

18 Metaphor

Metaphor and Style through Genre, with Illustrations from Carol Ann Duffy's *Rapture*

Gerard Steen, University of Amsterdam

Chapter Overview

Introduction	308
Metaphorical Conceptualization, Genre and Style ('metaphor in thought')	311
Metaphorical Expression, Genre and Style ('metaphor in language')	315
Metaphorical Communication, Genre and Style ('metaphor in interaction')	318
Conclusion	322

1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present an encompassing approach to the study of metaphor as an important component of style. It is a novel approach that brings together some recent developments in the study of metaphor, style and discourse. For instance, for most researchers today, metaphor is not just a matter of style (and especially literary style), as it used to be in the 1970s (e.g. Lodge 1977) but has become a ubiquitous feature of all language and thought (e.g. Gibbs 2008). As we have come to realize since Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) groundbreaking *Metaphors we live by*, we think and talk metaphorically about almost everything

that is not concrete but abstract, and not simple but complex, including emotions, relations, organizations, societies and so on. This radical shift in the conceptualization of metaphor has produced a wealth of research, three dedicated scholarly journals (*Metaphor & Symbol*, *metaphorik.de*, and *Metaphor and the Social World*), one book series (*Metaphor in Language, Cognition and Communication*) and a new society for Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM). Metaphor has now become a 'figure of thought' instead of a figure of speech (Lakoff 1986) and is defined as conceptualizing one thing in terms of something else. Such metaphorical understanding presumably gives rise to conventionalized mappings across domains in our conceptual systems that are expressed in all sorts of familiar and occasionally innovative figurative ways in our everyday language use. All of this raises a question: How we can still approach metaphor as a feature of style? Moreover, how can we at the same time retain and indeed exploit the new insights about metaphor in language and thought?

The answer to these questions, I argue, can be found in developing a broader view of the relations between metaphor and style on the one hand, and metaphor in language and thought on the other, through the notion of discourse, and in particular, genre. I define style as a feature of discourse, in that a style is a specific, often somewhat idiosyncratic language variety employed in a specific discourse situation. Style can therefore be found in one discourse event, as when we speak of the style of an important work, such as the Bible or a play by Shakespeare, but it can also be encountered across a number of discourse events, as when we are interested in the individual style of an author or speaker. I intentionally use the term 'discourse event' even though in most cases, stylisticians do not study discourse events but texts and transcripts; my reason is that texts and transcripts are related to written and spoken language use in discourse events, and that their stylistic analysis is typically structural-functional in relation to those encompassing discourse events, since stylisticians aim to describe and explain stylistic structures in relation to their functions in (albeit mostly postulated) processes of production, reception and interaction.

Discourse events can be usefully approached through the notion of genre (Steen 2011). Adopting a genre approach helps to differentiate one discourse event from another on the basis of people's default knowledge that they are engaged in a distinct language use activity. We listen to the news on the radio when we wake up, have a conversation at the breakfast table before we go out, read the newspaper on the train to work, read and write email messages before beginning the work day, go to seminars, lectures, faculty meetings and so on before we may end up in the bar at the end of the day for a drink with colleagues. Each of these activities involves so many distinct discourse events that are organized by more or less specific genre knowledge and expectations that, in turn, constrain our language use in production, reception and interaction.

The genre expectations involved can be grouped into three areas (Steen 2011), having to do with the text of a genre event, the code in which the text is expressed and the context in which the text is located (the notion of 'text' referring to spoken or written monologue, dialogue or multilogue). For any genre event, we have more or less specific knowledge and expectations about its text in terms of its content, form, type and structure. For any genre event, we also have more or less specific knowledge and expectations about its context in terms of participants, medium, situation and domain. And for any genre event, we have more or less specific knowledge and expectations about its code in terms of modality, language, register, style and rhetoric. Style is hence one 'code' variable in a wide range of genre variables that characterize the properties of a discourse event and affect observable language use.

It is well known that there used to be an elaborate system of stylistic decorum for many different genres in Western civilization. Educated people had specific knowledge and expectations about which style to apply in which situations. This included conventions about metaphor use in, for instance, religious versus scientific versus literary texts. However, metaphor is not just driven by such stylistic expectations. Metaphor use may also be due to expectations about all other genre variables. Thus, Jonathan Charteris-Black (2005) has shown how Winston Churchill, Martin Luther King, Margaret Thatcher, Bill Clinton, Tony Blair and George W. Bush each display their personal repertoire of metaphor use, which has to do with knowledge and expectations about participants. Expectations about the role of metaphor in science versus literature versus politics and so on also vary with reference to the nature and function of distinct domains of discourse. Metaphors in narrative may work differently than metaphors in argumentation, which has to do with the variable of text type. But metaphor use may also be influenced by knowledge and expectations about register (the metaphors in a sermon by Martin Luther King orient themselves to a religious register, whereas the metaphors in his civic addresses relate to the register of politics) or style (metaphor use may be affected by the recent trend to conversationalization in public discourse, including, for instance, the news). What we therefore need is an elaborate model and careful theoretical definitions of, on the one hand, the relations between these genre aspects and, on the other, the way these are reflected in metaphorical versus non-metaphorical language structures and functions in language (cf. Biber and Conrad 2009 for genre and language use; and Deignan, Littlemore and Semino 2013 for the same with special attention to metaphor).

In this complex relation between genre and language use, I have shown that the overall model of language use should allow for three distinct dimensions of metaphor: expression ('metaphor in language'), conceptualization ('metaphor in thought') and communication ('metaphor in interaction'). These dimensions derive from the effect of the three main components in any situation of

discourse: the means of discourse, that is, language (expression), the individual discourse participants using their minds (conceptualization) and the combined participants doing their joint interaction (communication). The three dimensions are clearly visible for all metaphor in all language use, which always displays distinct linguistic forms (e.g. metaphor versus simile), distinct conceptual structures (novel versus conventional metaphor) and distinct communicative functions (deliberate versus non-deliberate metaphor). There are other properties, too (cf. Steen 1999), but these are the ones that researchers have mostly concentrated on.

In order to show how metaphor can be related to style from this genre-analytical perspective on language use, I will ask how metaphor is used in Carol Ann Duffy's award-winning volume *Rapture*. I will first look at metaphorical conceptualization, then expression and finally communication, and in each case I will offer examples of descriptions and then genre-driven interpretations or explanations that zoom in on the role of metaphor in style. In the conclusion section I will offer some integrating comments on the construction of a stylistic profile for metaphor in this book of poems.

2 Metaphorical Conceptualization, Genre and Style (‘metaphor in thought’)

Frank Tallis (2005), a clinical psychologist, has written a wonderful book, *Love sick*, without any reference to metaphor, even though the volume is one extended metaphor comparing love with mental illness. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), love is metaphorically conceptualized as a physical force, a patient, madness, magic and war. In all of these cases, it is clear that our culture and language offer conceptual metaphors or metaphorical models for understanding love in terms of something completely different. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 49) offer evidence from conventionalized language use like the following:

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE

I could feel the *electricity* between us. There were *sparks*. I was *magnetically drawn* to her. ...

LOVE IS A PATIENT

This is a *sick* relationship. They have a *strong, healthy* marriage. ...

LOVE IS MADNESS

I'm *crazy* about her. She *drives me out of my mind*. ...

LOVE IS MAGIC

She *cast her spell* over me. The *magic* has gone. ... I'm *charmed* by her. ...

LOVE IS WAR

He is known for his many rapid *conquests*. She *fought* for him, but his mistress *won out*. He *fled* from her *advances*. ...

The index of Kövecses (2010), an overview of metaphor research triggered since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), adds love as a bond, as a collaborative work of art, a journey, a nutrient, [*sic*] a rapture, a unity, an economic exchange, closeness and fire (2010: 373). All or most of these are supposed to be conventionalized mappings across two distinct conceptual domains, helping people to understand the relatively complex and abstract concept of love in terms of the simpler and more concrete domains of force, patient and so on. It is the main claim of this cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor that we all automatically and unconsciously use these conceptual mappings as conventional, established thought structures in our everyday language use. How are these regular metaphorical conceptual structures used in *Rapture* and how can they be related to the genre variable of style?

First of all, the volume is called *Rapture*, it has one poem called 'Rapture' at about one quarter of the book, and it ends on a note of rapture with the last poem, which is called 'Over' and describes the end of the love relationship. The epigraph to that final poem has the following quotation from a poem by Robert Browning:

That's the wise thrush; he sings each song twice over,
Lest you should think he never could recapture
The first fine careless rapture!

According to Kövecses (2010: 51), it is a conventional metaphor in thought to understand love as rapture. This would suggest that the entire frame for this book of poems is a direct and explicit expression of a conventional metaphor in thought. And also according to Kövecses, our use of this conceptual metaphor LOVE IS RAPTURE is essential for understanding this text as a love poem, that is, for approaching it through the appropriate genre category.

But is LOVE IS A RAPTURE a conventional conceptual metaphor? For *rapture* is 'a feeling of great happiness or excitement' according to the Macmillan Dictionary (Rundell 2002). Can we call this a mapping across two distinct conceptual domains? Or is rapture one typical or extreme manifestation of love, which does not make it metaphorical at all? I believe that the latter is the case, and that there is nothing metaphorical about its use in conceptualizing love.

This critique is not meant to belittle the merits of the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor in thought and language. On the contrary, it is intended to illustrate how difficult it can be to decide what counts as a metaphor in thought. Kövecses makes this proposal for a conventional metaphor LOVE IS

A RAPTURE on the basis of an interpretation of an Emily Dickinson poem that presents love in terms of being drunk; he postulates the existence of an underlying conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A RAPTURE as self-evident on the basis of everyday linguistic expressions like 'I'm *drunk with love*.' However, the way in which particular words and expressions in language are related to underlying metaphors in thoughts is highly complex and very difficult to establish in valid and reliable ways (Steen 2007; Cameron and Maslen 2010); it seems that in this case, the analysis is mistaken. By contrast, the idea that being in love is like being drunk seems thoroughly metaphorical to me, simply because the two conceptual domains are distinct, independent and in principle have nothing to do with each other. From the perspective of their (metaphorical) comparison, what they share is that they are both instantiations of rapture. However, this would plead for LOVE IS BEING DRUNK but does not make LOVE IS A RAPTURE a metaphorical mapping. Instead, it is a mapping (if it is one) that signals a form of categorization or class inclusion: love is a form of rapture. The book of poems is quite non-metaphorically supposed to be about the state of being very happy and excited.

In language use, the relation between metaphor in thought and metaphor in language is therefore quite tenuous and often difficult to analyse. What happens with some of the other conceptual metaphors for love and their expressions in *Rapture*? To give an impression of the relation between conceptual metaphor theory and the use of conceptual metaphor in this book of poems, I checked all fifty-seven content words used in the illustrations by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 49) selectively quoted above. Of these, forty-three do not occur at all in *Rapture*. Eight do occur, but never as metaphorical expressions about love: 'dead', 'feet', 'shape', 'mind', 'wild', 'fled', 'relentless' and 'ground'. Two conventional metaphorical expressions for love occur in novel applications: 'the river staring up, lovesick for the moon' (from 'Absence', line 20) and 'hearing the sea, crazy/for the shore', (from 'Love', lines 9/10). The latter is directly followed by a seemingly related expression: 'seeing the moon ache and fret/for the earth'. In all three of these cases, a situation in nature is portrayed as if it involves a love relationship between two natural entities: river-moon, sea-shore and moon-earth. The river-moon relationship would involve LOVE IS A PATIENT, the sea-shore relationship LOVE IS MADNESS, and the moon-earth relationship perhaps a bit of both. If you accept the postulated conventional conceptual metaphors and their related conventional expressions in language, then these are solid manifestations. They are interesting projections by the poetic persona of her own amorous state of mind on her environment, creating three locally prominent personifications that enhance the volume's overall concern with love.

But the most interesting finding is that the volume's central metaphorical conceptualization of love seems to derive from just one conceptual metaphor, LOVE IS MAGIC. Thus, the opening and closing poems both have the word 'spell'.

The opening poem 'You' sets off the love relationship on a conventional note of LOVE IS MAGIC in its very first four lines:

Uninvited, the thought of you stayed too late in my head,
so I went to bed, dreaming you hard, hard, woke with your name,
like tears, soft, salt, on my lips, the sound of its bright syllables
like a charm, like a spell.

The closing poem 'Over' does the opposite, concluding the whole volume with the following lines at the centre, emphasizing that the abandoned lover needs to live on without a spell now that love has died:

What do I have
to help me, without spell or prayer,
endure this hour, endless, heartless, anonymous,
the death of love?

The opening poem 'You' reinforces the metaphorical idea that love is magic in line 4 by adding 'like a charm', another keyword from Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 49). In fact, 'charm' is used five times in the complete volume, the third poem 'Name' solidly reinforcing the metaphorical theme set by the first poem as follows:

When did your name
change from a proper noun
to a charm?

This link between the lover's name and a charm is then re-instated in the poem 'Ithaca', two thirds into the volume. And then even nature is 'spelling a charm' in 'Your Move', reinforcing its above-mentioned assistant role in creating an all-encompassing atmosphere of love, this time with an interesting combination between 'charm' and 'spell' (the latter as a verb meaning something else). The two other linguistic expressions coming from the conceptualization of love as magic concern 'magic' ('the magic hour when time becomes love', from 'Midsummer Night') and 'trance' ('where I watch you entranced', from 'Absence').

At first glance, it seems then that language use in *Rapture* is characterized by one central metaphorical conceptualization of love as magic, other possibilities being ignored (love as a force or as war) or used for specific local and supportive effects (love as a patient or madness). The central conceptualization is quite conventional and is presented as an explicit cross-domain mapping from the very first poem, appealing to our shared cultural knowledge

about love that has even become consolidated in familiar everyday language use. Novel uses applying other conventional mappings to natural entities such as the river and the moon or the sea and the shore are interesting local flares of metaphor use; they can be related to other features of the volume in the next section.

We will see later that there are other interesting metaphorical conceptualizations of love that we need to attend to, but here we should wrap up this section by returning to the connections with style and other genre features. How do our observations of *Rapture*'s metaphorical conceptualization of love by means of magic and other conceptual metaphors relate to genre and style? The conceptualization via magic is conventional and presented as such, which is more a reflection of the context variable of domain (this is a typical volume of love poems in literature), the text variable of content (we speak of love in terms of magic and so on) and the code variable of register (this language variety makes use of expected metaphorical mappings in its lexis) than of style (this poet has a predilection for magic metaphors). We can only determine the latter if we can compare this book of love poems to a background of other, similar volumes, either by the same poet or other ones. Only then can *Rapture* turn out to have a specific style of metaphorical conceptualization of love as well. This would be an interesting challenge for further research.

3 Metaphorical Expression, Genre and Style (‘metaphor in language’)

As is suggested by Lakoff and Johnson's examples quoted above, most expressions of metaphor in everyday language use are of a particular kind, and these also feature in poetic language. Examples in *Rapture* include ‘... the river *staring up*, lovesick for the moon, ...’, ‘... hearing the sea, *crazy/for* the shore’, and ‘... seeing the moon *ache* and *fret/for* the earth’. Expressions of metaphor typically do not come as similes (‘like a charm, like a spell’ in line 4 of the opening poem) or other explicit forms of metaphorical comparison between one distinct entity and another. Instead, most metaphor in language involves what is called indirect language use (Lakoff 1986; Steen et al. 2010); the theoretical assumption is that words like ‘staring up’, ‘sick’, ‘crazy’, ‘ache’, ‘fret’ all have basic meanings that have nothing to do with love and that these basic meanings function as lexical points of entry to distinct conceptual source domains from which an indirect, metaphorical meaning is derived by means of a cross-domain mapping to the target domain of love. Thus, our knowledge of the domain of madness is supposed to afford a conceptual basis for projecting a corresponding conceptual structure for the domain of love in which we can be metaphorically crazy for our lover: we do strange things, we talk strangely, our minds

are disordered and so on. This use of 'crazy' is indirect language use, since the word involved is supposed to exhibit a metaphorical meaning that is dependent on some prior more basic meaning, all of which is unconscious and automatic and does not require a representation of the source domain as a source domain in the meaning of the utterance. The above utterances simply instruct us to set up an utterance interpretation about nature in terms of love, not in terms of love via madness.

This is fundamentally different for similes, which I have analysed as involving direct metaphorical meaning (Steen et al. 2010). Consider 'like a charm, like a spell'. Here, the meaning of the words in the utterance is not indirectly metaphorical but profiles the relevant source domains of magic directly. We are supposed to think of the domain of magic as a relevant and distinct referential domain in the ongoing text when we comprehend these expressions. Moreover, when we have included the referents 'charm' and 'spell' as 'charm' and 'spell' into our representation of the meaning of the utterance, we need to connect them to the referential domain of love by means of some form of comparison, as is signalled explicitly by the two prepositions 'like'. This is a very different linguistic form of metaphorical expression, even though it does express the same underlying phenomenon in thought, a mapping across two conceptual domains.

Recent corpus work has shown that indirect metaphor is massively predominant and that direct metaphor hardly ever occurs (Steen et al. 2010). If metaphor is defined as understanding one thing in terms of something else, this presumably happens indirectly, automatically and unconsciously most of the time, while direct explicit comparison between two distinct domains is the exception. This ubiquity of indirect metaphor has been the reason of the attraction of the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor, as it suggests that metaphor may be pervasive in all of our language use but at the same time does its work automatically and unconsciously, presumably affecting our thought in all sorts of subtle but unavoidable ways. This raises the question, then, of how this works for a genre like love poetry, where one might expect more overt linguistic attention to, and play with, these conceptual metaphors. And, on top of this, one poet may do this in rather different ways than another (cf. Lodge 1977; Tsur 1987), which brings us back to the question of metaphor and style.

Although I have not been able to perform an exhaustive reliable and quantitative analysis of *Rapture*, it is clear that it is full of indirect metaphor. What is more interesting here, however, is that it is also full of direct metaphor. A quick count of the number of occurrences of the preposition 'like' yields fifty-eight instances in a book of sixty-two pages, with only two non-metaphorical comparisons out of fifty-eight. The noun phrase following the preposition is on average three and a half words long, ranging from one word as in 'Love loved

you best; lit you/with a flame, *like talent*, under your skin;...' (from 'Elegy') to a maximum of eleven in 'Then love comes, *like a sudden flight of birds/from earth to heaven after rain....*' (from 'Rapture'). This means that some 4 per cent of all 6,732 words in the complete volume are involved in simile. This is ten times higher than the average for fiction, which in turn has exponentially more similes than, for instance, academic texts or conversations (Dorst 2011; Herrmann 2013; Kaal 2012; Krennmayr 2011; Pasma 2011). Naturally, these are considerations of register more than of style, and the question of poetic style between poets or even between works of poets has to be left aside here for reasons of space. It should be clear, however, that this is one way how stylisticians can go about determining the contribution of metaphor to style in poetry.

It is a small step from simile to so-called 'A is B' metaphors. Simile is typically discussed in the literature as going back to the formula 'A is like B', and much philosophical and psycholinguistic research on metaphor has adopted this starting point in order to contrast simile to metaphor in the form of 'A is B'. Two comments are in order. First of all, 'A is like B' similes and 'A is B' metaphors hardly ever occur in everyday language use. Secondly, all similes in *Rapture* mentioned just now are not of the allegedly classic 'A is like B' form. Instead, they typically comprise prepositional phrases with just the source domain preceded by 'like', which then function as an adverbial adjunct to offer a metaphorical comment, often of manner, on the main predication of the clause – as in the lines quoted in the previous paragraph from 'Elegy' and 'Rapture'. Against this background, it is highly relevant that 'A is B' metaphors, by contrast, do feature quite prominently in the volume. A striking example comes on the very first page, setting the stage for the volume's encompassing ambivalence towards the experience of love:

Falling in love
is glamorous hell; ... (from 'You')

There are even two poems that are entirely built around whole series of 'A is B' metaphors. The sixth poem, 'Haworth', has five triplets, each of which has a variant of an 'A is B' metaphor. Even more spectacular is 'Absence', which has a list of audacious comparisons between consecutive elements and moments of the day on the one hand and their projected similarity with the lover or the experienced love on the other. The last eight lines may serve as an illustration of the variety, audacity, beauty and occasional depth of the metaphors:

Then a butterfly paused on a trembling leaf is your breath.
Then the gauzy mist relaxed on the ground is your pose.
Then the fruit from the cherry tree falling on grass is your kiss, your kiss.
Then the day's hours are theatres of air where I watch you entranced.

Then the sun's light going down from the sky is the length of your back.
Then the evening bells over the rooftops are lovers' vows.
Then the river staring up, lovesick for the moon, is my long night.
Then the stars between us are love urging its light. (from 'Absence')

After these two early poems highlighting 'A is B' constructions, later local uses in, for instance, 'New Year' and 'Night Marriage' make for the reader's recognition of a firmly established stylistic device, promoting the experience of a stylistic pattern.

There are other linguistic forms of expression of metaphor that should be considered here, and for an intriguing overview I refer to Goatly (1997). But when it comes to the relation between the expression of metaphor in language use on the one hand and style as a feature of genre on the other hand, the above comments may suffice for present purposes. The observation that this volume is full of 'A is B' metaphors and similes is a clear indication that we are dealing with poetry, including love poetry. This could be a typical aspect of register (code) and domain (context), mostly. Again, whether these prominent uses are also due to the style of this volume or Carol Ann Duffy's manner of writing is a question that can and should be posed but cannot be answered without further comparative research along the same lines as demonstrated in this section.

4 Metaphorical Communication, Genre and Style (*'metaphor in interaction'*)

One recent development in metaphor research has been the realization that metaphors are not just a matter of thought (conceptualization) and language (expression) but also of interaction (communication, Steen 2008); metaphors are occasionally used *as* metaphors for communicative purposes, that is, as cross-domain comparisons that are expressed as such so that addressees must pay attention to both target *and* source domain. Such metaphors are deliberate metaphors, as opposed to all other metaphors that are metaphorical in language and thought but not used deliberately *as* metaphors in interaction. In fact, the attraction of the cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor lies in the tenet that most metaphors are not deliberately used as metaphors but work automatically, simply because they are already available in our linguistic and conceptual systems. This starting point launched a revolution in metaphor studies at the beginning of the 1980s but obscured the fact that there always have been metaphors that are deliberately used as explicit cross-domain comparisons that invite people to pay attention to the correspondences between two superficially unlike concepts or domains.

All 'A is B' metaphors discussed in the previous section are deliberate; they construct identity statements or class-inclusion statements that are clearly false, and by flouting the maxim of quality, they invite addressees to construct relevant alternative interpretations by comparison. The same holds for all similes discussed there; with simile, the intention to use a metaphor *as* a metaphor is made entirely explicit by the use of a metaphor signal, such as 'like'. There are other forms of deliberate metaphor that we shall inspect in a moment, but let us first contrast these cases with non-deliberate metaphor use.

Consider the following two lines from 'Hour':

We find an hour together, spend it not on flowers
or wine, but the whole of the summer sky and a grass ditch.

From a conceptual and a linguistic point of view, the verbs 'find' and 'spend' are metaphorical. The first verb typically concerns discovering or obtaining concrete things in its basic meaning, here changing a stretch of time into a valuable object that can be discovered or obtained by chance. The second verb is related to the same idea, that time is a valuable object that can be spent on experiencing particular events and emotions. However, neither of these metaphor-related words shows any indication of having been intended to be used deliberately as a metaphor, in the sense of drawing attention to its original source domain as a relevant perspective for the meaning of the utterance. With deliberate metaphor use, by contrast, this is precisely the point: 'A is B' metaphors, similes and comparable constructions force the addressee to go to the source domain, represent it as a distinct referential area for the utterance and re-view the target domain concept of the metaphor from that perspective. The first lines of the first poem of the volume explicitly instruct us to see the beginning of this love affair from the perspective of a charm, a spell. Deliberate metaphors are perspective changers, intentionally introducing an alien referential domain into the meaning of the text, whereas non-deliberate metaphors do not. The communicative point of deliberate metaphors is always to instruct the addressee to set up a cross-domain comparison as part of the meaning of the text; non-deliberate metaphors do not have such a communicative point.

To see how this analytical angle works, let us search for occurrences of the word 'love' and see how these are accompanied by metaphorical expressions around them. Ignoring the two dedicated poems called 'Love' and 'The Love Poem', I found some twenty-odd immediate metaphorical environments for the noun 'love', far outnumbering the immediate environments of 'love' that were not metaphorical. Space restrictions forbid exhaustive discussion, but here are some relevant observations.

One group includes those cases where 'love' is personified, portraying love as an agent who has control over people. Here follow examples from three poems, 'River', 'Hour', and 'Elegy':

Down by the river, under the trees, love waits for me
to walk from the journeying years of my time and arrive.

...

Then I can look love full in the face, see
who you are I have come this far to find, the love of my life. (from 'River')

Love's time's beggar, but even a single hour,
bright as a dropped coin, makes love rich.

...

Time hates love, wants love poor,
but love spins gold, gold, gold from straw. (from 'Hour')

Love loved you best; lit you
with a flame, like talent, under your skin; let you
move through your days and nights, blessed in your flesh,
blood, hair, as though they were lovely garments
you wore to pleasure the air.

...

that love, which wanders history,
singled you out in your time? (from 'Elegy')

What is interesting here is that the personifications become part of a partial narrative frame imposed upon the text as a whole, turning the local metaphor into a device that lends additional coherence to the poem as a whole; the personifications invite extended comparison and analogizing between two domains across the text, which requires dedicated effort in order to construct a complex interpretation that is different than for most other metaphors. In the case of 'River', this happens in an almost symbolist setting in which the river may be a symbol for time and life where the 'I' persona meets love, who also is the love of her life. In the case of 'Hour', there is more of an expository text type based on a metaphorical argument in which the relation between love and time is personified, eliciting an almost metaphysical atmosphere. In 'Elegy', we have personification and narrative at a fairly abstract level of conceptualization. In none of these cases would it make sense to deny that the metaphors are intended to be interpreted as metaphors, the contrasts between the abstract nouns and the concrete verbs requiring hard work on the part of the reader to picture a coherent and relevant situation for the texts.

A second group comprises cases in which love is not personified but rather made concrete in a physical situation that metaphorically represents love as a mental state that people can be in. This may be relatable to the cognitive-linguistic proposal that mental states, including love, can be metaphorically conceptualized as containers:

We passed it, walking and walking
into our new love; ... (from 'Swing')

Then the stars between us are love urging its light. (from 'Absence')

so my love will be shade
where you are,
and yours,
as I turn in my sleep,
the bud of a star. (from 'World')

Note how the first example, from 'Swing', involves an indirect metaphor, in that there is no explicit comparison between love and some physical source domain; we have to see that covert conceptual connection via the combination of 'love' with the preposition 'into'. There can be little doubt, however, also given the context of the poem, that there is a deliberate comparison intended between love and a place. In the second and third examples, these comparisons are made verbally explicit by means of the 'A is B' constructions, demonstrating how such constructions are clear cases of deliberate metaphor use.

A third group turns the default expectation of this volume of love poetry on its head and uses love as a source domain:

A century's heat in the garden, fierce as love. (from 'Rain')

The urgent fireworks fling themselves
against the night, flowers of desire, love's fervency. (from 'New Year')

... The fireworks
were as loud as love, if love were allowed
a sound. ... (from 'Chinatown')

The significance of these cases is to show the persona's utter obsession with love, such that everything that in everyday life has nothing to do with love but normally helps people to conceptualize love now itself gets interpreted via the reverse relationship. If love is normally conceptualized as heat, this now gives occasion to exploit the reverse direction and conceptualize heat as love. The third example even makes explicit the fact that this kind of metaphorical mapping is counterfactual ('if love were allowed a sound').

This is a playful and innovative, as well as functional, variation upon a conceptual convention that clearly suggests that these metaphors are deliberate metaphors.

Deliberate metaphors range from 'A is B' constructions and similes to overt metaphorical utterances that have such abstract referents as love as their topic and construct highly deviant situations around them. Other variants include extended comparisons across texts, whether these are symbolist, metaphysical or have yet another character. These are deliberate metaphors, in that they instruct the reader to set up cross-domain comparisons as part of the meaning of the text. They introduce alien perspectives into the text that make the reader rethink the nature of love from the standpoint of, for instance, human agency (personification) or containment (concretization). Such deliberate metaphors work *as* metaphors in communication, while non-deliberate metaphors typically pass by unnoticed.

From a genre perspective, deliberate metaphors are clearly first and foremost features of the domain of literature (including love poetry) and its associated register of literary or poetic language. Their reflection of the content parameter is probably striking, as love is indeed an abstract topic but is not always talked about in these deliberately metaphorical terms. Text structures, text types and even text forms are implicated as well when we have to do extended metaphorical comparison as in a metaphysical or symbolist setting. This may also be an aspect of the rhetoric of the poem, which clearly also contributes to the experience of a rich and complex and even sometimes abstract style of the volume. This may be the dimension where the stylistic role of Duffy's metaphors becomes most prominent.

5 Conclusion

A three-dimensional approach to metaphor in the language use of *Rapture* hence yields a number of observations that can then be related to an encompassing discourse approach of *Rapture* by genre, which includes style as one important variable for description. On the dimension of metaphor in thought, we observed that love was mainly conceptualized as magic. On the dimension of language, we saw that the volume expresses metaphorical mappings by means of numerous indirect metaphors, as is to be expected, but also exhibits a high number of similes and of 'A is B' metaphors. And on the dimension of interaction, many metaphors were found to have a deliberately metaphorical communicative function, in that they force the reader to pay explicit attention to the source domain as one that offers an alien and interesting and beautiful perspective on the target domain of love. These three dimensions of language use build a complex picture of metaphor in *Rapture*, which can be partly explained as a matter of style.

Style is one variable in the genre of a book of love poems. It can only be assessed if comparative work is done between different books of love poetry by the same or different authors, which unfortunately lies beyond the scope of this chapter. Style would be the individual variation of a work or an author on top of other variation that can be explained by, for instance, the domain of poetry, the content of love poetry or the registers of the language of love and love poetry that can be associated with them. In our analysis, it looks as if the style of conceptualization (love as magic) is rather regular and that, against that background, other moments stood out when the poet used cross-domain mappings for love involving natural elements loving each other. The style of expression, by contrast, does have a prominent feature that clearly belongs to this work and not to every work of love poetry in the same degree, and that is the varied use of rather striking 'A is B' metaphors on particular occasions. These are also deliberate metaphors, which adds to the style of communication.

It is interesting to note that Carol Ann Duffy herself has commented on her style: she aims for an effect where simple words do complicated things. It is clear that some of the metaphors contribute to this effect. The symbolist and metaphysical examples mentioned above offer appropriate illustrations, just like the condensed 'A is B' metaphors.

I have presented an approach to metaphor as a feature of style in relation to metaphor in language and thought. Style has to do with genre, while language and thought have to do with language use. My main message has been that we need good models for both. For language use, we should not restrict ourselves to language and thought but should also include interaction and employ a three-dimensional model for metaphor in order to examine its conceptual, expressive and communicative properties. For genre, we should develop a multidimensional model for discourse and include style as one of the variables that have to do with code. Only by bringing the two together can we study metaphor and style through genre.

References

- Biber, D. and Conrad, S. (2009), *Register, Genre, and Style*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L. J. and Maslen, R., eds (2010), *Metaphor Analysis: Research Practice in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*, London: Equinox.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005), *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deignan, A., Littlemore, J. and Semino, E. (2013), *Figurative Language, Genre and Register*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorst, A. G. (2011), *Metaphor in Fiction: Language, Thought, and Communication*, Oisterwijk: BOXpress.
- Duffy, C. A. (2005), *Rapture*, London: Picador.

- Gibbs, R. W., ed. (2008), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goatly, A. (1997), *The Language of Metaphors*, London: Routledge.
- Herrmann, J. B. (2013), *Metaphor in Academic Discourse: Linguistic Forms, Conceptual Structures, Communicative Functions, Cognitive Representations*, Utrecht: LOT.
- Kaal, A. A. (2012), *Metaphor in Conversation*, Oisterwijk: BOXpress.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010), *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, 2nd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krennmayr, T. (2011), *Metaphor in Newspapers*, Utrecht: LOT.
- Lakoff, G. (1986), 'The meanings of literal', *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 1: 291–6.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980), *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lodge, D. J. (1977), *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy and the Typology of Modern Literature*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Pasma, T. (2011), *Metaphor and Register Variation: The Personalization of Dutch News Discourse*, Oisterwijk: BOXpress.
- Rundell, M., ed. (2002), *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Steen, G. J. (1999), 'Metaphor and discourse: Towards a linguistic checklist for metaphor analysis', in L. Cameron and G. Low (eds), *Researching and Applying Metaphor*, 81–104, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G. J. (2007), *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage: A Methodological Analysis of Theory and Research*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G. J. (2008), 'The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor', *Metaphor & Symbol*, 23: 213–41.
- Steen, G. J. (2011), 'Genre between the humanities and the sciences', in M. Callies, W. R. Keller and A. Lohöfer (eds), *Bi-directionality in the Cognitive Sciences: Examining the Interdisciplinary Potential of Cognitive Approaches in Linguistics and Literary Studies*, 21–42, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T. and Pasma, T. (2010), *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tallis, F. (2005), *Love Sick*, London: Arrow Books.
- Tsur, R. (1987), *On Metaphoring*, Jerusalem: Israel Science Publishers.

The Bloomsbury Companion to Stylistics

Edited by
Violeta Sotirova

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

B L O O M S B U R Y
LONDON • OXFORD • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

BLOOMSBURY and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2016

© Violeta Sotirova and Contributors, 2016

Chapter 17, Defamiliarization and Foregrounding © Catherine Emmott and Marc Alexander, 2015

Violeta Sotirova has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988,
to be identified as the Editor of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted
in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying,
recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior
permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or
refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication
can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-4411-6005-8
ePDF: 978-1-4411-4320-4
ePub: 978-1-4411-4325-9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Bloomsbury Companion to Stylistics / edited by Violeta Sotirova.
pages cm. – (Bloomsbury companions)

ISBN 978-1-4411-4325-9 (epub) – ISBN 978-1-4411-6005-8 (hardback) –
ISBN 978-1-4411-4320-4 (epdf) 1. English language–Style. 2. English language–Versification.
3. Creation (Literary, artistic, etc.) 4. Style, Literary. I. Sotirova, Violeta, editor.

PE1421.B56 2015
808'.042–dc23
2015010278

Series: Bloomsbury Companions

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India
Printed and bound in Great Britain