

Małgorzata Brożyna¹

**Report on the International Conference
“The Stockholm 2011 Metaphor Festival”,
Stockholm 8–10 September 2011**

In September, the Department of English at Stockholm University once again organised the annual international conference named “The Metaphor Festival”. This started as internal departmental seminars on the character and occurrence of metaphors, but has grown into an international symposium on figurative language.

The almost 100 participants from all over the world – Jordan, Russia, Sweden, Serbia, the United Kingdom, Poland, Georgia, Spain, the United States, Brazil, Canada, Italy, Japan, Ukraine, Denmark, Austria, Iran, Germany, France, Oman, Finland, Romania, Croatia, the Netherlands – were hosted at Stockholm University. Before the four parallel sessions of the festival started, the participants were welcomed by a board of notable hosts: Christina Alm-Arvius (the chair of the Organising Committee for the Stockholm Metaphor Festival, Associate Professor of English linguistics at Stockholm University), Nils-Lennart Johannessen (Professor of English linguistics at Stockholm University) and David Minugh (Foreign Lecturer at Stockholm University). The welcoming board expressed their pleasure at having the opportunity to meet and exchange ideas and experiences. They were glad that so many participants had been able to attend. Next, they

¹ Jagiellonian University (Kraków, Poland), a linguist specialising in English and Polish linguistics and culture studies. Email: malgorzatabrozyna@wp.pl

provided the participants with the details of the festival programme. They also gave instructions concerning the social events taking place as a part of the conference.

After the welcoming speech, Professor Ronald W. Langacker from the University of California, San Diego gave his lecture on *Metaphors in Linguistics Thought and Theory*. He introduced his topic with the statement that metaphor is a dangerous phenomenon which is pervasive at all levels of the linguistic enterprise. It is obvious that metaphor is a source of insight and creativity. However, we may argue that it is also inappropriate in some respects that can lead to spurious questions, conceptual confusion, misconception of the target and pointless arguments. Langacker proved his assertion by giving the following examples from the lexicon: the *modular* view of linguistic organisation (lexicon is a module); the *container/content* view of lexical items and their meanings; and the *network* model of polysemy (vs. the *field* model). To make his point clearer, he presented two extended case studies. The first one (“Boxes and Clouds”) involved the comparison of the *network* and *exemplar* models of categorisation with special reference to the nature and status of *schemas*. The second case (“Buildings and Rivers”) concerned the interplay of hierarchical and serial organisation in linguistic structure. Langacker finished his lecture with the concluding remarks that metaphor is pervasive and unavoidable, but not all-powerful. To some extent people control metaphor instead of being controlled by it. With patience and vigilance we can gradually sort things out. Furthermore, alternative metaphors make it easier to distinguish the target from its metaphorical construal.

After Langacker’s speech and a short coffee break the presentations took place in three or four sessions. Each slot was limited to 30 minutes for the presentation and answering questions from the floor. English was the working language.

The presentations constituting the festival corresponded to the following areas of research: Methodological Problems in Analysis of Metaphors; Metaphors in Language; Metaphors in Literature; Metaphors in Different Types of Discourse. Additionally, a workshop on metonymy was organised on Saturday (10 September).

1. Methodological Problems in Analysis of Metaphors

Discussion in this particular area of research centred on different methods that can be applied to the study of metaphors. Ulf Magnusson (Luleå University of Technology, Sweden) showed the limitations of Mark Johnson’s definition of the BALANCE image schema, suggesting that

BALANCE should be seen as a conceptual phenomenon, not as a purely physical one. Next, Gudrun Reijniere (VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands) presented some consequences of using one dictionary (and not another) for metaphor identification. Veronika Koller (Lancaster University, UK) investigated the links between metaphor and interdiscursivity, exploring how metaphor has contributed to discursive and textual hybridity across genres and time.

Mihailo Antović (University of Niš, Serbia) proposed a new theoretical approach to a common problem in the study of music cognition, that is the utilisation of the four-space Conceptual Blending model with a reinforced role for the generic space.

Mayya Choban (National Academy of Security Service of Ukraine) mentioned the transfer schema of the force-dynamic world to categorise metaphorical transfer in three-participant situations with two animate participants.

2. Metaphors in Language

Presentations examining metaphors that are found in language as a system were also an important part of the conference. Marlene Johansson Falck (Umeå University, Sweden) put the following questions in her presentation: *Why do things “at the last minute”? How variation at the level of conceptual metaphor influences the usage patterns of English and Swedish prepositions.* Yulia Mukhina (Saratov State University, Russia) interpreted expressions with semantic idiomaticity which took on the opposite meaning and which were used in texts ironically. The semantic shift in Russian adjectives and adverbs was the major subject of concern in Olga Karpova’s (Russian State University of Humanities) paper.

The strategy of “reversal” of the literal meaning of lexical words or the “misuse” of grammatical gender was the main interest of Iwona Kraska-Szlenk’s (University of Warsaw, Poland) paper. The case of irony absorbed Alan Bailin (Hofstra University, New York, USA), who claimed that ironic interpretation crucially depended on typical or connotative characteristics. Abdullah Albarakat (Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan) raised the problem of racism that can be observed in the usage of language.

There were several presentations that dealt with the relationship between language and culture. For example, Mohammad Amin Sorahi (Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran) studied the use of colour terms in Persian and English. Nino Daraselia (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia) analysed metaphors of silence in English, Georgian and Russian. Two presenters from Higher School of Economics & Perm State

University (Russia), Tatyana M. Permyakova and Svetlana Yu. Zhdanova, studied the metaphoric representation of intercultural communication on the basis of the English and Russian languages. Ana Mansilla Perez (University of Murcia, Spain) analysed a bilingual Spanish-German Phraseological Corpus, focusing on metaphors that covered concepts involving offensive speech.

Narges Ghandchi (University of Copenhagen) had prepared a poster that presented the results of cross-linguistic study of conceptual metaphors: fluids, family, anger, and honour.

By analysing modern and traditional metaphors of fear in English Izabela Dixon (University of Gdańsk, Poland) showed in her presentation how fear blended with other abstract ideas. Expressions of time in sign language were examined by Michiko Kaneko and Rachel Sutton-Spence (University of Bristol, UK).

A separate group of presentations was constituted by papers that discussed metaphors in second language acquisition. Marianna Bolognesi (University of Torino, Italy) analysed motion verbs used metaphorically in both the first and second language. Zahra Fotovatnia and Shekoofeh Hajjalikhani (Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran) investigated English idioms in L1 and L2. Laure Huber (University Lumières Lyon 2, France) studied children's comprehension of both creative and conventional metaphors.

3. Metaphors in Literature

An important part of the conference constituted presentations that demonstrated the results of analysis of metaphors in literature. The keynote lecturer – David Punter (University of Bristol, UK) – delivered a speech on *Metaphors, Ghosts and the Uncanny*, claiming that metaphor is an influential phenomenon. It resides or even originates in the need to describe something to a person who is not there. The constitutive role of absence links metaphor with ghosts and the uncanny. The discussion finished with comments on the double function of metaphor, which is a string between revivifying of dead language and the potential for succumbing to the all too familiar, to the stereotype.

The majority of presentations examined the applicability of different methods, including cognitive ones, for studying figures of speech in literature and poetry. Thomas Eder (University of Vienna) presented the results of the application of cognitive linguistics and relevance theory to the analysis of poetry. Marjaana Svala (University of Helsinki, Finland) investigated extended cognitive metaphors in Torgny Lindgren's *Hummelhonung* and

Pölsan. Natalia Bagdavadze (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi University, Georgia) exemplified conceptual metaphors in Thomas Hardy’s novel *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. Gerson Mgaya (University of Eastern Finland) examined the functions of rhetorical devices in 1 Corinthians 12 – 14. The category of writer was the main issue of the presentations made by Philip Eubanks (Northern Illinois University, USA) and Alina Kwiatkowska (University of Łódź, Poland). Silvia Canuti (University of Salento, Lecce, Italy) concentrated on the expression of faith and freedom in the first two collections of poems by Bing Xin. Perception, metaphoric coherence and modal worlds in Dylan Thomas’s *Under Milk Wood* were the main subjects of Anne Päivärinta’s (University of Tampere, Finland) speech. Two presenters, Annika Bergström (Gotland University, Sweden) and Misuzu Shimotori (Umeå University, Sweden), investigated environmental descriptions illustrating people’s emotions in Swedish and Japanese crime novels. The issue of emotions was also an area of research performed by Cristóbal Pagán Cánovas (University of Murcia, Spain), who applied blending theory to study recurrent conceptual patterns in poetic imagery conceptualising emotions. The concept of theatricality of the elusive figure was introduced by Marie-Pier Beaulieu (University of Montreal, Canada) who examined Bernard-Marie Koltés’ play *The Night Just Before The Forests*. Hedda Friberg-Harnesk (Mid-Sweden University, Härnösand) examined a few examples of metaphoric language in John Banville’s *The Infinities*, focusing specifically on similes that highlight the fluid boundaries between human, animal and mythically divine forms. Three dimensions of metaphor — textual, verbal and visual iconic — were raised by Manana Rusieshvili and Rusudan Dolidze (Tbilisi State University, Georgia), who studied *The Hoods* by Harry Grey, the script and the resultant film by Sergio Leone, *Once Upon a Time in America*. Metaphor is a stylistic device which can be used to create an image in a novel — such was the statement made by Mathilde Savard-Corbeil (University of Montreal, Canada) who examined *The Body Artist* by Don DeLillo. Andrew Cooper (Stockholm University, Sweden) discussed the tradition in the study of *Beowulf* which has always held the competition between Beowulf and Breca, which described in a conversation between Beowulf and Unferth (506-581), was in swimming, although the word which is translated as “swim” has the literal meaning “row”. Hisham A. Jawad (English Department, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman) tried to explore the thematic and symbolic motif of sound/voice in the autobiography of the Egyptian writer Taha Hussain.

Tomonori Okubo (Kansai University, Japan) applied the linguistic polyphony theory to studied litotes seen as a kind of mitigated irony.

The poster prepared by Małgorzata Zawilińska-Janaszek (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland) dealt with the same area of research

connecting metaphor and literature. The title was: *Do Poets Prefer Conventional Forms of Synesthetic Metaphors? Non-literary vs. literary synesthetic metaphors in English and Polish.*

4. Metaphors in Different Types of Discourse

The presentations in this section dealt with metaphorical expressions that can be identified in different types of discourse. Tatiana Aleksandrova (Saratov State University, Russia) discussed the metaphorical extensions of the conceptual domain BUSINESS LIFE in Russian and English media discourse. Baramée Kheovichai (University of Birmingham, UK) then spoke about few words on metaphorical narratives in the discourse of business sciences. Joanna Chwesiuk (Warsaw University, Poland) investigated metaphorical expressions in speech on BBC Radio. Marzena Chojnowska (University of Gdańsk, Poland) shared her findings and reflections on the usage of metaphors in Jeremy Clarkson's programme *Top Gear* and his articles published in *The Sunday Times*.

Film discourse was the subject of Anna Bączkowska's (Kazimierz Wielki University, Bydgoszcz, Poland) presentation. She put the main focus on the interaction between words and gestures on the metaphorical level, introducing multimodal metaphor.

There were a few presentations on metaphors in political discourse, such as: *The Image Component of Metaphor Semantics: Idioms in Russian political discourse* by Dmitrij Dobrovól'skij (Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia) and Ludmila Pöppel (Stockholm University, Sweden); *War Metaphors and Disease Metaphors in English and Polish political discourse* by Małgorzata Brożyna (Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland); *A Matter of Life and Death, or How the Tunisian Revolution Was Conceptualised in the Press* by Soumaya Ladhari (University of Paris-Diderot Paris 7, France). Caixia Dong (University of Copenhagen, Denmark) and Hermine Penz (University of Graz, Austria) analysed metaphors in key speeches of President Barack Obama and President Hu Jintao. Elena Negrea (College of Communication and Public Relations, Bucharest, Romania) emphasised one element of political discourse that she found interesting: name shortenings and colloquial appellatives as irony and humour enhancers.

Stefanie Vogelbacher (Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg) studied board discourse and talked about the pragmatic functions of metaphors as a sociocultural phenomenon.

Two papers focused on the function of metaphors in academic discourse. Kenneth Kristjan Bondesson (Kanda University of International Studies, Japan) pointed to metaphors that "we live by" in internationalising

Japanese higher education. Raffaella Negretti (Stockholm University, Sweden) underlined the prominent role metaphors have in academic communication, and tried to find out how L2 students of English for Academic Purposes responded to the metaphorical language used in published academic texts.

Paulina Rejniewicz (University of Gdańsk, Poland) analysed the language used in describing classical string music pieces, discussing musical interpretation, or writing music reviews. Aneta Czyżewska (Warsaw University, Poland) dealt with the phenomenon of synesthesia in the interpretation of postimpressionist paintings.

The relationship between metaphor and photography at different levels and in different contexts was the main interest of Juanita Bagés’ (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain) paper.

5. Workshop on Metonymy

Antonio Barcelona, Olga Blanco and Maria Isabel Hernández Gomáriz (University of Córdoba, Spain) organised the workshop *Topics in Metonymy*, which was sponsored in part by the research Group HUM-693 and the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain. The workshop focused on two main topics. The first was a discussion of the difficulties associated with a detailed description of metonymy and the development of a typology of metonymy. The second one was titled: *Metonymy at, under, and above the lexicon* and was very broad and open to contributions from any interested scholars. The following researchers presented their findings and reflections on metonymy: Antonio Barcelona (University of Córdoba, Spain), John Barnden and Mihaela Popa (University of Birmingham, UK), Margarida Basilio (Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Ewa Biernacka (The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK), Olga Blanco Carrión (University of Córdoba, Spain), Andrea Coles-Bjerre (University of Oregon, USA), Ingrid Lossius Falkum (University of Oslo, Norway), Isabel Hernández Gomariz (University of Córdoba, Spain), Rossella Pannain (University of Naples “L’Orientale”, Italy), Susan Ryland (University for the Creative Arts, UK), Karina Ivett Verdin Amaro (Autonomous University of Queretaro and Autonomous University of Nayarit). Additionally, there were two presentations during the conference (apart from the workshop papers) that dealt with metonymy. Sylwia Wojciechowska (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland) showed metaphor-metonymy interplay in expressions using *hand*. Sandra Handl (University of Munich, Germany) stated that underspecified metonymic meanings are direct manifestations of our perceptual preferences and frequently employed in natural discourse.

On 9th September the conference dinner took place at Örtagården, allowing guests to enjoy delicious food and exchange ideas and impressions after the second day of the festival.

An excursion to runic inscriptions was part of the social programme of the conference that took place on Saturday afternoon. Thanks to sunny weather the participants were able to admire the green landscapes of the outskirts of Stockholm and enjoy a rest after the three working days of the conference.