



International seminar  
*New Directions in Metaphor Research*

## PROGRAM

Time: October 10th & 11th 2013

Place: Department of Language and Communication

Sdr. Stationsvej 28, DK-4200 Slagelse

Please register by email to Thomas Wiben Jensen at [twj@sdu.dk](mailto:twj@sdu.dk) no later than September 15th.

---

<b>Thursday</b>	9:15-9:30	Official welcome
<b>October 10th</b>	9:30-10:30	<b>Cornelia Müller:</b> The emotional side of metaphor. Metaphors in gestures and audio-visuals
Room B-1.18	10:30-11:00	<b>Anders Hougaard:</b> Metaphors as Objective Correlatives
	11:00-11:15	Coffee break
	11:15-11:45	<b>Thomas Wiben Jensen:</b> The written language bias in the study of metaphor - On the differences between written metaphors and metaphoricity in social interaction
	11:45-12:45	Lunch
	12:45-13:15	<b>Astrid Jensen and Mette Skovgaard:</b> Metaphors, Narratives and Company Karma: A study on the use of metaphors and narratives in organizational development
	13:15-14:15	<b>Lynne Cameron:</b> The dynamics of metaphor and empathy
	14:15-14:45	<b>Søren Vigild Poulsen:</b> Semantic relations and schema metaphors on websites
	14:45-15:00	Coffee break
	15:00-15:30	<b>Linda Greve:</b> Metaphor Detection through Triangulation
	15:30-17:00	Workshop led by <b>Lynne Cameron &amp; Cornelia Müller</b>
<b>Friday</b>	9:30-10:30	<b>Charles Forceville:</b> Creative multimodal metaphor in commercials and film
<b>October 11th</b>	10:30-10:45	Coffee break
Room B-1.18	10:45-11:45	<b>Joep Cornelissen:</b> Finding Metaphors In and Across Organizations
	11:45-12:45	Lunch
	13:00-14:30	Workshop led by <b>Charles Forceville &amp; Joep Cornelissen</b>
	14:30-14:45	Coffee break
	14:45-15:45	Panel discussion: New Directions in Metaphor Research

---

# INTRODUCTION

The focus of the seminar is on new theoretical as well as methodological approaches to metaphor. The seminar will be an international and interdisciplinary forum of discussion, gathering scholars working within or at the intersection of different empirical approaches and with different types of data - i.e. speech, writing, gesture, visual and strategic communication. In particular, the focus is on researchers who in various ways represent the development that has taken place in metaphor theory since the cognitive turn of conceptual metaphor theory. In recent years this cognitive vantage point has been supplemented and to a certain degree also challenged by a growing focus on empirical investigations from many different types of data. Reflecting these tendencies, the various speakers at the seminar reflect a combination of cognitive as well as interactional, dialogical, multimodal and organizational perspectives on metaphor in various settings.

## ABSTRACTS

### **The emotional side of metaphor. Metaphors in gestures and audio-visuals**

***Cornelia Müller***

**Professor, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder)**

The talk addresses the emotional side of metaphor as part of its very nature. In a combination of theoretical reflection and empirical analysis of metaphors in co-speech gestures and metaphors in TV-news this idea will be developed. Our take on metaphor and emotion is a product of collaborative work between cognitive linguistics, gesture, and film studies (Kappelhoff & Müller 2011). It entails a dynamic view on metaphoric meaning making and considers emotions as temporal structures of movement (Kappelhoff 2004, 2013; Müller 2008). The dynamic view on metaphor and emotion assumes furthermore that the interaction between spectator and film is comparable to a face-to-face-communication in which multimodal metaphors are constructed and emotions are expressed and perceived both verbally and bodily.

It will be argued that the 'emotional side of metaphor refers to the expressive dimension of language, gesture and audio-visual compositions. Relying on Bühler's functional theory of language (Bühler 2011 [1936]) and Müller's adaptation of it to gesture (Müller 1998, 2009) it will be proposed that any performance of a metaphoric gesture entails both: conceptualization and expression of affect. This means that gesture will be conceived as an expressive movement, as felt sensation of a moving body (cf. also Sheets-Johnstone 1999). This will be related to Kappelhoff's embodied view on audio-visual composition (Kappelhoff 2004, 2013), which conceives of compositions of films as expressive movements (cf. also Kappelhoff & Grotkopp 2012; Kappelhoff & Müller 2011). Our theoretical line of argument will be further supported by empirical analyses of the dynamic unfolding and the expressive qualities of multimodal metaphoric meaning making which characterizes the movement dynamics of the affective orchestration of a three party conversation and of a TV-report. Moreover the composition of the TV-report mobilizes felt sensations that the experiential source domain of metaphoric meaning makes available to the co-participants in a conversation as much as for the spectators of a TV-news show.

## References

Bühler, Karl (2011) *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kappelhoff, Hermann (2004): *Matrix der Gefühle. Das Kino, das Melodrama und das Theater der Empfindsamkeit*. Berlin: Vorwerk.

Kappelhoff, Hermann (2013): "Sense of Community": Die filmische Komposition eines moralischen Gefühls. In: S. R. Fauth, K. Green Krejberg, J. Süselbeck (eds.): *Repräsentationen des Krieges. Emotionalisierungsstrategien in der Literatur und in den audiovisuellen Medien vom 18. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen, 2012: 43-57.

Kappelhoff, Hermann and Matthias Grotkopp (2012): Film genre and modality. The incestuous nature of genre exemplified by the war film. In: S. Lefait, P. Ortolí (eds.): *Praise of cinematic bastardy*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012: 29-39

Kappelhoff, Hermann and Cornelia Müller (2011): "Embodied meaning construction. Multimodal metaphor and expressive movement in speech, gesture, and in feature film". In: *Metaphor and the Social World*, 1: 121-153.

Kövecses, Zoltán (1990): *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer.

Lakoff, George (1987): The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds.): *Cultural models in language and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 195-221.

Müller, Cornelia (1998): *Redebegleitende Gesten: Kulturgeschichte - Theorie - Sprachvergleich*. Berlin: Arno Spitz.

Müller, Cornelia (2008): *Metaphors – dead and alive, Sleeping and waking. A dynamic view*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Müller, Cornelia (2009): Gesture and language. In: Malmkjaer, K. (ed.): *The linguistic encyclopedia*. Abington/ New York: Routledge: 214-217.

Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine (1999): *The primacy of movement*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

# Metaphors as Objective Correlatives

**Anders Hougaard**

Associate professor, University of Southern Denmark

This talk presents a new way of accounting for and analysing the grounding, meaning and function of a certain class of metaphor. Borrowing Washington Allston's (1840) term "objective correlative", which was applied and made famous by poet and essayist T.S. Eliot (1920) in his critique of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the talk extends and modifies this poetic concept to provide a basis for a different understanding and description of the everyday use of metaphor in different modalities (e.g. verbal and written utterances, images in ads, etc.). The notion of metaphors as objective correlatives (MOC) is introduced against the theory of conceptual metaphor (CM) (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999) and the further development of conceptual metaphor theory, the neural theory of metaphor (Lakoff 2008). The key points where MOC departs from and takes issue with CM include the following: 1) Whereas CM sees the "metaphorical expression" as reflecting an underlying mapping through which a target domain acquires a clear structure, MOC sees the metaphorical expression as a 'literal', imagistic reinforcement of the "target" of the expression. 2) CM considers an expression metaphorical irrespective of perspective. MOC introduces perspectival layers by distinguishing the first person perspective on a metaphorical expression from other perspectives. As seen from a first person perspective a metaphorical objective correlative is not metaphorical but rather a reinforcement, which gives it the quality of making good bodily sense for the experiencer and being strongly recognizable for others whom the expression is shared with. Metaphorical objective correlatives thus may serve to achieve a shared bodily orientation towards a first person experience. As seen from other perspectives the images of the expressions are something else than what they refer to and the expressions may therefore be considered metaphorical as seen from these perspectives. 3) CM focuses on underlying, general, abstracts systems of conceptual metaphors. MOC focuses on capturing the experience and sense connected to each metaphorical expression. The talk will present and analyse a collection of data consisting of images as well as spoken and written language. The discussion of MOC entails a critique of CM, and furthermore the notion of MOC will be elaborated in light of selected issues from the fields of phenomenology, sociological phenomenology, embodied cognition, and emotion (e.g. *appraisal theories* (fx Lazarus 1991)).

## References

Eliot. T.S. 1920. *The Sacred Wood; Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf; Bartleby.com, 1996.

Lakoff, George. 2008. *The Neural Theory of Metaphor*. I R. Gibbs (red.) *The Cambridge Handbook on Metaphor and Thought*: New York: Cambridge University Press. 17-38.

Lakoff, George. & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*, Basic Books: New York.

Lazarus, R.S. 1991. *Emotion and Adaptation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Washington Allston. 1840. *Lectures on Art*. Project Gutenberg (<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/11391/11391.txt>), 2004.

# The written language bias in the study of metaphor – On the differences between studying metaphors in written texts and metaphoricity in social interaction

**Thomas Wiben Jensen**

Associate professor, University of Southern Denmark

In this talk I will argue that the majority of metaphor research has been characterized by a written language bias. This claim leads me to propose the need for a principal distinction between on the one hand metaphors as they appear in written text and on the other hand metaphoricity in whole-body social interaction. The written language bias (WLB), proposed by Per Linell (2005), concerns a widespread tendency, in linguistics as well as in general, to describe and understand spoken language in the terms of the norms of written language leading to a neglect of the distinct characteristics of spoken language (Chafe 1994). The underlying assumption leading to WLB is that writing and speaking are only different external manifestations of the same underlying language system and that writing and speaking are basically in the same business of “expressing human thought” – albeit in different ways.

My claim is that the basic tenets of conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1999) and its successors to a large degree suffer from a WLB. Often it is simply assumed that metaphorical expressions in spoken language are basically the same phenomena as metaphors in written texts. While important work has been done on verbal metaphor, multimodal metaphor and metaphoric gesture accompanying speech in recent years (Cameron 2007, Gibbs & Cameron 2008, Cienki & Müller 2008, Müller 2008) fundamental questions still linger concerning the far-reaching differences between written and spoken language in relation to metaphor. In this talk however, based on empirical examples, I will suggest an *ecological* alternative and way forward. Informed by recent developments within dialogism (Linell 2005, 2009) and distributed language and cognition (Cowley 2011, Hodges 2009, Thibault 2011, Kravchenko 2011, Steffensen 2012) this talk will lay out an account on metaphor in written language and metaphoricity in spoken language, or languaging, as interwoven with fundamentally different types of ecologies (Jensen & Cuffari forth.). It is argued that these different ecologies afford very different types of metaphorical thinking and cognition.

## References

- Cameron, L. (2007). Confrontation or complementarity?: Metaphor in language use and cognitive metaphor theory. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 5(1), 107-135.
- Chafe, W. (1994): *Discourse, consciousness, and time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cienki, A., & Müller, C. (2008). Metaphor, Gesture, and Thought. In R. W. Gibbs Jr (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowley, S. (Ed.) (2011): *Distributed language*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins.
- Gibbs, R. W. & Cameron, L. (2008): The social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance. *Cognitive Systems Research* 9: 64-75.
- Hodges, B.H. (2009): “Ecological pragmatics: Values, dialogical arrays, complexity, and caring.” *Pragmatics & Cognition* 17(3): 628-652.
- Jensen, T. W. & Cuffari, E. (forth.): “Doubleness in experience. A distributed enactive approach to metaphor in real life data”. *Metaphor & Symbol*.

Kravchenko, A. (2011): "The experiential basis of speech and writing as different cognitive domains. In S. Cowley (Ed.) *Distributed language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 33-56.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999): *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Linell, P. (2005): *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics. Its nature, origins and transformations*. London and New York: Routledge

Linell, P. (2009): *Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically. Interactional and Contextual Theories of Human Sense-Making*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.

Müller, C. (2008): *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and waking. A dynamic view*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Steffensen, S. V. (2012): Care and conversing in dialogical system. *Language Sciences*, Vol. 34, Nr. 5, 513-531.

Thibault, P. J. (2011): "First-Order Language Dynamics and Second-Order Language: The Distributed Language View". *Ecological Psychology*, 23: 210-245.

## Metaphor, Narratives and Company Karma

**Astrid Jensen**

**Associate professor,**

**University of Southern Denmark**

**Mette Skovgaard**

**Associate professor,**

**Copenhagen Business School**

*Company Karma is a business philosophy on "doing good" while doing business (THORNICO's Company Karma Report ([www.thornico.com](http://www.thornico.com))).*

The purpose of this paper is to explore and analyze the cognitive underpinnings of corporate social responsibility. By identifying how metaphors and narratives are used as cognitive resources for sense-making and sense-giving processes, we will explore to what extent the concept of "Company Karma", despite its claim to being a more holistic business philosophy, can be seen as a mere translation of more general approaches to Corporate Social Responsibility.

In this paper, we will argue that CSR approaches in general are cognitively structured by the metaphorical components of two cognitive models of moral systems, presented by Lakoff & Johnson in *Philosophy in the Flesh* (1999), i.e. the Strict Father and the Nurturant Parent models, and further, that these models are translated into different narratively structured projects that are used as resources for sense-making. From the perspective of distributed cognition, narratives may be seen as cognitive resources that, by forming a relationship between the storyteller, the participants in the story and the larger environment, can be used in support for positions in arguments. We wish to explore the dynamic inter-relationships between metaphors, cognitive models, and narratives in order to be able to identify similarities or conflicting patterns in CSR-argumentation, and subsequently look into if and how, the business philosophy of Company Karma differs from more general approaches to social responsibility.

Our analysis will be based on the "Company Karma Report" and the projects "Change the World through Sport".

## The dynamics of metaphor and empathy

**Lynne Cameron**

**Professor of Applied Linguistics, Open University, UK**

My talk will reflect on outcomes of using metaphor as a research tool in a five-year project on empathy. Empathy is characterized as activity that tries to understand the feelings and thinking of another person, from their perspective. Metaphor analysis was used as a central method in investigating empathy in contexts of violence and conflict, with spoken data from UK, N Ireland, USA, Brazil, and Kenya.

Firstly, I will elaborate my hypothesis that ‘metaphor favours the negative’, and show how metaphors particularly contribute to the construction of negative alternative scenarios that speakers use to justify particular choices.

Secondly, I will discuss ‘social landscape metaphors’ that apply physical locational vehicles to social phenomena, such as *divided communities* or *(9/11) is close to home*. I show how people’s embodied social interactions on local landscapes provide the basis for metaphors they use in moral reasoning about other people, and how metaphors of *BOUNDARIES* and *HOME* construct emotional responses to fear of violence.

Thirdly, I will show how findings from metaphor analysis are informing my choices as I build a dynamic model of empathy in dialogue.

## Semantic relations and schema metaphors on websites

**Søren Vigild Poulsen**

**PhD-scholar, University of Southern Denmark**

In this talk I will demonstrate the descriptive power of combining non-linear models and schema metaphors by analyzing two websites of a Danish insurance company. I propose that my analyses open up for new empirical as well as theoretical questions that need further investigation.

According to Martinec and van Leeuwen (2009) websites are nonlinear multimodal texts. This means that as semiotic products their semantics are organized in nonlinear ways, which in turn are realized by combinations of several semiotic modes, e.g. language, images and sound.

Working within a social semiotic framework, Martinec and van Leeuwen propose the analytical concept of nonlinear models, which are simple diagrams that map out the conceptual structures of texts, and that help to explain how texts are understood. While nonlinear models promise an advance in the study of websites, they also give raise to questions of the modeling of the construction of nonlinear semantics.

I propose to combine the concept of nonlinear model with cognitive schema theory ((Hampe & Grady, 2005; Hurtienne, 2009; Hurtienne & Israel, 2007; Johnson, 1987, 2007, 2010) . Schemas are seen as conceptual structuring’s of our experience, and I argue that non-linear models need to be understood as metaphorical projections of schemas (‘schema metaphors’) in order to be understood as diagrams of a website’s semantics.



Furthermore I propose that the metaphorical projection of schemas in relation to nonlinear model can be described on two levels. Hereby it becomes possible to describe in more detail the non-linear modeling of conceptual structures on one level, and on another level the different ways in which the conceptual structure can be realized as a visual structure in the web design.

## References

Hampe, B., & Grady, J. E. (2005). *From perception to meaning: image schemas in cognitive linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hurtienne, J. (2009). Cognition in HCI: An ongoing story. *Human Technology: An Interdisciplinary Journal on Humans in ICT Environments*, 5(1), 12-28.

Hurtienne, J., & Israel, J. H. (2007). *Image schemas and their metaphorical extensions: intuitive patterns for tangible interaction*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Tangible and embedded interaction.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (2007). *The meaning of the body: aesthetics of human understanding* (Vol. Paperback ed.). Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (2010). Multimodal Metaphor: Charles Forceville, Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 2009, 470 pp. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(10), 2848-2850.

Martinec, R., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2009). *The language of new media design: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

## Metaphor Detection through Triangulation

**Linda Greve**

**PhD-scholar, Aarhus University, Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation**

Metaphors reveal underlying concepts and image schemes (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). But even though metaphors are present in thought and communication, they are also sometimes “only” present in language (Steen, 2008). In my talk I will present a method for metaphor detection through three different methods; language analysis, gesture analysis and analysis of creation of an artifact. All three methods are well described and common in use, but put together they show a more precise picture of which metaphors are primarily in language and which are supported in gesture and present in making the artifact.

The target domain, I investigate is knowledge. I analyze groups primarily in SME’s. All groups define themselves as part of a knowledge company and they have an articulated strategy of being knowledge creating or innovative.

In the talk, I will present the method through showing data from my research. This will include metaphors present in language by use of MIP-VU (Steen et al. 2010), and metaphors present in gesture (Cienki and Müller 2008) and finally in artifact creation (Fusaroli and Tylén, 2012 (poster at CogSci)). On the basis of these three modes of analysis, I will discuss what this method adds to understanding metaphors for knowledge.



## Creative multimodal metaphor in commercials and film

**Charles Forceville**

**Professor, Universiteit van Amsterdam**

The cognitive metaphor theory (CMT) paradigm, primarily associated with Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), has spawned a wealth of conferences, books, and papers and is still very much alive today (see Gibbs, ed., *The Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, 2008; Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, 2010). But a lot has happened since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's book. One important development is a growing interest in multimodal metaphors, that is, metaphors whose target and source are entirely or partly rendered in different modes/modalities. For the purposes of the present talk, these modes are: language, visuals, music, and sound.

While the investigation of verbal metaphor is now progressively more corpus-governed (e.g., Deignan 2005, Charteris-Black 2006, Caballero 2006), multimodal metaphor scholars are still in the stage of combining theory with detailed case studies. In this presentation I will outline what research questions in this young branch of metaphor studies await scholarly answers, drawing on examples from the genres of advertising and fiction film. This requires adaptation and expansion of the model developed in Forceville (1996), which discussed *static* representations from a single genre: print advertising. Issues that will be addressed include: what is the function of particular modes in the identification and interpretation of metaphors? Are modes equally distributed over a metaphor's targets and source? How do decisions to what genre a text (commercial? narrative film?) belongs affect the processing of metaphors occurring in it? Several of these issues are addressed in the volume edited by Forceville and Urios-Aparisi (2009), as well as in Forceville (1999, 2007).

Systematically studying creative multimodal metaphor is a vast scholarly project that urgently requires further work from linguists knowledgeable about audiovisual mass-culture and from media students knowledgeable about cognitive linguistics, and will benefit both metaphor studies, the theorization of multimodal discourse, and eventually even cognition studies.

Film fragments and clips will be shown to serve as case studies.

## Finding Metaphors In and Across Organizations

**Joep Cornelissen**

**Professor, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam**

In this presentation I will explore and analyse the use of metaphors in private and public organisations (e.g., in the merger between AirFrance and KLM, in entrepreneurial ventures, and in a metropolitan police department). I will start the talk by presenting past research on metaphors in the domain of management and organization studies. Work in organisation theory and organisational communication generally features prescriptive metaphors that aid the practice of theorising and research; research in organisational development tends to use metaphors for intervention in individual and group decision-making; while studies of organisational behaviour emphasise the metaphors-in-use within individuals' sense-making accounts of critical events within their organisation. Alongside these differences in focus, the form of metaphor analysis also differs across these contexts, ranging from text- and discourse-based analysis to the analysis of non-linguistic modalities such as pictorial signs, gestures and artefacts. In the presentation I will demonstrate the pervasiveness and critical functions of metaphors across various organization settings and communication and sensemaking contexts, and draw out suggestions for further research.