience and responsibility, something that could be seen as metaphorical form of the verb. In general, the construction-like uses of *hebben* are often judged as having a relation to metaphor, even if the comparison between the contextual use and basic meaning is not immediately clear.

A large number of instances of *hebben* in the historical news texts have been used in a metaphorical sense, with many cases complemented by objects that are abstract and that contrast with the typical concrete, tangible objects that the verb combines with in its basic meaning. The use of different word classes and phrases in combination with *hebben* shows that the variety of objects with the metaphor-related instances of the verb is much higher than that with the basic uses. Concomitantly, the meaning of the verb seems to become more abstract in combinations where the verb is complemented by abstract entities or adverbs, or when it occurs in constructions. Although not all uses of *hebben* are delexicalised in the narrow sense of the word, having lost semantic content, the results show a gradual cline from basic senses to very abstract and more or less delexicalised uses. For historical news, this is predominantly visible in the combination of the verb with various adverbs, and the occurrence of delexicalised constructions.

#### 7.4.2 *Hebben as a metaphor-related verb in current news*

The concordance results for *hebben* as a main verb in current news yield similar patterns to those in historical news, but due to the overall rise in frequency of the verb, some of the patterns seem to stand out more prominently. Additionally, the current news data contains usage patterns that do not occur as such in the historical news texts. Again, there are several cases of *hebben* in the current news articles

where the verb is judged to be used in its basic meaning, amounting to ten in total. However, most of these seem to be of a slightly different order than the typical basic uses in historical news (or conversations). Whereas the basic uses discussed above contain a human subject, some of the instances seen as a basic use in current news have a non-human subject, such as in the example below.

(27) ... waardoor ruim de helft van de vrachtwagens nog geen dodehoekspiegel heeft.

‘... the reason why more than half of the trucks still do not *have* a blind spot mirror.’

(*De Telegraaf, editorial*)

Here, the grammatical subject of *hebben* is *vrachtwagens* ‘trucks’, which in the current context do not have a *dodehoekspiegel* ‘blind spot mirror’. This use of *hebben* is also seen as one of the basic uses: both arguments are concrete objects, and they are related by a part-whole relationship. *Hebben* here is used in the sense described by *Van Dale* as ‘voorzien zijn van, toegerust zijn met’ (‘be provided with’), and requires two concrete parts that belong together. Other cases that are seen as basic uses of *hebben* are more ambiguous due to the objects of *hebben* being less tangible and physical than those typically complementing the verb in its basic sense. The example below is a good illustration of this.

(28) Zij ontdekten dat de dieren in hun hersenschors neuronen hebben die gevoelig zijn voor een bepaald getal.

‘They discovered that the animals *have* neurons in their cerebral cortex that are sensitive to a certain number.’

(*Trouw, science*)

*Hebben* here is seen as literal because *neuronen* ‘neurons’ is a physical object that is indeed inherently part of the subject in question, *de dieren* ‘the animals’. Although neurons are not visible or tangible, they are understood as physical elements that exist in a person’s or animal’s body. Additionally, they seem to be very much an essential part of animate beings and in particular of their brains, and can, when magnified, be seen as parts of the body. In the example above the animals actually own the neurons, and *hebben* is thus seen as literally used here. The difference with the examples in the previous part describing emotions and feelings, which are seen as human but are also abstract, lies in the fact that neurons are physical parts of a body: although invisible to the human eye, they are independent essential physical elements of the body. Some of the other examples of basic uses of *hebben* in the current news texts require similar argumentation, but all describe a concrete possession or part-whole meaning relationship between the subject and object of the verb.

The patterns for the basic uses of *hebben* in current news illustrated by 27 and 28 seem more ambiguous than those for historical news or conversations. In all

cases, the basic uses of *hebben* are followed by an object noun phrase that describes the concrete object that is possessed by the subject of *hebben*, but all examples too are deviant from the most common basic meaning. The ambiguous instances can already be an indication that the verb has undergone an ongoing process of delexicalization, losing one particular basic sense, but more on this idea will recur after discussing the metaphor-related instances.

The verb *hebben* is the most frequently used metaphor-related verb in current news, with 119 instances. Relatively speaking, this number is considerably higher than the frequency in historical news, but still lower in comparison to conversations. Similar to historical news texts, the uses can be grouped into different categories, with an apparent cline from combinations with nouns denoting personal experiences to combinations with abstract subjects as well as abstract objects, to being part of more abstract and complex fixed constructions. The main metaphorical patterns in which *hebben* refers to experiencing certain abstract entities are similar to those found in historical news, but are more prominent here. Of the 119 cases of metaphorical *hebben*, 21 can be classified as experiencing a certain feeling or other cognitive process, or experiencing a personal issue. Two examples that fit within this pattern are (29) and (30).

- (29) De voormalige tegenstander [van het treintraject] zegt geen idee te *hebben* wie achter de vernielingen zit.

‘The former opponent [of the train route] says he *has* no idea who is behind the vandalism.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, national*)

- (30) Ze zien er een bevestiging in dat de situatie niet meer beheersbaar is en ze *hebben* hun twijfels bij het tijdelijk karakter van de voorziening.

‘They see it as a confirmation that the situation is not under control anymore and they have their doubts about the temporary character of the facility.’

(*NRC, national*)

Example (29) denotes the existence of an abstract cognitive process, that of forming an *idee* ‘idea’, and example (30) denotes the experience of the emotion *twijfel* ‘doubt’. The same argument about the metaphorical use of *hebben* in relation to personal feelings that was discussed in the previous section also applies to examples (29) and (30). Although entities such as ideas and emotions are inherently human experiences, they are abstract and intangible, and can thus not be physically possessed. In these contexts, then, *hebben* is metaphorically used and refers to the act of experiencing.

The second large group of instances that form a distinctive pattern includes those where the object of the verb is a situation, event or opportunity that a person has at one’s disposal, so to speak. The concordances include 16 examples that

could be classified as belonging to this category. Examples of such instances are given in (31) and (32).

- (31) Acht van de tien contracten lopen af, alleen Patrick Faydherbe en Angelo Flanders *hebben* een doorlopende verbintenis.

‘Eight of the ten contracts run out, only Patrick Faydherbe and Angelo Flanders have a standing contract.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, sports*)

- (32) Fortuyn *heeft* inmiddels een *kandidatenlijst* met 30 kandidaat-Kamerleden, onder wie medisch specialisten ...

‘Fortuyn by now *has* a list of candidates with 30 candidate-Members of Parliament, among them medical specialists ...’

(*De Telegraaf, national*)

Again, there is a form of ‘possession’ visible in these examples where the person seems to be in control of something, but the possessed objects are abstract entities that denote certain situations or states. In these instances, the verb thus refers to the experience rather than a form of possessing. *Hebben* refers to a similar degree of experience when complemented by a word denoting a negative situation, like in (33).

- (33) Leger en veiligheidschefs zeggen “een groot probleem” te *hebben* om met MDC-kandidaat Tsvangirai samen te werken.

‘The army and security chefs say they *have* “a serious problem” with working together with MCD-candidate Tsvangirai.’

(*De Telegraaf, international*)

Here, *probleem* ‘*problem*’ is a negative situation, but it is experienced in the same degree as positive states or situations, similar to what was suggested for the metaphorical use of *krijgen* ‘*get*’ in section 7.3.

The following example is included in the pattern of having opportunities or situation at one’s disposal, but includes more elements that originate from the basic domain of physical possession. It concerns a headline of a news article on the elections in Zimbabwe, and the role of its president, Mugabe, in the expected results. Information occurring further on in the article is also given in (34) to show what the headline refers to.

The headline of example (34) is interesting in different ways: the verb and object in the sentence both have a concrete basic meaning, but so does the prepositional phrase *in handen* ‘*in hands*’. Moreover, the phrase as a whole strengthens the idea of concrete physical possession referred to by the verb. The expression used here is idiomatic, and in its basic sense refers to a card game where the ‘*troef*’ is a trump card, a card of one of the four suits that brings benefits when played in certain situations.

(34) Mugabe *heeft* alle troeven in handen

... De ook in eigen land aan populariteit inboetende Mugabe zocht zijn toevlucht in repressieve wetgeving en gewelddadige intimidatie van de oppositiepartij MDC van Tsvangirai. (...) Het hooggerechtshof, dat op de hand van Mugabe is, sloot gisteren tienduizenden kiezers met een dubbel paspoort uit van deelname [aan de verkiezingen]. (...) Het aantal stemlokalen in de steden waar de MDC sterk is, is gehalveerd ...

‘Mugabe *has* all trumps in hands’

‘... Mugabe, whose popularity is also weakening in his own country, resorted to repressive laws and violent intimidation towards the Tsvangirai’s opposition party MDC. (...) The Supreme Court, who supports Mugabe, yesterday excluded tens of thousands of voters with a double passport from taking part [in the elections]. (...) The number of voting booths in cities where MDC is popular, was halved ...’

(*De Telegraaf, international*)

It can be argued that the expression ‘*troef in handen hebben*’ ‘*have trumps in hands*’ is metaphorical as a whole, and it is indeed given as an example of an idiomatic expression in *Van Dale*. Our procedure of metaphor identification focuses on separate words, however, where each word can contribute to the meaning of the expression as a whole. For the idiom used here, all words separately contribute to the metaphorical meaning of the expression. Therefore, we analyse each word separately, which results in the judgement that *hebben* is used metaphorically, since the notions of trumps and hands are used for abstract referents in this context. The separate elements of the expression compare to the separate elements in the metaphorical meaning, in which *troef* corresponds to different *assets* that can be brought into action, *in handen* to *at disposal*, and *hebben* to *making use* of it. In brief, *hebben* is seen as metaphorically used because the situation described by the whole expression refers to an abstract situation, and not simply because its complement is abstract. In general, the examples above are part of a sub-pattern related to having situations and options at one’s disposal, and together fit within the overarching main pattern of experiencing feelings, situations or events. The examples demonstrate that such a general pattern and the different sub-patterns are more prominent and at the same time more diverse than similar patterns found in historical news, which is related to the rise in overall numbers.

There are also numerous instances where both the subject and the object of the verb *hebben* are abstract entities. In total, there are 35 instances in which both the subject and object are non-human, but a number of those are highly abstract and will be discussed in more detail below. Roughly 20 examples are of a pattern with more semantic content. Again, this pattern seems considerably more prominent and much more diverse than that found in historical news. Abstract subjects of *hebben* in current news include traditions or cultural notions, but also

denote activities, situations, etc. The following three examples are a selection of the different possibilities.

- (35) Inspanningsincontinentie kan verschillende oorzaken *hebben*, legt Bary Berghmans uit.  
'Stress incontinence can *have* different causes, Barry Berghmans explains.'  
(*Algemeen Dagblad, science*)
- (36) "... De huidige situatie *heeft* alle trekken van een hype," aldus Kok, die verwees naar het mediaspektakel rond Fortuyn en Leefbaar Nederland.  
' "... The current situation *has* all the features of a hype," says Kok, who referred to the media spectacle around Fortuyn and Leefbaar Nederland.'  
(*De Telegraaf, front page*)
- (37) De wetgeving [rond het milieu] is erg ingewikkeld en *heeft* veel mazen.  
'The legislation [concerning the environment] is very complicated and *has* many loopholes.'  
(*de Volkskrant, national*)

These examples show the diversity of subjects that *hebben* can take, but also show that for many cases, *hebben* seems to denote the same relation between subject and object. It describes the characteristics of these situations, events, activities, or entities. For all the examples above it is possible to argue that *hebben* has semantic content, even though it is combined with abstract subjects as well as objects. The general meaning seems to be an abstract form of 'possessing' something, different from the basic meaning of *hebben* because of the abstract character of the subjects and the objects, but also similar because of the inherent 'possessive' relationship between the subjects and the objects that the forms of *hebben* refer to here.

There is a considerable number of cases of *hebben* as metaphor-related that are even more abstract than the examples above, resembling delexicalised forms and constructions. Complex structures with *hebben* as a main verb occur frequently in the current news texts, much more so than in the historical news texts. Different abstract structures together make up for roughly one third of the metaphor-related cases of *hebben* in current news. Below are examples with some of the more complex structures that were found, and some which posed more serious problems for metaphor identification. Examples (38) and (39) each contain a combination with a preposition and an existential pronoun which is sometimes filled in by a noun, *er belang bij hebben* 'have an interest in' and *van doen hebben met* 'be dealing with' respectively. Constructions such as in (38) and (39) seem very productive in current news; other expressions with this structure were *ergens gevoelens bij hebben* 'have feelings with something', *ergens belang bij hebben* 'have interest in something', *ergens vrede mee hebben* 'have peace with something', and *ergens recht op hebben* 'have right to something'.

(38) “... dan moet hij praten met de mensen die het onderzoek hebben gedaan. Ik heb er gewoon geen belang bij.”

‘ “... then he has to talk to the people who conducted the research. I have no interest in it.” ’

(*Trouw, national*)

(39) Met de door CDA-leider Balkenende beloofde ‘hoofdoriëntaties van beleid’ (...) heeft het akkoord nog maar weinig van doen.

‘The agreement has now little to do with the ‘head orientations of policy’ (...) promised by CDA party leader Balkenende.

(*NRC, editorial*)

All of them to some extent show emotions that people have in certain situations, or benefits that they can have. In all cases, the objects in these expressions are typical abstract notions, and thus the possession or experience of these notions is abstract in a sense as well. Although the structure of *hebben* and its complements becomes more complex in cases such as (38) and (39), the same abstract notions as in some of the previous metaphorical examples still seem to be at play here. The idea that *hebben* here relates the experience of abstract emotions, events or situations to the subjects and objects in question is potentially still present, and *hebben* is thus seen as potentially metaphor-related. The expression *nodig hebben* ‘need’ and *gelijk hebben* ‘have right/be right’, are similar to this, and also occur in historical news.

One construction in which *hebben* indeed seems to contain minimal lexical content is the expression *te maken hebben met* (‘to make have with’- to have to do with). A similar construction also occurs with *krijgen*, as was illustrated in section 7.3, but has a slightly different meaning and is more frequent with *hebben*. Both the verb *hebben* and a form of the frequent verb *maken* ‘make’ are present.

(40) Ze geeft aan dat zij niets te maken heeft gehad met de dood van Rowena ...

‘She states that she *had* nothing to do with Rowena’s death ...’

(*De Telegraaf, national*)

The coding of *hebben* and *maken* in this expression in current news shows that it is indeed difficult to judge the verbs here for semantic and at the same time metaphorical content; in two of the eleven instances that this expression occurs, *hebben* was originally not coded as metaphorically used, and in one instance it was classified as a borderline case. The other instances, eight in total, did receive a metaphorical code for the verb *hebben*. To give an explanation for this, *hebben* was seen as still containing some form of content that could potentially be compared to the basic meaning of the verb. In abstract constructions such as (40), the abstract use of *hebben* could in general terms be contrasted to the most concrete use of *hebben*, with the most basic conceptual structure of *abstract versus concrete* being in operation here. Although the expression will most probably not be understood as

such, the language still potentially points to this analysis by using a form of *hebben* as a main verb in an abstract context.

What is clear from the examples examined above is that *hebben* is generally combined with a range of complements in current news. There seems to be a clear cline from lexical uses that can be seen as clearly related to metaphor to uses of the verb in highly abstract constructions such as *te maken hebben met*, with a number of categories occurring in between. A form of delexicalization is indeed visible when all uses of *hebben* are taken into account, much more so than in historical news. It is at its strongest in fixed constructions such as *te maken hebben met* which does not occur in historical news. At the same time, though, the clear metaphorical uses also have a more prominent pattern in current news than in historical news. Having personal feelings, emotions, experiences and so on are cases where the verb refers to the abstract concept of experiencing different abstract entities and situations, and as such is related to metaphor. The fact that these are conventional uses of *hebben* that together underlie the general comparison of experiencing as possessing may result in the idea that current news texts seem to have a stronger level of metaphoricity overall, albeit abstract.

#### 7.4.3 *Hebben as a metaphor-related verb in conversation*

The frequency of the main verb *hebben* in conversation deviates considerably from the figures in the two news periods. There are 573 instances of *hebben* as a main verb, 277 of which are coded as metaphor-related. The total number of metaphor-related cases is thus considerably higher than in current or historical news, but the proportion is considerably lower. The concordance results for *hebben* in conversation demonstrate a considerably higher frequency of literal uses of *hebben* than occurring in both news periods. Many instances of literal *hebben* in conversations refer to concrete issues that are present at the time of reference, such as *Ik heb thee* 'I have tea' or, in the context of a game played during the recordings, *Heb jij graan?* 'Do you have grain?', referring to the cards that players had in their hands. The fact that the conversation data in the corpus consists of spontaneous, casual talk accounts for the frequent occurrence of concrete topics present in the space that people are situated in.

One striking feature of the metaphor-related group of *hebben* in conversation is that many instances are very abstract. Within that large group of abstract cases, it is difficult to deduce clear patterns that illustrate a cline from relatively abstract to highly abstract. Still, not all uses of *hebben* in conversation are the same. There is a wide variety of instances that seem to denote an abstract form of possession referring to human traits and characteristics, instances in which the verb seems clearly metaphorically used, but at the same time there is a variety of instances in which *hebben* occurs with more complex structures in which the verb seems to possess little content.

Examples of *hebben* with various objects denoting abstract characteristics, traits or entities that people possess occur roughly 55 times. They can be gathered under the sense of *hebben* as being in control, possessing or experiencing a personal issue, feeling, human characteristic, and so on. These uses are similar to what was shown above for historical and current news. In (41), for instance, the person referred to is said to possess a characteristic personality trait.

- (41) - en Bram *heeft* gewoon heel veel humor dan  
- ‘and Bram just *has* a lot of *humour* at that moment’

(CGN – fn000675)

Here, *hebben* denotes that the person in question, *Bram*, possesses a personal characteristic or trait, *humor* ‘*humour*’. Although this personal trait may inherently be part of the person, it is an abstract notion and cannot literally be possessed as a tangible object. The instance of *hebben* in (41) is thus seen as a metaphorically used word.

The abstract object in (41) is just one example of many different entities that are expressed as objects of *hebben*; the verb also occurs with entities such as *aandacht* ‘*attention*’, *opleidingsniveau* ‘*level of education*’, *idee* ‘*idea*’, *aandacht* ‘*attention*’, or *dorst* ‘*thirst*’, to name but a few. These are all seen as being metaphorically possessed, either as experiencing or as controlling some kind of situation, event, or general entity. Smaller sub-patterns with, for instance, the characteristic of *opleidingsniveau* ‘*level of education*’ or the characteristic of *naam* ‘*name*’ occur, but they are relatively small and together with the variation in other traits, experiences and characteristics form a large pattern that is most significant.

Conversations also contain a high number of instances of *hebben* in which the verb denotes that something exists. This use is referred to in *Van Dale* as ‘in het subject aanwezig zijn’ (‘existing in the subject’). In these instances, the verb is usually complemented by at least one abstract entity, but still seems to describe a form of a part-whole relation. In example (42) existence of a beach is referred to in this manner.

- (42) - waar wij nou ook gaan zitten *heb* je heel mooi strand  
- ‘where we are now going to stay they *have* a lovely beach too’

(CGN – fn007824)

The expression in (42) explains the fact that a certain place in the world consists of a nice beach. Although these entities are rather concrete, referring to visible places, the idea of possession is not present in, and the verb is simply used to denote the relation between the spot on earth and the fact that it is covered by a beach. This could be interpreted as similar to the basic part-whole meaning of *hebben* but used in a more abstract manner. The use of *hebben* in (42) has been seen as possibly related to metaphor because of the comparison between concrete and abstract part-whole relations.

A great number of instances of *hebben* in conversations are part of constructions in which the verb seems to have no particular meaning, but should be seen as a grammatical part. Expressions such as *te maken hebben met* ‘have to do with’ and *nodig hebben* ‘need’ are good examples of fixed chunks in which the separate parts do not seem to contribute their meaning but function together as a whole. In all, there are roughly 40 instances in which *hebben* occurs as part of a fixed chunk, often combined with an adverb or with function words. Example (43) contains a use of *hebben* in combination with the adverb *nodig* ‘necessary’, together meaning ‘need’.

- (43) - u ook een graan.  
 - ik ook een graan.  
 - nou nou 'k heb nou heb 'k acht nodig op tijd xxx  
 - ‘you one grain too.’  
 - ‘me one grain too.’  
 - ‘well well I have well I the need for eight on time xxx’

(CGN – fn000423)

In those instances, *hebben* is very abstract, or rather grammatical, and could be seen as having become delexicalised. Just as with most typical delexicalised verbs, however, there is a cline of delexicalization, also within a group of instances that are by default abstract. The instances of *hebben* in contexts such as (43) and other construction-related contexts are still seen as possibly related to metaphor. The abstractness of *hebben* in examples such as above is far removed from the concreteness of the basic uses of *hebben*, but at the same time can be compared on the highest level of domains, where abstract entities or situation are compared to concrete objects. This idea is applied here as well, also because it seems difficult to draw a line between clear metaphorical instances and rather unclear cases of *hebben* where a meaning is difficult to assign.

A final pattern of *hebben* typical of conversations is the specific combination of *hebben* with the preposition *over* ‘over, about’ and an abstract object depicting a certain topic, which as a combination have the meaning of ‘talking about a topic’. There are 18 instances of *het over iets hebben* ‘have it over something’ or in correct English ‘talk about something’. In (44), this combination occurs in the context of talking about age.

- (44) - we hebben 't er wel al in de loop van die gesprekken over *gehad* dat uh de leeftijden steeds hoger worden.  
 - ‘we did have it [talked] about it in the course of the conversations that ehm the ages are getting higher.’

(CGN – fn007848)

The combination of *hebben* and *over* seems arbitrarily related to the concept of talking about a topic. However, the preposition *over* in particular can be related to the concept of talking about a topic. One of its basic meanings has a concrete element of covering a space, described in *Van Dale* as ‘ter aanduiding dat iets een oppervlakte geheel of gedeeltelijk bedekt’ (‘indicating that something covers a space or place in its entirety or partly’), with an example such as ‘een kleed over de tafel spreiden’ (‘put a tablecloth over the table’). The use of *over* in (44) seems related to this; in the context of talking about a topic, *over* can refer to the fact that the topic is discussed in its entirety as well. The use of *hebben*, however, remains rather abstract and functional in the context, and seems to be needed simply to refer to the fact that conversations take place during a specific time. The use of *hebben* plus *over* in the sense of having a conversation about a topic occurs predominantly in conversations due to the fact that they are inherently that which the expression refers to.

The many cases of *hebben* as a metaphor-related verb in conversations show a wide variety of meanings, uses and patterns. In general, conversations contain a number of instances in which the verb seems clearly metaphorical, referring to the possession, control, or experience of a personal trait, characteristic or human-related situation. Many other instances are more abstract and simply refer to the existence of something, or the relation between two entities. In those instances, the uses of *hebben* are highly abstract and show a cline in combinations with constructions. The pattern of *hebben* combined with *over* is characteristic of conversations, occurring only in settings where people indeed talk about particular topics. In general, the instances of *hebben* in conversation show a much wider variety of meanings and uses, some of which have a higher degree of abstractness than the uses in news.

#### 7.4.4 Changes in the use of metaphorical *hebben*

The different patterns of the verb lemma *hebben* used metaphorically show overlap for the historical news articles and the current news articles. In general terms, the verb is used in clear metaphorical senses when it is followed by an object that denotes an emotion, event, situation, human trait, or so on. The general pattern of experiencing these notions, and different sub-patterns that fall within it, are more prominent and diverse in current news, suggesting a growing focus on such topics.

It is in the more complex constructions with *hebben* that the patterns between the news sets start to deviate more prominently. Current news contains more kinds of complex construction, such as *hebben* with an abstract notion followed by a particular preposition, or *hebben* in very abstract fixed expressions such as *te maken hebben met*, which do not occur in historical news. Additionally, there is more variation within these more complex constructions with *hebben*; different abstract notions are expressed in the construction with a preposition, and in cases where *hebben* occurs with an adverb only, more variation is found in the

adverbs. These patterns point to the idea that current news contains considerably more constructions where *hebben* becomes gradually more abstract. Apart from the fact that the patterns of use differ, there is the simple fact the frequency of *hebben* as a metaphor is considerably higher in current news. This fact alone points to the idea that more abstract expressions and constructions are in use in current news.

In general, the main differences between the two news periods and conversations with the particular pattern of *hebben* referring to possessing human characteristics and so on, is that conversations show the largest variety in possible objects. Combining this with the results from historical and current news, we see a cline from reasonable variation in historical news to considerably more variation in current news to the highest degree of variation in conversation. For this pattern of *hebben*, then, current news is in between historical news and conversation in frequency and variation.

The numerous examples where the verb is used either in a basic sense or in a clear metaphorical sense, with similar syntactic structures of subject-verb-object, gives rise to the idea that in those cases, the verb indeed has a particular meaning, and that the one more basic meaning can be compared to a number of metaphorically derived meanings. At the same time, *hebben* is so frequently used in fixed or complex constructions that it indeed is delexicalised in some instances; it is difficult to pinpoint what exactly the verb means when occurring in fixed expressions. It thus seems that there is a cline in the degree of lexical content and metaphoricity of the verbs. This cline does not only occur within the different corpus sets, but particularly occurs between historical news, current news, and conversation. Historical news only contains a few abstractly used cases of *hebben* in comparison to the other two sets. Current news shows a wider variety of abstract instances of *hebben*, but conversation is the most prominent in its abstract patterns. In short, the language of news seems to have moved towards conversations with regard to the verb *hebben*.

### 7.5 *Gaan* as metaphor-related verb

Even though *gaan* 'go' is generally not seen as one of the main auxiliary verbs in Dutch, the concordance results show that *gaan* is often used as an auxiliary, similar to *hebben*. Example (45) demonstrates this use.

- (45) Het kabinet heeft onlangs besloten om de permanente bewoning van recreatiewoningen als een economisch delict te *gaan* bestraffen.

'The cabinet recently decided to go punish the permanent occupation of recreational accommodation as an economic offence.'

(*de Volkskrant, editorial*)

*Gaan* here is an auxiliary that expresses the future time, indicating that the action of the main verb, in (45) *bestrafen* 'punish', will be carried out or take place in the

near future. Such uses of the verb seem to be purely grammatical in the sense that they express grammatical time, and do not add lexical weight to the verb phrase. These instances of *gaan* are not considered metaphorically used, or judged for metaphoricity in the first place, since they can be interpreted as a grammatical category of the verb, similar to the auxiliary use of *hebben*.

The basic meaning of *gaan* ‘go’ as a main verb is described in *Van Dale* as ‘zich voortbewegen en zo van plaats veranderen’ (‘move and in that way change place’). Example (1) at the beginning of this chapter included an instance of *gaan* in its basic sense. Example (46) originates from one of the conversations, and also includes a basic use of *gaan*.

- (46) dat dacht ik neem ik het mee als ik op vakantie *ga* nou als je met 't vliegtuig *gaat* dan neem je niet zo'n zware pot mee  
‘that is what I thought I take it with me when I *go* on vacation well if you *go* by plane then you won’t take such as heavy jar’  
(CGN – *fn000259*)

Here, both instances of the verb *gaan* indicate a physical movement towards a new place, being accompanied by constituents indicating the destination (*op vakantie* ‘on vacation’) and the means by which the movement is realized (*met 't vliegtuig* ‘by plane’), two elements that are inherently related to the action of movement.

*Gaan* as a main verb occurs much more frequently in current news than in historical news (118 versus 46 instances respectively), but the portion of metaphor-related cases is similar in both sets at roughly 77%. The total number of instances of *gaan*, however, has nearly doubled in the current news set: 0.18% of all the words in historical news is a form of *gaan*, and 0.30% of all the words in current news is a form of *gaan*. Due to this rise, the number of metaphorically used instances in current news has also risen in relation to historical news, despite the fact that the relative proportions within the verb forms are the same for the two sets. For conversations, the figures for the main verbs as well as the portion of metaphor-related cases within the main verbs are slightly lower, but with 71 cases of metaphor-related *gaan*, the verb is still one of the more frequent metaphor-related verbs in conversation. Below, the patterns of *gaan* will be discussed in more detail to find out whether the differences in frequencies are accompanied by differences in usage patterns.

### 7.5.1 *Gaan as metaphor-related verb in historical news*

As mentioned above, *gaan* in historical news is used as an auxiliary in approximately one fifth of the cases. These will not be taken into account here. Seven instances out of the remaining 46 are used in their basic sense, in similar forms as illustrated in example (45). Those instances seen as metaphor-related

demonstrate a number of interesting patterns with respect to meaning, collocations and general uses.

Firstly, there is a group of examples in which *gaan* seems to denote a kind of abstract movement, where a situation commences or ends. This group contains ten instances of various kinds. In the majority of such instances, the verb form is accompanied by other metaphor-related words that also have basic senses related to concrete space, direction or movement. An example of this is given in (47).

(47) Zweden *gaat* naar duurder geld.

‘Sweden *goes* to more expensive currency.’

(*Trouw-historical, economics*)

The combination of *gaat* ‘*goes*’ and *naar* ‘*to*’ is an instantiation of the source domain of concrete movement from one place to another. In the context of (47), the words refer to a change in situation, where the current situation will be substituted by the future situation referred to in the sentence. Other instances in which *gaan* is used in similar ways in the historical data give combinations with spatial words such as *weg* ‘*road*’, *heen* ‘*gone to*’ and *weg* ‘*gone*’.

The majority of the metaphor-related cases of *gaan* in historical news, 16 in total, is rather vague in use and seems to be part of constructions in which less of the semantic content of the verb is evident. One group is formed by five cases in which the verb is combined with a ‘to-noun’ phrase, such as *te werk* ‘*to work*’ or *te lijf* ‘*to body*’. (48) and (49) are examples of this use:

(48) Dit zijn kort samengevat de principes volgens welke men hier te werk wil *gaan* ten einde de achterlijke streken op te heffen.

‘Briefly summed up these are the principle according to which one has will have to operate in order to remedy backward regions.’

(*NRC-historical, economics*)

(49) ... toen de Chinees mogelijk dreigde een mes te zullen halen om zijn ongewenste gast mee te lijf te *gaan*.

‘... when the Chinese man possibly threatened to get a knife to go to the body [attack] his unwanted guest.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, national*)

*Te werk gaan* ‘*go to work*’ and *te lijf gaan* ‘*go to body*’ mean something like ‘act in a certain way’ and ‘attack someone’ respectively. The use of *gaan* here seems to refer to some form of continuing action. In this respect, there is a comparison possible between the basic meaning of *gaan* as moving from one place to another, and the contextual meanings in (48) and (49) as a continuation of the action. The basic meaning first and foremost relates to a movement of a tangible entity, but also entails that this movement takes place over a stretch of time. It seems that the first, ‘movement’, cannot exist without the latter, ‘stretch of time’. It is this latter

part which seems to form the basis for the uses in (48) and (49): *gaan* here refers to some action that continues through time, without there being a concrete movement. A continuing event over time is then understood as a continuing movement through space. The phrases in these examples can be seen as forms of constructions, but the verb forms still seem to add meaning to the phrases as a whole. Other examples of *gaan* as metaphor-related also refer to the same idea of something happening during a stretch of time, or a situation, or event continuing during a stretch of time.

There are four examples with *gaan* in historical news that seem to be constructions more so than anything else. These are cases where *gaan* is combined with *om* 'about', like in (50).

(50) Een paar weken gelden ondernamen enkele toffe jongens een kraakje (...).  
Het *ging* maar even om een partijtje lood van vijf ton.

'A couple of weeks ago a few fen boys undertook a little burglary (...). It *went* about a load of five metric tons of heavy metal.'

(*De Telegraaf, international*)

The phrase *het ging om* 'it was about' in context means something like 'dealt with', and indicates that the object, in this case '*partijtje lood van vijf ton*' is referred to explicitly. It seems that *gaan om* in this context, and contexts similar to (50), occurs simply to be able to refer to the object; there is no sense of continuation in space or time present here, only the idea of 'mentioning'. Structure-wise, combinations of *gaan* and *om* only occur in the singular form combined with *het* 'it', an existential use of the pronoun to indicate that something exists or is the case.

The instances of *gaan* in this construction are marked as metaphorical uses of the verb. *Van Dale* does not include the construction as a frequently occurring use of the verb, neither under the intransitive uses nor under what is labeled the impersonal uses. The sense coming closest to what is referred to in contexts such as (50) seems to be 'handelen, spreken' ('acting, speaking'). This meaning of *gaan* as a main verb can be interpreted as an abstract form of dealing with a specific manner. The abstract discourse function is contrasted with the concrete spatial function, and as such is seen as a possible metaphorical derivation of the basic verb meaning. The metaphorical use of *gaan* in this construction should be seen as a borderline case of metaphoricity; it is possible to see a contrast and comparison between the basic concrete meaning of moving within a space and the contextual abstract meaning of dealing with a discourse topic (as some form of continuation in a discourse setting), but the comparison seems marginal due to the high degree of abstractness of the verb in the construction *gaan om*. This use could be seen as a representation of the delexicalization of the verb in some uses and constructions.

In general, there are some clear literal as well as metaphorical patterns of *gaan* in historical news, the first denoting a clear movement in space and the second often referring to a temporal change. The concordances also show that *gaan* can occur in constructional expressions in which it has a more abstract,

delexicalised use. In those examples too, though, the verb can be interpreted as still containing some form of continuation in its meaning. This is the case with *gaan om*, where discourse is seen as a space. As the results below will show, though, this abstract pattern has become more prominent in current news.

### 7.5.2 *Gaan as metaphor-related verb in current news*

In current news, *gaan* is used as an auxiliary in nearly a quarter of the cases. These will not be taken into account here. Sixteen cases of the remaining 118 are basic instances of *gaan*, such as example (1) at the start of the chapter and repeated here as (51):

- (51) Voordat de minderjarigen toestemming kregen naar Groot-Brittannie *te gaan* voor een abortus moesten zij door een wettelijk mijnenveld.  
'Before the minors got consent *to go* to Great Britain for an abortion, they had to go through a legal mine field.'  
(*De Telegraaf, international*)

As mentioned above, the proportion of metaphor-related cases of *gaan* is nearly equal in both news periods (around 77%), while the total number of occurrences of the verb has doubled for current news. In all, there are thus considerably more instances of metaphor-related uses of *gaan* in current news, which may result in clearer patterns of metaphor contexts than found so far in historical news.

Some of the clearer metaphorical uses of *gaan* in current news include those in which some abstract form of movement is referred to. In total, 23 instances can be assigned to this pattern. Examples (52) and (53) each demonstrate a metaphorical use of *gaan* in combination with adverbs that also originate from the domain of space or movements through space.

- (52) Aegon (...) verloor 1,8 procent op €24,75. De andere financials *gingen* eveneens onderuit.  
'Aegon (...) lost 1.8 per cent on €24.75. The other financials also *went* down.'  
(*Algemeen Dagblad, economics*)
- (53) Ondanks die tegenslag kreeg Bloemendaal nog de beste kansen, maar Amsterdam *ging* er verrassend met de overwinning vandoor.  
'Despite that setback Bloemendal got the best chances, but Amsterdam *went* away surprisingly with the victory.'  
(*Algemeen Dagblad, sports*)

In both examples, the verb is accompanied by adverbs that also denote some kind of movement through space when they are used in their basic sense. In (52), *onderuit gaan* ‘go down’ refers to prices progressing to lower levels, and is a much-used instantiation of seeing financial changes in terms of movements through space. In (53), *er vandoor gaan met* ‘go away with’ refers to claiming victory at the end of a match. There seems to be an element of fictive motion involved in this instance: the Amsterdam team goes home after having won the match and as such add the relevant points to their total scores. These and other cases demonstrate the frequent comparison of domains such as continuation of events or situations, results of events, changes in prices or results and perspectives with the concrete spatial domain of movements through spaces, be it from starting points, past places along the way or to destinations.

There are also instances in which *gaan* in context refers to having some sort of goal or describing a continuation of a situation, but where this is not fully compared to a movement in space due to the lack of adverbs or prepositional phrases that normally collocate with *gaan* in its basic sense. In example (54), for instance, an abstract goal is pursued.

- (54) Ieder jaar roept de in Oxford geboren Engelsman dat hij voor de hoofdprijs gaat op Wimbledon ...

‘Every year the Englishman, born in Oxford, says that he will go for the first prize at Wimbledon ...’

(NRC, sports)

There is a clear reference to achieving a goal, namely a victory in a tennis competition, in example (54). The process of achieving this goal is represented by *gaan*, and the goal itself can be seen as a destination. The idea presented here is then that achieving a goal is like reaching a destination, and the process of achievement is like moving towards that destination.

It becomes more difficult to interpret the uses of *gaan* that seem more abstract or that occur in more abstract constructions. Similar to historical news, current news also contains a large group of cases where the verb is vague in meaning, and is combined with typical expressions. As mentioned above, some cases in historical news show a combination of *gaan* with a form of *te* ‘at’ plus noun. This construction also occurs in current news, five times in total, but here predominantly has the form of *ten koste gaan van* ‘go at the expense of’. This expression could be seen as a kind of fixed construction, in which different elements still seem to contribute some of their meaning to the overall meaning of the construction. Example (55) deals with the topic of government budgeting.

- (55) ... als het [Congres] meer geld uittrekt voor defensie en de binnenlandse veiligheid, *gaat dat ten koste van* de reserves voor social security, de Amerikaanse AOW.

‘... when the Congres reserves more money for defence and the homeland security, this will go at the expene of the reserves for social security, the American social security act.’

(*de Volkskrant, international*)

The expression *ten koste van* is often used in contexts where *koste* ‘cost’ refers to actual costs, such as in (55), but also in contexts where it refers to abstract situations in which general harm is caused. In all contexts, though, the use of *gaan* is seen as metaphorical, since it never involves actual movement in space, but generally refers to a situation that occurs, continues, or is caused by something. In this respect, there is again a comparison between continuation of a situation in time and movement of a concrete object or person through space.

Thus far, the patterns in current news are similar to those found in historical news. There seems to be a slight tendency towards a clearer use of *gaan* in combination with an abstract goal in current news, judging from the frequencies, but the examples of uses discussed so far are highly similar. It seems that there is only one real difference between the metaphor-related uses of *gaan* in historical news and in current news, and that difference is related to the verb in the fixed use of *gaan om* ‘be about’. As mentioned above, *gaan om* can be seen as the most delexicalised use of the word as a main verb, which is still potentially metaphor-related. Of those instances of *gaan* coded as metaphor-related, 29 occurred in an expression with *om*. In percentages, this amounts to 25% of all the instances of the main verb and 31% of the metaphor-related instances (against 9% and 11% in historical news). Examples (56), (57) and (58) illustrate the general use of *gaan om* in the singular combined with existential *het* ‘it’.

- (56) Het *ging om* een claim aan omzet. De claims over en weer werden tegen elkaar weggestreept.

‘It *went* [was] about the claim of sales. The claims back and forth cancelled each other out.’

(*Trouw, national*)

- (57) De politie zegt ervan uit te *gaan* dat het om een afrekening in het criminele milieu *gaat*.

‘The police say they assume that is *goes* [is] about a liquidation in the criminal scene.’

(*De Telegraaf, front page*)

(58) De Amerikaanse regering is van plan duizenden illegalen uit het Midden-Oosten het land uit te zetten (...). Het *gaat* om mensen die eerder een deportatiebevel hebben genegeerd.

‘The American government intends to deport thousands of illegal immigrants from the Middle East from the country (...). It goes [is] about people who previously ignored a deportation order.

(*de Volkskrant, front page*)

As mentioned above, the use of the verb *gaan* in the fixed construction of *het gaat om* (and past tense *het ging om*) is seen as metaphorical. The meaning of *gaan* as a main verb can be interpreted as referring to an abstract discourse-related meaning, used to indicate that the object in the sentence is the topic referred to. This abstract discourse meaning of ‘mentioning’ is contrasted with the concrete spatial meaning of *gaan*, and as such is seen as a possible metaphorical derivation of the basic verb meaning. The metaphorical use of *gaan* in this construction is a marginal case of metaphoricity; it is possible to see a contrast and comparison between the basic concrete meaning of moving within a space and the contextual abstract meaning of dealing with a topic, but the comparison only seems to work on the highest domain levels of abstractness versus concreteness. The expression *het gaat/ging om* can be interpreted as a grammatical construction in which the verb in particular is vague in meaning, and is delexicalised to a considerable degree.

The instances of the construction shown in the last three examples have grown in numbers considerably when historical and current news are compared. The rise in numbers of metaphorically used cases of *gaan* instigated by the rise in overall numbers of the verb is mostly visible in the extensive use of the construction *het gaat/ging om*. The different uses of *gaan*, particularly in current news, then seem to show a discrepancy in relation to the other frequent verbs discussed in the previous sections: of the three verbs discussed here, *gaan* both seems to be used most often in its basic lexical sense of movement and in a highly constructional expression that is delexicalised. Thus, of those verbs often marked as ‘delexicalised’, *gaan* is both highly lexical, having a clear basic meaning which is used regularly, and having clear metaphorically derived uses that have semantic content, and it is highly delexicalised at times, appearing in abstract constructions in which the verb has little lexical content.

### 7.5.3 *Gaan as metaphor-related verb in conversation*

In the conversation-part of the corpus, there are nearly 400 cases of *gaan*, of which the vast majority appears as an auxiliary. The auxiliary numbers are much higher in the conversations than in the two subsets of news, which suggests that this use of *gaan* is characteristic for conversation, or spoken language. Roughly 70 instances are coded as metaphor-related. The majority of those either refers to an abstract progression in time, where a combination of words originating from the spatial

domain is used to refer to the domain of time, or to a general notion of occurring or progressing in time in an abstract form. The first is represented by example (59), where a person talks about her age.

- (59) - we *gaan* langzaam richting tachtig maar ja goed ik won wanhoop d'r zeker niet aan  
- 'we are slowly going towards eighty but yes well I don't dis despair for sure'

(CGN – *fn007848*)

There are nine examples where an abstract form of progression, predominantly in time, is referred to by a form of *gaan* and another constituent originating from the domain of space. These examples are all instances of the more abstract domain comparison of TIME as SPACE, also visible in the two news periods.

The other pattern, containing the general notion of something occurring or progressing in time in an abstract form, is represented by example (60), where a situation which is enjoyed is the topic.

- (60) - als je dat leuk vindt en dat *gaat* gewoon lekker dan hou je dat gewoon vast  
- 'when you find it fun and it *goes* just nicely then you keep to it'

(CGN – *fn007887*)

Here, *gaan* is used to refer to the fact that a situation or event is progressing in time, and thus also essentially sees concept of TIME in terms of the concept of SPACE. There are 16 cases in which are similar to example (60), and all describe a progression in time, often in the context of a favourable situation or circumstance where situation are going well.

As with historical and current news, conversations also contain a number of examples where *gaan* is combined with *om* in similar contexts as described in examples (56), (57) and (58). There are five example of *gaan* in conversation that occur in this context, and they all mention a particular situation. In addition, conversations also contain four examples of *gaan* with *over* 'about'. Example (61) shows that *gaan over* is used too when a situation is referred to, but in this particular combination stands much closer to the actual topic of the conversation.

- (61) - cartoons en en dan de titel weghalen en dan uh laat ze maar vertellen over welk actueel onderwerp *gaat* 't nou  
- 'cartoons and and then deleting the titles and then ehm let them tell you about about which current topic this now *goes* [is]'

(CGN – *fn008413*)

As with *hebben over*, the combination *gaan over* is used predominantly when a topic of a conversation is discussed. The verb is generally seen as metaphor-related

in this context, because a sense of progression is again visible in contexts such as (61). Although the progressions seems to take place on a more abstract level than in the previous examples, it is possible to see a comparison between the abstract progression of a topic and the concrete progression through space.

The patterns of *gaan* in conversation are to a large extent similar to the patterns discussed for historical and current news. There are clear concrete uses of *gaan* as well as clearly metaphorically derived use, and also more abstract instances of the verb in combination with *om* and *over*. The combination that look most like a construction and that can be seen as the furthest delexicalised, namely the combination of the verb with preposition *om* or *over*, is used frequently in conversations, similar to the patterns occurring current news texts. Particularly the instances of *gaan* with *om* are highly abstract in conversations, forming the most delexicalised uses of the verb.

#### 7.5.4 Changes in the use of metaphorical *gaan*

The concordance results have shown that the proportion of metaphor-related cases within the total number of cases of *gaan* is equal for historical and current news. At the same time, the total number of instances of the verb has doubled in current news, which results in a higher number of metaphorical instances in that news period as well. The frequencies for conversations are slightly lower overall and for metaphor-related instances.

The patterns deduced from the concordances show that the verb is used in its basic sense and in metaphorically derived senses in similar ways the three corpus sets. The general comparison of the continuation of a situation or event in time with the basic meaning of denoting movement of a person or object in space occurs in historical news, current news, and conversations similarly; an expression such as *we gaan langzaam richting de tachtig* ‘we are slowly going towards the age of eighty’ (example (59)) is a clear case.

The higher number of metaphorical uses of *gaan* in current news in comparison to historical news is visible most prominently in the abstract construction of *het gaat/ging om*, describing that the sentence or text ‘deals with’ the referred topic. This difference is an illustration that the verb *gaan* occurs as a delexicalised verb more and more. The conversations also contain this delexicalised combination, but also contain a similar abstract combination of *gaan* with *over*, which can also be used to refer to a topic of speech. The similarities between the current news texts and the conversations with respect to *gaan* in an abstract and delexicalised context such as with *gaan om* and *gaan over* is an illustration of the idea that current news is similar to conversations in its use of abstract, delexicalised verbs, and that historical news is much more removed from the patterns in conversation when it comes to *gaan om* and *gaan over* specifically.

## 7.5 Conclusion

One of the main conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis of delexicalised verbs is that it does not seem possible to talk about pure forms of delexicalised verbs, at least not for Dutch. Even the most productive verbs such as *hebben*, *gaan* and *krijgen* are used in basic, concrete forms and clearly metaphorically used instances in the historical and current news sets as well as in the conversations. There are thus instances of these verbs where they contain lexical content, either related to concrete spatial concepts or to more abstract concepts.

The main patterns of metaphor-related uses of *krijgen*, *hebben*, and *gaan* do illustrate a difference between the news periods and the contemporary registers. On the whole, the patterns are most predominantly abstract in conversations. The register of news does show a move in its use of metaphor-related delexicalised verb patterns towards the more abstract pattern of conversations when historical and current news are compared. Historical news contains a few dominant abstract uses of *krijgen*, *hebben* and *gaan*, but current news is more pronounced in the use of similar abstract patterns. On the whole, the various metaphorical as well as more abstract uses of the verbs under research occur more frequently in current news, and main patterns of use are more prominent and more clearly linked to the verb uses in conversation.

The frequencies of metaphor-related verbs in historical and current news in general seem to cause two main issues with regard to metaphor uses of verbs in news. On the one hand there is more variation in and within patterns of verb metaphors in current news. The higher frequencies of clear metaphorical uses in current news cause the feeling that current news is generally more metaphorical. Although overall frequency patterns from chapter 6 do not show a pronounced difference between the two periods, the prominence of the metaphor patterns discussed above may increase the general metaphoricity of current news. On the other hand, the patterns above suggest a tendency for verbs in current news to become more abstract. This abstract uses of metaphor-related verbs results in a similarity between current news and conversations, which also demonstrate a high degree of abstractness regarding metaphor-related verbs. In this respect, the language of current news tends to take on some of the important characteristics of conversations when it comes to the use of verbs. It becomes more abstract, delexicalised, and shows important aspects of conversations, particularly in the metaphorical use of some verbs which refer to conversational practices. In general, it can thus be said that the language of news has adopted a more conversational style when it comes to metaphorical patterns of delexicalised verbs.

## 8. Metaphor and deliberateness in Dutch news discourse

### 8.1 Introduction

The previous two chapters discussed frequent patterns of metaphor-related words in historical and current news. Chapter 6 focused predominantly on patterns of frequent metaphor-related lemmas within a number of main word classes, and showed that the significant differences between the two news periods with regard to metaphor-related words were rare, but occurred for three words classes in particular, nouns, preposition and verbs. Chapter 7 looked at the word class of verbs and discussed in detail the metaphorical patterns of frequent so-called delexicalised verbs. The frequency patterns that were discussed in chapters 6 and 7 clearly indicated that a large group of metaphor-related lexical units in both news periods were extremely conventional metaphorical expressions. It was also suggested that the differences between the two news periods for such conventional metaphors were rather subtle. The present chapter moves away from the patterns deduced from the quantitative analyses, and focuses solely on individual metaphorical expressions that stand out because of their potential deliberateness, and that seem to be used for specific rhetorical goals.

Thus far, the main concern of the previous chapters related to linguistic metaphors and their frequencies and structures in two different registers of discourse and in two periods of the register of news. Most of the patterns discussed so far dealt with highly conventional metaphors that occurred relatively frequently in different sections of the corpus. Examples of such highly conventional metaphorically used words are frequent prepositions such as *in* 'in' and *op* 'on', or common nouns and verbs that relate to space, such as the examples from section 6.4.2. The statistical results and the patterns for most frequent metaphor-related words demonstrate interesting differences between the contemporary registers of conversation and news, but only minor differences between historical and current news. With regard to the linguistic metaphor patterns, the data do not give clear indications of shifts in news language towards a more involved, personal style, different from what is expected based on results from previous lexico-grammatical variation studies (e.g. Biber & Finegan, 1989, 1992, 2001).

A change in personalised and involved style of language for current news may be more prominently visible in the language of metaphors when focusing on deliberate metaphors. A number of conventional metaphors as well as the rare novel metaphorical expressions seem to have specific rhetorical goals. Such deliberate metaphors can give specific texts and the general register of news a more personalised character because they typically evoke a special metaphorical comparison and communicate the personal intentions of the individual journalist or the newspapers. In addition, the use of deliberate metaphor can create personal images and cross-domain comparisons that often seem to make an individual text

more prominently metaphorical, and can consequently give the text, or a group of texts, a more prominent metaphorical touch, even if actual frequencies of metaphor-related words are not above average.

The main question that will be answered in the present chapter is whether, in accordance with the stylistic shifts in news language found so far, current news makes more prominent use of deliberate metaphors that make texts feel more involved and personalised than historical news. When taking into account specifically those metaphorical expressions that are used to communicate a certain intention, and that have a specific rhetorical effect of changing a reader's perspective on the topic, it may be possible to find differences between the two news periods that can be described as a shift in personalised style, that of journalists as a group, newspapers as institutions or news language as a register. In particular, the occurrence and use of deliberate metaphor in historical news will be compared to its occurrence and use in current news to find out if this is an area where metaphorical expressions contribute to the changing trend towards an involved and personalised style of news language. But first, the notion of deliberate metaphor will be discussed in more detail.

### 8.1.1 Metaphor understanding and deliberateness

Recent metaphor studies often distinguish novel metaphorical expressions from conventional metaphors. Novel metaphorical expressions are metaphorical uses of words that are produced ad hoc, and that are uncommon, new, and do not appear as a conventional use in the dictionary. Roughly speaking, less than one per cent of all the metaphor-related words in our data could be marked as novel expressions. Example (1), for instance, describes the children's plays written by one play writer, Pascale Platel.

- (1) De verhalen van Pascale Platel verlopen zoals een klein meisje het zou verzinnen, als een *kralensnoer* van spontane invallen vol playback-acts, absurde dansjes en videobeelden.

'The stories by Pascale Platel move like a little girl would make them up, as a *beads necklace* of spontaneous ideas full of imitating acts, absurd dances and video shots.'

(*Trouw, arts*)

Here, the notion of *verhalen* 'stories' is described as *kralensnoer*, a necklace made of beads with many different elements. This is a comparison between two notions that is not conventionally made in other situations, but created here to highlight specific elements of the stories. In the case of novel metaphors, readers have not encountered the metaphorical use of a word before, and are forced to make a comparison between the context or situation in which the word is normally used and the context or situation in which they encounter it; they set up a cross-domain

mapping between the source domain of the word and the target domain of the context.

The majority of the metaphor data in the corpus can be classified as conventional. A metaphorical expression is conventional when it is regularly used in the intended metaphorical meaning, and when this meaning is also listed in the dictionary as one of the possible meanings in context of the word. Previous studies within the field of cognitive linguistics and psycholinguistics have suggested that there are differences between the understanding processes of novel metaphorical expressions and conventional metaphorical expressions. Bowdle and Gentner (2005) suggest that the mode of comprehension of a metaphor shifts from comparison to categorisation as metaphors are conventionalized (2005: 193). This is described by the Career of Metaphor hypothesis, in which they suggest that novel metaphors are processed by comparison whereas conventional metaphors may be processed by categorisation or comparison.

In novel metaphors, both the target and base terms refer to domain-specific concepts at roughly the same level of abstraction. Novel figurative statements will therefore be interpreted as comparisons, in which the target concept is structurally aligned with the literal base concept. In conventional metaphor, however, the base term is polysemous – it refers both to a domain-specific concept and to a related domain-general category. Conventional figurative statements may therefore be interpreted either as comparisons, by aligning the target concept with the literal base concept, or as categorizations, by aligning the target concept with the metaphoric category named by the base term. (Gentner and Bowdle, 2001: 231)

If this indeed holds, then it is likely that the majority of the linguistic metaphor data in the current corpus is not understood or comprehended as metaphorical, that is as a comparison between two distinct domains. Most of the data in our corpus are so conventional that readers do not have to perform a cross-domain mapping to understand the meaning of a particular metaphorically used word in context, even if it is a linguistic metaphor (Steen, 2008). However, the data also shows instances of conventional metaphorical expressions that seem to be used deliberately in a specific context; that is, the writer seems to have chosen the particular metaphorical expression, albeit conventional, to communicate a certain idea. Such metaphorical expressions differ from other conventional metaphorical uses in that they seem to draw attention to their metaphorical meaning, thereby invoking a cross-domain mapping and thus an understanding of the metaphorical expression by comparison. Example (2) can be seen as a deliberately used conventional metaphor:

- (2) Marica maakt funky beelden zonder noodzaak of duidelijke betekenis, kunstwerken die net zo *luchtig* zijn als het piepschuim waarvan ze gemaakt zijn.

‘Marica makes funky sculptures without necessity or clear meaning, art works that are just as *airy* as the polystyrene foam that they are made of.’

(NRC, arts)

Here, the word *luchtig* ‘*airy*’ is a conventional metaphorically-used word to describe a situation or idea that has little meaning, but since it here also refers to the material, it can be seen as deliberately used to create a specific rhetorical effect of word play. More about this example will be said below.

In his three-dimensional model of metaphor, Steen (2008, in press b) proposes to extend the distinction between conventional and novel metaphor to a more detailed contrast of metaphor-related words. He includes the idea of deliberate metaphor, metaphor in communication, which can be novel or conventional, and always involves the intentional use of a source domain term to review a target domain. In this view, novel metaphorical expressions are always perceived as deliberate metaphors, but some conventional metaphorical expression, such as in example (2), can also be seen as deliberate metaphors evoking a cross-domain mapping.

As pointed out in chapter 2 above, the idea of deliberate metaphor has also been discussed in other discourse-analytical studies. Charteris-Black and Musolff (2003) distinguish between a semantic definition of metaphor, which is a broad definition that seems to correspond to the notion of linguistic metaphor, and a pragmatic definition of metaphor, which is more narrow and concerned with what they call the particular emotive and opinion forming effects of metaphor (Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003: 158; also see Charteris-Black, 2004). This seems similar to Steen’s idea of deliberate metaphor, but they do not make a clear distinction between metaphor in language, thought, and particularly communication. Cameron and Deignan (2003) also use the term deliberate metaphor, suggesting a distinction between deliberate metaphors on the one hand and conventionalized metaphors that seemed to be used as part of normal, everyday language on the other hand (2003: 152). They thus seem to distinguish conventional metaphors and deliberate metaphors, whereas in Steen’s approach, conventional metaphors can also be deliberate metaphors.

Steen’s (2008, in press b) approach to deliberate metaphor as metaphor in communication seems to be the most detailed, and fits in light of our methodological approach of analysing linguistic metaphors separately from their conceptual structure. For the current corpus study, the approach of focusing on deliberate metaphor can prove useful in showing more detailed patterns of metaphor use in Dutch news discourse. The initial idea that current news discourse is likely to contain more involved, personalised or subjective patterns of language use in the form of metaphors than news discourse from the 1950s only gave marginal results for the linguistic metaphor patterns in the previous chapters, and in

those cases only when looking at specific patterns for individual words. Linguistically, the two periods make use of similar metaphorical word classes, and of similar lemma patterns within those word classes. For instance, the same kind of delexicalised verbs in historical and current news are metaphorical, and are so in Dutch in general, and the same kind of prepositions are metaphorically used in similar manners in both news periods. Hence, there are no major quantitative differences between historical and current news. However, within the conventional metaphor data and the rare novel expressions, there may be a difference in the use of deliberate metaphor between the two news sets. Assuming that deliberate metaphors are used when a reporter wants to evoke and communicate a specific idea about a topic, this can be interpreted as a way of adding personal and subjective ideas to the news reports. It can hence be assumed that, when the idea of news becoming more personalised and subjective through the use of specific metaphorical images is true, that this is visible in deliberate metaphor.

### 8.1.2 How to find deliberate metaphors: operationalisation issues

The objective of the present chapter is then to describe the use of deliberate metaphor in both sets of news, current and historical. In order to do this, it is necessary to operationalise the idea of deliberate metaphor in more concrete notions, and identify the instances. Although Steen is elaborate in the description of his three-dimensional model and the role of deliberate metaphors, he only provides marginal suggestions on how to identify them. The notion of deliberate metaphor as metaphor in communication, changing perspective and invoking an understanding in terms of comparison, is extremely difficult to put into practice when analysing texts. A starting point can be made by finding those forms of metaphor that are often said to be used intentionally *as* metaphorical and that explicitly set up a comparison of two distinct domains. One such form is simile. Similes are direct metaphors, in which the language involved presents a temporary local topic different from the topic of the context, and which is separately represented in a situation model (cf. Steen, in press b). Psycholinguistic studies on the processing of indirect and direct structures of metaphorical language showed that the linguistic forms of similes as comparisons are processed as comparisons as well. Gentner and her colleagues not only found a correlation between conventionality of metaphor and mode of understanding, but also found a correlation between metaphor form and mode of processing (Gentner & Bowdle, 2001). Their idea of grammatical concordance proposes that ‘metaphors should invite classifying the target as a member of a category named by the base, whereas similes should invite comparing the target to the base’, based on the notion that metaphors are grammatically identical to literal categorizations statements and similes are grammatically identical to literal comparison statements (2001: 231). The use of a simile marker such as *like* or Dutch *als* explicitly invites the reader to

set up a comparison between a source and a target, and thus makes the reader aware of the use of metaphorical language. Similes are then always deliberate.

Additionally, several discourse-based studies have shown that when writers or speakers want to make it known to their addressees that they use a metaphorical expression deliberately, they often signal that metaphor (Billig & MacMillan, 2005; Cameron & Deignan, 2003; Goatly, 1997; Semino, 2002). In Goatly's (1997) study of the language of metaphor, he devotes a complete chapter of his book to the signalling of metaphor, in which he describes the need for signals, the functions of signals and the forms of signals. According to Goatly (1997: 168, 169), signals of metaphor are predominantly used to guide the reader at different stages in the metaphorical processing. In addition, there seems to be a correlation between the functions of different metaphors and signalling. For instance, metaphorical expressions that function as explanations usually have signals, and often both the source and the target are specified. Metaphorical expressions that are needed to fill gaps for abstract notions hardly ever use signals, and target terms are left out.

The list of signals defined by Goatly includes all kinds of forms, and describes different functions and combination of signals and function of metaphors. A study by Semino (2002) on the representation of the euro in British and Italian newspapers found that some of the signalling devices listed by Goatly, such as quotation marks and references to cognitive processes such as *think about*, are frequently used to mark what they call metaphorically active expressions, those that seem deliberately used. Goatly's list also ties in with discourse-analytical studies by Cameron and Deignan (2003), who compared and combined small and large corpora to study tuning devices for metaphors in spoken discourse. They found that a set of words and phrases frequently and consistently combine with linguistic metaphors to help the hearer as well as the speaker towards the intended interpretation, or alert the hearer to possible problems in the interpretations (2003: 150). Some of the functions of signals in educational discourse were guiding students to a particular interpretation, indicating the nature of the mapping between the source and the target, and alerting addressees to unexpectedness or semantic mismatching (2003: 153, 154).

In addition to signalling, there are instances where a number of metaphorical expressions from one particular source domain are used closely together to describe elements of a particular target domain. Such forms of metaphor, variously called serial, extended, or clustered, often indicate that a writer or speaker deliberately and consciously deploys a certain source domain to describe a certain target domain. The idea of serial or extended metaphor has been described and studied in different forms (eg. Crisp et al., 2002; Koller, 2003; Semino, 2008). As Semino (2008) rightly points out, it is usually difficult to define the idea in exact terms, and to identify the phenomenon with precision (2008: 25). In our case, something is seen as a form of serial or extended metaphor when an individual news text make use of several expressions from one source domain to describe several elements of one target domain. As the analysis below will show, not all instances of such extensions of metaphor should be seen as forms of

deliberate metaphor, but when a novel serial comparison is present, it is often used deliberately.

The idea put forward by Steen is that deliberate metaphors are metaphors in communication, where the deliberate use of a metaphorical expression is intended to bring about a change in perspective of a topic. In more precise words, ‘when a metaphor is used deliberately, it instructs the addressee to momentarily adopt another standpoint, in another frame of reference, and to reconsider the local topic from that point of view’ (Steen, in press b: 10). Although it is difficult to examine with text analysis alone whether a certain metaphor is understood as a deliberate comparison and leads to a change of perspective, it may be possible to find and examine potentially deliberate metaphors by looking for textual clues in the form of signals and extensions. In many of those cases, it can be said with certain confidence that the metaphor intentionally communicates a specific idea and changes the perspective on a referent, but for some combinations of signal and metaphorical expressions it may remain difficult to predict the actual intention, communication, and change in perspective. The data and examples discussed below demonstrate different realisations of using signals and marking deliberate metaphor, as well as using deliberate metaphor to communicate specific intentions.

The remainder of this chapter takes up the notion of deliberate metaphor and related issues of intention and awareness. The two sets of news texts, historical and current news, are examined separately for their occurrences of potentially deliberate metaphors, in order to find out if there are differences in the way they include various forms of deliberate metaphor, and what this means for the idea of personalization and involvement of news. The following section focuses on the method of finding deliberate metaphors, and sections 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5 discuss in detail the patterns that were found for deliberate metaphor, and similarities and contrasts between the two news periods.

## **8.2 Method**

To be able to implement the idea of deliberate metaphors and locate potential deliberate metaphors in the corpus texts, it is useful to work with a set of criteria with which to conduct the analysis. The discussion of metaphor identification procedures (like in chapter 4 on the application of MIPVU to Dutch) illustrates that it is possible to formulate a method with which to identify linguistic metaphors in a systematic way. This is possible first and foremost because we separate the notion of linguistic metaphor, metaphor in language, from conceptual metaphor, metaphor in thought; linguistic metaphors can be identified without explicitly stating the conceptual structure behind it. It becomes more difficult when we also want to identify deliberate intentions, since texts alone only give underspecified information on intentions. However, in many cases of deliberate metaphor use there are textual clues that give us information on the nature of the metaphorical meaning and the communicative intention of the metaphorical expressions. Such

clues are also indicators that the journalist uses the metaphorical expression *as* a metaphorical expression, and can be seen as signals to the addressee to interpret the expression in a particular manner.

The criteria that were formulated include a list of possible markers or signalling devices for metaphorical expressions, and contain ideas about the form of potential deliberate metaphors and the context in which they could occur. Signalling devices are often seen as markers of potentially deliberate uses of metaphor; they often actively invite readers and hearers to set up a comparison, or to interpret a linguistic expression as a mapping between two distinct domains. Additionally, the corpus texts were also searched manually for typical forms of extensions which could be analysed as possibly used deliberately.

### 8.2.1 *Markers and signalling devices*

A list of markers and signalling devices of metaphors was constructed on the basis of previous suggestions put forward by different metaphor scholars. Most noteworthy in this respect is the list of possible markers of metaphor in Goatly's (1997) study of the language of metaphors. The list of signals defined by Goatly includes all kinds of forms, and describes different functions and combinations of forms of signals and function of metaphors. A number of other studies have drawn from the list, and showed that some signals were indeed used frequently and functionally in different corpus material (Cameron & Deignan, 2003; Semino, 2002). For the current study, a number of possible signalling devices of metaphor were selected from these previous studies, and translated into Dutch. This yielded a list of lexical and orthographic devices as shown in table 8.1, specifying what the relation of the signals to metaphorical expressions could be (summarized from Goatly (1997) and Cameron and Deignan (2003)).

The devices were used for concordance searches with *WordSmith Tools*, and results of the concordance searches were reordered and analysed. Some of the devices turned out not to occur in our corpus, and others occurred, but were not accompanied by metaphorical expressions. Signals that did not produce results are still shown in the table, since it may be used for future reference and searches in larger corpora of Dutch, but will not return in the discussion below. There were also devices that often signalled metaphorical language use but that did not always signal potentially deliberate metaphors. To put it the other way around, the metaphors that were found in combination with signalling devices were not automatically deliberate metaphors. However, as the results will show, using a list of signals as tools to search for deliberateness helped in finding the most prominent cases. Deliberate metaphors that were not accompanied by a signal, such as extended forms, had to be found manually.

*Table 8.1 Dutch metaphor signalling devices and their functions*

<b>Signal in Dutch</b>	<b>Equivalent in English</b>	<b>Signal function and metaphor expression</b>
als	as / like	direct metaphor, simile
zoals	as / like	direct metaphor, simile
alsof	as if / as though	direct metaphor, simile
(als een) soort	a sort / kind of	direct metaphor, simile
lijken	seem / appear	direct metaphor, simile
schijnen	appear / seem	direct metaphor, simile
klinken (als)	sound (like)	sensory comparison (perceptual process)
aanvoelen (als)	feel (like)	sensory comparison (perceptual process)
eruitzien (als)	look (like)	sensory comparison (perceptual process)
smaken (als)	taste (like)	sensory comparison (perceptual process)
als het ware	as it were	comparison
bij wijze van spreken	so to speak	comparison
zeg maar	so to say	comparison
zogezegd	so to say / so to speak	comparison
zogenaamd	so to say / so to speak	comparison
metafoor / metaforisch	metaphor / -ically	indirect metaphor, explicit marker
figuurlijk	figurative / -ly	indirect metaphor, explicit marker
letterlijk	literal / -ly	intensifier, enhancing effect
min of meer	more or less	hedging, downtoning
in zekere zin	in a certain way	hedging
tot op zekere hoogte	to a certain degree	hedging
<i>inverted comma</i> ‘...’	<i>inverted comma</i> ‘...’	emphasising

### 8.2.2 *Extended forms of metaphor*

In addition to searching for the signalling devices listed in table 8.1, the texts in the corpus were also examined for other instances of metaphorical language use that was potentially deliberate, such as cases of serial or extended metaphors in single texts. By manually going through the texts, it is possible to detect examples of deliberate metaphors that are difficult to find using automatic search terms. There are examples of serial metaphor on a small scale, but also more extended forms that stretch out over a complete text. We also encountered a small number of idiomatic expressions that could be interpreted as being used in a potentially deliberate way based on the co-text, but these were eventually left out of the

present analysis because of their specialised nature and complex individual structures.

In general, instances of extended metaphors were rather rare in the news texts. Generalisations about the use of extended deliberate metaphors are difficult to make on the basis of the few results in our data. However, the instances that do occur can tell us something about the role of metaphor in the idea that news texts (and news language in general) may have moved towards a more personalised style of language use. One complex metaphorical comparison in which various elements of the source (and possibly) target domains are explicitly used can often produce considerable impact on the general metaphoricity of a text. That is, when a text contains a comparison that has been worked out in detail throughout the text, the text may feel more metaphorical than a text in which only highly conventional metaphorical expressions occur. It seems that a denser use of particularly those metaphorical comparisons that are more complex and that are exploited throughout a text fits in with the idea that contemporary news articles are more personalised, coloured or subjective in language style.

The different search methods that were used to find potentially deliberate metaphors finally produced a selection of prominent cases. The clearest examples of deliberate metaphors are metaphors in the form of similes; a large number of markers defined in table 8.1 are interpreted as possible simile markers, and together yield the most interesting results out of all the pre-defined markers. Also interesting is the frequent use of orthographic markers such as inverted commas to mark metaphorically used words. With regard to these, some cases show interplay between the metaphorical expression and the use of direct quotes. The manual search through the texts also produced a number of interesting extensions of metaphor. Each section hereafter focuses on one of the above-mentioned forms of metaphor, comparing the different findings for the two news periods, and describing the nature of the potential deliberateness and its different prominence in the two news periods. Section 8.3 focuses solely on similes, section 8.4 focuses on metaphors marked by inverted commas, and section 8.5 discusses a case study of extended metaphor.

### **8.3 Similes as deliberate metaphors in news**

During the compiling of a list of possible signalling devices of possibly deliberate metaphor, it showed that some of the most common signals discussed in previous studies were those marking similes, such as *als* 'as/like', *zoals* 'as/like' and (*als een*) *soort* '(as a) sort/kind of', *lijken* 'seem/appear' and *schijnen* 'seem/appear'. Table 8.2 lists the most important outcomes of the concordance searches for these words.

Table 8.2 Occurrences of possible simile signals in corpus

Signal in Dutch	Equivalent in English	Results metaphor signalling in data	Comments
als	as / like	marks the vast majority of similes	also used in literal comparisons and examples
zoals	as / like	not combined with metaphor in the data	only introduces literal examples of concepts, in utterances such as: ' <i>forms of punishment, [zoals] isolation...</i> '.
alsof	as if / as though	found twice as marker of simile in current news	no instances of <i>alsof</i> in the historical data.
(als een) soort	a sort / kind of	found once as marker of simile in the current news.	often used to introduce a literal comparison, such as ' <i>a [soort] hut...</i> '
lijken	seem / appear	sometimes used as marker of simile in current news	not found in historical news
schijnen	appear / seem	not combined with metaphor	infrequent in the data in general
als het ware	as it were	found once in the historical news data in combination with metaphor	not found in current news at all
bij wijze van spreken	so to speak	not combined with metaphor	generally downtones a statement
zeg maar	so to say	not combined with metaphor	conversational style, generally downtones a statement, informal
zogezegd	so to say / so to speak	not combined with metaphor	conversational style, generally downtones a statement, formal
zogenaamd	so to say / so to speak	not combined with metaphor	generally downtoning, introducing fantasies too

The information in the table shows that not all words that were initially identified as possible signals for similes in fact also flagged similes; some only signalled literal examples of concepts (*zoals*), others signalled literal comparisons between objects or situations (*soort*). The signalling device most frequently used to flag or introduce a simile is *als* 'as/like' (but not all instances of *als* in the data flagged a simile).

The similes that occur in the news data are seen as potentially deliberate metaphors. The linguistic structure of similes overtly invites addressees to make a

comparison between two distinct domains, something that is initialised by the use of one of the simile signals. The occurrence of one or more expressions from the source domain as well as the target domain additionally make the structure of the comparison explicit; it is likely that the writer intentionally initialises the explicit comparison, and it is likely that the addressee understands the intended comparison as such due to the use of the signal as well as the source and target domain elements that are present. Thus, a simile is ‘an explicit statement of comparison between two different things’ (Semino, 2008).

The question then arises whether similes as deliberate metaphors also commonly try to elicit a particular rhetorical effect. In general, the effect that similes cause is that addressees are triggered to set up a cross-domain comparison in which the perspective about a target domain is guided by the use of expressions from a distinct source domain. However, there is variation in the complexity of how this is achieved, which may also cause variation in the kind and strength of a possible rhetorical effect. The similes that occur in our data are variously structured, ranging from relatively simple comparisons of a person to an animal, to very complex comparisons where multiple features are aligned. Only a handful of the similes appear in the form that is generally used in the studies discussed above, *A is like B*. The majority of the similes in the corpus show a more complex structure, where two or more words from the source domain or the target domain, or both, are used, and where a combination of direct and indirect language use appears (cf. Croft & Cruse, 2004). Examples where interaction between simile and metaphor occurs are more common for unconventional similes, according to Semino (2008: 17). Some of the similes draw attention to one small element or attribute, and others are used in a more extended manner, comparing relations. Depending on the interaction between source and target domain expressions and the structure of the simile, the intended communicative effect may be more or less prominent.

Overall, the number of similes is relatively small considering the total number of metaphor-related words that were found in the different corpus sets. The similes that occur in historical news are all similar in complexity, being relatively simple in structure, but some of the similes in current news are much more complex in structure, and seem to include more elements from target and source domains. More precise details will be discussed below. Differences in how the two news sets make use of similes can give more insight into possible differences in personalised style of certain texts or newspapers in particular, and news language in general.

### 8.3.1 *Similes in historical news*

There are only four similes in the historical news data, and all are signalled by *als* ‘like’. They are all more or less structured the same, describing different features of people. In addition, they all contain only one directly used word to talk about the

respective source domains. One example occurs in a news text from the arts sections, reviewing a play performed by a famous theatre group. The remaining three similes occur in the sports sections of the newspapers, and all originate from texts describing football matches. This means that for historical news, deliberate metaphors in the form of similes only occur in subsections of news that are traditionally seen as more informal and involved sections to begin with.

Example (3) describes an action by a football player, Van der Hoeven.

- (3) Door zich voortreffelijk in de naaste omgeving van de Fries [Lenstra] op te stellen had v.d. Hoeven alles. *Als een magneet trok* hij [v.d. Hoeven] de bal naar zich toe.

‘By positioning himself in the near vicinity of the Frisian [Lenstra], v.d. Hoeven had everything. *Like a magnet* he [v.d. Hoeven] *pulled* the ball towards himself.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, sports*)

The metaphor foci in this example are *magneet* ‘*magnet*’, a form that is used directly to compare the football player v.d. Hoeven with, and *trok* ‘*pulled*’, a form used indirectly to describe the movement of the player. *Als* ‘*like*’ is seen as a metaphor signal, introducing the simile form. The structure of which element in the sentence belongs to which domain, and how the elements and relations are aligned and compared, can be shown systematically by describing the propositions in their full form and aligning them in open or closed comparisons. This can be done by using the 5-step method developed by Steen (1999a, 2009). This method moves from the text on paper to the propositions to the metaphorical comparison and its conceptual structure in five steps. The procedure is used in this section as a tool to uncover the sometimes complex structures of similes.

With respect to (3), the first step describes the different definitions of the metaphor-related words.

#### Step 1:

*Als een magneet trok hij de bal naar zich toe*

*magneet*

**contextual and basic sense:** stuk staal dat op kunstmatige wijze deze eigenschap (kleine stukjes ijzer aantrekken) gekregen heeft (kunstmagneet) (piece of steel that gained the property of being able to attract small pieces of iron)

*trekken*

**contextual sense:** ‘in bezit krijgen en houden’ (gain possession and keep)

**basic sense:** kracht uitoefenen op iets dat men vasthoudt in de richting naar zich toe, althans in de richting waarin het deel dat men vast heeft zich moet bewegen of zich beweegt (put pressure on someone or something that one holds in the direction towards him/her...)

In the next step of the analysis, the propositions are spelled out systematically. The simile can be interpreted as a reduced form of a more complex comparison: the way the football player takes the ball towards him is compared to the way a magnet pulls iron towards itself. The more complex form can be presented in propositions where all elements of the relation are shown, also the implicit ones, but since step 2 is typically used to represent the propositions as they occur in the text base, a simple version is used here.<sup>18</sup> The version that does not take into account the simile's reduced nature would look like step 2 below. Here, the propositions of the text base are represented structurally.

**Step 2:**

S1				
DU1 <sup>19</sup>	P1	(TREKKENs	HIJ	BAL)
	P2	(NAARTOE	P1	ZICH)
	P3	(ALS	P1	MAGNEETs)

In step 3, the source and target domains are, as it were, pulled apart, and an operator is introduced to indicate the connection between the two propositions that are part of the main comparison. In the case of similes, this operator is the signal, *als* in (3).

**Step 3:**

<u>Derived from S1-DU1-P3: (ALS P2 MAGNEET)</u>				
SIM: ALS { $\exists F, \exists y$				
(F		HIJ	BAL),	
([NAAR-ZICH-TOE]		TREKKEN	MAGNEET	y),s}

The comparison in step 3 contains gaps in both source and target domain. These are the elements that are not explicitly stated in the text, but that can now be inferred from the definitions presented in step 1. So although we are dealing with a simile in which the source and target domain elements are usually included, the open comparison shows that the target domain expression for the action is not

<sup>18</sup> The complete comparison could be presented in the following manner: *Zoals een magneet ijzer naar zich toe trekt, trok hij de bal naar zich toe* 'Like a magnet pulls pieces of iron towards itself, he pulled the bal towards himself'. This is represented in propositions in the following way, with the implicit elements between square brackets:

- (P1 TREKKEN HIJ BAL)
- (P2 NAARTOE P1 ZICH)
- (P3 ALS P1 P4)
- (P4 [TREKKEN] MAGNEET [IJZER])
- (P5 [NAARTOE] P4 [ZICH])

<sup>19</sup> Here and in the following boxes, DU refers to discourse unit. For more information on this, see Steen (1999).

referred to in the text, and the same goes for the element that is related to *magnet* by way of pulling. In the next step of the procedure, the open slots are filled in on the basis of the definitions from step 1. The full comparison and the labels of the domains are then revealed.

**Step 4:**

Derived from S1-DU1-P3: (ALS P2 MAGNEET)

SIM: ALS {		
([BIJ-ZICH-HOUDEN]	HIJ	BAL)t = football player
([NAAR-ZICH-TOE]TREKKEN	MAGNEET	IJZER)s = magnet}

The closed comparison shows that by filling in the gaps, the different elements in the two relations are compared: the player and the magnet, the ball and iron, and the action of gaining possession performed by the player and the action of pulling by the magnet.

As a last step in the procedure, the different elements from the two domains are aligned in two columns, and more elements that are potentially part of the comparison and that can be inferred are added to the alignment. The alignment in step 5 shows that it is not the attributive features of a magnet that are mapped onto the football player, but that a relation between a magnet and iron, the natural force of iron being pulled towards a magnet, is compared to the physical efforts of the football player getting the ball and keeping the ball close to himself.

**Step 5:**

Derived from S1-DU1-P3:  
*football player is magnet*

T		S
BIJ ZICH HOUDEN	←	TREKKEN
HIJ (V.D. HOEVEN)	←	MAGNEET
BAL	←	IJZER
	inferences	
INTENTIONAL	←	INHERENT
MANUAL LABOUR	←	NATURAL FORCE

The notion of *magnet* is conventionally used to describe people or entities that attract other people or entities, which is also defined as a meaning in *Van Dale*. However, in the case of (3), the expression is a deliberate metaphorical expression that invites the reader to set up a comparison, evoked by the use of the signal *als* and the simile form. The word *magnet* (and the complete comparison) is used to highlight one specific characteristic of the football player. What it seems to do is describe the football player Van der Hoeven in a particular way that is deviant from how football players in general are viewed. It is particularly the naturalness of

gaining possession of the ball that is the main focus which the comparison wants to bring across.

The source and target domain labels that are used in steps 4 and 5 are on the same level as the actual linguistic realisations in the text, namely *football player* and *magnet*. It would also be possible to say that this example of a cross-domain comparison is an instantiation of a higher-level conceptual metaphor such as PEOPLE ARE MACHINES, or SPORTS PLAYERS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS, or PHYSICAL FORCE IS NATURAL FORCE, but it seems that the writer wants to convey the idea that the features ascribed to the football player are personal and individual rather than generally part of any sports player's assets. The simile in (3) is related to the idea that deliberate metaphors can be conventional terms, but are used to describe an ad-hoc, unique situation. Not all football players act like magnets, only this particular one does.

Another example of a simile from the historical news texts is found in another football report.

- (4) Ben Barek slingerde zich omhoog, ving de bal op zijn borst, draaide half rond, *schoot als een kat door de mensenhaag* en het eerste doelpunt was geboren.

‘Ben Barek swung himself upwards, caught the ball on his chest, turned half around, *shot like a cat through the hedge of people* and the first goal was born.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, sports*)

Again, the structure of the comparison can be made clear by going through the different steps. In step 1, the different metaphor-related words are defined. For ease of reference, only the clause containing the simile is repeated.

The propositions from the text base are systematically structured in step 2. The comparison between the source and target domain can be deduced in step 3 from the use of *als*. The interesting issue here is that a compound noun seems to contain elements from both the source and the target domain. The ‘mensen’ part of *mensenhaag* ‘*hedge of people*’ refers directly to the people on the field, whereas the ‘haag’ part seems directly used to describe a hedge, which can be seen to refer to the area that cats sometimes have to move through. This combination is represented in step 3 by combining the separate source and target parts if the word to the open slots *b* and *y*. A completely filled-in comparison where labels are added to the domains is presented in step 4.

**Step 1:**

[Ben Barek] schoot als een kat door de mensenhaag.

*schieten*

**contextual and basic sense:** (intrans.) zich plotseling snel bewegen of aldus bewogen worden in de richting die een bepaling noemt (suddenly move quickly or being moved quickly in the direction of the co-text)

*kat:*

**contextual and basic sense:** viervoetig klein huisdier, afstammend van de wilde kat (...) (four footed little pet, descendent of the wild cat)

*(mensen)haag:*

**contextual sense:** (figuurlijk) op een rij naast elkaar geschaarde personen of zaken (people or objects that are placed in a row next to each other)

**basic sense:** heining tot bescherming of afpaling van een stuk land, bestaand uit geschoren kreupelhout of (doornig) struikgewas (enclosure as a protection of a piece of land, consisting of undergrowth or shrubs)

**Step 2:**

S2 DU1 P1	(SCHIETEN	BEN BAREKt)	
	P2	(DOOR	P1 MENSENHAAGs)
	P3	(ALS	P1 KATs)

**Step 3:**

derived from S2-DU1-P3: (ALS P1 KAT)

SIM: ALS { $\exists b, \exists y$

(SCHIETEN-DOOR	BEN BAREK	MENSEN- <i>b</i> )t
(SCHIETEN-DOOR	KAT	<i>y</i> -HAAGs}

**Step 4:**

derived from S2-DU1-P3: (ALS P1 KAT)

SIM: ALS {

(SCHIETEN-DOOR	BEN BAREK	MENSEN-RIJ)t = football player
(SCHIETEN-DOOR	KAT	BOSJES-HAAG)s = cat}

The way the football player Ben Barek moves along a row of opponents, ‘*the hedge of people*’, is seen as similar to the way a cat can move through a hedge.

This simile sets up a comparison between the movements of the football player and the movements of cats, a comparison which is not conventionally used to describe the way football players generally move. Although it could be possible to see this as an instance of a higher-level metaphor such as PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, the example is a unique description of this particular player in this particular

situation. Consequently, it creates an image of the football player and his movements that is potentially deviant from the image an addressee normally has of a football player. It can be seen as the perception that the reporter has of the football player, which is something he wants to share with his audience. By adding the personal note of the reporter to the description of the actions reported on, the text gains a more involved and personalised impression.

The similes above are rare examples of deliberate uses of metaphorical language in the historical news texts. Both examples above have shown that their communicative intention seems to be to view the playing style of a certain player in a specific way. There are two more similes in the historical data, which work on the same levels as examples (3) and (4). In those, people are compared to historical or royal characters, and here too, the comparisons are intended to view the topics in highly individual ways. One interesting notion is that three of the four similes found in historical news occur in sports reports, and one is a comparison of an actor with a historical person, in a review of a theatre play. For historical news, then, it seems that certain subsections of news allow for potentially deliberate metaphors more so than other subsections. Sports sections and art reviews can be seen as instances of what is often called 'soft news', and such sections may allow for a more personal style of describing events and using a personal point of view. Only a small selection of historical news language seems to allow for such deliberate metaphors that portray personal views and styles.

### *8.3.2 Similes in current news*

The current news data shows a wider variety of similes and simile structures than the historical news texts, although the total number of similes (14) is still extremely low in comparison to the number of indirect expressions of metaphorical language use (around 11,300 cases). It is still considerably more than the number that occurred in historical news, though, also relatively speaking. In addition, a number of similes in current news contains more than one word to talk about the source domains in question, with a maximum of four directly used words describing the source domain in the most explicit similes. The majority of the similes occur in reports from the arts sections of newspapers, with one art review contributing in particular. This could be seen as a signal that simile use is dependent on the preference of the writer and his or her intentions in communicating certain ideas, or on the abstractness of the topic of the report, but these notions will be discussed in more detail after having looked at the examples below.

A number of similes occurred in sports reports, and a small selection was found in the national news sections and the front pages. With regard to the subsections in which the similes occur, these thus seem similar to what was found for the historical news sections. The fact that a small selection from the current news set did indeed occur in other subsections of news that are traditionally viewed

as more or less objective and formal (such as front page and national news) may already be an indication that the use of deliberate metaphors as similes is spreading, and that personalised descriptions become more common. A selection of the similes will be discussed in more detail.

The first two examples occurred in one art review. The similes describe aspects of a set of art objects, focusing on the material they are made of and their exterior appearance. The art objects in question are four large white sculptures with round forms that look like ancient Roman sculptures of female figures. The sculptures are actually made of polystyrene foam, and are thus very light and vulnerable. Their particular features are compared to features of other materials. The similes that are used focus mainly on attributive features and not so much on relational features. Example (5) describes the exterior of the sculptures:

- (5) De huid van de beelden is *glad als gepolijst marmer*, maar ook *transparant als een blok ijs*.

‘The skin of the sculptures is *smooth like polished marble*, but also *transparent like a block of ice*.’

(NRC, arts)

The example contains two similes, in which one and the same element is compared to two different elements in an opposition. As with the similes discussed in the section above, this example is of a different structure than those usually referred to in studies on simile understanding. Instead of having an *A is like B* structure, these two parts are structured as *A is x like B*. For (5), this means that it is not structured as ‘skin of sculpture is like polished marble’ but as ‘skin of sculpture is smooth like polished marble’. The *A is like B* structure could be used for (5) to interpret the meaning that the skin of the sculptures are smooth, but this can only be done if the addressee sees ‘smooth’ as one of the features of marble that can be compared. By extending the simile structure to include the actual compared feature, the addressee is guided towards a very specific interpretation. It is particularly the smoothness of marble, and not its colour or solidness, for instance, that the sculptures are compared to. The same goes for the second part; it is particularly the transparency of ice, and not its temperature or substance for instance, which resembles the outside of the sculptures. Although the differences between the two simile structures seem small, they may possibly cause different comparisons and potentially different understandings of the comparison.

The different steps structurally demonstrate that only attributive features are compared, and not relational features.

**Step 1:**

*De huid van de beelden is glad als gepolijst marmer, maar ook transparant als een blok ijs.*

*glad*

**contextual and basic sense:** (of surfaces) giving little friction when moving over it, smooth (zeer weinig wrijving gevend bij beweging erover, effen)

*marmer*

**contextual and basic sense:** dense, fine-grained limestone like substance (dicht, fijnkorrelig kalkgesteente)

*transparant*

**contextual and basic sense:** see-through (doorzichtig)

*blok ijs*

**contextual and basic sense:** block of frozen water (blok bevroren water)

The metaphor-related words in (5) are all thus directly used. However, there are two comparisons of objects that can be deduced from the propositions in step 2.

From the propositions, two comparisons are derived with the same target domain, namely the sculptures, but with different source domains, labelled s1 and s2 in the propositions above. This is done in step 3.

**Step 2:**

S3 DU1 P1	(MAAR OOK	DU1	DU2)
P1	(ZIJN	HUID	GLAD)
P2	(VAN	HUID	BEELD)
P3	(ALS	P1	<b>MARMER</b> <sub>s1</sub> )
P4	(MOD	<b>MARMER</b> <sub>s1</sub>	<b>GEPOLIJST</b> <sub>s1</sub> )
DU2 P1	([ZIJN]	[HUID]	TRANSPARANT)
P2	(VAN	[HUID]	[BEELDEN])
P3	(ALS	P1	<b>BLOK-IJS</b> <sub>s2</sub> )

**Step 3:**

derived from S3-DU1-P3 (ALS P1 MARMER)

SIM: ALS {

(ZIJN [HUID-VAN-BEELD] GLAD)t  
(ZIJN [GEPOLIJST-MARMER]GLAD)s }

derived from S1-DU2-P3 (ALS P1 BLOK-IJS)

SIM: ALS {

(ZIJN [HUID VAN BEELD] TRANSPARANT)t  
(ZIJN BLOK-IJS TRANSPARANT)s }

The comparisons are closed in step 3 already, because the same properties for the two source domains, *marble* and *block of ice*, apply to the sculptures in equal manner. Step 4 then gives the same comparisons, but adds the labels for the different domains.

**Step 4:**

derived from S3-DU1-P3 (ALS P1 MARMER)

SIM: ALS {  
 (ZIJN [HUID-VAN-BEELD] GLAD)t = sculpture  
 (ZIJN [GEPOLIJST-MARMER]GLAD)s = marble}

derived from S1-DU2-P3 (ALS P1 BLOK-IJS)

SIM: ALS {  
 (ZIJN [HUID VAN BEELD] TRANSPARANT)t = sculpture  
 (ZIJN BLOK-IJS TRANSPARANT)s = block-of-ice}

There are thus two comparisons that only include attributes; for the first, the attribute of smoothness is compared, and for the second the attribute of transparency is compared. The alignments in step 5 do not include any other elements than those explicitly stated in the propositions. This is because it is explicitly stated that the only features from the two source domains that are mapped onto the target domain are the smoothness and the transparency features. As mentioned above, the explicit structure of the simile chosen here ideally only triggers one feature of each source domain.

**Step 5:**

Derived from S3-DU1-P3:

*sculpture is marble*

T		S
SCULPTURE	←	MARBLE
OUTSIDE	←	OUTSIDE
SMOOTH	←	SMOOTH

Derived from S3-DU2-P3:

*sculpture is block of ice*

T		S
SCULPTURE	←	MARBLE
OUTSIDE	←	OUTSIDE
TRANSPARENT	←	TRANSPARENT

The idea that these two comparisons are deliberately used is formed on the basis of the particular choice of the mapped elements and the notion that two similes are used in consecutive order. The writer guides the addressee to see the skin of the sculptures in terms of only one particular feature of marble, namely its

smoothness. The same can be said about the transparency feature of the sculpture and the block of ice. In addition, the two compared do not occur in isolation in possible coincidental instances, but are placed next to each other in an intentional description of the sculptures. It is because of this that the comparisons can be interpreted as deliberate.

The expression of a cross-domain mapping in the form of a simile in (6) deals with the same art objects and their materials.

- (6) Marica maakt funky beelden zonder noodzaak of duidelijke betekenis, kunstwerken die *net zo luchtig zijn als het piepschuim waarvan ze gemaakt zijn*.

‘Marica makes funky sculptures without necessity or clear meaning, art works that are just as *airy* as the polystyrene foam that they are made of.’

(NRC, arts)

The crucial element in this comparison is the word *luchtig* ‘*airy*’, which can be read as being used literally and metaphorically at the same time. The preceding context tells the reader that the current topic deals with the meaning of the art works, but here a link is made between their meaning and their substance. The abstract light-hearted character of the sculptures – the fact that they do not convey a clear meaning or message which the artist wants to convey with his work – is compared to the actual airy quality of the material of which the sculptures are made. Although the interpretation of this simile could be rather straightforward, it is more complicated to explain its formal structure and determine the roles of the different elements. This can be illustrated by paraphrasing the intended meaning of the essentially reduced simile. Example (6) can in basic terms be read as saying that ‘*the art works are just as airy in meaning as they are airy in material*’.

The double meaning of *luchtig* ‘*airy*’ to describe both the art works’ abstract meaning and the substance of their material is a form of wordplay that can be interpreted as an indication of the deliberateness of the simile. The double meaning of *luchtig*, both literal and metaphorical, triggers the addressee in assessing the comparison consciously. The fact that there is a clear form of word play here also suggests that the writer intentionally chose this metaphorical use of the word over another option. The conventionality of it may still influence the final processing (both uses of *luchtig* are conventional), but it can be concluded that it is used deliberately by the writer, and will potentially be noticed as such by the addressee through the textual clues.

There are more news texts from arts sections in which similes are used to describe the nature of a performance. Example (7) occurs in a review of a classical concert, and describes the performance by the conductor leading the orchestra. It is the most complete simile found in the data and subsequently also the most creative example of metaphorical language use found in any of the news texts (or the conversation in the corpus, for that matter).

- (7) *Als een slangenbezweerder die niet een maar vele kronkelende gifslangen onder bedwang probeerde te houden, hypnotiseerde Van Zweden de naar het afstandelijke neigende musici van het Residentie Orkest tot een volledige overgave aan de gecompliceerde hectiek en contrapuntiek van Mahlers Zevende symfonie.*

*'Like a snake charmer who tried to control not one but many wriggling venomous snakes, Van Zweden hypnotised the musicians of the Residence Orchestra, who leaned towards a distancing, to a complete surrender to the complicated frantic and contrapuntal state of Mahler's Seventh symphony.'*

*(NRC, arts)*

The example shows an extended simile in which a number of elements from the source domain and the target domain are present. The step by step analysis of its propositions shows the complexity as well as the completeness of the comparison more clearly. For ease of analysis, the sentence stops after '*volledige overgave*' in step 1.

**Step 1:**

*Als een slangenbezweerder die niet een maar vele kronkelende gifslangen onder bedwang probeerde te houden, hypnotiseerde Van Zweden de naar het afstandelijke neigende musici van het Residentie Orkest tot een volledige overgave.*

*slangenbezweerder*

**contextual and basic sense:** 'iem. die vertoningen geeft met gevaarlijke slangen die hij in zijn macht heeft' ('someone who gives performances with dangerous snakes that he controls')

*kronkelend*

**contextual and basic sense:** zich herhaaldelijk wendend of buigend, allerlei bochten, kronkels makend ('continuously turning and bending, making twisting turns')

*gifslangen*

**contextual and basic sense:** giftige slang ('venomous snake')

*onder bedwang houden*

**contextual and basic sense:** bedwingen, in toom houden ('control, keep under control')

*hypnotiseren*

**contextual sense:** sterk onder zijn invloed brengen (door dirigeren) ('bring under influence, by means of conducting them')

**basic sense:** in hypnotische toestand brengen ('bring in a hypnotising state')

Step 1 shows that one word is used indirectly, namely *hypnotiseren* 'hypnotise'. The other words that are part of the simile directly express elements of the source domain, including *onder bedwang houden* 'control', which directly refers to the

same source domain element to which *hypnotise* indirectly refers. The propositions are constructed in the box below. The underlining and bold show which elements are part of the source domain. There is one comparison that is completely fleshed out, with both the directly used word *control* and the indirectly used word *hypnotise* to refer to the same target element. Using two lexical units to refer to the same source domain element emphasises the image that is created by this simile.

Step 2:				
S4				
DU1	P1	<u>(HYPNOTISERENs</u>	VAN ZWEDEN MUSICI)	
	P2	(MOD MUSICI	[NAAR HET AFSTANDELIJKE NEIGENDE])	
	P3	(VAN MUSICI	RESIDENTIE-ORKEST)	
	P4	(TOT P1	OVERGAVE)	
	P5	(MOD OVERGAVE	VOLLEDIG)	
	P6	(ALSmflag P1	P7)	
	P7	<b>[(ONDER-BEDWANG-HOUDENs]</b>	<b>SLANGENBEZWEERDERs GIFSLANGENs)</b>	
	P8	(MOD GIFSLANGEN	<b>KRONKELENDs)</b>	
	P9	(AANTAL GIFSLANGEN	<b>[NIET-EEN-MAAR-VELEs]</b> )	

In step 3, the first comparison is derived from the simile marker, and includes the target and source domain expressions that are explicitly stated in the simile. The indirectly used *hypnotise* returns in the second comparison as the source domain predicate.

Step 3:	
derived from S4-DU1-P6: (ALS P1 P7)	
SIM: ALS { $\exists F$	
( $F$	VAN ZWEDEN [NAAR-AFSTANDELIJKE-NEIGENDE MUSICI-VAN-RESIDENTIE-ORKEST])t
([ONDER-BEDWANG-HOUDEN]	SLANGENBEZWEERDER [NIET-EEN-MAAR-VELE-KRONKELENDE-GIFSLANGEN)s}
derived from S4-DU1-P1:	
SIM { $\exists F, \exists x, y$	
( $F$	VAN ZWEDEN [NAAR-AFSTANDELIJKE-NEIGENDE- MUSICI-VAN-RESIDENTIE-ORKEST])t
(HYPNOTISEREN	x y)s }

The first comparison derived from the simile signal *als* can be considered as nearly closed; all but the predicate of the target domain occur in the text base. Derived from the first proposition is an open comparison with the indirectly used verb

*hypnotiseren*. The following step would be to fill in the open slots from the source and target domains, and subsequently also the predicate element in the target domain of the first comparison.

Both the source domain and the target domain are clearly represented in the simile in the language; the source domain of *slangenbezweeren* ‘snake charming’ is represented by the expressions *slangenbezweerder* ‘snake charmer’, *vele kronkelende gifslangen* ‘many wriggling venomous snakes’ and *onder bedwang houden* ‘control’. These occur at one side of the comparison. The target domain of *dirigeren* ‘conducting’ is represented by the conductor *Van Zweden* and by *musici van het Residentie Orkest* ‘musicians of the Residence Orchestra’.

**Step 4:**

derived from S4-DU1-P1:

SIM {  
 ([ONDER-INVLOED-BRENGEN-DOOR-DIRIGEREN] VAN ZWEDEN [NAAR-  
 AFSTANDELIJKE-NEIGENDE-MUSICI-VAN-RESIDENTIE-ORKEST])t = conducting  
 (HYPNOTISEREN HYPNOTISEUR/ SLANGENBEZWEERDER  
 PERSOON/SLANG)s = hypnotising/snake charming }

derived from S4-DU1-P6: (ALS P1 P7)

SIM: ALS {  
 ([ONDER-INVLOED-BRENGEN-DOOR-DIRIGEREN] VAN ZWEDEN  
 [NAAR-AFSTANDELIJKE-NEIGENDE-MUSICI-VAN-RESIDENTIE-  
 ORKEST])t = conducting  
 ([ONDER-BEDWANG-HOUDEN] SLANGENBEZWEERDER  
 [NIET-EEN-MAAR-VELE-KRONKELENDE-GIFSLANGEN) s = snake charming }

One of the interesting elements in this sentence is the use of *hypnotiseren* ‘hypnotise’. The unit *hypnotise* can be seen as being part of the source domain of *snake charming*, parallel to the unit of *controlling*. These two verbs are both part of the source domain, but one is used directly (*control*) to talk about the source domain and the other is used indirectly (*hypnotise*) to talk about the target domain. The actual target expression of *conducting* is not overtly stated. The verb *hypnotise* is indirectly used; Van Zweden does not literally hypnotise the musicians, but the way he conducts them is seen as similar to the way someone hypnotises others, or more specifically, the way snake charmers hypnotise snakes. The crux here is that there are two verb forms that can be seen as being part of the same source domain, of which one is used directly to refer to the controlling of snakes and one indirectly to refer to the target element of conducting an orchestra. Whereas most similes usually contain one indirectly used verb (as in the previous examples from historical news) or, when the comparison is completely filled in, a directly used target and source domain expression, the situation in (7) is an exception. When aligning the source and target domain elements, *onder bedwang houden* and *hypnotiseren* are both source domain expressions to describe *conducting*.

**Step 5:**

derived from S4-DU1-P6: (ALS P1 P7)  
*conducting is snake charming*

T		S
VAN ZWEDEN (= conductor)	←	SLANGENBEZWEERDER
MUSICI VAN ORKEST	←	GIFSLANGEN
NAAR AFSTANDELIJKE NEIGENDE	←	KRONKELEND
DIRIGEREN	←	ONDER BEDWANG HOUDEN
DIRIGEREN	←	HYPNOTISEREN
	inferences	
BATON	←	FLUTE
CONCERT HALL	←	SQUARE
ORCHESTRA AREA	←	BASKET

The extensiveness of the comparison can also lead to more inferred mappings between elements from the two domains. It is likely that such substantial inferences occur when comprehending the simile.

There are a number of crucial textual elements that lead to the idea that the example of metaphor-related language use in example (7) is an instance of deliberate metaphor. Firstly, the signalling device *als* invites addressees to set up a comparison between the two domains. In addition, the elaborate nature of the simile, in which a relation between elements from the source and target domain is extensively described, is an indication of the intentions on the part of the reporter towards the manner of comprehension of the comparison. Thirdly, the interaction between directly used words and indirectly used words from the same source domain reveal that the structure and wording of the comparison are carefully constructed. The extended nature of the simile results in a rich image of the performance (the target), and image to which the addressee is guided by means of the various textual clues. The effect of such a complex and complete metaphorical expression is to bring across the special nature of the performance described, and to put emphasis on the abilities of the actors in the performance. In addition, including such an extended metaphorical comparison in a report gives the text a high level of metaphorical meaning, much more so than frequent conventional metaphors occurring in the text accomplish. This is due to the creative and vivid image that the simile evokes: the level of ‘metaphoricity’ of the text rises with this deliberate metaphor. It also personalises the text to the extent that the reporter chooses to express his own views on the performance in a pronounced manner. Presence of deliberate metaphors such as these mark the language of some sections of news as subjective and personalised in style.

Besides art reviews, other ‘soft news’ sections such as sports news were also relatively frequent sources of deliberate metaphors in the form of similes. One example that stands out is shown in (8).

- (8) Engeland valt sinds een week in lyrische bewoordingen over Bergkamp heen. Alsof God terug is op aarde.

‘Since one week, England waxes lyrical about Bergkamp. As if God is back on earth.’

*(De Telegraaf, sports)*

The interesting case here is that the target domain situation is not mentioned overtly; the comparison between the source domain of God returning to earth and the target domain related to the football player can only be understood if addressees know the situation at that time regarding the player, Dennis Bergkamp. The rest of the news text provides only part of the context, commenting on the nature of the goal scored by the player and the choices made by the coach regarding the player. More background information and knowledge about the current situation, however, is needed to fully grasp the choice and comparison of the simile. Such knowledge will tell the addressee that the player in question, Bergkamp, was one of the star players for Arsenal, but had been performing inadequately for quite some time and had not been part of the first team during that time. The situation changed during the match previous to the one reported on, in which Bergkamp had shown some of his former excellence again. The goal that he scored in the match reported on in (8) was of such quality that reporters, football experts and fans regained faith in Bergkamp’s playing qualities. In all, the situation prior to and during the current match sparked the comparison with a religious event. Knowing the background situation of this story, the reporter compares Bergkamp to God, Bergkamp’s prior excellence to God’s initial work on earth, Bergkamp’s temporary inadequate quality to the fact that God abandoned the people on earth, and Bergkamp’s recent return to excellence as a possible return of God to our world. The actual comparison in example (8) can thus only be fully understood when the addressee is aware of the background situation in which the comparison needs to be placed.

By choosing to compare the football player with God, the writer seems to convey the intention of ranking Bergkamp’s football qualities and importance at a high level of excellence. The choice of a comparison to this source domain may additionally lie in the fact that one of the frequent nicknames of Bergkamp in England used to be ‘God’. Although the nature of the comparison is implicit in this example, the choice of the target domain and the structuring of the simile as a separate sentence are clues that point towards an intentional use of the metaphorical comparison. The text seems to become more personalised towards the style and knowledge of the reporter through the implicit comparison used here. With regard to understanding this metaphor, it is clear that the addressee will see the sentence as a metaphorical comparison. Whether one also understands the intended comparison and inferred mappings, however, remains dependent on the addressee’s background knowledge of the situation.

The examples discussed above represent the different complexities in simile structures that occur in the current news data from the corpus, including some that contained more than one directly used word referring to the source domain. In some cases, like the description of art objects in (5) and (6), only attributive features are compared, but in those cases a combination of source domains or word play draw additional attention to the comparison. In other cases, like the description of music or sports performances in (7) and (8), the complex structure of the simile and the extensions used are clear indications of the intention suggested by the writer, and the deliberateness of the metaphor. In general, the deliberate metaphors in the current news texts predominantly have the effect of making the respective texts feel more personalised because the similes repeatedly emphasise the personal views of the reporters. In addition, their complexities make part of the current news language, particularly the language of subsections such as art and sports reviews, feel more metaphorical and richer in imagery through the use of extended comparisons.

### *8.3.3 Conclusion*

The examples from the previous two sections have illustrated the different manners in which similes occur in Dutch historical and current news texts. Due to the small number of examples found in both periods, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions, but general trends do rise to the surface. The majority of the similes in both periods occur in specific subsection of the newspapers, and seem particularly characteristic for two subsections, namely the art reviews and the sports reports. In that respect, the two news periods are comparable, with the exception that current news also contained two similes used in front page and national news reports, and thereby seems to show that possibilities exist to use intentional metaphors in more objective reports.

An important difference between the two time periods is that the current news data contains relatively more, and more complex, similes. The ones occurring in historical news compared relations between elements in the target domain with relations between elements from the source domain, but always produced a relatively straightforward comparison in steps 3 and 4 of the analysis method. The similes in current news showed a wider variety of structures, of which some focused only on attributive features, but at the same time explored possibilities of word play, and of which others were completely fleshed out, included different source domain terms for the same referent, and contained more than one directly used word referring to the source domain.

The wider variety of similes found in the current news texts suggests that it has become more accepted to use metaphorical comparisons to describe people, situations or events. The metaphorical elements hence also seem to trigger the notion that current news texts are more vivid and contain more detailed images than historical news. In addition, the fact that some reports included a relatively

large number of similes also suggests that reporters can personalise reports when needed, and can add a subjective note to their writing. Two of the examples discussed above (and three remaining that were not discussed in detail) originate from one and the same report from the arts section, a review of an exhibition by one artist. Extensive use of simile in one text can depend on the topic of the text (art objects typically consist of attributive features that need descriptions), but can also be due to the preference of the reporter. In general, the frequencies of similes, the number of directly used words within one simile, and the different complexities lead to the overall conclusion that current news reports allow for a more personalised style of language in the form of deliberate similes. The fact that both news periods predominantly produced similes in newspaper sections that traditionally are seen as the softer news reporting also suggest for now, however, that not all parts of the news freely allow for a personal styles of writing.

#### 8.4 Inverted commas as markers of metaphor in news

Inverted commas in news discourse are most commonly used to indicate that the parts surrounded by inverted commas are direct quotes, in which the words of a particular source are represented (see for instance Semino & Short, 2004). Inverted commas also occur around expressions to indicate that the relevant expression is some kind of trope such as hyperbole, euphemism, metaphor, or word play, or a foreign expression. Examples (9) and (10) include inverted commas around words or phrases that need a specific signal to indicate that they are either specialised terms or euphemisms, and deviate in use from the surrounding text.

- (9) Bij de meeste verkeersongelukken met dodelijke afloop wordt ‘dood door schuld’ ten laste gelegd.

‘With most fatal traffic accidents, the charge is “culpable homicide”.’

(NRC, *national*)

- (10) ... de beschikbare onderzoeken naar de effecten van de ‘pedagogische tik’ c.q. het pak slaag.

‘... the studies available on the effects of the “pedagogical slap”, or the beating.’

(NRC, *science*)

In (9), *dood door schuld* ‘*culpable homicide*’ is an official legal term of conviction that is indicated as such by inverted commas. In (10), the term *pedagogische tik* ‘*pedagogical slap*’ is euphemistic for a beating, and stressed as such by the inverted commas. The sentences above include clear examples of uses of inverted commas that have been used to guide the reader towards a particular understanding of the word or phrase.

In a relatively large number of cases, inverted commas are used to mark off certain expressions that have a metaphorical meaning. In those instances, the inverted commas can be seen to signal to the addressee that the word in question should be taken as metaphorically used. According to Goatly (1997: 189), it is relatively common in news discourse that inverted commas mark off metaphorically used terms, whether they are conventional or novel ('inactive' or 'active' in Goatly's terms). The idea put forward by Goatly is that metaphorically used words are explicitly marked by inverted commas when the context and co-text do not provide enough clues for the addressee to disambiguate the meaning of the word (1997: 297). When that is the case, a writer can choose to use inverted commas to signal the deviating metaphorical use of the particular word or phrase.

In some situations, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly what the function of the inverted commas is; there are examples where more than one of the above-mentioned functions of inverted commas seem to be present. As Goatly suggests, "inverted commas (...) are ambiguous. On the one hand the primary speaker uses them to mark off someone else's speech which she is mentioning and embedding in her utterances (...). On the other hand they mark off a metaphor from literal language around it (...). In some cases they may be doing both (...)" (Goatly, 1997: 189). In practice, when inverted commas surround phrases consisting of more than one word, they usually indicate that those words report direct speech. When they mark off a single word or a small phrase, the different options mentioned by Goatly are possible. In news texts, various possibilities usually occur. In some cases, there seems to be an interaction between the notion of direct speech representation and emphasising the non-literality of the word or phrase.

In many cases of metaphor signalled by inverted commas, it is clear that the only reason why inverted commas are used is to guide the addressee to interpreting the word as metaphorically used. In some other cases, however, it seems that the inverted commas are also used partly because the words originate from a particular source different from the journalist. In theory, there are many reasons for choosing to use a particular word or phrase and signalling it with inverted commas, but these reasons are often difficult to deduce from the text alone. In addition, there can be combined reasons that relate to using quotes from sources and using metaphorically used words (as noted by Goatly too, see above). One can wonder, for instance, whether the choice for a particular quoted utterance from a source is related to that utterance having a certain metaphorical meaning, and whether that metaphorical expression has subsequently been deliberately chosen to communicate a certain idea or intention. It has often been noted that reporters consciously choose one particular quote above another in order to put a person or situation in a particular light. Unfortunately, these choices are difficult to retrieve when only the text is available.

Yet it can be asserted that most cases where signals are used in combination with metaphor-related words are intended to make the addressee aware of the metaphorical meaning. The use of a signal seems to imply that the reporter is at least aware of the metaphorical meaning of the word in context, and

with the help of signals wants to communicate this awareness to the reader. Thus with inverted commas around metaphorical expressions, there too is a form of deliberateness. However, there seem to be examples where the metaphorical expression is surrounded by commas but does not seem deliberately used. In example (11), for instance, the word *plan* ‘*plan*’ is coded as a metaphorically used word; the basic meaning of *plan* is ‘*schets, plattegrond*’ (‘*sketch, map*’), but it is used here to refer to a detailed idea or proposal according to which the Italian government should carry out certain actions.

- (11) Over dit ‘plan’ is al veel gediscussieerd. Di Vittorio zelf heeft het uitgewerkt en enige maanden geleden wereldkundig gemaakt. (...) Het is gebaseerd op drie cardinale punten: electriciteit, ontginning, woningbouw.

‘A lot has already been discussed about this “plan”. Di Vittorio himself has developed it and made it public some months ago. (...) It is based on three principle points: electricity, reclamation, house construction.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, international*)

The metaphorically used *plan* is surrounded by inverted commas in this sentence. The reason for this, however, does not seem to be to signal the reader towards understanding the word as a metaphor. The rest of the text includes different views of the proposed plan, of which some are opposing the proposed ideas. The inverted commas around *plan* here seem to relate to the idea that some parties do not view the plan as an idea that is not worthy to be called a plan. In this case, the inverted commas seem not intentionally used to guide the addressee towards a metaphorical understanding of the word but to indicate the unworthy character of the actual plan.

In general, the examples of metaphors surrounded by inverted commas in the corpus seem to show a relative sliding scale with regard to deliberateness; not all instances are potential deliberate metaphors, and those that are seem to have different degrees of intention. The discussion of prominent cases below will outline in more detail the cline that can be found in intention, awareness and deliberateness of metaphor in news. Various cases from historical and current news are discussed in detail. The focus will predominantly lie on deliberate metaphor occurrences and their effects, but attention will also be given to the apparent sliding scale of deliberateness.

#### 8.4.1 *Inverted commas and metaphor in historical news*

In general, the historical news texts contained quite a few single words and small phrases that were marked off by inverted commas, but only six signalled metaphor-related expressions. The examples of inverted commas that seem to have been intentionally used to signal the metaphorical meaning of a word or phrase occur in a number of newspaper sections that vary from descriptive news reports to more interpretive reviews of football matches and theatre plays. Excerpt (12) includes a

number of metaphorically used words that are surrounded by inverted commas, but that also seem to be conventionally used as metaphors in the given context.

- (12) Lenstra had al spoedig zijn meester gevonden: de Ajacied v.d.Hoeven. Zonder zijn grote tegenspeler te schaduwen groeide deze rechtshalf naar de ‘vorm’, die hem tot de beste speler van het veld maakte. (...) En Lenstra leed er zichtbaar onder. Hij trachtte door zijn bekende ‘wippertjes’ en een aantal goede passes hier enig tegenwicht tegenover te plaatsen. (...) Dräger had Mertens op een vierkante meter van zich af gegoocheld, diens lage en harde voorzet werd door Lakenberg ‘doodgemaakt’ voor de voeten van Michels ...

’Lenstra soon found his master: the Ajax player V.d. Hoeven. Without shadowing his great opponent, this right half back grew to the “form” that made him the best player on the field. (...) And Lenstra visibly suffered. He attempted to outbalance this with his well-known “little chips” and a few good passes. (...) Dräger had spirited away Mertens on the square metre, his low and hard cross pass was “killed” before the feet of Michels’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, sports*)

There are three metaphorically used words here that are marked by inverted commas, *vorm* ‘form’, *wippertjes* ‘little chips’ and *doodmaken* ‘kill’. Although these words seem conventional metaphorical expressions, they are marked to alert the reader of their existence. Compared to other conventional metaphorically used words in (12) that are not marked by commas, such as *meester* ‘master’, *schaduwen* ‘to shadow’, *tegenwicht* ‘contra-weight’, there then seems to be something special about the metaphors *form*, *little chips* and *kill* in the context of (12). These are marked by commas to guide the reader to their contextual metaphorical meaning. A fine line seems to be present here between deliberate metaphors and technical terms. The words *vorm* and *wippertjes* may several decades ago not have been well-known sports terms. The choice to use these metaphorical terms makes the text more specialised, and the use of commas can enhance this. At the same time, their metaphorical meaning increases their specialised use, and the commas create awareness of their metaphorical meaning in relation to technical football terms. The fact that signals are used can be seen as a form of awareness on the part of the reporter of the metaphorical meanings as well as their relations to football in this context.

The word *doodgemaakt* ‘killed’ seems to have a more distinct effect than the other two. The basic meaning of the word is rather resolute and vehement, something which is not the case in the contextual sense of the word. In addition, the contrast between the contextual meaning of stopping the ball and the basic meaning of killing a person is considerable. The reporter seems to want to draw attention to the fact that the contextual and less rigorous football-related meaning is intended here. Although this can also be understood from the context, the reporter possibly wants to make the reader aware of the manner of speaking that is used

here through the inverted commas, and that in football terms, the act of *doodmaken* is related to the game only. At the same time, guiding the addressees to the metaphorical meaning also makes them aware of the apparent skills that are present in the act of *doodmaken* when related to football.

The words in (12) seem to be deliberately used in a slightly different manner than suggested by Steen (2008) and than seen for the similes, since their rhetorical effects are marginal. However, the commas create awareness that the words should be understood metaphorically, which in turn put focus on the creative nature of the different football actions like *wippertje* and *doodmaken*. The signal makes the idea that the word can be understood by a comparison more plausible; addressees are easily guided to such an understanding through the signals. In short, the deliberateness here lies in the awareness of the use, and not so much in the change in perspective by the metaphor.

An example in which the inverted commas seem to be the predominant clues for the correct interpretation of a word in context is given in (13)

- (13) Schmitz is een klassieke speler met een fraaie, beheerste plastiek en een krachtige, klankvolle dictie, een acteur met ‘panache’ zoals men hier, in Holland, weinig vindt.

‘Schmitz is a classic player with a fine, poised expressiveness and a vigorous, resonant diction, an actor with “panache” who is rarely found here, in Holland.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, arts*)

The contextual meaning of *panache* is a proud or splendid style, and relates to the preceding descriptions of the actor. In Dutch, the basic meaning of *panache* is a plume, a bunch of feathers on top of a helmet. The idea that *panache* could refer to the basic meaning in the context of (13) is not unimaginable, given the fact that the description relates to a performance in which different costumes could be of importance. However, the commas focus on the marked use of this word and make the addressee aware of this. In addition, it signals that the word is originally a foreign term, something that may not be picked up automatically by all addressees. There then seem to be two possible reasons for marking this word with signals. The first relates to the foreign origin and the fact that some readers may not be familiar with the term. The second reason relates to the intended metaphorical reading of this word, emphasising that the possible basic meaning should not be interpreted here. In any case, the signals lead addressees to pay attention to the intended meaning and put awareness on the metaphorical comparison between the basic and contextual meanings.

The examples so far all included words with inverted commas that were chosen by the reporter, and were marked to guide the reader to the correct contextual understanding. The phrase in the following example seems to be signalled by inverted commas because of several reasons, namely because the phrase is metaphorically used, is an alternative version of a well-known idiomatic

expression, and because it is a representation of words uttered by someone else than the reporter.

- (14) Duizenden, die vreesden, dat Labour zou zwichten voor de bonden (...) weten nu, dat Attlee geen ‘schaap in schaapskleren’ is zoals Churchill hem eens noemde.

‘Thousands, who feared, that Labour would give in to the unions (...) now know, that Attlee is not a “sheep in sheep’s clothes” like Churchill once called him.’

(*de Volkskrant-historical, front page*)

The phrase *schaap in schaapskleren* ‘*sheep in sheep’s clothes*’ was originally uttered by Churchill to describe his successor, Clement Attlee. It is an alternative version of the idiom ‘a wolf in sheep’s clothes’, which typically describes a person who seems to be friendly or harmless (like a sheep) but is in fact dangerous or dishonest (like a wolf). The word change of *wolf* into *sheep* in (14) seems to be a representation of the idea that Churchill viewed Attlee as a person that seemed harmless but also in fact was harmless. The use of the inverted commas is likely to have three motives. Firstly, the reader is made aware of the metaphorical meaning of this phrase; Attlee was in no respect a real sheep, but his characteristics could be compared to the typical characteristics of a sheep. Secondly, the commas also put emphasis on the fact that the phrasing in (14) is somewhat redundant, with *sheep* and *sheep’s clothes* more or less referring to the same notion, and that it deviates from the phrasing of the original idiomatic expression, *a wolf in sheep’s clothes*. Thirdly, the inverted commas mark the fact that the phrase is a quote which was originally uttered by Churchill, something which is confirmed in the last part of (14). Thus, there is interplay between a metaphorically used word, creative use of an idiomatic expression and quoted language material. It is hard to tell which of the reasons is predominantly responsible for the choice of using inverted commas, but the fact that the sentence continues with explicitly ascribing the words to Churchill may be seen as an indication that the commas refer first and foremost to the direct quote status of the phrase. Subsequently, the commas put additional emphasis on the idiomatic character of the phrase, and the switch between the original wolf and the current sheep may draw added attention to the metaphorical use of *sheep*. Readers are likely to recognise the idiomatic status of the phrase, but in parallel have to adjust some parts and change their understanding of the idiom. Thus, signaling the phrase is likely to have these particular influences on how the reader understands the idea that is communicated in this sentence.

The examples above show that not all cases of metaphor marked by commas should be seen as equally deliberate. There seems to be a sliding scale in the deliberateness of the metaphor, in this respect that most cases can be seen as somehow deliberately used, but not all cases also clearly communicate a rhetorical goal with the metaphorical comparison in question. Examples like (12) and (13) can be seen as potentially deliberate, but also include other aspects like technical

use and foreign origin. In all examples above, however, the reporters seem to be aware of the use of different metaphor-related expressions in their writing, and want to signal this to the readers. The fact that they are marked as metaphorical terms, even when foreign or technical, puts emphasis on the meaning, and creates awareness of the metaphorical comparison. They are thus likely to be understood by comparison, and often as such create a more prominent sense of metaphoricity within a text.

#### 8.4.2 *Inverted commas and metaphor in current news*

The majority of inverted commas in the current news texts occur around quoted material from different news sources. In a number of cases where the language surrounded by inverted commas consist of small phrases, lexical units or single words should be read as marked language use that is intentionally signalled as such. This marked language use in current news appears in many forms, similar to historical news, of which one dominant form is metaphorical expressions. There are 21 cases where metaphors and signals are combined. In general, the role of inverted commas around metaphorically used words or phrases is to signal to the addressee that the language in question should not be interpreted as literally true, but as metaphorically used. In this respect, it is also similar to the cases found in historical language use. However, there seem to be some interesting differences between the two time periods in the area of conventionality and deliberateness.

In some instances of inverted commas combined with metaphorically used words, the inverted commas mark both the metaphorical use of the word and the fact that it is possibly a direct quote, like in (15).

- (15) De bouwcombinatie eist dat de overheid haar tegemoet komt omdat de technische aanpassingen voor de beveiliging van de tunnel meer geld gaan kosten dan begroot. Een aantal betrokken gemeenten (...) heeft in overleg met de regionale brandweer veel strengere veiligheidseisen aan de tunnel gesteld dan het ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat aanvankelijk deed, zegt burgemeester M. Zonneville van Leiderdorp. Volgens hem heeft het ministerie pas na 'druk' van de gemeenten een speciale veiligheidscommissie voor de tunnel opgezet.

'The building combination demands that the government makes concessions because technical adjustments for the safety of the tunnel will cost more money than budgeted. A few involved cities (...) have in accordance with the regional fire department put much stricter demands to the tunnel than the ministry of Traffic and Water had done, says mayor M. Zonneville of Leiderdorp. According to him, the ministry has set up a special security for the tunnel committee only after "pressure" of the town councils.'

(NRC, front page)

The metaphorically used word *druk* ‘pressure’ is a highly conventional metaphorical expression in the context in which it appears here. The contextual meaning of *druk* refers to an abstract sense of pressure, taken up by a person or official authority and addressed to another person or authority. It can be compared with the basic meaning of *druk*, the force or weight produced by an object or gas. Since the metaphorical use of *druk* in contexts such as in example (15) is highly conventional, it is likely that readers understand the intended meaning of *druk* correctly without necessarily needing to be drawn to its metaphorical use by signals. There may therefore be some other reason for this signal.

There are a number of textual clues that the commas are a way of indicating that *druk* is the actual word uttered by a quoted source; the phrase *volgens hem* ‘according to him’ refers to M. Zonneville, who has been introduced by a verb of speaking (*zei* ‘said’) in the previous sentence. Indicating that *druk* was taken over from a source, the reporter distances him or herself from the particular choice of *pressure*, and wants to indicate by way of using inverted commas that the suggestion made by using *pressure* in this stretch originates from the source.

From the textual clues alone, it is only possible to say that there is interplay between quoted material and metaphorical use. One consequence of marking only *druk* with inverted commas is that emphasis is placed on that word deliberately. Although it is difficult here to establish that marking was partly done to show its metaphorical use, the emphasis consequently makes the reader aware of the use of *druk*, and may potentially invoke a metaphorical understanding of the word, albeit a conventional metaphorical understanding which is not likely to have a rhetorical origin.

Another example of a marked word which both originates from a source and is metaphorical in the current context is given in (16). In this case, however, the inverted commas also seem to be used as a mark of specialised language use.

- (16) Omdat gisteren veel bedrijven gesloten waren, was er volgens René Lokenberg van Van der Hoop Effectenbank sprake van een ‘zeer dunne dag’.

‘Because many companies were closed yesterday, there was talk of a “really thin day” according to René Lokenberg from Van der Hoop Securities House.’

(*Algemeen Dagblad, economics*)

The expression *dunne dag* ‘thin day’ is originally used by an external source, René Lokenberg, which is shown by textual clues such as *volgens* ‘according to’ and *sprake van* ‘talk of’. The fact that the expression is a quote seems to be part of the reason for the inverted commas. Another reason is the fact that the expression *dunne dag* is probably not well-known outside the financial and trading world. In fact, when searched for on the internet, there are only sporadic hits that contain *dunne dag* in the same economic setting as in example (16). What is more, the expression is metaphorically used, where *dun* does not refer to the slim size of an

object but to the minor activities on the financial market during the day. The expression in the context of (16) is not found in *Van Dale*, and may be understood as a novel metaphor. The fact that it is an apparent novel metaphor may also be part of the reason why it is surrounded by inverted commas, and then suggests that the reporter realised it may not be understood correctly as a metaphorical expression if not signalled clearly. Again, there thus seems to be interplay between showing that the phrase is a direct speech representation and that it can be seen as a novel metaphor for non-specialised language users.

The deliberateness in use of the two examples above does not seem to lie in the fact that the reporters chose the different metaphorical expressions to communicate deviating perspectives on the topics, but lies more in the idea that the writer wants to signal the marked use of the different words. Example (15) and (16) do not present vivid images or extended metaphorical use, but they do signal to the reader that the words and phrases are to be understood in a different meaning from their basic senses. The deliberateness of the metaphors here does not lie so much in idea of creating a deviating effect by using a particular comparison, but in creating awareness of the special language use deployed here.

An example of metaphorical language use that entirely originates from the reporter of the text is found in one of the editorials. The reporter comments on the idea that the mayor of Rotterdam should be chosen directly by the public, the inhabitants of the city. This idea is rejected by the writer on different grounds, one of which is stated in (17).

- (17) Wanneer het hele voortraject van onderzoek naar geschikte kandidaten door deskundigen gedaan wordt en ik uiteindelijk kiezen mag tussen voorgeselecteerden, die in een korte campagne vooral joviaal doen en van alles beloven waartoe ze later geen bevoegdheid zullen hebben, dan wordt het een 'Miss Rotterdam'-verkiezing.

‘When the complete course of researching suitable candidates is carried out by experts and at the end I am allowed to choose one of the pre-selected candidates, who in a short campaign behave jovially and promise many things which they are in the end unauthorized to carry out, then it becomes a “Miss Rotterdam”-election.’

(*Trouw, editorial*)

The writer compares current ideas about mayor elections with a *Miss-verkiezing* ‘*Miss-election*’, which is characteristically associated with judgements based on appearance and not on skills. The phrase was coded as metaphorically used since a typical *Miss-election* originates from a distinct domain from that of the rest of the text, the discussion about mayor candidates in Rotterdam; the first belongs to the domain of entertainment in the form of beauty contests, the second to the domain of local politics.

It is particularly the ‘*Miss Rotterdam*’ part that the writer chose to mark with inverted commas, and not ‘election’. The election element can generally be

applied to both the situation of beauty contests and politics. By using the inverted commas around the Miss-section, the writer demonstrates the deliberateness of the choice of phrasing, and at the same time seems to create awareness of the deviation of the metaphor from the target topic of the text. Because the addressees are made aware of the discrepancy between politics and beauty contests, they are potentially guided towards understanding the situation of electing a mayor as similar to electing a beauty queen. Without the inverted commas, the change of domains may still be clear, but the overlap between the domains, the notion that both are in general terms elections, may decrease the awareness of the comparison between two distinct domains.

The following example seems to be a case of deliberate metaphor use in which both the inverted commas and the context mark its deliberateness. The sentence refers to a goal made by Arsenal football player Dennis Bergkamp.

- (18) Zelden was een doelpunt vaker herhaald dan de pirouette van de ‘prima ballerina’ in Newcastle.

‘Rarely was a goal so often repeated on TV as the pirouette of the “prima ballerina” in Newcastle.’

(*De Telegraaf, sports*)

The writer chose to represent the football player Bergkamp as a *prima ballerina*, of which the basic meaning is the leading dancer in a ballet performance. *Prima ballerina* here is thus metaphorically used, and is signalled as such by inverted commas. The term is preceded by *pirouette*, which is particularly used in the domain of ballet, but seems to be an extension of the generalised meaning of a rotation around one’s axis. However, the specialised meaning, a rotation on one foot referring to the domain of dancing, seems to have formed the basis for the metaphorical use of *prima ballerina* in the context of (18). The combination of terms in the sentence is a clear example of a metaphor that is developed over a number of words, in which a football player is compared to a ballet dancer, and his football moves to the dancing moves of the ballerina. In retrospect, the term *pirouette* could thus also be seen as a metaphorical expression because of the combination with *prima ballerina*. The difference in expectations of readers’ understanding between the more general *pirouette*, which can be understood literally as a term for rotating around one’s axis, and the more specific *prima ballerina*, which should be understood metaphorically, seems reflected in the use of inverted commas for the latter term and a lack of signalling for the first term.

The use of inverted commas stresses the deliberateness of *prima ballerina* and is further evoked by the use of *pirouette*. Due to the extension of the metaphor, we can assume that the comparison evoked by the metaphor, that between the player’s movements and movements performed by a ballet dancer, is understood by the addressee as a cross-domain mapping. It seems that the writer added the inverted commas to signal to the reader that the combination of these units was indeed intended, and that the metaphor is deliberate and should indeed be

understood as a cross-domain mapping between a ballerina and the football player. The inverted commas seem to be deliberately added to draw emphasis to a metaphorical expression, and to make sure that addressees do not see the player as a literal prima ballerina, but as a metaphorical one.

The reason for using this particular image to describe the skills of the football player, and the effect it may have, are difficult to guess, but the choice of the source domain may give some ideas. Comparing the player and his football skills with a prima ballerina and her ballet skills potentially puts emphasis on the supple movements of the player and on the difficulty of the actions performed. It may also be seen as a subjective manner of viewing the player as exceptional; a prima ballerina is the leading dancer in a ballet and is often one of the most exceptional dancers of a company, a notion that may be mapped onto the player Bergkamp. It could also be that the writer wants to draw attention to seeing football as a kind of art form such as ballet, particularly when it is carried out by a player such as Bergkamp, who was often praised for his technical skills and creative ideas on the field. The praise that the reporter makes known here is similar to some of the effects that were discussed in the simile examples from the previous sections.

There are a number of other instances in which different sports players are compared to specific persons or objects from other domains than the topic of the text, and where the expression is signalled by inverted commas. Examples (19) and (20) each compare a tennis player with respectively a war veteran and a wall.

- (19) Vandaag, op Super Saturday (...) verkeert Schalken inderdaad in goed gezelschap. Naast Sampras, die andere Amerikaanse ‘veteraan’, André Agassi, plus de Australische nummer een van de wereld Lleyton Hewitt.

‘Today, on Super Saturday (...) Schalken indeed is in good company. Besides Sampras, the other American “veteran”, André Agassi, plus the Australian number one of the world Lleyton Hewitt.’

(*Trouw, sports*)

- (20) De rest van de partij (...) werd een one-man-show van ‘de levende muur’ Hewitt.

‘The rest of the match (...) became a one man show of “the living wall” Hewitt.’

(*NRC, sports*)

In (19), André Agassi is presented as a *veteraan* ‘veteran’. The basic meaning of *veteraan* is an ex-soldier who participated in previous armed conflicts for his country, but here it is used in the conventional meaning of someone who is experienced in what he does and has been doing it for a long time. In (20), Hewitt is presented as a *levende muur* ‘living wall’. In basic terms, a wall is a brick object that divides rooms in houses and typically obstructs other objects, but here it describes tennis player Hewitt who does not let any of the returning balls through. Although the images that are potentially intended in (19) and (20) may not be as

vivid as in (19), here too the metaphorical expressions seem deliberately used, judging by the inverted commas. The deliberateness in (19) seems to resemble the deliberateness in examples such as (15) and (16), partly suggested by the conventional use of *veteraan* to describe people experienced in their field. The deliberateness in (20), however, seems to resemble the deliberate use of the metaphor as in example (18); *muur* is not a conventional term to describe a tennis player, but rather highlights specific characteristics of this one player, Hewitt.

The examples of metaphor marking by inverted commas in current news that have been discussed so far were found in a number of different sections of news similar to the cases in historical news. Although sports reports and editorial writing seem to be the sources of most of the examples, potentially deliberate metaphors with inverted commas also occur in national and international news coverage. In a few cases, the metaphorical expressions can be seen as wordplay, particularly when they are signalled by inverted commas. Sentence (21) is a good example of ambiguous use of a phrase, resulting in a form of wordplay. It is the headline of a report on the collapse of the Croatian government.

- (21) Coalitie Kroatië ‘werkt niet meer’. In Kroatië is de regering gevallen ...  
‘Coalition Croatia “does not work anymore”. In Croatia the government collapsed ...’

(NRC, *international*)

The verb *werkt* ‘works’ was coded as metaphor-related: the basic meaning of *werk* is an activity carried out by a person, but the subject in (21) is an official governmental body. *Werk* can be seen as a personification when the coalition is seen as a whole, in which case the contextual meaning of *werk* is ‘to function properly’. This example is interesting because of the apparent ambiguous status of the phrase *werkt niet meer* ‘does not work anymore’: if *coalition* is interpreted as referring metonymically to the people forming the coalition, then *werk* can be interpreted in its basic sense, in which the people in the coalition do not perform their jobs any more. The other interpretation is the personification interpretation described above, in which the coalition as a whole is not operating or functioning properly anymore. The inverted commas draw attention to the ambiguity of the phrase, and seem to intentionally guide the reader to recognising both interpretations. The first can be said to be literally true (if coalition is seen as metonymic for the politicians staffing the coalition), and the second interpretation as metaphorically used.

The potential effect that is caused by the inverted commas is a kind of word play that puts focus on both the literal and the metaphorical meaning of the phrase in the context in which it appears here. It is likely that when addressees recognise the ambiguity, they are able to understand the phrase in both a metonymic and metaphorical manner. The fact that *werkt niet meer* is inserted in commas is an indication that the writer recognises the ambiguity and wants to make the reader aware of it and recognise it in the same way.

A last example that will be discussed here concerns a form of serial metaphor, in which three relating metaphorical expressions occur close together in one text and are all three signalled by inverted commas.

- (22) De onderzoekers gebruiken de fusie-eiwitten als ‘aas’ om andere eiwitten te lokken. (...) Het ‘lokaas’ krijgt zo de kans complexen te vormen met eiwitten (...). De complexen met het fusie-eiwit worden tussen deze stoffen ‘uitgevist’ door het fusie-eiwit aan zijn kenmerkende staartje uit de celsoep te trekken.

‘The researchers use the fusion-proteins as “bait” to attract other proteins. (...) The “bait” gets a chance to form complex proteins (...). The complexes with the fusion-proteins are “fished out” from between these matters by pulling out the fusion-protein from the cell soup with his characteristic tail.’

(*de Volkskrant, science*)

The example is taken from a text in the scientific section of one of the newspapers, and describes the combined workings of certain proteins. The excerpt contains a serial metaphor comparing a protein with bait, selecting these proteins with fishing, and particularly with fishing them out. The complexity of the topic may be seen as one of the reasons for using a serial metaphor that compares the complex target domain topic, the fusion of proteins, with a more concrete source domain topic which may be more familiar to the addressee, fishing. Previous studies on academic discourse have shown that this register makes use of metaphorical language to a large degree, something which seems to be due to the fact that topics that are dealt with are often complex and highly abstract. Similar issues occur in the scientific articles in newspapers. An efficient way of explaining complex and abstract situations, processes or events is to describe them in more concrete, familiar situations that the addressee can relate to more easily.

This also seems to be true for the metaphorical expressions in (22). It seems that the writer wants to make sure that the addressee does not see *aas* ‘bait’, *lokaas* ‘bait’ or *uitgevist* ‘fish out’ as technical terms but as metaphorically used expressions to compare and explain the workings of different proteins in a specific process. Due to the clear difference in domains between the topic of the text and thus the target domain and the source domains from which the metaphorical expressions originate, it is fair to assume that the metaphors were intentionally used to explain the abstract process. The fact that inverted commas are used to mark the expressions makes it even more plausible that the metaphors were chosen deliberately. In the case of (22), the choice of using a serial metaphor seems to have to do with simplifying the explanation of an abstract complex topic, and is thus communicatively used to explain a complex process.

In some of the cases described in this section, there is interplay between different reasons for using inverted commas: they can be seen to mark the words as originating from a source and words that should more specifically be interpreted in

a metaphorical way at the same time. While these instances may not be properly deliberate metaphors in the sense that their metaphorical structures create a change of perspective on the topic, the fact that they are marked creates awareness, puts emphasis on the metaphorical meaning of the words in question, and by doing so potentially make the addressee understand the words as metaphors and see them as cross-domain mappings. There are also clear examples where the metaphorical expressions marked by inverted commas are clearly intentionally metaphorical, and have a specific effect of creating a more personalised account of the events reported on. In some cases, the deliberateness is enhanced by the serial character of the metaphorical expressions.

### *8.4.3 Conclusion*

By looking at instances of inverted commas around metaphorical expressions, one can find interesting examples of deliberate metaphors. Not all combinations of inverted commas and metaphorical expressions point to a deliberate use of the expressions (like example 11), but in many cases the comma signal creates awareness of the metaphorical use of a word and the comparison intended. The results of the concordances for historical and current news demonstrate some important differences between the two news periods. First of all, the number of potentially deliberate metaphors marked by commas is again much higher in current news than in historical news, also when taking into account the different sizes of the two corpus parts. The examples from historical news show that those metaphorically used words marked by commas could be interpreted as deliberately used and deliberately marked as metaphorical, but are rarely properly deliberate in the sense of creating a change in perspective and a rhetorical effect. At the same time, the fact that they are signalled shows that the reporter was aware of the deviating use of the word in context and created awareness of the metaphor towards the addressee.

The examples from current news include instances similar to those in historical news summarised above. In addition, the data include much clearer examples of deliberate metaphors signalled by inverted commas, instances of metaphor that were likely to be used to create a personalised effect and a deviating view on the topic in question. Examples such as (18) and (22), for instance, can be interpreted as clear deliberate metaphors, where the signals emphasise the metaphorical meaning and make sure that the addressee picks up on the intended comparison. The effect of such metaphorical expressions is that the reports in questions become more personalised, containing personal ideas and views on the topic as in (18), or level to the knowledge of the addressee, viewing a complex topic in everyday words like in (22). The higher number of marked metaphors in current news increases the density of metaphorical expressions that are potentially understood as cross-domain mappings, and in doing so may increase the idea that current news is more involved and personalised with respect metaphorical language

use. Although it is still difficult to determine the influence of signals and of context on the actual understanding processes of the words and phrases, the signals are likely to create more awareness, and signalled metaphorical terms can be picked up more easily as deliberate metaphors than conventional metaphorical expressions that are not signalled.

### **8.5 Metaphor extension in Dutch news data: a case study**

In the previous section on the role of inverted commas with metaphorically used words, some of the examples showed were classified as serial metaphors, in which terms from a source domain were used systematically to explain, for instance, a complex scientific process ('fishing' in example 22) or the movements of a football player ('ballet' in example 18). It was assumed for these metaphorical expressions that they could be interpreted as deliberately used not just because they were marked by inverted commas, but also because the respective source domains were exploited in extended and connected ways. Serial metaphors such as in (18) and (22) show awareness of the use of a particular source domain to describe a particular target domain.

Previous studies on news texts from different sections and conversational discourse data have shown that these registers can often contain forms of serial metaphor, where a certain topic is repeatedly expressed by different terms from one source domain (cf. Cameron, 2003; Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003). Such forms of metaphor are often used to evaluate a situation in a certain manner, create a certain rhetorical effect, or show understanding and appreciation of a person's ideas or utterances. In that respect, serial or extended metaphors are often cited in relation to deliberate uses of metaphorical expressions.

There are a number of news texts in the historical and current news sets that generally contain systematic or extended metaphor use, but most of these do not use extensions to deliberately create a certain image. The different reports from the economic sections of both the historical and current newspapers, for instance, make use of numerous metaphorical expressions originating from a particular source domain to describe a particular topic, but are not deliberate metaphors. Financial situations such as trading processes of companies, the advances in exchange rates, sudden financial losses or gains, etc. are typically described by expressions originating from domains such as movement in horizontal and vertical directions and spatial orientation (see, for instance, Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003: 159). Different expressions such as 'low rates', 'prices dropped' and 'shares closed higher' often occur together in one text in a systematic way. However, describing changes in prices and rates as 'going up and down' or 'rising and falling' is highly conventional and can usually not be classified as deliberate, even if the originate from one source domain and describe one particular topic. It seems that the default manner in which to describe changes in financial processes is using concrete spatial orientation and movement expressions. These domains are

typically human-oriented, embodied and primary, and conventionally used to describe a range of familiar abstract entities (cf. Grady, 1997; Kövecses, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

There are, however, examples where a particular source domain does seem to be deliberately deployed into a complex metaphorical comparison that recurs throughout one text. A detailed reading of the corpus material reveals that it is predominantly the current news texts that seem to make use of metaphor extensions, some more extensive than others, and that the historical news texts lack instances where a metaphorical idea is worked out in more detail within one text. Thus, with respect to deliberate metaphors that consist of serialised expressions, the main difference between the two news periods is that historical news does not make use of this, whereas current news does have some interesting examples.

The remainder of this section covers a case study of one news text from the current corpus in which a form of metaphor extension is present. The examples illustrate how a serial metaphor can work, what kind of influence it can have on the general level of metaphoricity of a single text, and whether this may influence our ideas of the changing style of news language. The text in which the serial metaphor occurs originates from the international news section of one of the newspapers, and reports a discussion between the USA Democrats and Republicans about tax raises and the economy in the USA (see Appendix B for the full text and translation). The text contains a clear example of a serial metaphor in which different elements from a particular source domain are used throughout the text to describe similar elements from the target domain of the text. By way of introduction, the headline of the report is given in (23).

- (23) Politici in Washington weer terug in *loopgraven*  
'Politicians in Washington back in *trenches* again'  
(*de Volkskrant, international*)

The word *loopgraven* '*trenches*' was coded as metaphorically used: its basic meaning refers to long narrow holes dug in the ground that were usually used as protection against enemy soldiers, but here the word applies to a situation in which politicians argue about the topic of taxes and the American economy. Because of *terug* '*back*', the headline implies that the politicians were in the same situation of argument before, but had abandoned that situation for a short period up until the moment of reference. The text continues in its first sentences with an explanation of the parties that are arguing, the Democrats and the Republicans, and refers to their discussions as *politieke strijd* '*political battle*' and *bitter gevecht* '*bitter fight*'. Here too, the discussions over taxes and the economy are compared to war-related situations such as battles and fights. Describing political arguments and discussions in terms of war situations is thus continued from the headline to the body of the text. At this point in the text, however, the comparison between the source domain situation and the target domain situation still includes rather general elements. Words such as *strijd* '*battle*' and *gevecht* '*fight*' are conventional expressions to

describe arguments<sup>20</sup>, but seem more specialised due to the use of the specific term *loopgraven* 'trenches'. At this point, however, the choice of *loopgraven* is not elaborated, despite possible expectations of domain extensions.

It is not until the second half of the text that the choice of the source domain becomes thematised and the metaphorical comparison is expanded and rhetorically exploited. It turns out that the comparison which was initiated in the first section originates from a source other than the reporter, and should be seen as a kind of analogy that is introduced by the verb *vergelijken* 'to compare'. The crucial section that includes the form of simile is given in (24).

- (24) Na 11 september heerste er tijdelijk een *wapenstilstand* in Washington, maar politicoloog Ross Baker van Rutgers Universiteit *vergelijkt* het met *het Kerstbestand uit 1914*. De troepen kwamen toen even uit de loopgraven om samen kerstliederen te zingen, maar daarna ging het schieten meteen weer door.

'After September 11 there temporarily was a *cease fire* in Washington, but political scientist Ross Baker of Rutgers University *compares* it to *the Christmas truce of 1914*. The troops then briefly left the trenches to sing Christmas carols together, but afterwards the shooting immediately continued.'

The current situation of Democrats and Republicans arguing over taxes is not simply compared to a battle fought in the trenches, but to one particular situation during the First World War. The use of *trenches* in the headlines may have already triggered a more specific war situation than the general idea of *battle*; trenches were indeed predominantly used during the First World War. It is not until the second half of the text, however, that the reader is explicitly told this. The actual comparison that is referred to here is the situation occurring during what is now known as the Christmas truce of 1914. Otherwise fighting each other in the trenches in France and Belgium, British and German soldiers ceased fire during Christmas 1914, and celebrated Christmas all together on the no man's land between the opposing trenches. After the short truce, the two armies went back to the front line and continued fighting each other.

The combination of the first part of the text and the extended simile in the second half provides a more complex image of the metaphorical comparison used here. The source domain used to explain the current political situation is not just a general war situation, but a specific historical war event. The extended comparison that is utilised throughout the text contains elements from both domains that can be compared. It is not until the addressees reach the second half of the text that they recognise the comparison. There are elements from the source domain that need to

---

<sup>20</sup> The words *strijd* and *gevecht* in this context can be seen as linguistic representations of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. ARGUMENT IS WAR is probably one of the most frequently used conceptual metaphor examples to discuss and explain the pervasiveness of metaphor in language and thought. See, for instance, Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

be inferred from general knowledge about the historical situation: the general *troepen* 'troops' that is used in (24), for instance, is not followed by a specific reference to which troops were involved. In contrast, expressions from the target domain refer to the generic *politici* 'politicians' in the headline as well as the more detailed 'Democrats' and 'Republicans' further down. An overview of the different source and target elements, both explicit and implicit, is given in table 8.3.

The phrases in italics represent those elements that are not explicitly used in the text. One is part of the source domain (*British and German soldiers*), but the rest is part of the target domain. Interestingly, the mix of source domain elements that are used directly and indirectly, as part of the simile or as metaphorically used words, make this a complex comparison in which several explicitly mentioned phrases belonging to the source domain refer to one and the same corresponding target domain element. This happens, for instance, in the stretch of sentences given in (24): the temporary *wapenstilstand* 'cease fire' is metaphorically used and refers to the truce between the politicians, and the directly used *Kerstbestand uit 1914* 'Christmas truce of 1914' through the comparison refers to the same truce between the politicians.

An interesting issue with the serial metaphor that is used in this text is that the comparison was initialised by an American scientist, but seems to have been extended to a more complex combination of direct and indirect metaphor-related words which are utilised throughout the complete text. The reader may initially not be aware of the full scope of the comparison, but after having reached the second half of the text in which the comparison is explicated more clearly, the image can be completed in different ways. Having taken a source's metaphor, so to say, and extending it throughout the rest of the text, the writer shows awareness of the metaphoricality of the comparison, and the deliberateness of the choice and the extended use is hence made clear.

Table 8.3 also includes a number of inferences that were drawn from the actual analogy in the text. These are made on the basis of what is in the text and what may be known about the historical situation during Christmas 1914 and the current American political and economic situation in the aftermath of the WTC attacks. One example of an inference which is not overtly mentioned in the text, for instance, would be the idea that the events of September 11 temporarily made Democrats and Republicans forget that they disagreed about solving the unstable economic situation in their country and more or less united them in a similar matter that the British and German troops temporarily forgot that they were enemies during Christmas time, a time during which they all missed families and sought company.

The text contains a number of words that belong to the same general source domain of war, but that are not part of the specific source situation, the Christmas truce. These are expressions such as *verloren* 'lost', *aanval* 'attack', *torpederen* 'torpedo' and *strategie* 'strategy'. These elements are not mentioned in table 8.3, but do indeed strengthen the general idea of seeing political arguments in terms of war, and they enhance the more specific comparison of the two historical source

and target situations. Although not part of the narrow comparison, they can be seen as part of the serial metaphor and contribute to the overall image that is created through the text.

Table 8.3 Comparison of source and target domain terms for the serial metaphor

ARGUMENT IS WAR (POLITICAL SITUATION IN AMERICA 2001/2002 IS WAR SITUATION IN EUROPE 1914)		
Target		Source
<i>political situation start of 2002</i>		<i>WWI troops end of 1914</i>
politicians in Washington <sup>21</sup>	←	troops (in France/Belgium)
Democrats and Republicans	←	<i>British and German soldiers</i>
<i>discussion/argument</i>	←	battle
<i>discussion/argument</i>	←	fight
(continue) arguments	←	(back in) trenches
<i>truce in discussions</i>	←	cease fire
<i>truce in discussions</i>	←	Christmas truce of 1914
September 11 2001	←	Christmas 1914
	inferences	
before, during and after September 11 attacks	←	before, during and after Christmas 1914
September 11 unites politicians of opposing parties	←	Christmas unites troops of opposing countries
bonding over helping victims	←	bonding over Christmas carols

The fact that the comparison used in this text is extended in multiple expressions throughout the text is a clear indication of the deliberateness of the metaphor. At the same time, there again seems to be a combination of using quoted material and signalling it as deliberate by extending it, in the same way described for examples of serial metaphors marked by inverted commas. The fact that it is broadened by the writer of the text and introduced in the first half of the text turns it into the version deliberately presented by the journalist. Signals such as *vergelijk* 'compare' and repeated use of various elements from the same source domain to describe one particular target domain are all textual indications of the deliberate choice of the writer and the potential understanding of a deliberate idea by the reader. One noteworthy result of using a metaphorical comparison in such an extended manner is that a large part of the text can be interpreted as being part of

<sup>21</sup> For ease of reference, this table only includes my English translations of the terms in the text. For the original Dutch words and phrases, please refer to the examples and the full text in Appendix B.

the comparison, and thus having metaphorical meaning. In this way, the level of metaphoricity of such texts seems much more prominent than in texts that do not contain deliberate metaphors exploiting certain source domains. Additionally, the fact that the metaphor in the case study appears in report and subsection of news that is generally seen as formal makes the level of metaphorical images stand out more. Examples such as these are likely to contribute strongly to the general idea that current news language moves towards a more personalised, involved and subjective form of reporting, and away from a more objective, tedious language style.

## 8.6 General conclusion

The notion of deliberate metaphor as metaphor in communication, where specific intentions are being communicated, is a plausible notion, but remains difficult to outline on the basis of text analysis alone. Communicative intentions are difficult to establish when only the text that is produced is available. However, this chapter has demonstrated that there are a number of textual clues and functions of context and co-text that can be used to find cases of potentially deliberate metaphors. A signal such as *als* 'as/like', for instance, is often used in combination with metaphorical expressions in the form of a simile, which are seen as deliberate metaphors. Other signals such as inverted commas are often combined with metaphorical expressions to create awareness of the use of a metaphor, and by doing so put emphasis on the metaphorical meaning of the expressions. Serial metaphors are usually deliberately used to create a vivid image, and through their extensions are likely to be picked up as deliberate metaphors.

The results show that there are some interesting differences between historical news and current news in their use of deliberate metaphors. Most importantly, the density of deliberate metaphors is considerably higher in current news than in historical news. Although both periods contain examples of the major forms of deliberate metaphors, and in similar sections of news, the current news texts display a more prominent use of similes, deliberate metaphors combined with comma markers, and forms of serial metaphors or metaphor extensions. In addition to there being more instances of deliberate metaphor, there is also a wider variety of complex structures and of different effects achieved, such as giving personal views on situations, creating word play, and explaining complex process. The combination of a higher frequency, a variety in complex structures and the different rhetorical goals achieved enhances the idea that current news shows a continuous trend of becoming more diverse in metaphor use, more subjective and involved in style, and more personalised in language. It can thus indeed be said that, on the level of deliberate metaphors communicating personal intentions and perspectives, the current news texts are more personalised and involved in language style than the historical news texts. Additionally, it can be concluded that although frequencies of linguistic metaphors may not show differences for the two

news periods, the structures and ideas communicated through deliberate metaphor use may enhance the level of metaphorical language and the general level of metaphoricity in news language.



## 9. Conclusion

### 9.1 Introduction

This thesis addressed the role of metaphor in the trend of the conversationalization of Dutch public discourse. Several quantitative studies were conducted to determine the forms and frequencies of linguistic metaphors in the contemporary registers of Dutch conversation and news, and in two periods of Dutch news. They focused on the typical metaphorical forms of conversations and of news and aimed to determine whether current news had shifted towards conversations in its use of linguistic metaphors in comparison to historical news. In addition, qualitative studies were conducted that focused on specific patterns of metaphors communication personal intentions in historical and current news, metaphors that were deliberately used to draw attention to its topic.

In this concluding chapter, the findings are summarised in relation to the research questions outlined in the introduction and specified in chapter 1. In addition, the limitations of the present study are discussed. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

### 9.2 Summary of the main findings

#### 9.2.1 Main research questions

The conversationalization hypothesis proposed by Fairclough entails the modelling of public discourse upon conversational practices in a broad sense, where public discourse increasingly shows a trend of including features of conversations (Fairclough, 1994). Some of the main features of this trend, according to Fairclough, include the increasing use of linguistic elements such as colloquial vocabulary, personal pronouns, hedges, and several more, in the language of public discourse, and the changing roles and relations between participants, particularly visible in political speeches (Fairclough, 1994; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). Although Fairclough's ideas are mainly based on intuitions and sporadic linguistic evidence, several corpus-based studies have shown that his claims are intuitively correct (Pearce, 2005; Steen, 2003). Pearce found that British political party manifestos have become more informal over the period of several decades, basing his analysis on the occurrence and frequencies of several linguistic features that can be marked as features of informal language use (such as first and second personal pronouns and stance adverbs (Pearce, 2002, 2005). Steen found that one particular type of news text, editorials in *The Times*, have also undergone the trend of conversationalization between 1950 and 2000; more recent editorials contained more features of involved language use and persuasive language such as first and

second personal pronouns and modal auxiliaries. The result from these corpus-based studies thus confirmed the ideas of conversationalization of public discourse.

Several other corpus-based studies of diachronic variation in different varieties of language illustrated similar trends as the ones described above. Most notable are Biber and Finegan's (1989, 1992, 2001) studies based on Biber's (1988) multi-feature/multi-dimensional approach to variation in speech and writing. Biber and Finegan (2001) found that the register of news reportage has followed a general drift towards more oral styles during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, and showed the strongest shift in the later period. Their conclusions are based on the fact that news reportage increasingly contains linguistic elements from dimensions that reflected involved production and situation-dependent reference, summarized by Biber and Finegan as reflecting oral styles (1989, 2001). Similar results were also found by Westin (2002; and Westin & Geisler, 2002) for editorials in particular, although the patterns for some dimensions were less clear than for other dimensions due to the variation in newspapers included in the study.

The studies above focused predominantly on linguistic features involved in the conversationalization and informalization of news discourse. A number of studies focused on textual and contextual issues in relation to trends of conversationalization, such as Hundt and Mair (1999) and Mair (2006), who stated that textual conventions such as the increasing use of direct quotes in news reportage contributed to what they call the colloquialization of news discourse. In addition, Holly (2008) commented on the change in visual features such as headlines, layout and photos that reflected an increasing resemblance to popular tabloids. In all, the different trends observed within different fields and based on different elements of discourse all seem to point to an ongoing change in the style of news language in the direction of conversational practices.

None of the studies above, however, have taken into account lexical semantic features such as subjective lexical markers, metaphorical language or irony, to name a few examples, as possible features involved in the conversationalization of news. With respect to metaphorical language, many discourse-based studies on metaphor in news have shown that metaphors can play an important role in how news is brought across, and may be employed to informalize and personalize the style of news in various ways. The excerpts in the introduction offered an illustration of these issues. In addition, metaphors seem to behave differently in different registers; some metaphor in conversations can be seen as characteristic for conversation, whereas some metaphors in news may be seen as characteristic for news. Based on the findings of the forms and functions of metaphors in various language varieties, it may be that this lexical semantic phenomenon may also play an important role in the conversationalization of news.

Based on the general findings for the conversationalization of news and the forms and functions of metaphor in different registers such as conversations and news, two main research questions were formulated.

1. In how far do the contemporary registers of conversations and news differ from each other on the frequencies, forms and functions of metaphorical language? If there are differences, can these be ascribed to the functional differences between the registers in general?
2. In how far do historical news language and current news language differ from each other on the occurrence and use of metaphorical expressions? If there are differences, do these contribute significantly to the processes of style shifts in news discourse, that is, can they be seen as part of the general trend of conversationalization?

In short, the question that that will be answered is whether metaphors are linguistic elements that also contribute significantly to the processes of style shifts in news discourse, and how they this contribution then works.

In order to answer these questions, various facets of metaphorical language use in contemporary Dutch conversation, current news and historical news have been analysed in detail from a quantitative and qualitative perspective.

### *9.2.2 Metaphor in language, thought, and communication*

The main element under review in this study is the lexical-semantic phenomenon of metaphor. There seem to be as many ideas about what constitutes metaphor as there are metaphors in a language. The view of metaphor adopted in this thesis is based on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), a cognitive-linguistic theory of metaphor that has become influential since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors we live by* (1980). The notion of a conceptual metaphor is generally described as a cross-domain mapping: one conceptual domain, the target domain, is understood in terms of another conceptual domain, the source domain, with systematic sets of correspondences or mappings occurring across the conceptual domains. One of the main claims of CMT is that metaphor is not just a matter of language, but essentially a matter of thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). It emphasises the idea that we conventionally think and thus talk about abstract, complex or unfamiliar concepts or domains in terms of concrete, human-oriented, or spatial concepts. They mainly present linguistic examples to support their ideas, but at the same time stress that linguistic metaphors are possible because people have metaphors in their conceptual systems.

The main criticism towards CMT is focused on the fact that it does not take into account naturally observed language data; what is said about the way people use metaphors is not based on the way metaphors occur in real, naturally produced language. The Pragglejaz Group (2007: 1) sums up the main problem by suggestion that claims about the ubiquity and realistic understanding of metaphors ask for explorations of metaphor in the real world as speakers and writers produce it in varying contexts. In addition, the top-down approach taken by CMT, departing

from pre-existing ideas of conceptual metaphor structures and presenting decontextualised linguistic evidence to underpin the ideas, has been criticised by various corpus-based studies. Cameron (2003) and Deignan (2005), for instance, suggests that a bottom-up approach to metaphor in discourse, where linguistic metaphors are identified first and possible systematic patterns of conceptual structure are deduced from the data, may provide a more detailed picture of the forms and patterns of metaphors.

In order to find linguistic metaphors in a systematic and reliable manner, the Pragglejaz Group (2007) have developed MIP, a metaphor identification procedure. MIP is intended to be an explicit, reliable, and flexible method for finding metaphorically used words in naturally occurring discourse, and in doing so pulls apart the linguistic analysis from the conceptual analysis (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). The procedure is based on the notion that a metaphor is a cross-domain mapping between source and target domain, but also says that metaphor in language and metaphor in thought are two separate elements that can be found and viewed in separation from each other. It intends to identify the metaphorically used words, and not the complex underlying conceptual structures.

Corpus-based studies of metaphor have demonstrated that metaphor in discourse is often highly conventional, showing that many genres of discourse contain similar metaphorical expressions with similar underlying conceptual structures. In a number of cases, such highly conventional linguistic metaphors may be metaphorical in language, but may not be understood as such due to their conventional nature. Examples are the use of expressions from the domain of spatial movement to describe economic processes in news reports from the economy section. However, it is also suggested in some studies that, even when a metaphorical expression is conventional, it can still invoke a cross-domain mapping for which the addressee has to set up a comparison between the source and target domain. Many examples of such metaphors occur in genres such as political speeches or classroom talk, where metaphors are used deliberately to express an particular idea and communicate an intention on the part of the speaker or writer. There thus seem to be important differences between the functions and communicative intentions of different kinds of metaphors, even when they could be classified as conventional.

To distinguish between those kinds of metaphorical uses, Steen (2008) proposes to adopt a three-dimensional approach to metaphor, distinguishing not only between metaphor in language (the linguistic expression) and metaphor in thought (the conceptual structure), but also between metaphor in communication (the function). The latter takes into account deliberate metaphor as a form of metaphor that involves the intentional use of a source domain term to review a target domain (Steen, 2008). As Steen puts it, 'when metaphor is studied as part of actual language use, or events of discourse, it does not only manifest a linguistic form and a conceptual structure, but also a communicative function' (Steen, 2008: 221). Although this idea of communicative function may not apply clearly to every

metaphor in authentic language use, it does seem to apply for a number of metaphors, novel as well as conventional.

The analysis of metaphor in the present study is then based on Steen's three-dimensional model of metaphor, and focuses particularly on the forms and frequencies of metaphor in conversation and news (metaphor in language) and occurrences and functions of those metaphors used deliberately in news (metaphor in communication), with the latter is also taken into account on the basis of the underlying conceptual structures (metaphor in thought).

### *9.2.3 Developing and applying a tool for linguistic metaphor identification in Dutch discourse*

In order to find all the linguistic metaphors in natural discourse, the present study developed and applied an extensive, systematic and reliable method for linguistic metaphor identification, called MIPVU. The method is based on the original MIP procedure developed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007), but has been explicated and extended to also find direct metaphors and implicit metaphors. In addition, MIPVU was adjusted and expanded slightly to be applicable to Dutch discourse. The differences between MIP and MIPVU can be found in the clearer explication of how to deal with multi-word lexical units and different grammatical categories of one word form, but differences essentially entail the additional steps to identify direct metaphor, usually in the form of similes, implicit metaphor, and metaphor signals (such as *like* to signal a simile).

In order to use it for metaphor identification in Dutch discourse, a number of additional issues had to be explicated. The most important issue entailed the dictionary used to define contextual and basic senses of lexical units; the absence of a, preferred, corpus-based dictionary for Dutch forced us to use a historically based dictionary to assist us in determining different senses of lexical units. This caused a few operational problems which related to the basic foundations of the method; historically based dictionaries generally keep archaic senses of words in their list of definitions, which interfered with the basic contemporary perspective; and a number of nouns are generally defined by nominalisations of the related verb, which sometimes interfered with the tenet of separating different grammatical classes of one word form in the analysis of meaning. These issues were explained in the adjusted version of the manual for Dutch, and solutions were also given. In addition, a number of language-specific issues with respect to complex multi-word units arose; these were also described and resolved in the extended version.

The adjusted version of MIPVU for Dutch yielded equally reliable results for the identification of metaphor as MIPVU did for English in the English-language project. The reliability results demonstrated that the procedure works in a consistently reliable manner for Dutch contemporary language data and Dutch historical language data, similar to its reliability for English language data reported on in previous work (Steen, Dorst et al., 2010). Reliability is high, solid, and

consistent across the five reliability tests. It is encouraging that this is the case for the Dutch data, consisting of different registers and different periods, and with a different dictionary and various language-specific issues. The fact that this study, in collaboration with the English language metaphor project, has yielded a systematic tool for linguistic metaphor identification that has given reliable results over two different languages, four different register, and two different periods, is one of the main assets of the study.

#### *9.2.4 Register variation: metaphor forms and frequencies in contemporary Dutch conversation and news*

The quantitative analysis of linguistic metaphors in the registers of conversation and news showed that they differ greatly from each other on the level of frequencies and grammatical forms of metaphors. The two data sets were first compared on their general frequencies of eight main word classes to determine whether they show similar patterns of linguistic variation as found in Biber's (1988) variation study, namely that news contained many nouns, prepositions and adjectives, and that conversation contained many pronouns, adverbs and verbs. A chi-square analysis showed that there was a significant interaction between register and words class. Conversations contained significantly more adverbs than news and also showed a higher frequency of the remainder category, which contained, among other features, the personal pronouns. News contained significantly more nouns and prepositions. The percentages of verbs in the two registers were comparable. On the whole, the patterns found in the Dutch conversations and news texts are in agreement with the patterns found in Biber's (1988, 1989) studies of English discourse. The findings illustrate that Dutch conversational would score high on the 'involvement' pole of the Dimension 1 distinguishing spoken from written language, and that Dutch news would score high on the 'informational' pole of the same dimension.

With regard to grammatical forms of metaphor, it was expected that the two registers would differ from each other in the frequencies of the different grammatical forms, based on the overall differences of word class and on the assumption that different registers often require different metaphor forms for different purposes. A loglinear analysis showed a significant three-way interaction between register, word class and metaphor, which means that the way in which non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words are divided over the registers is dependent on the word classes that appear in each register.

Two main patterns could be deduced from the results. Firstly, conversation and news showed a significantly different distribution of metaphor over the eight main word classes. In conversations, determiners (29.6%) and prepositions (29.3%) each account for nearly one third of the total number of metaphor-related words, and verbs (21.7%) are the third most frequent word class for metaphor-related words. In news, prepositions (47.8%) account for nearly half of all the metaphor-

related word. Verbs (22.7%) and nouns (15.8%) are the second and third most frequent word classes for the metaphor-related words. These findings relate to the overall differences in word class per register mentioned above. In general, the differences between the two Dutch registers are in agreement with findings from previous corpus-based studies on the linguistic forms of metaphor in various discourse varieties (cf. Cameron, 2003, 2008; Deignan, 2005; Steen, Dorst et al., 2010).

Secondly, the separate word classes behaved metaphorically in different ways in each of the registers. The most noteworthy differences occur for determiners, prepositions, verbs, and to some extent nouns. While 28.8% of the determiners in conversations have been coded as metaphor-related, only 6.5% of the determiners in news are metaphor-related. This is partly due to the different sub-classes within the word class of determiners. Particularly the demonstratives *die* 'that' and *dat* 'that' are frequently used metaphorically in conversations. The occurrence of metaphor-related demonstratives in conversation is predominantly due to the nature of this register; when interacting with each other, participants often refer back to (aspects of) previous utterances using demonstratives. News is more often descriptive in the sense that reports refer to concrete events and actions that occurred in specific places.

With respect to prepositions, they are often metaphor-related in general, but much more so in news (70.7% of the total number of prepositions) than in conversations (53.4% of the total number of prepositions). The high frequencies of metaphor-related prepositions in the two registers are partly due to the inherent characteristics of prepositions. The most frequent prepositions have basic meanings that denote spatial relations, but are also often used to denote temporal relationships or other abstract connections between entities (cf. Cuyckens, 1991; Lindstromberg, 1998; Tyler & Evans, 2003). The difference in metaphor portions between the two registers seems extensively due to the frequent occurrence of a few prepositions in news that are semantically complex, in particular the Dutch *van* 'off/for'.

Relatively speaking, verbs occur nearly as often in conversation as in news (16.6% in conversation and 15.9% in news), but the proportion of non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related verbs is different in the two registers. Of all the verbs in conversations, 15.5% was coded as metaphor-related, while of all the verbs in news, 31.5% was coded as metaphor-related. This means that verbs are metaphor-related twice as often in news. The frequencies for verb lemmas in the metaphor-related show that the higher proportion of metaphor-related verbs in news is not caused by the frequencies for the ten most used verb lemmas. The list of most frequent metaphor-related verbs in the two registers and the type-token ratio for metaphor-related verb lemmas seems to suggest that particular verb lemmas that are frequent behave metaphorically in similar ways in conversation and news, but that news contains a much wider variety of verb lemmas and thus more options for verbs to be metaphorical. The main idea behind the variety is that the variation in topics and the notion that news language is used to refer to specific actions, events,

people, places, and dates require news language to contain words that can describe and denote these affairs

Lastly, the word class of nouns also shows different frequencies for metaphor-related words for conversations and news. In conversations, 7.2% was coded as metaphor-related, while in news 12.2% was coded as metaphor-related. Nouns are thus not only more frequent in news than in conversation, but are also relatively more often metaphorically used in news. The overall frequency for nouns in news that are metaphor-related is not so much influenced by a few very frequent metaphorical nouns, but by many infrequent metaphorical nouns. This is also reflected by the higher type-token ratio for news in comparison to conversations. The patterns for metaphorical nouns in news are complex but can be explained partly by the inherent nature of news. News discourse typically reports on a large variety of topics, situations and events, and consequently needs a large variety of nouns to describe these issues. Many of those topics deal with abstract or complex situations which can be explained by using more concrete nouns that relate to human experience and behaviour. It seems that due to the variety in topics in news there is more demand for metaphorical nouns that can denote and describe the topics in concrete terms.

What the metaphor data in the two registers demonstrate most of all is the conventional nature of the majority of the linguistic metaphors in conversation as well as news. Many lemmas occur as a metaphor more than once in the various word classes, and many are used in conventional manners to refer to abstract entities within abstract domains. Within those conventional patterns, specific news and conversation patterns for a number of lemmas stand out. The detailed linguistic analysis of metaphors in two contemporary registers provides additional evidence for the general idea that metaphor is pervasive in everyday language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). At the same time, the high degree of conventionality of the linguistic data may suggest that metaphors are predominantly just that, and may not be pervasive in thought as well. Many examples from the different word classes in chapter 5 indicate that the possible underlying conceptual structures of the conventional expressions are abstract and at points skeletal, and that they thus may be metaphorical in language but not in thought (cf. Bowdle & Gentner, 2005; Cameron, 2003; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

### *9.2.5 Diachronic variation: metaphor and the personalization of news language*

The quantitative analysis of linguistic metaphors in two periods of news showed that the periods only differed on some level of frequencies and grammatical forms of metaphors. The two data sets were first compared for their general frequencies of eight main word classes to determine whether current news texts showed similar stylistic shifts towards conversations as suggested and illustrated by the studies focusing the conversationalization of metaphor. A chi-square analysis showed that there is a significant interaction between the time periods for news and word class.

The significant interaction is mainly due to the word classes of nouns and conjunctions; nouns are more frequent in current news, while conjunctions are more frequent in historical news. The patterns for word class frequencies in Dutch historical and current news are different from what was found by Biber and colleagues (cf. Biber & Finegan, 1989, 1992, 2001). Dutch current news texts contain fewer determiners and fewer verbs, and significantly more nouns than Dutch historical news texts. With respect to adjectives, adverbs and prepositions, the differences in frequencies for the two news sets are minimal, and not significant. The contrary of what Biber and colleagues found seems to be true: current news texts contain more informational features such as nouns and fewer involved features such as determiners and verbs, and thus seem to have become even more informational and formal in comparison to historical news.

With regard to grammatical forms of metaphor, it was expected that the two periods would differ from each other in the frequencies of the different grammatical forms, based on the idea that metaphors may play a role in the overall conversationalization of news. A loglinear analysis showed a significant three-way interaction between news period, word class and metaphor, thus suggesting that the way in which non-metaphor-related and metaphor-related words are divided over the news periods is dependent on the word classes that appear in each period. When comparing the manner in which metaphors are distributed over the eight word classes in each of the period, it seems that their distributions overlap to a considerable degree. These frequency findings can be partly explained by the fact that the frequencies of word classes in the two periods were also relatively equal.

Despite the relatively equal distribution in the two periods, there are differences between the periods in the portion of metaphor-related words for some word classes. They may not be as clear as the differences between conversation and current news, but do contribute to the significant three-way interaction between word class, metaphor, and news period. In historical news, 73.7% of the total number of prepositions were coded as metaphor-related, while in current news, 70.7% of the total number of prepositions were coded as metaphor-related. The data for prepositions have shown that this word class occurs highly frequently as metaphors in both news periods, and often consist of complex metaphorical structures and mappings.

Of all the verbs in historical news, 26.6% were coded as metaphor-related, against 31.5% metaphor-related verbs in current news. So although verbs overall occur more frequently in historical news, they are used metaphorically more often in current news. The patterns of *vinden* in historical and current news make clear that current news texts seem to make more use of direct and indirect quotations from different kinds of sources. The instances of *vinden* in current news that were discussed above show that, although *vinden* is hardly ever used in combination with a personal opinion of the writer, it is frequently used in combination with the opinions of different news sources. A comparison with what happens in historical news also shows that this kind of use of opinions from other people is more frequent in the current news texts in relation to news reports from 1950.

Consequently, the rise in metaphorical instances of *vinden* in news reports seems to be related to the rise of quotations from different sources and their opinions in the reports. Although these opinions are not formed by the writer, as in the case of conversations and speakers, they do enhance the idea that current news looks more like conversations and their structures than historical news.

The main patterns of metaphor-related uses of *krijgen*, *hebben*, and *gaan* illustrate a difference between the news periods and the contemporary registers. On the whole, the register of news showed a move towards the more abstract pattern of conversations in its use of metaphor-related verb patterns when historical and current news were compared. The various metaphorical as well as more abstract uses of the verbs under research occurred more frequently in current news, and main patterns of use were more prominent and more clearly linked to the verb uses in conversation. So although overall frequency patterns from the quantitative diachronic analysis do not show a distinct difference between the two periods, the distinction of the metaphor patterns discussed above may have increased the general metaphoricality of current news.

The patterns in chapter 7 illustrated a tendency for verbs in current news to become more abstract. This abstract uses of metaphor-related verbs resulted in a similarity between current news and conversations, which also demonstrated a high degree of abstractness regarding metaphor-related verbs. In this respect, the language of current news tends to take on some of the important characteristics of conversations when it comes to the use of verbs. In general, then, it can be said that the language of news has adopted a more conversational style when it comes to metaphorical patterns of delexicalised verbs. These finding may be interpreted as a trend of conversationalization of the language of news, similar to what previous studies on conversationalizations suggested (Biber & Finegan, 2001; Fairclough, 1994, 1995a, 1995b; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). However, the shift in delexicalised patterns that seemed to have occurred between news language from 1950 and 2002 focused on the abstraction of metaphorical language more so than on the more informal or personalised uses of metaphorical language. In that respect, the changes did not seem to affect the register of news as strongly as, for instance, Fairclough suggests in his hypothesis.

A more prominent difference between historical news and current news was found in metaphorical expressions that were intended *as* metaphors, that is the deliberate metaphors. As indicated in chapter 8, a change towards a more personalized and involved style of language for current news in the language of metaphors could be detected when focusing on deliberate metaphors that are consciously used to communicate a certain intention. These can be novel (but those hardly occurred in our data) or conventional, and distinguish themselves from non-deliberate metaphors in the fact that they are consciously employed to elicit particular rhetorical effects by drawing deliberate attention to the use of another domain as a source domain for re-viewing the target domain (Steen, 2008: 223). Deliberate metaphors in historical and current news were found by looking for signals, in particular the Dutch *als* 'as/like' and inverted commas.

With regard to similes, a general trend of making news language more personal and vivid seemed to surface. The overall number of similes were low in comparison to indirect metaphorical expressions, occurred 14 times in current news and only four times in historical news. Despite the relatively low numbers, interesting patterns could be detected nonetheless. The similes in current news were generally more complex than the similes in historical news. The ones occurring in historical news produced a relatively straightforward comparison between target and source domains. The similes in current news showed a wider variety of structures; some focused explored possibilities of word play, and in others the comparison was completely fleshed out, included different source domain terms for the same referent.

The wider variety of similes found in the current news texts suggests that it has become more accepted to use metaphorical comparisons deliberately to describe people, situations or events. The metaphorical elements hence also seem to trigger the notion that current news texts are more vivid and contain more detailed images than historical news. In addition, the fact that some reports included a relatively large number of similes also suggests that journalists have, or take, the freedom to personalise reports when deemed effective, and can add a subjective note to their writing. In general, the frequencies of similes, the number of directly used words within one simile, and the different complexities lead to the overall conclusion that current news reports allow for a more personalised style of language in the form of deliberate similes. The fact that both news periods predominantly produced similes in newspaper sections that traditionally are seen as the softer news reporting also suggest for now, however, that not all parts of the news freely allow for a personal styles of writing.

With respect to metaphors signalled by inverted commas, some important differences between historical and current news occurred as well. Again, current news texts included more and clearer examples of deliberate metaphors signalled by inverted commas than historical news texts. The effect of these metaphorical expressions marked by inverted commas seemed to be that the reports in questions became more personalised, containing personal ideas and views on the topic they apply to (such as in the arts and sports sections), or level to the knowledge of the addressee, viewing a complex topic in everyday words (such as in science reports). With respect to the latter function, this is similar to how science and educational discourse generally seems to work (cf. Cameron, 2003; Cameron & Low, 2004; Darian, 2000; Low, 2005). The higher number of marked metaphors in current news increases the density of metaphorical expressions that are potentially understood as cross-domain mappings, and in doing so may increase the idea that current news is more involved and personalised with respect metaphorical language use. Although it is still difficult to determine the influence of signals and of context on the actual understanding processes of the words and phrases, the signals are likely to create more awareness, and the signalled metaphorical terms in current news can be picked up more easily as deliberate metaphors.

Current news texts also showed a number of interesting examples of metaphorical comparisons that were extended on different occasions in one text. Such extensions generally create a coherent metaphorical mapping that is given weight by the fact that they are built on throughout a text. One example in particular stood out in current news, while such extensions did not occur in the historical news data. These results also enhanced the idea that deliberate metaphors are more often used in current news than in historical news, and are, moreover, much more personalised, complex and vivid than the rare cases found historical news. On the whole, it can be concluded that current news indeed show a clear tendency of becoming more personalised and rhetorically more diverse through the use of deliberate metaphors.

In conclusion, then, we can say that there seems to be a trend of personalization, and to some extent a general trend of conversationalization, in the register of Dutch news with respect to metaphorical language. The main patterns add valuable information on lexical-semantic features to the previously suggested trends of conversationalization, informalization and personalization of news language that focused on lexico-grammatical features (Biber & Finegan, 1992, 2001; Fairclough, 1994; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997; Pearce, 2005; Steen, 2003; Westin & Geisler, 2002). Detailed qualitative analyses of deliberate metaphorical expressions showed that current news seems to move towards conversations in their use of metaphorical delexicalised verbs and deliberate metaphors. Overall, the register of news shows a general trend of conversationalization in its use of verbs and a general trend of personalization in its employment of deliberate metaphors.

#### **9.4 Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research**

During the analysis stage of the study, a number of decisions with respect to corpus material and metaphor identification were taken that inevitable influenced the outcome of the study. Firstly, we chose to include only typical spontaneous conversations in the conversation part of the corpus, seeing these as the most basic form of informal conversations and thus the most basic form of typical conversational language. However, it turned out during the metaphor analysis that because of their high degree of casualness, they did not provide very many metaphorical expressions apart from the highly conventional ones. This high abstract and conventional nature was seen as typical for spontaneous conversations and taken into account in the quantitative metaphor analysis, but it yielded little data to analyse from a qualitative perspective; the data did not show deliberate metaphors. In hindsight, a combination of various conversational settings may have provided a more diverse metaphor data set representing the diversity of conversational language in more detail.

As mentioned above, one of the main assets of the present study is the output of a reliable and systematic method for linguistic metaphor identification, MIPVU. This method includes a number of clear instruction and explications on

how to deal find metaphor-related words. However, developing such as systematic method also includes making decisions that can consequently influence the data set and its analysis in a particular manner. One of the main decisions to find metaphor on the level of words, for instance, greatly influences the metaphor data set with which the analyses were conducted. Although we have our clear reasons for choosing the unit of words as our main unit of analysis, it is also possible and defensible to choose, for instance, the level of phrases as the unit of analysis, although it is difficult to consistently demarcate one phrase form another. Such a decision will have its impact on the metaphor data, and this should be taken into account when comparing the results of this study to other studies' results. In any case, it remains important for future researchers of metaphor in discourse to be specific about the decisions they have taken during metaphor identification to be able to compare their outcomes with other studies.

One of the main foci of this study is on the quantitative analysis of linguistic metaphors. Such a focus on the language of metaphors limits the analysis of metaphor on other levels, such as the conceptual structures as metaphor in thought. Due to the heterogeneous nature of the news section of the corpus and the abstract nature of the conversation part of the corpus, the possibilities to give useful and detailed suggestions about the conceptual structures in relation to conversationalization and personalization proved difficult to do. In addition, the ideas about deliberate metaphors are based on discourse analysis, due to which we can only guess what is intended and which effect is reached, but not say for certain because text does not gives us results with respect to comprehension. This is something which future studies may pick up, as will also be suggested below.

Finally, only two periods in time were used for this study, which makes it more difficult to show a clear trend of change in the style of news over a period of time. It could just be the case that we are analysing two samples that reflect the language use in their respective periods of time, but that the differences in results are not related clearly. However, the fact that we have used a diverse data set for each period, including a wide range of newspapers, news sections, and texts spread over the period of one year each, thus representing news from a broad perspective, can give us a clear idea of the general conventions in the language of that period.

To conclude, there are number of options and recommendations for future research based on the findings and limitation of this study. First of all, it would be interesting to look at metaphor use in various periods of news in a more qualitative manner. As said before, due to heterogeneous nature of the news this study did not look at detailed mappings and conceptual comparisons between news periods, and thus did not incorporate ideas on possible changes in how people have describe similar news facts in the course of several decades, or even centuries. It would be interesting in the light of a possible personalization of news to approach metaphor from a diachronic angle by looking at a diachronic corpus of news texts on a particular topic that may recur over time. It may be, for instance, that economic texts did not include the same conventional metaphor patterns 200 years ago as

they have done for the past decades. This can only be found when the focus of the metaphor analysis lies on one particular topic and on qualitative metaphor analysis.

In addition, the ideas proposed in the previous chapter about the increasing role of deliberate uses of metaphor in news language may be taken up from an experimental perspective. A discourse-analytic approach can give only a limited idea of how deliberate metaphors seem to word and seem to influence the rhetorical effect of a text; for one, it cannot give conclusive answers on how deliberate metaphors are processed and understood, and whether they indeed were intended as deliberate and caused addressees to set up the cross-domain mapping of some kind. More experimental research can shed light on the processing and effects of deliberate metaphors, and whether they influence the proposed ideas of conversationalization, and most importantly, whether this idea is indeed picked up and experienced as such by the readers.

It becomes clear from the suggestions above that many issues remain with regard to studying metaphor from a diachronic perspective as well as a register perspective. The present study has intended to give some insights into the diverse linguistic forms and uses of metaphor in Dutch news as well as conversations from a synchronic and diachronic perspective, and with the latter perspective has introduced an approach to metaphor in language that has not been taken frequently yet. It is hoped that this thesis has given some interesting insights into the frequencies, forms and functions of metaphor, and that it forms a useful basis for future research into metaphor in different registers and from different periods.

## Appendix A

### Overview of corpus materials

- Convesation: extracts from 29 conversations from the CGN classified as spontaneous face-to-face conversations

Table 1: Selected spontaneous conversations and meta-data from CGN corpus

CGN file code	number of words per excerpt	number of speakers	speaker roles
<i>fn000249</i>	2114	two	friends
<i>fn000259</i>	2153	two	parent-child
<i>fn000280</i>	1527	three	couple and friend
<i>fn000308</i>	1510	three	couple and friend
<i>fn000313</i>	1671	two	couple
<i>fn000319</i>	2184	two	friends
<i>fn000327</i>	1078	two	couple
<i>fn000349</i>	1053	two	acquaintances
<i>fn000370</i>	1066	two	friends
<i>fn000394</i>	2333	three	parent-child and siblings
<i>fn000423</i>	1891	five	parent-child, couple, in-laws
<i>fn000496</i>	1585	two	couple
<i>fn000554</i>	2081	three	friends and neighbour
<i>fn000616</i>	2085	two	acquaintances
<i>fn000647</i>	1026	two	couple
<i>fn000675</i>	1629	three	friends
<i>fn000690</i>	1793	four	neighbours
<i>fn000723</i>	2027	three	couple and parent-child
<i>fn000745</i>	2102	two	colleagues
<i>fn000760</i>	1309	two	friends
<i>fn007824</i>	2368	four	couple and friends
<i>fn007826</i>	1314	two	friends
<i>fn007848</i>	1891	two	<i>unknown</i>
<i>fn007887</i>	1497	two	parent-child
<i>fn007934</i>	1772	two	in-laws
<i>fn007961</i>	2114	three	siblings and friend
<i>fn008413</i>	2145	two	friends
<i>fn008469</i>	1229	two	friends
<i>fn008512</i>	2004	three	friends

- Current news: 99 news texts from eight sections of five national Dutch newspapers
  - de Volkskrant: first week January 2002
  - De Telegraaf: first week March 2002
  - Trouw: first week August 2002
  - NRC Handelsblad: first week July 2002
  - Algemeen Dagblad: first week May 2002
- Historical news: 50 news texts from main sections of four national Dutch newspapers
  - de Volkskrant: first week January 1950
  - De Telegraaf: first week March 1950
  - Trouw: first week August 1950
  - NRC Handelsblad: first week July 1950

*Table 2 Number of texts per newspaper per section (with total words in brackets)*

	<b>de Volkskrant</b>	<b>De Telegraaf</b>	<b>Trouw</b>	<b>NRC Handelsblad</b>	<b>Algemeen Dagblad</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2002 news</b>						
national	3 (1362)	3 (1615)	3 (1510)	3 (1179)	3 (1618)	15 (7284)
international	4 (1705)	3 (1424)	3 (1362)	3 (1562)	3 (1542)	16 (7595)
economics	2 (1070)	2 (1181)	2 (872)	3 (1102)	3 (1187)	12 (5412)
arts	2 (1328)	2 (1141)	2 (1335)	3 (1644)	2 (1290)	11 (6738)
editorial	3 (1779)	4 (892)	2 (1202)	2 (1379)	1 (863)	12 (6115)
sports	2 (1180)	3 (1620)	2 (1383)	2 (1380)	3 (1620)	12 (7183)
front page	3 (1210)	2 (1177)	3 (1190)	3 (1249)	2 (1014)	13 (5840)
science	2 (986)	1 (1052)	1 (905)	2 (948)	2 (1529)	8 (5420)
<i>Total</i>	21 (10,620)	20 (10,102)	18 (9759)	21 (10,443)	19 (10,663)	99 (51,587)
<b>1950 news</b>						
national	2 (1450)	2 (1316)	2 (1149)	3 (2068)	--	9 (5983)
international	2 (1690)	2 (1480)	2 (818)	2 (1362)	--	8 (5350)
economics	2 (1145)	2 (415)	1 (618)	3 (2124)	--	8 (4302)
arts	2 (1918)	--	1 (462)	1 (957)	--	4 (3337)
editorial	3 (1304)	--	1 (1270)	--	--	4 (2574)
sports	2 (2433)	1 (679)	--	2 (1112)	--	5 (4224)
front page	2 (1137)	2 (1150)	2 (1167)	2 (1222)	--	8 (4676)
science	2 (902)	1 (746)	1 (498)	--	--	4 (2146)
<i>Total</i>	17 (11,979)	10 (5786)	10 (5982)	13 (8845)	--	50 (32,592)

## Appendix B

### Text case study section 8.5

*[Source: de Volkskrant, 8 January; international news]*

#### **Politici in Washington weer terug in loopgraven**

Nu de strijd in Afghanistan luwt, begint in Washington de aloude politieke strijd weer op te laaien. Eind dit jaar zijn er verkiezingen voor het Congres en de Democraten maken zich op voor een bitter gevecht met de Republikeinen met als inzet de kwakkelende economie en de slinkende begrotingsoverschotten.

Voor de aanslagen van 11 september hadden de Democraten goede hoop in november 2002 het Congres op de Republikeinen te heroveren. Vorig jaar verloren de Republikeinen al de meerderheid in de Senaat door het overlopen van senator Jim Jeffords en de Democraten zagen goede kansen om bij de verkiezingen ook de meerderheid te krijgen in het Huis van Afgevaardigden, maar na 11 september kwam alles anders te liggen.

President Bush geniet nu een ongekennde populariteit en als opperbevelhebber is hij boven elke kritiek verheven. Maar de Democraten hopen dat Bush, net als zijn vader, het slachtoffer zal worden van de economische tegenspoed. Bush sr. verloor in 1992 de verkiezingen, ook al genoot hij nog zoveel populariteit na de geallieerde zege in de Golfoorlog.

De Democratische leider in de Senaat, Tom Daschle, lanceerde eind vorige week een frontale aanval op het economische beleid van Bush. Volgens Daschle is de recessie maar ten dele te danken aan de aanslagen van 11 september. De situatie is volgens hem verslechterd door de enorme belastingverlaging (van 1350 miljard dollar over elf jaar) die Bush vorig jaar door het Congres joeg.

Het gevolg is dat het Congres alleen maar 'slechte keuzes' heeft: als het meer geld uittrekt voor defensie en de binnenlandse veiligheid, gaat dat ten koste van de reserves voor social security, de Amerikaanse AOW.

Aanvankelijk was afgesproken dat een groot deel van de voorspelde overschotten zou worden gebruikt om de staatsschuld af te betalen, zodat er later extra geld zou vrijkomen voor het social security-stelsel. Maar verwacht wordt dat het totale overschot nu hooguit op eenderde van de voorspelde 5600 miljard dollar (over tien jaar) zal uitkomen.

Na 11 september heerste er tijdelijk een wapenstilstand in Washington, maar politicoloog Ross Baker van Rutgers Universiteit vergelijkt het met het Kerstbestand uit 1914. De troepen kwamen toen even uit de loopgraven om samen kerstliederen te zingen, maar daarna ging het schieten meteen weer door.

Onder leiding van Daschle torpedeerden de Democraten in de Senaat eind vorig jaar al het economische stimuleringspakket van president Bush, dat onder meer voorziet in het versnellen van de belastingverlagingen. De Democraten klagen dat de maatregelen vooral ten gunste komen van grote bedrijven die de hulp niet nodig hebben.

De Democraten zijn van plan er nog een schepje bovenop te doen als de regering-Bush deze week bij het Congres moet aankloppen voor toestemming om het plafond voor de staatsschuld te verhogen. Zonder de belastingverlagingen was dat volgens hen niet nodig geweest.

Om de Democraten in een kwaad daglicht te stellen, draait Bush het om en hamert hij erop dat de Democraten erop uit zijn de belastingen te verhogen, een beschuldiging die in de VS altijd heel gevoelig ligt.

De Republikeinen hopen ook dat de kiezers niet hen, maar de terroristen zullen aanwijzen als de schuldigen voor de economische malaise. Volgens de opiniepeilingen is dat inderdaad het geval, zodat het nog onzeker is of de strategie van de Democraten zal werken.

Daarbij komt dat november nog ver weg is. Tegen die tijd, zo hopen de Republikeinen, heeft de economie zich misschien al hersteld.

### **[English translation]**

#### **Politicians in Washington back in trenches again**

Now that the battle in Afghanistan is subsiding, the old political battle is charged ahaom. At the end of this year there are elections for the Congress, and the Democrat prepare themselves for a bitter fight with the Republicans, with the ailing economy and the dwindling budget surplus at stake.

Before the attacks of September 11 the Democrats were hopeful to reconquer the Congress from the Republicans in November 2002. Last year the Republicans lost the majority in the Senate because of the desertion of senator Jim Jeffords and the Democrats were hopeful to get the majority in the House of Representatives too during the elections, but after September 11 everything changed.

President Bush is incredibly popular now and as supreme commander he sees himself above all criticism. But the Democrats hope that Bush, like his father, will

become the victim of economic adversities. Bush senior lost the 1992 elections, despite his popularity after the allied victory in the Gulf War.

The Democratic leader in the Senate, Tom Daschle, launched a frontal attack on the economic policies of Bush last week. According to Daschle the recession is only partly to blame on the September 11 attacks. The situation has worsened according to him because of the enormous tax reductions (1350 million dollars in eleven years) that Bush pushed through the Congress last year.

The consequence is that the Congress only has 'bad choices': when it reserves more money for defence and the homeland security, this will go at the expense of the reserves for social security, the American 'social security act'.

Initially it was agreed that a large part of the predicted surplus would be used to redeem the national debt, in order to release extra money later for the social security system. But it is expected that the total surplus will arrive at only one third of the predicted 5600 million dollars.

After September 11 there temporarily was a cease fire in Washington, but political scientist Ross Baker of Rutgers University compares it to the Christmas truce of 1914. The troops then briefly left the trenches to sing Christmas carols together, but afterwards the shooting immediately continued.

Under the leadership of Daschle the Democrats in the Senate torpedoed Bush's economic encouragement packet last year, which among other things provided for an acceleration of the tax reductions. The Democrats complain that the measure predominantly benefits the large companies who do not need the help.

The Democrats plan to add a little extra if the Bush administration has to appeal to the Congress for consent to raise the ceiling for the national debt. Without the tax reductions that would not have been needed according to them.

To put the Democrats in a poor light, Bush revolves the issue and keeps hammering that the Democrats intend to raise the taxes, an accusation that is always sensitively reacted to in the US.

The Republicans hope that the voters will point not them but the terrorists as the culprits of the economic depression. According to opinion polls that will indeed be the case, which means it is still uncertain whether the strategy of the Democrats will work.

Furthermore, November is still far away. Until that moment, the Republicans hope, the economy has perhaps restored itself.



## References

- Aarts, F.G.A.M., & Wekker, H.C. (1987). *A contrastive grammar of English and Dutch / Contrastieve grammatica Engels/Nederlands*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Aisenman, R.A. (1999). Structure-mapping and the simile-metaphor preference. *Metaphor and Symbol, 14*, 45-51.
- Artstein, R., & Poesio, M. (2008). Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics. *Computational Linguistics, 34*, 555-596.
- Bateman, J.A. (2008). *Multimodality and genre: a foundation for the systematic analysis of multimodal documents*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Berber-Sardinha, T. (2008). Metaphor probabilities in corpora. In M.S. Zanotto, L. Cameron & M.C. Cavalcanti (Eds.), *Confronting metaphor in use: an applied linguistic approach* (pp. 127-147). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Bhatia, V.K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: a genre-based view*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Bhatia, V.K. (2008). Genre analysis, ESP and professional practice. *English for Specific Purposes, 27*, 161-174.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (1989). A typology of English texts. *Linguistics, 27*, 3-43.
- Biber, D. (1999). A register perspective on grammar and discourse: variability in the form and use of English complement clauses. *Discourse Studies, 1*, 131-150.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2001). Register variation: a corpus approach. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 175-196). Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Drift and the evolution of English style: a history of three genres. *Language, 65*, 487-517.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1992). The linguistic evolution of five written and speech-based English genres from the 17th to the 20th centuries. In M. Rissanen, O. Ihalainen, T. Nevalainen & I. Taavitsainen (Eds.), *History of Englishes: new methods and interpretations in historical linguistics* (pp. 688-704). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (2001). Diachronic relations among speech-based and written registers in English. In S. Conrad & D. Biber (Eds.), *Variation in English: multi-dimensional studies* (pp. 66-83). London: Longman.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Billig, M., & MacMillan, K. (2005). Metaphor, idiom and ideology: the search for 'no smoking guns' across time. *Discourse & Society*, 16, 459-480.
- Blom, C. (2005). *Complex predicates in Dutch: synchrony and diachrony*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Boers, F. (1999). Learning vocabulary through metaphoric awareness. *Etudes et Travaux*, 3, 53-66.
- Booij, G. (2002a). Constructional idioms, morphology, and the Dutch lexicon. *Journal of Germanic linguistics*, 14, 301-327.
- Booij, G. (2002b). Separable complex verbs in Dutch: a case of periphrastic word formation. In N. Deh, R. Jackendoff, A. Macintyre & S. Urban (Eds.), *Verb-particle explorations* (pp. 21-42). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boroditsky, L. (2000). Metaphoric structuring: understanding time through spatial metaphors. *Cognition*, 75, 1-28.
- Bovair, S., & Kieras, D. (1985). A guide to propositional analysis for research on technical prose. In B. Britton & J. Black (Eds.), *Understanding expository text* (pp. 315-362). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bowdle, B.F., & Gentner, D. (2005). The career of metaphor. *Psychological Review*, 112, 193-216.
- Cameron, L. (1999). Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse data. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 105-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Cameron, L. (2007). Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk. *Discourse & Society*, 18, 197-222.
- Cameron, L. (2008). Metaphor and talk. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 197-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2003). Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18, 149-160.
- Cameron, L., & Low, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Researching and applying metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L., & Low, G. (2004). Figurative variation in episodes of educational talk and text. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8, 355-373.

- Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Metaphor analysis: research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities*. London & Oakville: Equinox.
- Cameron, L., & Stelma, J.H. (2004). Metaphor clusters in discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 7-36.
- Carter, R. (2004). *Language and creativity: the art of common talk*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Chafe, W.L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35-54). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: the persuasive power of metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2006). Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society*, 17, 563-582.
- Charteris-Black, J., & Ennis, T. (2001). A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 249-266.
- Charteris-Black, J., & Musolff, A. (2003). 'Battered hero' or 'innocent victim'? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 153-176.
- Chiappe, D., Kennedy, J.M., & Smykowski, T. (2003). Reversibility, aptness, and the conventionality of metaphors and similes. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18, 85-105.
- Chilton, P.A. (1996). *Security metaphors: Cold War discourse from containment to common European home*. New York & Bern: Peter Lang.
- Chilton, P.A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Cienki, A., & Müller, C. (Eds.). (2008a). *Metaphor and gesture*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cienki, A., & Müller, C. (2008b). Metaphor, gesture, and thought. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 483-501). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conboy, M. (2007). *The language of the news*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Conrad, S., & Biber, D. (2001). *Variation in English: multi-dimensional studies*. London: Longman.
- Crisp, P., Heywood, J., & Steen, G.J. (2002). Metaphor identification and analysis, classification and quantification. *Language and Literature*, 11, 55-69.

- Croft, W., & Cruse, A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuyckens, H. (1991). The semantics of spatial prepositions in Dutch: a cognitive-linguistic exercise. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Antwerp (UIA).
- Cuyckens, H. (1993). The Dutch spatial preposition "in": a cognitive-semantic analysis. In C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (Ed.), *The semantics of prepositions: from mental processing to natural language processing* (pp. 27-71). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cuyckens, H. (1995). Family resemblance in the Dutch spatial prepositions *door* and *langs*. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6, 183-208.
- Darian, S. (2000). The role of figurative language in introductory science texts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 163-186.
- Deignan, A. (1999). Corpus-based research into metaphor. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 177-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Deignan, A. (2006). The grammar of linguistic metaphor. In A. Stefanowitsch & S.T. Gries (Eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy* (pp. 106-122). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Deignan, A. (2008). Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 280-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deignan, A. (2010a). The cognitive view of metaphor: conceptual metaphor theory. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities* (pp. 44-56). London & Oakville: Equinox.
- Deignan, A. (2010b). The evaluative properties of metaphors. In G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world* (pp. 357-373). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Deignan, A., & Potter, E. (2004). A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in English and Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1231-1252.
- Den Boom, T., & Geeraerts, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Van Dale Groot woordenboek van de Nederlandse Taal*. Utrecht & Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie. (Electronic version).
- Dorst, A.G. (in prep.). *Metaphor in fiction*. Unpublished PhD thesis, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1995). Idiomatic expressions and their role in the organization of topic transition in conversation. In M. Everaert, E.J. Van der Linden, A. Schenk & R. Schreuder (Eds.), *Idioms: structural and*

- psychological perspectives* (pp. 117-132). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Drew, P., & Holt, E. (1998). Figures of speech: figurative expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society*, 27, 495-522.
- Dunn, G. (1989). *Design and analysis reliability studies: the statistical evaluation of measurement errors*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eggs, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. London & Oakville: Equinox.
- Everaert, M., Van der Linden, E.J., Schenk, A., & Schreuder, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Idioms: structural and psychological perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Evertse, J. (2005). Ff babbelen: een stilistische vergelijking tussen de mondelinge, schriftelijke en digitale tekstsoorten *TTWiA*, 73.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1994). Conversationalization of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In R. Keat, N. Whitely & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *The authority of the consumer* (pp. 253-268). London & New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: an analytical framework. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 142-162). Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fairclough, N., & Mauranen, A. (1997). The conversationalisation of political discourse: a comparative view. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11, 89-119.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Finegan, E., & Biber, D. (1995). *That* and zero complementisers in Late Modern English: exploring ARCHER from 1650-1990. In B. Aarts & C. Meyer (Eds.), *The verb in contemporary English* (pp. 241-257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foolen, A. (2004). Expressive binominal NPs in Germanic and Romance languages. In G. Radden & K.-U. Panther (Eds.), *Studies in linguistic motivation* (pp. 75-100). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Forceville, C. (2008). Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 462-482). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, D.C. (1970). *Linguistics and literary style*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

- Gabrielatos, C., & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: a corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press, 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 36, 5-38.
- Gentner, D. (1983). Structure-mapping: a theoretical framework for analogy. *Cognitive Science*, 7, 155-170.
- Gentner, D., & Bowdle, B.F. (2001). Convention, form, and figurative language processing. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 16, 223-247.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (1994). *The poetics of mind: figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (1995). Why idioms are not dead metaphors. In C. Cacciari & P. Tabossi (Eds.), *Idioms: processing, structure, and interpretation* (pp. 57-77). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (2005). *Embodiment and cognitive science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr., Lima, P.L.C., & Francozo, E. (2004). Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1189-1210.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr., Nayak, N.P., & Cutting, C. (1989). How to kick the bucket and not decompose: analyzability and idiom processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28, 576-593.
- Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language: from metaphors to idioms*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glucksberg, S. (2008). How metaphors create categories - quickly. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 67-83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Glucksberg, S., & Keysar, B. (1990). Understanding metaphorical comparisons: beyond similarity. *Psychological Review*, 97, 3-18.
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Grady, J.E. (1997). Theories are buildings revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 8, 267-290.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning* London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hellsten, I. (2000). Dolly: scientific breakthrough or Frankenstein's monster? Journalistic and scientific metaphors of cloning. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15, 213-221.
- Herrmann, J.B. (in prep.). *Metaphor in academic discourse*. Unpublished PhD thesis, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

- Heywood, J., & Semino, E. (2007). Metaphors for speaking and writing in the British press. In A. Esslin & S. Johnson (Eds.), *Language in the media: representations, identities, ideologies* (25-47). London & New York: Continuum.
- Heywood, J., Semino, E., & Short, M. (2002). Linguistic metaphor identification in two extracts from novels. *Language and Literature*, 11, 35-54.
- Holly, W. (2008). Tabloidisation of political communication in the public sphere. In R. Wodak & V. Koller (Eds.), *Handbook of communication in the public sphere* (pp. 317-341). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Holt, E., & Drew, P. (2005). Figurative pivots: the use of figurative expressions in pivotal topic transitions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38, 35-61.
- Hundt, M., & Mair, C. (1999). "Agile" and "uptight" genres: the corpus-based approach to language change in progress. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 4, 221-242.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kaal, A.A. (in prep.). *Metaphor in conversation*. Unpublished PhD thesis, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Kitis, E., & Milapides, M. (1997). Read it and believe it: how metaphor constructs ideology in news discourse. A case study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 557-590.
- Koller, V. (2003). Metaphor clusters, metaphor chains: analyzing the multifunctionality of metaphor in text. *Metaphoric.de*, 5, 115-134.
- Koller, V. (2004). Business women and war metaphors: possessive, jealous and pugnacious? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8, 3-22.
- Koteyko, N., Brown, B., & Crawford, P. (2008). The dead parrot and the dying swan: the role of metaphor scenarios in UK press coverage of avian flu in the UK in 2005-2006. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23, 242-261.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2008). Metaphor and emotion. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 380-396). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krennmayr, T. (in prep.). *Metaphor in newspapers*. Unpublished PhD thesis, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought, 2nd edition* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London: Longman.
- Lindstromberg, S. (1998). *English prepositions explained*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Littlemore, J. (2009). *Applying cognitive linguistics to second language learning and teaching*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Littlemore, J., & Low, G. (2006). *Figurative thinking and foreign language learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Low, G. (1999). "This paper thinks...". Investigating the acceptability of the metaphor AN ESSAY IS A PERSON. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 221-248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Low, G. (2005). Explaining evolution: the use of animacy in an example of semi-formal science writing. *Language and Literature*, 14, 129-148.
- Low, G. (2008). Metaphor and education. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 212-231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Low, G., Todd, Z., Deignan, A., & Cameron, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lu, L.W.-L., & Ahrens, K. (2008). Ideological influence on BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese presidential speeches. *Discourse & Society*, 19, 383-408.
- Lule, J. (2004). War and its metaphors: news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003. *Journalism Studies*, 5, 179-190.
- Maalej, Z. (2007). Doing critical discourse analysis with the contemporary theory of metaphor: towards a discourse model of metaphor. In C. Hart & D. Lukes (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 132-158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacArthur, F., & Littlemore, J. (2008). A discovery approach using corpora in the foreign language classroom. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology* (pp. 159-188). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mair, C. (2006). *Twentieth-century English: history, variation, and standardization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markert, K., & Nissim, M. (2003). Corpus-based metonymy analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18, 175-188.
- Mayer, R.E. (1993). The instructive metaphor: metaphoric aids to students' understanding of science. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 2nd edition (pp. 561-578). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Miller, G.A. (1979). Images and models, similes and metaphors. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 357-400). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: a corpus-based approach*. Oxford & New York: Clarendon Press.
- Müller, C. (2008). *Metaphors. Dead and alive, sleeping and waking. A cognitive approach to metaphors in language use*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21, 23-38.
- Nerlich, B., Clarke, D.D., & Dingwall, R. (2000). Clones and crops. The use of stock characters and word play in two debates about bioengineering. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15, 223-240.
- Nuñez, R. (2008). Conceptual metaphor, human cognition, and the nature of mathematics. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 339-362). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oostdijk, N. (2000). *The Spoken Dutch Corpus: overview and first evaluation*. Paper presented at the ELRA, Paris.
- Ortony, A. (1979a). Beyond literal similarity. *Psychological Review*, 86, 161-180.
- Ortony, A. (Ed.). (1979b). *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paardekooper, P.C. (1956). Een schat van een kind. *De nieuwe taalgids*, 49, 93-99.
- Paltridge, B. (1995). Working with genre: a pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24, 393-406.
- Pasma, T. (in press). Metaphor identification in Dutch discourse. In F. MacArthur, J.L. Oncins-Martínez, M. Sánchez-García & A.M. Piquer-Píriz (Eds.), *Metaphor in use: context, culture, and communication*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pearce, M. (2002). Informalization of UK General Election propoganda 1964-1997. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Leeds.
- Pearce, M. (2005). Informalization in UK party election broadcasts 1966-97. *Language and Literature*, 14, 65-90.
- Philip, G. (2007). *Decomposition and delexicalisation in learners' collocational (mis)behaviour*. Paper presented at the Online proceedings of Corpus Linguistics 2007.
- Philip, G. (2010). "Drugs, traffic, and many other dirty interests": Metaphor and the language learner. In G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World* (pp. 63-80). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22, 1-39.
- Reddy, M.J. (1979). The conduit metaphor: a case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reijnierse, G. (2010). In search of metaphors in French: can the Metaphor Identification Procedure help find them? *TTWiA*, 83.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999). 'Like an animal I was treated': anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 191-224.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Schelfhout, C., Coppen, P.-A., & Oostdijk, N. (2003). Positions of parentheticals and interjections: a corpus-based approach. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 20, 155-166.
- Scholfield, P. (1995). *Quantifying language: a researcher's and teacher guide to gathering language data and reducing it to figures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Semino, E. (2002). A sturdy baby or a derailing train? Metaphorical representations of the euro in British and Italian newspapers. *Text*, 22, 107-139.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E., & Masci, M. (1996). Politics is football: metaphor in the discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy. *Discourse & Society*, 7, 243-269.
- Semino, E., & Short, M. (2004). *Corpus stylistics: speech, writing and thought presentation in a corpus of English writing*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. London: Longman.
- Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Collins Cobuild English grammar*. Glasgow: HarperCollins.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J., & Renouf, A. (1998). A lexical syllabus for language learning. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching* (pp. 140-160). London: Longman.
- Steen, G.J. (1994). *Understanding metaphor in literature: an empirical approach*. London: Longman.
- Steen, G.J. (1999a). From linguistic to conceptual metaphor in five steps. In R.W. Gibbs, Jr. & G.J. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 57-77). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Steen, G.J. (1999b). Genres of discourse and the definition of literature. *Discourse Processes*, 28, 109-120.
- Steen, G.J. (2003). Conversationalization in discourse: stylistic changes in editorials of *The Times* between 1950 and 2000. In L. Lagerwerf, W. Spooren & L. Degand (Eds.), *Determination of information and tenor in texts: multidisciplinary approaches to discourse 2002* (pp. 115-124). Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Steen, G.J. (2005). What counts as a metaphorically used word? The Pragglejaz experience. In S. Coulson & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *The literal-nonliteral distinction* (pp. 299-322). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Steen, G.J. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G.J. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23, 213-241.
- Steen, G.J. (2009). From linguistic to conceptual structure in five steps: analyzing metaphor in poetry. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics: goals, gains and gaps* (197-226). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Steen, G.J. (in press a). Genre between the humanities and the sciences. In M. Callies, W. Keller & A. Lohöfer (Eds.), *Bi-directionality in the Cognitive Sciences*.
- Steen, G.J. (in press b). When is metaphor deliberate? In N.-L. Johannesson, C. Alm-Arvius & D.C. Minugh (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second Stockholm Metaphor Festival, 2008*.
- Steen, G.J., Biernacka, E., Dorst, A.G., Kaal, A.A., López-Rodríguez, I., & Pasma, T. (2010). Pragglejaz in practice: finding metaphorically used words in natural discourse. In G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world* (pp. 165-184). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G.J., Dorst, A.G., Herrmann, J.B., Kaal, A.A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: from MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tversky, A. (1977). Features of similarity. *Psychological Review*, 84, 327-352.
- Tyler, A., & Evans, V. (2003). *The semantics of English prepositions: spatial scenes, embodied meaning and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ure, J.N. (1971). Lexical density and register differentiation. In G.E. Perren & J.L.M. Trim (Eds.), *Applications of linguistics: selected papers of the*

- second international congress of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 443-452).  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van den Bosch, A., Busser, G.J., Daelemans, W., & Canisius, S. (2007). An efficient memory-based morphosyntactic tagger and parser for Dutch. In F. Van Eynde, P. Dirix, I. Schuurman & V. Vandeghinste (Eds.), *Selected Papers of the 17th Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Meeting* (pp. 99-114). Leuven, Belgium.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). *Discourse and context: a sociocognitive approach*.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*.  
New York & London: Academic Press.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). News genres. In R. Wodak & V. Koller (Eds.),  
*Handbook of communication in the public sphere* (pp. 317-341). Berlin &  
New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Verhagen, A. (2005). Constructiegrammatica en 'usage based' taalkunde.  
*Nederlandse Taalkunde, 10*, 197-222.
- Vis, K. (in prep.). *Subjectivity in news discourse*. Unpublished PhD thesis, VU  
University Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Wallis, P., & Nerlich, B. (2005). Disease metaphors in new epidemics: the UK  
media framing of the 2003 SARS epidemic. *Social Science & Medicine*,  
*60*, 2629-2639.
- Westin, I. (2002). *Language change in English newspaper editorials*. Amsterdam:  
Rodopi.
- Westin, I., & Geisler, C. (2002). A multi-dimensional study of diachronic variation  
in British newspaper editorials. *ICAME Journal, 26*, 133-152.
- Wijfjes, H. (2004). *Journalistiek in Nederland: beroep, cultuur en organisatie  
1850-2000*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Zinken, J. (2003). Ideological imagination: intertextual and correlation metaphors  
in political discourse. *Discourse & Society, 14*, 507-523.

## Summary in Dutch

### Metaforiek en registervariatie

De personalisatie van Nederlandstalig nieuwstaal

#### Introductie

Nieuwsmedia zijn in een tijdsbestek van enkele decennia op verschillende niveaus zeer divers geworden. Niet alleen wordt er steeds meer gebruik gemaakt van visuele middelen, zoals video's, foto's en lay-out, maar ook wordt er een breder scala aan onderwerpen en genres binnen de verschillende media gehanteerd. Ook de traditionele geschreven pers, de kranten, lijken onderhevig aan de veranderingen in visueel en tekstueel opzicht.

Wat betreft het taalgebruik van kranten bestaat er de algemene opvatting dat deze veranderd is onder invloed van de algehele veranderingen in modaliteit, onderwerpen, en presentatie. Vanuit verschillende onderzoeksgebieden is geconstateerd dat het taalgebruik in kranten informeler en persoonlijker lijkt te zijn geworden, en meer is gaan lijken op gesproken taal (cf. Conboy, 2007; Fairclough, 1994; Wijffes, 2004). Fairclough (1994) heeft dit verschijnsel de conversationalisatie van publiek taalgebruik genoemd. Aspecten zoals veelvuldig gebruik van persoonlijke voornaamwoorden, lexicale woorden met subjectieve lading, lay-outaanpassingen en dergelijke die een tekst moeten doen opvallen zijn genoemd als duidelijke tekenen van de stijlverschillen en de talige verschuivingen binnen het taalregister van nieuws in de richting van gesproken taal.

In dit onderzoek zijn de rol en invloed van metaforiek in de veranderingen van nieuwstaal bestudeerd. Metaforen worden vaak gezien als stijlfiguren die een tekst een bepaalde subjectieve, persoonlijke lading kunnen geven. Daarnaast kunnen ze gebruikt worden om een bepaald retorisch effect te creëren door bewuste keuzes voor bepaalde vergelijkingen te maken. Daarnaast is er in corpusgerelateerde studies naar de frequentie en het gebruik van metaforen op gewezen dat metaforen in verschillende genres in heel verschillende talige vormen en voor heel verschillende doeleinden gebruikt worden. De meest frequente metaforen in conversaties zijn bijvoorbeeld vaak van andere aard, zowel in vorm als in functie, dan de meest frequente metaforen in nieuwsteksten of dan die in fictie. De ideeën die hierboven genoemd worden, hebben geresulteerd in de twee algemene onderzoeksvragen die in dit proefschrift behandeld zijn, namelijk:

1. In hoeverre verschillen de hedendaagse registers van conversatie en nieuws van elkaar wat betreft de frequentie en de functie van metaforisch taalgebruik? Als er verschillen zijn, kunnen die dan toegeschreven worden aan de functionele verschillen tussen de registers in het algemeen?

2. In hoeverre verschillen historische en hedendaagse nieuwstaal van elkaar wat betreft de frequentie en de functie van metaforisch taalgebruik? Als er verschillen zijn, dragen die dan significant bij aan de processen van stijlverschuivingen in de taal van het nieuws? Met andere woorden, kunnen die verschillen gezien worden als een onderdeel van de algemene conversationalisatietrend?

Om deze vragen te beantwoorden is in deze studie gebruik gemaakt van een corpus bestaande uit Nederlandstalige recente conversaties en krantenteksten en Nederlandstalige historische krantenteksten. In totaal zijn ruim 50.000 woorden conversatie, ruim 50.000 woorden hedendaagse nieuwsteksten en ruim 30.000 woorden historische nieuwsteksten geanalyseerd op de aanwezigheid van talige metaforen. Er is gekeken naar de frequenties, de vormen en de functies van de metaforen in alle drie de corpusonderdelen, zowel vanuit een kwantitatief als kwalitatief oogpunt.

### **Theoretisch kader**

Vanuit verschillende hoeken is gesuggereerd dat het register van nieuwstaal de laatste decennia een verandering heeft doorgemaakt van een formele, objectieve stijl naar een meer informele, conversationele stijl. Binnen de traditie van Critical Discourse Analysis heeft Fairclough gesuggereerd dat publiek taalgebruik, waartoe nieuwstaal en politieke taal behoren, een proces van informalisatie heeft ondergaan, een proces dat hij grofweg opdeelt in conversationalisatie en personalisatie (Fairclough, 1992, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1998; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). Onder conversationalisatie verstaat Fairclough het modelleren van publiek taalgebruik naar de normen en gebruiken van gesproken taal (Fairclough, 1994: 253). Volgens Fairclough wordt in publieke taalregisters, en vooral in nieuwstaal, steeds meer gebruik gemaakt van talige elementen die als typisch conversationeel kunnen worden beschouwd, zoals informele woorden in krantenkoppen, verkorte woordvormen, persoonlijke voornaamwoorden, herhalingen, enzovoorts. Maar ook de interactie tussen taalgebruikers in politiek georiënteerde teksten en interviews lijken steeds informeler te worden (Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997). Conversationalisatie behelst dus een verschuiving in de frequentie van conversationele taalelementen en daaraan verbonden een verschuiving in de relatie tussen taalgebruikers. Onder de personalisatie van publiek taalgebruik wordt door Fairclough een soortgelijk proces verstaan, met dit verschil dat het meer focust op de context en minder op de talige uitingen, doordat het meer de focus legt op de verschuiving naar een meer persoonlijke relatie tussen taalgebruikers (Fairclough, 1995a).

De ideeën die Fairclough naar voren brengt lijken vooral gebaseerd te zijn op intuïtie en niet zozeer op taalkundige bewijzen. Er zijn echter ook corpusstudies

verricht die de conversationalisatiehypothese van Fairclough empirisch hebben getest door systematisch teksten te analyseren op de frequentie van vooraf gedefiniëerde talige kenmerken van conversaties en informeel taalgebruik (Pearce, 2002, 2005; Steen, 2003). Pearce (2005) vond voor Britse politieke partijprogramma's dat deze teksten in een tijdsbestek van 30 jaar (tussen 1966 en 1997) informeler zijn geworden door een toenemend gebruik van informele en conversationale talige elementen zoals persoonlijke voornaamwoorden, bijwoorden van houding, en vragen, en een afnemend gebruik van formele talige elementen zoals nominalisaties en bijvoeglijke naamwoorden (Pearce, 2005). Steen (2003) heeft een studie verricht naar de conversationalisatie van opinie-artikelen in *The Times*, waarvoor hij ook de frequenties heeft vergeleken van enkele typisch informele en subjectieve kenmerken, zoals persoonlijke voornaamwoorden en modale werkwoorden in verschillende periodes. De kwantitatieve analyse liet zien dat de artikelen uit de periode 1975-1995 significant meer informele elementen bevatten dan de artikelen uit de periode 1950-1970 (Steen, 2003). De resultaten van Pearce en Steen laten zien dat er dus ook kwantitief bewijs is voor de conversationalisatiehypothese.

Soortgelijke kwantitatieve analyses van diachrone taalveranderingen in verschillende taalregisters zijn uitgevoerd door Biber en Finegan (1989, 1992, 2001). Deze studies maken gebruik van een eerder door Biber ontwikkelde 'multi-feature/multi-dimensional' benadering waarmee talige en situationele variatie tussen genres in de Engelse taal zijn blootgelegd (Biber, 1988, 1989). Een statistische analyse van talige elementen in 23 genres heeft zes onderliggende functionele dimensies geïdentificeerd, waarvan Biber drie dimensies onderscheidt die specifiek een verschil tussen gesproken en geschreven taal lijken aan te tonen. Op basis van deze drie dimensies hebben Biber en Finegan een diachrone analyse van verschillende registers van het Engels uitgevoerd om te kijken of bepaalde registers verschuivingen vertonen tussen typisch gesproken taalgebruik en geschreven taalgebruik.

Voor het nieuwsregister vonden ze dat deze zich in de loop van enkele eeuwen (vanaf de 17<sup>e</sup> eeuw) had ontwikkeld in de richting van meer gesproken taalgebruik. De trend was vooral zichtbaar vanaf het begin van de 20<sup>ste</sup> eeuw (Biber & Finegan, 2001). Dit uitte zich in een significante stijging van talige elementen typisch voor informeel, betrokken taalgebruik zoals persoonlijke voornaamwoorden, bijwoorden, aanwijzende voornaamwoorden en tussenvoegsels, en een daling van talige elementen typisch voor informatief taalgebruik zoals zelfstandige naamwoorden, bijvoeglijke naamwoorden, voorzetsels, en een hoge type-token ratio. De bevindingen van hun diachrone studies lijken samen te gaan met de verschillende suggesties en bevindingen van Fairclough, Pearce, en Steen.

Enkele andere studies waarin op basis van Biber's multi-feature/multi-dimensional model gekeken is naar talige verschuivingen binnen het nieuwsregister resulteerden in soortgelijke bevindingen (Westin, 2002; Westin & Geisler, 2002). Westin en Geisler (2002) constateerden dat opiniestukken uit verschillende Britse kranten in de loop van de 20<sup>ste</sup> eeuw op enkele aspecten zijn verschoven richting

een duidelijk conversationalere, gesproken stijl. Dit was niet op alle vlakken even duidelijk door de grote variatie binnen hun corpus, maar kwam desalniettemin overeen met Biber en Finegans bevindingen en de hypothesen van Fairclough.

Bovengenoemde onderzoeken hebben alleen aandacht besteed aan de lexico-grammaticale elementen die kenmerkend zijn voor gesproken of geschreven taal. Er zijn ook studies naar veranderingen in het nieuwsregister die meer aandacht besteden aan tekstuele aspecten, zoals de opbouw van teksten en gebruik van bepaalde constructies, of naar multimodale aspecten zoals lay-out en gebruik van foto's. Hundt en Mair (1999, en Mair, 2006), bijvoorbeeld, constateren dat het journalistiek taalgebruik van nu informeler is dan enkele decennia geleden, een proces dat ze 'colloquialisatie' noemen. Dit zien ze deels in een stijging in het gebruik van informele woorden, maar vooral ook in een stijging in het gebruik van directe rede door aangehaalde bronnen. Hierdoor verandert de structuur van nieuwsteksten, maar ook de stijl wordt beïnvloed door direct gebruik van gesproken taal. Een andere trend die veranderingen in tekstuele elementen benadrukt is wat Holly (2008) de 'tabloidisatie' van publiek taalgebruik noemt. Deze trend verwijst naar de zogenaamde 'tabloids', de kranten die vooral focussen op sensationele nieuwsberichten en een sensationele stijl van journalistiek. Volgens Holly is deze trend ook steeds meer zichtbaar in serieuzere gebieden van het publieke register; nieuwskaternen die traditioneel focusten op serieuze berichtgeving en taalgebruik lijken steeds vaker gebruik te maken van talige en visuele elementen die de berichtgeving sensationeler maken (Holly, 2008).

Ondanks de veelzijdigheid van bovengenoemde studies, lijkt er een belangrijk aspect te ontbreken dat de stijl van nieuwsteksten kan beïnvloeden. In geen enkele van deze studies wordt aandacht besteed aan lexicaal-semanticke taalelementen. Het is echter vaker opgemerkt dat veranderingen in stijl ook kunnen worden veroorzaakt door veranderingen in semantische aspecten, zoals een voorkeur voor subjectieve woorden of het veelzijdig gebruik van metaforen om bepaalde mensen, situaties, of gebeurtenissen met een bepaald beeld te beschrijven. Dit laatste aspect, het gebruik van metaforen, is onderwerp geweest van vele studies naar taalgebruik in verschillende taalregisters en tekstgenres. Een algemeen idee dat in deze studies naar voren komt is dat metaforisch taalgebruik in verschillende registers en genres verschillende vormen en doelen heeft. In nieuws kunnen metaforen bijvoorbeeld een specifiek beeld geven van een gebeurtenis, persoon, of groep, een beeld dat persoonlijk door de journalist, of, breder, door de krant wordt gekozen (cf. Charteris-Black, 2004; Semino, 2008). Ook in conversaties worden metaforen herhaaldelijk gebruikt om zaken op een bepaalde manier onder woorden te brengen (cf. Cameron, 2003). Het gebruik van bepaalde metaforen kan een stijl van een tekst, krant, conversatie of register in het algemeen dus duidelijk beïnvloeden.

Metaforiek is echter een veelzijdig begrip dat op verschillende manieren kan worden onderzocht en geïnterpreteerd. Waar een metafoor enkele decennia geleden nog gezien werd als een creatieve stijlfiguur die altijd bewust werd gebruikt, hebben inzichten binnen de cognitieve linguïstiek deze aanname de

afgelopen jaren sterk veranderd. Lakoff en Johnson (1980) suggereren dat metaforiek juist vaak conventioneel is en veelvuldig voorkomt, niet alleen als talig fenomeen maar vooral ook in cognitie. Mensen structureren vaak abstracte concepten in hun gedachten als concrete concepten, en denken, redeneren en praten daardoor over bepaalde concepten in termen van andere concepten. Dit idee, de ‘Conceptual Metaphor Theory’ (CMT), behelst dat een conceptueel domein als een coherente organisatie van ervaringen wordt gezien (Kövecses, 2002), en dat conceptuele metaforen niet-letterlijke projecties tussen een brondomein en een doeldomein zijn, oftewel een ‘cross-domain mapping’ tussen domeinen (e.g. Croft & Cruse, 2004; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993; Kövecses, 2002). Een conceptuele metafoor zoals HET LEVEN IS EEN REIS, waarbij het abstracte concept LEVEN vaak wordt gezien in termen van het concrete concept REIS, komt bijvoorbeeld naar voren in uitdrukkingen als ‘Zij zijn op een *eindpunt* in hun relatie gekomen’. Een van de voornaamste algemene conclusies van CMT is dat metaforen conventionele elementen zijn die veelvuldig in ons taalgebruik en in ons denken voorkomen.

Studies met behulp van corpora hebben uitgewezen dat metaforen in taal inderdaad vaak conventionele metaforen zijn, en dat er vaak gebruik wordt gemaakt van uitdrukkingen die afgeleid zijn van dezelfde onderliggende conceptuele metafoor. Het is echter ook vaak zo dat zulke uitdrukkingen zo conventioneel zijn, dat ze door taalgebruikers niet als ‘cross-domain mappings’ worden gezien; in veel gevallen zullen taalgebruikers zich niet bewust zijn van de onderliggende conceptuele structuur en vergelijking. Hoewel metaforen bewust kunnen worden gebruikt om bepaalde concepten met elkaar te vergelijken en zo een bepaald beeld gecreëerd kan worden, lijkt het dus niet zo te zijn dat alle metaforische uitdrukkingen in een taal altijd een bepaalde reden of functie hebben en bepaalde vergelijking willen verwoorden. Resultaten van vele corpusstudies in verschillende talen lijken meer het tegenovergestelde te suggereren: metaforen in de taal zijn vaak zeer conventioneel en onbewust gebruikt.

Steen (2008) stelt daarom voor om niet alleen een onderscheid te maken tussen metaforen in cognitie (de conceptuele structuren) en metaforen in taal (de talige uitdrukkingen), maar daar een derde categorie aan toe te voegen, namelijk metaforen in communicatie (de functies). Metaforen in communicatie kunnen zowel nieuwe uitdrukkingen zijn als zeer conventionele metaforische uitdrukkingen, maar onderscheiden zich van andere metaforische uitdrukkingen door het feit dat ze opzettelijk als metafoor worden gebruikt en zo opgevat door de taalgebruiker. Opzettelijk gebruikte metaforen zijn anders dan niet-opzettelijk gebruikte metaforen in het feit dat ze bewust zijn gebruikt *als* metafoor en als zodanig moeten worden gezien, omdat de spreker of schrijver een bepaalde intentie of een idee wil verwoorden. Bij een opzettelijk gebruikte metaforische uitdrukking is op een bepaalde talige manier duidelijk gemaakt dat deze opzettelijk is gebruikt en worden taalgebruikers dus gewezen op de cross-domain mapping.

Het lijken vooral deze opzettelijke metaforen te zijn die de stijl van een register, of een individuele tekst, kunnen bepalen. Ze kunnen gebruikt worden om

een persoonlijk of informeel aspect aan het taalgebruik toe te voegen, of een subjectief beeld te geven van een situatie of entiteit. De vraag of de taal van nieuws in de loop der jaren onder invloed van metaforiek persoonlijker is geworden lijkt dus vooral te kunnen worden beantwoord door te kijken naar verschillen in het gebruik van bewuste metaforische uitdrukkingen die expliciet een cross-domain mapping uitlokken. Daarnaast is het belangrijk om te kijken naar de algemene frequentie van metaforen in de twee nieuwsperiodes, en dit te vergelijken met de algemene frequentie van metaforen in conversaties. Zo kan een beeld worden gevormd van de rol die metaforen spelen in het idee dat het taalgebruik van het nieuws persoonlijker, informeler en conversationeler is geworden

### **Metaforiek in Nederlandse conversaties en nieuwsteksten**

Het gehele corpus van ruim 130.000 woorden is geanalyseerd met de MIPVU methode, een betrouwbare metaforen-identificatiemethode die is ontwikkeld in samenwerking met de onderzoekers van het NWO-Vici metaforenproject aan de VU (NWO-Vici grant 277-30-001). Deze is aangepast voor het Nederlands, en is gebruikt om alle talige metaforen in de drie corpusonderdelen te identificeren. Met behulp van metadata zoals 'part-of-speech'codes zijn vervolgens de metaforenfrequenties van acht woordsoorten, adjectieven, bijwoorden, voornaamwoorden, zelfstandige naamwoorden, voorzetsels, werkwoorden, voegwoorden, en een restcategorie, in de conversaties en de historisch en hedendaags nieuwsteksten naar boven gehaald. Deze zijn gebruikt voor de statistische analyse van de metaforenfrequenties in de woordsoorten en de registers en periodes.

De eerste kwantitatieve analyse richtte zich op een vergelijking van metafoorfrequenties in de acht woordsoorten tussen twee registers, hedendaagse conversaties en hedendaagse nieuwsteksten. Allereerst is bestudeerd of de algemene frequenties van de woordsoorten overeenkomen met de eerder door Biber (1988) gevonden verschillen tussen conversatietaal en nieuwstaal. Hoewel de opdeling in woordsoorten voor het corpus niet zo gedetailleerd was als in Bibers onderzoek, lieten de frequenties in grote lijnen hetzelfde zien als Bibers resultaten. Hedendaagse Nederlandstalige conversaties en nieuwsteksten verschillen significant van elkaar in aantallen voornaamwoorden, bijwoorden, zelfstandige naamwoorden, adjectieven en voorzetsels. De Nederlandstalige conversaties kunnen worden gezien als typische voorbeelden van gesproken, informele taal wat betreft de hoge frequenties van conversationele taalelementen zoals voornaamwoorden en bijwoorden, en Nederlandstalige nieuwsteksten kunnen worden gezien als typische voorbeelden van informatieve taal wat betreft de hoge frequenties van adjectieven, zelfstandige naamwoorden en voorzetsels.

Wat betreft de frequentie van metaforen binnen de verschillende woordsoorten lieten de twee registers ook verschillen zien. Deze zijn deels gebaseerd op de algehele verschillen tussen woordsoort aantallen, maar deels ook

verklaarbaar doordat verschillende woordsoorten in de verschillende registers zich anders gedroegen wat betreft metaforiek. De significante verschillen werden gevonden in voornaamwoorden, voorzetsels, werkwoorden en ook zelfstandige naamwoorden.

In conversaties was 28,8% van de voornaamwoorden metaforisch gebruikt, terwijl in nieuws maar 6,5% metaforisch was gebruikt. Dit verschil is te verklaren door de functie van voornaamwoorden in conversaties; vooral de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden zoals *die* en *dit* zijn vaak metaforisch gebruikt in conversaties als ze gebruikt worden om naar (aspecten) van eerder geuite woorden te verwijzen. In nieuws worden deze woorden veel vaker gebruikt om naar werkelijk aanwezige objecten te verwijzen. Het aantal metaforische voorzetsels was juist veel groter in nieuws dan in conversaties, 70,7% tegen 53,4%. Dit verschil lijkt voornamelijk te komen door frequent gebruik van enkele voorzetsels in abstracte contexten, zoals *van*, in nieuwsteksten. Het totaal aantal werkwoorden was ongeveer gelijk in beide registers, maar de proportie metaforische werkwoorden was twee keer zo groot in nieuws als in conversaties, met respectievelijk 31,3% en 15,5%. De verklaring daarvoor lijkt vooral te zijn dat het register van nieuws gebruik maakt van een veel gevarieerdere groep werkwoorden, waardoor een gevarieerder metaforengebruik mogelijk is. Dit is inherent aan het karakter van nieuws, dat veelzijdig is en dus gebruik moet maken van een veelzijdigheid aan woorden die acties uitdrukken. Als laatste tonen ook de zelfstandige naamwoorden verschillende patronen voor de twee registers; 7,2% van alle zelfstandige naamwoorden in conversaties is metaforisch, terwijl 12,2% in nieuws dat is. De patronen voor metaforische zelfstandige naamwoorden in nieuws zijn veel complexer dan de patronen in conversaties, ook deels door het feit dat nieuwsteksten een grotere variatie aan onderwerpen moet behandelen.

De analyse laat zien dat hedendaagse conversaties en nieuwsteksten aanzienlijk verschillen in wat voor metafoorvormen (i.e. woordsoorten) ze gebruiken. Binnen woordsoorten zijn ook verschillen gevonden in de lemma's die vaak metaforisch worden gebruikt. De bevindingen komen overeen met eerdere resultaten voor Engels taalgebruik en verschillen tussen registers, zoals die door bijvoorbeeld Cameron en Deignan zijn gevonden (Cameron, 2003, 2008; Cameron & Deignan, 2003; Deignan, 2005). Wat echter ook opvalt is dat de metaforische woorden in zowel de conversaties als de nieuwsteksten zeer vaak conventioneel gebruikt zijn en daarin vergelijkbaar zijn met wat door vele corpusgerelateerde studies eerder al gevonden is.

De tweede kwantitatieve analyse richtte zich op een vergelijking van metafoorfrequenties in de acht woordsoorten tussen twee nieuwsperiodes, nieuws uit 1950 en nieuws uit 2002. Allereerst is bestudeerd of de algemene frequenties van de woordsoorten in de twee periodes op dezelfde manier verschillen als in eerdere diachrone studies naar nieuwstaal, zoals die van Biber en Finegan (1992, 2001), is gevonden. Een vergelijking van de frequenties van de acht woordsoorten in de twee periodes leverde alleen een significant verschil op voor zelfstandige naamwoorden en voegwoorden; zelfstandige naamwoorden waren frequenter in

hedendaags nieuws en voegwoorden waren frequenter in historisch nieuws. Deze resultaten zijn niet in overeenstemming met de bevindingen van Biber en Finegan (2001); ze lijken zelfs het tegenovergestelde. Wat betreft de algemene frequenties van de woordsoorten zijn hedendaagse nieuwsteksten dus niet meer gaan lijken op conversaties in het gebruik van deze lexico-grammaticale elementen.

Als we naar de frequenties van de metaforisch gebruikte woorden in de woordsoorten in de twee periodes kijken, dan zien we wel verschillen tussen hoe dezelfde woordsoorten zich metaforisch gedragen in de twee periodes. Voorzetsels worden iets vaker als metaforisch gezien in historisch nieuws (73,7%) dan in hedendaags nieuws (70,7%). Het verschil voor voorzetsels is vooral te verklaren door het complexere gebruik van *van*, maar ook doordat hedendaags nieuws juist in verhouding vaker niet-metaforische betekenissen van een voorzetsel gebruikt, zoals in het geval van *in*. Werkwoorden worden vaker metaforisch gebruikt in hedendaags nieuws (31,5%) dan in historisch nieuws (26,6%). Voor sommige lemma's is dit verschil duidelijk te verklaren door een stijging van meer conversationele praktijken, zoals het toenemende gebruik van directe rede. Hierdoor worden werkwoorden als *vinden* vaker metaforisch gebruikt in hedendaags nieuws, een patroon dat kan duiden op een lichtere voorkeur voor conversationele patronen in metaforisch gebruikte woorden.

Over het algemeen laat de kwantitatieve analyse van metaforenfrequenties en –patronen in de twee nieuwsperiodes zien dat er maar enkele subtiele frequentieverschillen zijn, vooral voor voorzetsels en werkwoorden. Vooral het metaforisch gebruik van specifieke lemma's, zoals het werkwoord *vinden*, lijkt te wijzen op een kleine verschuiving binnen het nieuwsregister naar conversationele metaforenpatronen. Deze verschillen tonen echter vooral aan dat veel talige metaforen onderliggend abstracte structuren hebben, en dat hedendaags nieuws vooral een wat abstractere stijl heeft aangenomen.

Er zijn prominentere verschillen te vinden wanneer er specifiek gekeken wordt naar drie werkwoordlemma's die frequent gebruikt worden, ook in metaforische contexten, in hedendaagse conversaties en nieuws en in historisch nieuws. Er is in detail gekeken naar hoe de zogenaamde delexicale werkwoorden *krijgen*, *hebben* en *gaan* metaforisch gebruikt worden (cf. Cameron, 1999). Deze werkwoorden hebben allemaal een concrete basisbetekenis, maar ook duidelijke afgeleide metaforische betekenissen alsmede zeer abstracte, delexicale vormen. Over het algemeen toont het nieuwsregister een verschuiving naar abstractere gevallen van de metaforisch gebruikte vormen van *krijgen*, *hebben* en *gaan*; de verschillende metaforische gevallen van deze werkwoorden tonen een duidelijkere graad van abstractie in hedendaags nieuws in vergelijking met historisch nieuws. Tegelijkertijd lijken de metaforische patronen van deze werkwoorden in hedendaags nieuws meer op de patronen voor dezelfde woorden in conversaties, en lijken de patronen in historisch nieuws juist in mindere mate op de patronen voor deze werkwoorden in conversaties. De resultaten voor de delexicale werkwoorden laten zien dat het taalgebruik van hedendaags nieuws belangrijke aspecten van

conversaties overneemt, en dus voor die aspecten een conversationelere stijl heeft dan historische nieuwsteksten.

De verschillen tussen historische en hedendaagse nieuwsteksten waren het meest prominent in de analyse van opzettelijk gebruikte metaforen, de metaforische uitdrukkingen die bedoeld zijn *als* metaforen en taalgebruikers bewust een bepaalde intentie opdringen. Met behulp van enkele talige markeerders werden metaforische vergelijkingen ('similes') en metaforisch gebruikte woorden die gesignaleerd worden door aanhalingstekens in de teksten gevonden. Deze vormen wijzen vaak op bewust gebruikte metaforen; woorden zoals *als* in vergelijkingen roepen de lezer of hoorder expliciet op om een cross-domain mapping te vormen tussen het bron- en doeldomein, en signalen zoals aanhalingstekens leggen de nadruk op de context van de woorden.

Wat betreft de vergelijkingen vertoonden de hedendaagse nieuwsteksten een hogere frequentie en grotere complexiteit dan de historische nieuwsteksten. De patronen en conceptuele structuren die ten grondslag lagen aan de vergelijkingen in hedendaags nieuws waren over het algemeen uitgebreider en creatiever, en gaven een meer persoonlijk kijk op de personen en situaties waarop de vergelijkingen van toepassing waren. De bredere variatie in hedendaags nieuws doet de suggestie wekken dat het tegenwoordig meer geaccepteerd is om persoonlijke ideeën en inzichten te verkondigen, en creatiever taalgebruik te hanteren. Dezelfde conclusie kan getrokken worden wanneer de metaforen met aanhalingstekens mee worden genomen. Ook voor deze categorieën was de variatie en persoonlijke intentie veel prominenter in hedendaags nieuws dan in historisch nieuws.

Daarnaast bevatten de hedendaagse teksten nog enkele uitgebreide vormen van metaforiek waarin binnen een tekst verschillende aspecten van een concept herhaaldelijk vergeleken werden met verschillende aspecten van een ander concept. Een nieuwstekst uit 2002, bijvoorbeeld, bevatte een uitgebreide vergelijking tussen een politieke situatie in de Verenigde Staten op dat moment met een historische gebeurtenis uit de Eerste Wereldoorlog. Verspreid over het artikel werden verschillende facetten en actoren uit beide situaties met elkaar vergeleken. Door herhaaldelijk gebruik van dezelfde onderliggende metafoor wordt aan de lezer duidelijk gemaakt dat de vergelijking opzettelijk gemaakt wordt. Door zo'n toepassing van een uitgebreide vergelijking in een tekst lijkt het alsof deze tekst aanzienlijk metaforischer en creatiever is dan andere teksten. De nieuwsdata liet duidelijk zien dat dit soort uitgebreidere vergelijkingen alleen voorkwamen in hedendaagse nieuwstaal.

## Conclusies

We kunnen concluderen dat er vooral een trend van personalisatie van het taalregister van nieuws te ontdekken is in het gebruik van metaforen, maar tot op zekere hoogte ook een algemene trend van conversationalisatie. Dat laatste is vooral zichtbaar in de abstractere metafoorpatronen voor bepaalde woordsoorten,

zoals voor ‘delexicale’ werkwoorden. De personalisatie van nieuwstaal is het meest opmerkelijk wanneer gekeken wordt naar hoe bepaalde metaforische uitdrukkingen opzettelijk gebruikt worden. In dat opzicht vertonen de hedendaagse teksten een aanzienlijk sterker gebruik van persoonlijke ideeën en opinies en creatievere beelden. Ook metaforen lijken dus een rol te spelen in de verschuivingen van een formele stijl naar een persoonlijkere stijl binnen het nieuwsregister. De gevonden patronen voor bewust gebruikte metaforen voegen waardevolle informatie toe aan de reeds eerder gevormde ideeën over de informalisatie en personalisatie van nieuwstaal (cf. Biber & Finegan, 2001; Fairclough, 1994; Fairclough & Mauranen, 1997; Hundt & Mair, 1999; Mair, 2006; Steen, 2003).

Het blijft echter lastig om duidelijke patronen naar voren te halen met relatief kleine corpora zoals gebruikt voor dit onderzoek. Een groter aantal teksten zal meer metaforendata opleveren, vooral wat betreft opzettelijk gebruikte metaforen. Tegelijkertijd wordt het dan moeilijker om uitgebreid kwalitatief onderzoek naar metaforen te verrichten, aangezien dat nog steeds handmatig moet en dus tijdrovend is. Een andere manier om het onderzoek meer slagkracht te geven is door meer tijdsperiodes te bestuderen en zo wellicht duidelijkere verschuivingen te ontdekken. Zo'n uitbreiding is relatief makkelijk uit te voeren met de beschikbare digitale archieven. Verder zou een homogener nieuwscorpus, een corpus dat bijvoorbeeld focust op nieuwsteksten met hetzelfde onderwerp of uit een bepaald katern, wellicht duidelijkere patronen kunnen genereren dan het corpus gebruikt voor dit onderzoek. Door zo weinig mogelijk verschillen in nieuwsonderwerpen te gebruiken, zal het relatief makkelijker zijn om duidelijk conceptuele patronen te vinden in de metaforisch gebruikte woorden. De bovengenoemde opties geven aan dat er nog volop werk te doen is op het gebied van metaforiek, nieuwstaal en de personalisatie van de stijl binnen het nieuwsregister.

## **Curriculum Vitae**

Trijntje Pasma was born in Boksum, Friesland, on 5 September 1981. After finishing secondary school (Christelijk Gymnasium Beyers Naudé in Leeuwarden) in 1999, she spent one year in Australia on an exchange program. She studied English language and culture at VU University Amsterdam, where she graduated in 2005. After graduating, she started her PhD research at the department of Language and Communication at VU University Amsterdam. Trijntje currently works at Windesheim University of Applied Sciences in Zwolle.