Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse

Denroche, C.

Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse

Charles Denroche
University of Westminster

Abstract

This article starts by looking at the various ways metonymic and metaphoric thinking, as independent phenomena, organize text at discourse level. The literature on Metaphor in Discourse is classified under three broad categories, 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metaphor'; while the less extensive body of research on Metonymy in Discourse is analyzed into parallel categories, 'metonymy clusters', 'metonymy chains' and 'extended metonymy'. The article goes on to look at the ways in which Metonymy in Discourse and Metaphor in Discourse phenomena combine in making meaning at text level. The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse referred to here as Text Metaphtonymy, is explored under headings adapted from Goossens (1990), namely, 'metaphor within metonymy' and 'metonymy within metaphor'. The ways in which metonymy and metaphor combine at discourse level are shown to be varied and intricate. This has implications for applied linguists working with text. The direction further work in this area might take is indicated.

Keywords: chains, clusters, extended metaphor, extended metonymy, discourse, metaphor, metaphtonymy, metonymy, text

1. Introduction

In his 1990 article, Goossens coins the term *metaphtonymy* (Goossens, 1990). The term refers to the interaction of metonymy and metaphor in linguistic expressions. Goossens is concerned with metonymy and metaphor as distinct phenomena appearing 'in combination' and 'intertwined', rather than linguistic items which represent intermediate stages on the metonymy-metaphor continuum (Goossens, 1990:323); and metaphtonymy as a phenomenon occurring on the small scale of individual expressions, rather than metonymy- and metaphor-led phenomena on the larger scale of the whole text, which is the focus of the present article. In order to signal that I am investigating the interaction of metonymy and metaphor across longer stretches of language, rather than within clause-length units, I adopt the term 'Text Metaphtonymy'.

The purpose of this article is to review the different ways in which figurative thought impacts on discourse at text level. First, I demonstrate various ways in which figurative thought manifests itself in speech/writing across different genres; then I look at how the same phenomena occur in various combinations. In Section 2, I look at Metaphor in Discourse phenomena under three broad categories – 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metaphor'. Section 3 deals with the less-studied topic of Metonymy in Discourse phenomena under three parallel categories – 'metonymy clusters', 'metonymy chains' and 'extended metonymy'. This manner of overviewing the field is both orthodox, in that it reflects the terminology and theorizing in the literature, and at the same time original in the way the categories are defined. Section 4 examines Text Metaphtonymy, the co-occurrence of these phenomena; while Section 5 reviews the contribution made to the field by the article and suggests the direction further research in this area might take.

2. Metaphor in Discourse

The sizeable literature on Metaphor in Discourse encompasses a variety of different approaches to understanding the role of metaphor in meaning-making at text level. They range from the systematic identification and enumeration of linguistic metaphor in text; on to noticing local metaphor activity at critical points in texts ('clusters'); on to observing the patterning of metaphors linking across a text ('chains'); and, finally, to single metaphors organizing long stretches of text and whole texts ('extended metaphor').

2.1 Metaphor Clusters

A number of invaluable tools have been developed for identifying metaphor in discourse, such as those devised by Cameron (2003), Cameron & Deignan (2006), Cameron & Maslen (2010b), Pragglejaz Group (2007), Steen (2002, 2007) and Steen et al. (2010). Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) operationalizes metaphor identification at word level by identifying words used metaphorically which have a more basic meaning (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). A modified version of MIP, MIPVU, includes similes, comparisons and extended comparisons (Steen et al., 2010). In Steen's

five-step procedure for metaphor identification, the clause is the unit of analysis (Steen, 2002, 2007). Metaphor Identification through Vehicle (MIV) analyses discourse for both single and multi-word 'vehicle terms' (Cameron 1999, Cameron 2003), using the full intonation unit as the unit of analysis (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:119, Cameron et al. 2010), and searching for words and phrases in 'soft assembly' rather than dictionary headwords (Cameron & Maslen, 2010a:105). The focus on 'emergent' meaning is central to the 'discourse-dynamics approach' to metaphor analysis (Cameron et al., 2009, Cameron & Maslen, 2010b). It enables researchers to recognize subtle, locally-occurring and often ephemeral metaphor activity, as well as more stable 'metaphoremes', units which show shared features of form, semantics, affect and pragmatics (Cameron & Deignan, 2006:676).

These identification tools have been helpful in the identification of metaphor 'clusters', concentrations of linguistic metaphors occurring in close proximity at particular points in a text. This uneven distribution of metaphor in discourse is discussed by Darian (2000), Koller (2003), Cameron & Low (2004), Cameron & Stelma (2004), Cameron (2008), Semino (2008) and Kimmel (2010). For Cameron & Stelma, 'clusters' involve conventional or novel linguistic metaphors and can derive from one or a number of 'vehicle' domains (Cameron & Stelma, 2004), while for Darian they are groupings of metaphoric expressions from the same metaphoric theme, developed over several sentences or paragraphs (Darian, 2000:180-181); but more usually 'clusters' refers to concentrations of linguistic metaphors from different domains, as in Semino's definition: "different metaphorical expressions drawing from different source domains in close proximity to one another" (Semino, 2008:226). In the 'mixed metaphor clusters' in newspaper texts which Kimmel discusses, metaphors appear in particularly close proximity, but although there is little coherence between the metaphors, being from unrelated sources, they present few processing problems (Kimmel, 2010).

Scholars agree as to the function of clusters: they occur where intense or important discourse work is being done. Koller observes that clusters at the beginning of a text will tend to have an ideational function, while the function of clusters mid-text or at the end of a text will tend to be interpersonal (Koller, 2003:120). Deignan et al. characterize clusters as 'higher than average' concentrations of metaphor which occur at points in text where the message is "particularly difficult or face threatening" (Deignan et al., 2013:8-9). For Cameron, they "mark points in talk where something complex or unfamiliar needs to be explained or interpreted", occurring on "both micro and macro scales of talk", from three to four intonation units to passages lasting minutes (Cameron, 2008:200). Cameron & Stelma observe bursts occurring at critical junctures in communication, "points where intensive and important discourse work is carried out" (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:135). Clusters provide a way of presenting 'otherness' in the reconciliation encounters considered by Cameron & Stelma, and provide a way of explaining difficult or unfamiliar topics in the literature on psychotherapist-patient discourse and religious sermons they review (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:132-135).

2.2 Metaphor Chains

A 'metaphor chain' is a Metaphor in Discourse pattern made up of related metaphors distributed more or less evenly across a text. Koller (2003) and Semino (2008) both use

the term ‘chain’ to describe this type of patterning. For Semino, metaphor chains are made up of (usually conventional) linguistic metaphors from a single source domain, “several related metaphorical expressions throughout a text”, and result from a combination of ‘repetition’, ‘recurrence’ and ‘extension’ (Semino, 2008:226). Koller identifies chains deriving from different domains, WAR, SPORTS and GAMES, in the marketing text she analyses (Koller, 2003), and shows how chains can overlap and interact without necessarily creating problems for the reader.

In the example I offer below, an extract from a newspaper article on the relative performance of two currencies, the pound and the euro, orientational/spatial metaphors and metaphors of movement, deriving mainly from BAD IS DOWN, play an important role in framing the message. Vehicle terms relating to the source domain DOWN are underlined below:

> The pound’s relentless slide towards parity with the euro picked up pace after it plunged to another record low against the single European currency. The latest slide saw sterling worth just 1.022 euros amid expectations for European interest rates to remain higher than in the UK […]. Sterling has lost 13% of its value against the euro this month alone as it sinks to yet more historic lows […] (*Metro*, 29 December 2008 – http://metro.co.uk/2008/12/29/pound-hits-near-parity-with-euro-270090/).

Metaphoric mappings related to BAD IS DOWN have a significant impact across a long stretch of this text; however, the metaphoric senses of the words *slide*, *plunged*, *low*, *slide*, *higher*, *sinks*, *lows* are conventional, well established meanings in the corpus of the language. They are also conventional in another sense, in that they are practically unavoidable for this particular news-reporting genre. If we were to look at newspaper reporting of the 2008 financial crisis, we would no doubt find many other words deriving from BAD IS DOWN, such as *collapse*, *slump*, *dive*, *fall*, *tumble*, used not creatively but in straight-forward reporting, as if “the metaphorical way of talking about it has become so conventionalized that it is almost the *only* way to talk about it” (Cameron et al., 2010:127). If the organizing metaphor is a ‘primary’ conceptual metaphor, then typically a chain of lexical items of this sort will result. If the organizing metaphor is novel, different patternings of lexis emerge, for which the term ‘chain’ is no longer suitable. These are more likely to be examples of ‘extended metaphor’ (Section 2.3).

Other terms which have been used to describe chains include ‘generative metaphor’ (Shön, 1993), ‘metaphor theme’ (Musolff, 2000) and ‘metaphor formula’ (Kimmel, 2012). Low uses the term ‘recurrent metaphor’ (Low, 2008). Darian defines ‘recurring metaphor’ as the “recurrence of the same image at different places in the text” (Darian, 2000:171), such as patterns deriving from *IMMUNE SYSTEM AS WAR*, *GENETIC TRANSFER AS FAMILY RELATIONS* and *BACTERIA AS HUNTERS* in the introductory science texts he considers (Darian, 2000:171-172). The most used and widely discussed term in this context is ‘systematic metaphor’ (Cameron, 2008, Cameron & Maslen, 2010b), defined by Cameron et al. as “a set of linguistic metaphors in which connected vehicle words or phrases are used metaphorically about a particular topic” (Cameron et al., 2010:127). “The systematic use of connected metaphors across talk” forms a larger ‘trajectory’ or ‘trace’ (Cameron et al., 2009:77), and thereby constructs a ‘metaphor trajectory’ inside the ‘discourse trajectory’ (Cameron, 2010:84). This ‘discourse dynamics’ perspective of

Cameron and her co-researchers is concerned with metaphor which is "processual, emergent, and open to change" (Cameron et al., 2009:67), where 'systematic metaphor' is "the dynamic collection of connected linguistic metaphors, a trajectory from one metaphor to the next over the dynamics of talk" (Cameron et al., 2009:78). The approach warns against over-interpreting data and over-generalizing beyond the text (Cameron et al., 2010:119, 124-125, 138). Systematic metaphors are less generalized than conceptual metaphors, describing choices relating to specific texts and genres (Cameron, 2008:208, 2010:129), coming closest to conceptual metaphors only when "highly conventionalized linguistic metaphors […] fall into highly conventionalized patterns of use" (Cameron et al., 2010:134).

The different terms reflect the different priorities and different schools of thought: Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) asks broad questions about metaphor in language in the mind; while Metaphor-led Discourse Analysis (MLDA) asks more specific questions about metaphor in relation to the context and the role of the mutual relationship, identities and culture of the participants in a specific speech event (Semino, 2008:31). Both generalize about metaphor, but while conceptual metaphors record higher-level generalizations about permanent cross-domain mappings in the conceptual systems in our minds, systematic metaphor describes local use by language participants while 'talking and thinking' in a specific discourse event (Cameron, 2003, Cameron & Maslen, 2010).

Semino distinguishes between 'discourse systematicity (of metaphors)' and 'global systematicity (of metaphors)', "the conventional use of a set of related metaphorical expressions" within a specific genre/discourse and across genres/discourses, respectively (Semino, 2008:227, 228). To indicate this difference, the typographical convention in the field is to write conceptual metaphors in non-italic SMALL CAPITALS and systematic metaphors in italic *SMALL CAPITALS* (Cameron et al., 2010:117), as it is in this journal.

2.3 Extended Metaphor

The third phenomenon I consider in this overview of Metaphor in Discourse is 'extended metaphor'. This is the novel extension of a single metaphoric idea across a substantial portion of text or an entire text. An example of this occurring on a small scale is given below:

> We have seen cuts in the health service not improvements, cuts that have not only gone through the skin but have cut into the flesh and as far as the bone in some cases ('Today', *BBC Radio 4*, author's transcription).

Scholars who discuss extension include Goatly (1997), Darian (2000), Steen (2007) and Semino (2008). 'Extension of metaphor' is the third of Steen's 'four dimensions of metaphor in usage', the others being 'directness', 'signalling' and 'explicitness' (Steen, 2007:319-323). He observes that 'metaphor extension' is processed differently from 'restricted metaphor', where metaphor is confined to a discourse unit, in terms of cross-domain mapping (Steen, 2007:321). Darian characterizes 'extended metaphor' as "one or several sequential paragraphs that embellish on an original metaphor and carry it

through several permutations", such as *DNA IS A LIBRARY* (Darian, 2000:171); he sees such metaphors as having a heuristic function, helping the reader 'understand' and 'remember' (2000:168-169).

For Semino, 'extension (of linguistic metaphors)' is the occurrence of "several metaphorical expressions evoking the same source domain and describing the same target domain in close proximity to one another in a text" (Semino, 2008:227). The size of unit extends to whole texts and to groups of related texts in Semino et al.'s discussion of texts drawing on *PAIN CONTROL IS A GATE*, *BERLUSCONI IS A DISEASE* and *HAVING A SPECIAL-NEEDS CHILD IS BEING SENT TO A HOLIDAY DESTINATION YOU DIDN'T CHOOSE* (Semino et al., 2013). They show how metaphors used to frame the original texts provide good candidates for 'recontextualization', allowing contributors to develop the original metaphor creatively ('re-frame') through 'use and reuse' in blogs and in online fora (Semino et al., 2013:46-51). Similarly, Deignan et al., considering metaphor extended across a range of genres and registers, such as climate change, and children and staff in a nursery context, show how *GENE REPLICATION IS COPYING* and *CONTROL OF PAIN IS A GATE* give rise to differently nuanced meanings when taken up in specialized or popular genres (Deignan et al., 2013).

There is potentially an overlap between extended metaphor and metaphor chains, as both involve a single metaphoric idea. Goatly and Semino both see metaphor chains as manifestations of metaphor extension, and link extension with organizing/systematic metaphor. For Goatly, extension involves different vehicle terms from one domain (Goatly, 1997:264), which, when numerous, form organizing metaphors (systematic metaphors), such as *ANTS ARE SOLDIERS*, and contribute to 'textual structuring' (Goatly, 1997:163).

The example below, a poster which appeared on the London Underground to recruit volunteers for the London 2012 Olympic Games, is unambiguously an example of extended metaphor rather than a chain. It is a particular kind of extended metaphor where a single novel metaphoric idea organizes the whole of the text and structures it into a number of clearly defined stages. The metaphor involved is *LONDON IS A FLAT*. In the 'mark-up' below, language relating to the target domain LONDON in shown in **bold** and language relating to the source domain FLAT is underlined:

> You know when your mum's coming round to your flat and you give the place a quick tidy? Well that's exactly what we're doing. Except our "flat" **is London** and our "mum" **is the rest of the world** coming round. **So we're cleaning London in time for the London 2012 Olympic Games. But that's a big job so we're asking people like you to lend us a hand. We have litter to pick, graffiti to scrub, and flowers to plant. To help London look its best just go to P&GCapitalcleanup.com. Come on.** Make your mum proud! (advertisement on the London Underground, Jan 2012).

The text starts with language from the source domain, FLAT; then there is a transition stage containing language from both the source and target, in which the metaphor is explained by making certain mappings explicit, even signalling them using inverted commas: flat equals **London**, mum equals **the rest of the world**. It then moves on to language from the target domain, LONDON; and finally there is a brief 'return' to the source domain, *Make your mum proud!* We sense here that this is deliberate metaphor

use, one which is 'worked at' consciously in a way rarely seen in speech, with the result that metaphor does not just pattern lexis but constructs a sequence of clearly identifiable moves: SOURCE-TRANSITION-TARGET-RETURN. The terms 'extended metaphor' and 'systematic metaphor' hardly seem adequate for describing this kind of Metaphor in Discourse phenomenon; a term such as 'text-constructing' or 'genre-constructing' metaphor might be more appropriate.

Paradoxically, the larger the unit of language organized by metaphoric thought, and, therefore, in a sense, the more important the role of metaphor, the less likely it is that the language will be identified as metaphoric using tools currently available. MIP, MIPVU and MIV, as well as automated analysis, procedures using electronic tagging and corpus studies (e.g. Deignan, 2005a, 2005b, Stefanowistch & Greis, 2006, Kimmel, 2012), are well suited to the identification of metaphor clusters, metaphor chains, emergent metaphor and systematic metaphor, where metaphor is expressed as linguistic metaphor, but they are not so well equipped to identify metaphoric thought operating on larger units. When metaphor organizes substantial stretches of language, linguistic metaphors may not actually be present; metaphoric writing does not necessarily contain local metaphor. The metaphor-identification procedures discussed above work at the small-scale end of analysis but if applied to the *Olympics Games* text, for example, would only identify two words as metaphoric, *flat* and *mum*; though, if the whole text were marked up for source and target language, as shown above, all the language of the article would be highlighted.

Metaphor identification protocols detect metaphor across discourse by identifying individual metaphoric expressions but metaphor across text is present in other ways. That is not to say that scholars working on the identification of linguistic metaphor are unaware of larger-scale phenomena. Cameron recognises systematicity at three levels: local, discourse and global (Cameron, 1999); Steen recognizes word, utterance, text and discourse levels of analysis (Steen, 2014). Steen describes text patterns found in education, science, advertising and propaganda, as well as literature, with two clearly defined sections, where "some cross-domain mappings are expressed as a text or section of a text with two different parts, one of which is devoted to the source domain and the other to the target domain" (Steen, 2007:342). He also observes that "extended comparison typically has relatively long stretches of direct language use for one domain followed by long stretches of direct language use for another domain" (Steen, 2007:321). It is 'direct language' of this sort which identification procedures are not well equipped to detect.

We have seen in this section that systematicity of metaphor use can produce patterning of language in text of two types; it can result in metaphor chains if the language and the metaphoric idea involved are conventional, or extended metaphor if the metaphoric ideas involved are novel. There will inevitably be contexts where the metaphoric idea is somewhere between the two, producing patterns which are not clearly chains or extensions.

3. Metonymy in Discourse

The literature on Metonymy in Discourse is far less extensive than the literature on Metaphor in Discourse. This reflects the nature of the literature on figurative language

and thought as a whole, metaphor having led the way in driving the 'cognitive turn'. Typically metonymy will occupy one chapter in books otherwise devoted to metaphor, e.g. Lakoff & Johnson (1980), Gibbs (1994) and Kövecses (2002). Key volumes in the Metonymy Studies literature, such as those edited by Benczes et al. (2011), Panther & Radden (1999) and Panther & Thornburg (2003), give little attention to metonymy at discourse level; while collections with 'metonymy' and 'metaphor' in the title, such as Barcelona (2000), Dirven & Pörings (2003) and Panther et al. (2009), give little space to the discussion of how metonymy and metaphor interact at discourse level. In the overview of writing on Metonymy in Discourse below, I consider work from semiotics (Jakobson, 1956) and literary linguistics (Lodge, 1977) as well as the work in cognitive linguistics, under headings which mirror the categories used in Section 2.

3.1 Metonymy Clusters

A 'metonymy cluster', in the way I am using the term here, is a group of individual metonymies, carefully chosen 'examples' used to convey a more general message. Metonymy clusters are a common and powerful rhetorical device. In a travel guide to a town in France, the shopping centre is described as a place where you can "shop, attend parties, enjoy concerts and prepare a meal in a rented apartment". These four examples are particular instances intended to be processed as metonymies, rather than a 'literal' list of all the possibilities open to a visitor to the centre. A metonymy cluster is not an exhaustive list like a shopping list or an inventory. If, for example, a text contained a list of all the facilities a gym or hotel offered, or all the things that take place in a village as part of seasonal festivities, these would be literal lists, not metonymic lists. The same items could be a literal list in one text and a metonymic list in the context of another. The impact of the cluster in the travel-guide example above is different from a generic phrase, such as *retail and entertainment possibilities*. The effect of a metonymy cluster is to reinforce argument by bringing the hearer/reader into closer physical contact with the situation being evoked through a register which is made more real and vivid.

The extract below is from a radio interview with a British bishop about the increased use of foodbanks (centres for distributing food to the needy) in the UK. It starts with a metonymy cluster consisting of two sentences (underlined):

> **Bishop Walker**: What we're finding is that this is about older people who are forced to choose between having the heating on or having breakfast. It's about children whose mums are faced with deciding who's going to go without a meal that day. Being on the breadline used to be a bit of a political metaphor. For half a million Britons it's now a tragic truth and the report we've just heard simply bears that out ('The World at One', *BBC Radio 4*, 20 February 2014).

The cluster gives two examples of people in society finding it hard to cope, older people and mothers. There are fewer components here than in the cluster from the travel guide discussed earlier, two rather than four, and they are longer. A 'cluster' may consist of a single example. Again the cluster demands that the hearer/reader processes the language involved metonymically, as non-literal; if understood literally, the issue discussed would seem to concern a much narrower topic, just two specific contexts.

It is not only the number but also the type of items which acts as a trigger; items in a metonymic lists are prototypical examples, as in this extract from a newspaper article:

> Compare 2000 London with the thin flame of Sixties Swinging London: then, there were only The Beatles, Carnaby Street, King's Road, Australians in damp Earl's Court basements, and a few thousand people discovering sex and pot (*London Evening Standard*, 12 May 2000, p13).

The choice of items signals that this is a metonymic list rather than a literal list. Our world knowledge tells us there was more to London in the 'Swinging Sixties' than is contained in the first three items. This is confirmed by the next item because it is so precise, *Australians in damp Earl's Court basements*; and finally, *a few thousand people discovering sex and pot*, leaves the reader in no doubt.

The impact of figurative thought on the larger scale of discourse gives rise to phenomena which are different in form and nature from those encountered at clause level, with the result that Metonymy in Discourse phenomena are not always immediately recognizable as examples of what most people think of as metonymy. The term 'metonymy' is, nonetheless, appropriate for describing the phenomenon outlined above because 'metonymy clusters' show the basic metonymic principle of a part-whole relationship: the examples are the parts; the more general message is the whole.

I also adopt 'metonymy' because the term is associated with this phenomenon in the literature. Jakobson makes fundamental statements about the role of metonymy in communication in his classic paper on aphasia, identifying two distinct 'poles' of communication, one metonymic, the other metaphoric (Jakobson, 1956). In the final section of this essay, he characterizes prose, cinema and realism as reflecting the metonymic 'way', and poetry, theatre and surrealism as metaphoric (Jakobson, 1956:76-79). Lodge takes up Jakobson's distinction, referring instead to metaphoric and metonymic 'modes' of writing (Lodge, 1977). He makes the important observations that writing may be metonymic at *text* level but not necessarily at *surface* level, and that 'metonymic writing' does not necessarily contain linguistic metonymies, consisting instead of 'literal' language and even metaphoric expressions: "It is metonymic writing, not metaphoric, even though it contains a few metaphors and no metonymies; it is metonymic in structure" (Lodge, 1977: 98-99). For the same reason that procedures developed for metaphor are not well equipped for identifying 'large scale' extended metaphor, the procedures developed for metonymy identification, such as those discussed by Littlemore (2015:125-127), are not well suited to the identification of metonymy clusters.

3.2 Metonymy Chains

The idea of a 'chain' of metonymies has two senses in the literature: a 'vertical' virtual sense and a 'horizontal' discourse sense (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:229). The vertical sense refers to multiple metonymic mappings initiated by a single lexical item, an inferred chain of concepts, each concept providing the vehicle for the next. Various terms have been used to describe this: 'chain of metonymies', e.g. *idea-word-page-book-library* (Reddy, 1993:186-187); '(inclusive) metonymic chain', e.g. *head-brain-*

thinking-mind-intelligence (Dirven, 2002:98, 103); 'chained metonymies' (Hilpert, 2010); and 'metonymic chaining', e.g. *glasses-goalkeeper-Preston North End football team* (Littlemore, 2015:131). I am concerned instead with the horizontal sense of a chain, a 'linear' sequence of metonymically-related lexical items linking across a text and serving a discourse function, for which I am using the term 'metonymy chain'.

There are many ways in which meaning relations between lexical items set up metonymy chains and networks in text, e.g. through meronymy, superordinancy, hyponymy, antonymy, but it is synonymy which I will use to illustrate metonymy chains in this section. In the theoretical framework of this article, meaning relations between synonyms are seen as metonymic because they involve parts and wholes: synonyms are related to each other metonymically because they share meaning components and because recognising relations between synonyms involves metonymic thinking. The extract below from a self-help book explores the relationship between Andrew and Gwen:

> Andrew handled his sensitivity and reactivity somewhat differently. Andrew's style was to turn a deaf ear to Gwen. She referred to this as the deep freeze. He was civil, even polite, but completely unavailable. Gwen had learned it was best to leave Andrew alone until he was ready to interact. Trying to talk with him when he pulled back was like cornering a fox, which will bite when trapped. It was hard for Gwen when Andrew walled her out. (D. Schnarch, *Resurrecting Sex: Resolving Sexual Problems and Rejuvenating Your Relationship*, 2002, p.42).

Each sentence in this passage enriches the message with a new term to describe emotional distance/isolation. A full picture of what being in a relationship with Andrew felt like for Gwen is built up through a chain of synonymous expressions (underlined). The terms are not exact equivalents but metonymically related, overlapping sufficiently for the reader to process them as related, made possible by "the 'Domain Availability Principle' and the existence of broad matrix domains" (Littlemore, 2015:192).

In Halliday & Hasan's account of cohesion in English, a chain of synonyms is one way 'reiteration' achieves 'lexical cohesion' in text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). I have chosen to use the term 'metonymy chain', rather than adopt Halliday & Hasan's terminology, to emphasise that the function of this sort of chain is not simply to re-refer, as Halliday & Hasan suggest, but to enrich meaning progressively as the text unfolds. The items in the chain in the text above, *turn a deaf ear*, *unavailable*, *not ready to interact* and *pull back*, have different associations, many of them metaphoric, and do not merely represent repetitions.

Viewing cohesion in terms of metonymic relations has been explored by Al-Sharafi (2004), Stirling (1996) and Brdar-Szabó & Brdar (2011). Al-Sharafi's cognitive-semiotic approach puts metonymy at the centre of communication and characterizes the 'sign' itself as metonymic. He considers all Halliday & Hasan's categories of cohesion, grammatical as well as lexical, to be metonymic, giving 'texture' through 'surface text ties' while also creating 'deeper' cognitive metonymic links: "I do not discuss cohesion as a set of surface text ties only, but from the point of view of its creation by metonymic relations in text" (Al-Sharafi, 2004:110). For Al-Sharafi, "metonymy accounts for the relations of lexical cohesion in a more satisfactory way than the term 'lexical cohesion' itself" (Al-Sharafi, 2004:126). Stirling examines cohesion in terms of metonymy but

concentrates on grammatical rather than lexical relations (Stirling, 1996). She uses the term 'metonymic anaphora' for contexts when a pronoun triggers an aspect of a lexical item different from the one initially intended, such as *they* triggering *Weight Watchers* in the sense of the 'people' rather than the 'institution' (Stirling, 1996:69); and maintains that inanimate to animate shifts such as these appear to be unproblematic in terms of processing in the studies she reviews (Stirling, 1996:71).

Brdar-Szabó & Brdar see the importance of metonymy in providing cohesion across text in their discussion of 'metonymic chains' (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:238). They distinguish between 'textual' and 'conceptual' metonymic chains. In a 'textual metonymic chain' the same lexeme is repeated across a text and different aspects of the lexical item are highlighted each time, allowing 'shifts' "between subdomains within a single domain matrix, picking different target meanings at different points in a text, while using a single lexeme as a metonymic source" (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:238-239). *Ancient Rome*, for example, can trigger various meanings – the territory of the Roman Empire, the city of Rome in Roman times, the influence, customs and culture of the Ancient Romans – depending on where it appears in a text. A 'conceptual' metonymic chain in contrast (more in line with my idea of a 'metonymy chain'), consists of different lexical items which develop a single mental concept as the reader progresses through the text, a series of different metonymic sources "unified by common metonymic targets" (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:232). Kimmel shows that a metonymic chain can be set up within the source domain of an extended metaphor, such as the chain *volte face, U-turn, withdrawing* (Kimmel, 2012:34).

3.3 Extended Metonymy

The third phenomenon I consider in this overview of Metonymy in Discourse is 'extended metonymy'. The term refers to the situation where a number of linguistic metonymies, all deriving from the same conceptual metonymy, occur together in close proximity. If the famous *Ham sandwich wants his check* example were extended to other people in the restaurant and their orders, we have an example of extending the FOOD ORDER FOR PERSON metonymy. Similarly, referring to people in a hospital ward by the conditions they are suffering would involve an extension of CONDITION FOR PERSON. Gibbs calls these 'contextual expressions' and gives an example where the desirability of future roommates is discussed through their possessions, referring to them as *steam iron, stereo, electric typewriter*, etc., through the extension of the metonymy POSSESSION FOR PERSON (Gibbs, 1994:334).

Under the heading 'Extended metonymy and viewpoint', Dancygier & Sweetser consider an example from *Passage to Juneau* by Jonathan Raban in which books on a sailing boat are thrown off the shelves onto the floor during rough seas (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014:194-195). A number of metonymies are used, BOOK-TITLE FOR THE PHYSICAL BOOK, AUTHOR'S NAME FOR THE PHYSICAL BOOK, BOOK-TITLE FOR IDEAS IN THE BOOK and AUTHOR'S NAME FOR THE AUTHOR AS A PERSON, which then gives rise to metaphoric language such as *unlikely tangle, pages gaping, jackets half-off* and *chance couplings*.

In my own example from an article about football in the UK, a paragraph deals with the injuries that players have suffered that season, using the metonymy INJURY FOR PLAYER (vehicle terms shown underlined below):

> England's other injury worries are also easing as the full complement of 23 players trained together for the first time in the Far East. Kieron Dyer (knee), Ashley Cole (neck) and David Seaman (groin) were all able to join (adapted from *London Metro,* May 29 2002, p48).

Extended metonymy involves novel rather than conventional expressions, deriving from the same conceptual metonymy and occurring together in the same section of text, thus showing parallels to 'extended metaphor' (Section 2.3), where a number of different linguistic expressions derive from the same conceptual metaphor. There is an important difference, however, as extended metaphor is more easily detected using identification procedures of the type discussed above than would be the case for extended metonymy. The reason for this is that conceptual metaphors, such as GOOD IS UP or LIFE IS A JOURNEY, pattern lexis according to specific domains; while the patterns organized by conceptual metonymies, such as OBJECT FOR PERSON or INANIMATE FOR ANIMATE, are more generalized and do not indicate specific lexical domains.

In this section, I have indicated that metonymic thinking, like metaphoric thinking, frequently plays a significant role not only at, and below, the level of the clause but also in organizing language at the level of the whole text. Not only does metonymy play a powerful role in discourse but it has many different manifestations and functions. The relationship between cognitive aspects of metonymy and linguistic manifestations of metonymy are complex and operate at different levels, with the consequence that figurative thought does not always manifest itself as figurative language. Having considered Metaphor in Discourse and Metonymy in Discourse individually in this and the previous section, I now look at how these phenomena interact.

4. Text Metaphtonymy

Goossens identifies four types of metaphtonymy, four ways in which metonymy and metaphor 'combine' and 'intertwine' at clause level (Goossens, 1990). These are paired into: *integrated metaphtonymy*, which comprises 'Metonymy within Metaphor' and 'Metaphor within Metonymy'; and *cumulative metaphtonymy,* which comprises 'Metaphor from Metonymy' and 'Metonymy from Metaphor' (Goossens, 1990:338). I will consider only *integrated metaphtonymy* as it is here that metonymy and metaphor combine but remain distinct. The word 'within' in Metonymy within Metaphor and Metaphor within Metonymy is key, as it pinpoints the salient notion that both metonymy and metaphor are present but that there is a scalar difference between the two elements, that there are two levels of magnitude. In *cumulative metaphtonymy*, 'from' indicates a process of derivation where either metonymy or metaphor is the 'end product' or 'result' (Goossens, 1990:338). While Goossens is concerned with strings of words of clause length or shorter, I am looking at the embedding of 'metonymy in metaphor' and 'metaphor in metonymy' on the larger scale of the whole text. For this I am using the term 'Text Metaphtonymy', while retaining Goossens' descriptors

'Metonymy within Metaphor' and 'Metaphor within Metonymy', considered in turn below.

4.1 Metonymy within Metaphor

To illustrate Metonymy within Metaphor at text level, I revisit to the *Olympics Games* text discussed in Section 2.3. The term 'Metonymy within Metaphor' indicates metaphor organizing a larger unit within which metonymy is present as a smaller unit, or, as Goossens puts it, "a metonymically used entity is embedded in a (complex) metaphorical expression" (Goossens, 1990:336). In the *Olympics Games* text, I am taking the whole text to be the larger unit, organized by the extended metaphor *LONDON IS A FLAT*, and the smaller unit the 'metonymy cluster' embedded within it, the tasks which have to be carried out before the games begin: *We have litter to pick, graffiti to scrub, and flowers to plant*. The *Olympics Games* text provides an example of a 'metonymy cluster' within an 'extended metaphor', and therefore a 'Metonymy within Metaphor'-type of Text Metaphtonymy.

The metonymy cluster in this example consists of three items – *litter to pick, graffiti to scrub, flowers to plant* – which express the **target** domain of the extended metaphor, LONDON; but a metonymy cluster could equally well draw from the source domain, as is the case in the spoken text below, part of an IT class where the extended metaphor *TEXT MANIPULATION IS PAINTING* is organizing the text at the whole-text level.

> My 'I-beam' is carrying a paint brush, so when I click on the mouse I know I will reformat the highlighted text. There is no point putting the paint brush in the paint and then putting it back in the pot. <u>You want to paint something, a fence, a door, a wall or something</u> (IT training session at a London University, adapted).

The instructor uses the 'metonymy cluster' *You want to paint something, a fence, a door, a wall or something* (underlined). The students are told that words in their documents need to be highlighted for the text-formatter tool to work, but the examples in the cluster, *a fence, a door, a wall or something*, are from the **source** domain, PAINTING, rather than the target domain of TEXT MANIPULATION. The *Olympic Games* and *IT Instruction* texts thus present a further distinction within Text Metaphtonymy, two types of 'Metonymy Cluster within Extended Metaphor', one in which the cluster is set up by the target domain, the other by the source domain.

A further pattern can be found in one of the 'Welcome to Holland!' texts discussed by Semino et al., where the metonymy cluster, *Coliseum, Sistine Chapel, gondolas*, is employed to represent 'Italy', drawing from the source domain TRAVEL of the extended metaphor *PARENTING IS TRAVEL* (Semino et al., 2013:53). This represents a second level of metonymy as Italy already stands for the larger category of all first-choice travel destinations, offering an instance of 'metonymy within metonymy within metaphor'.

4.2 Metaphor within Metonymy

I now illustrate the second of the two types of integrated metaphtonymy, Metaphor within Metonymy, using two examples, one in which metonymy is present as 'metonymy clusters' and the other as 'metonymy chains'. To illustrate the former, I use an example from a poem by the English poet Philip Larkin, *Toads Revisited* (Larkin, P., 1964, *The Whitsun Weddings*, p18-19). In this poem, metonymic clusters are used to evoke a number of different contexts: 'the park', 'the people you find in the park', 'what those people do during the day' and 'the office'. Looking closer we find there are local metaphors occurring within the larger frame of a metonymy cluster, a phenomenon noted by Lodge, who maintains that most metonymic texts "contain a good deal of local metaphor" (Lodge, 1977:111). The people in the park include 'clerks' and 'outpatients': *hare-eyed clerks with the jitters* and *wax-fleshed outpatients still vague from accidents*. *Hare* to describe 'eyes' and *wax* to describe 'flesh' are words used metaphorically; thus, we have an example of the 'Metaphor within Metonymy cluster'-type of Text Metaphtonymy.

A further level of complexity becomes apparent when we look at the poem in its entirety. On and above the metonymy clusters there is a further metaphoric layer, the *WORK IS A TOAD* metaphor which organizes the poem as a whole. This gives a hierarchical structure with three layers, the 'metonymy clusters' in the middle serving both as smaller units within the overall metaphoric framework of the poem and larger units in which local metaphors are embedded. The two types of *integrated metaphtonymy*, Metaphor within Metonymy and Metonymy within Metaphor, are found one within the other. Lodge recognizes this triple-decker metaphor-metonymy-metaphor structure in other Larkin poems, *The Whitsun Weddings* and *Church Going*, where examples of local metaphor are embedded in metonymic writing, while the overall framework of the poem is metaphoric (Lodge, 1977:217-218). This we might designate 'Metaphor within Metonymy within Metaphor'.

To illustrate Metaphor within Metonymy where metaphor occurs within a metonymy chain, I return to the *Andrew* text (Section 3.2). In this text, a 'metonymy chain' is set up through a string of synonyms which runs through the extract, establishing cohesion as well as adding to meaning item by item. As some of the items in the chain are metaphoric, ie *to turn a deaf ear*, *the deep freeze*, *pulled back*, *walled her out*, we have an example of local metaphor occurring within a metonymy chain. In Goossens' dictionary data, Metaphor within Metonymy is "extremely rare"[1], accounting for only one example, while Metonymy within Metaphor is "quite current" (Goossens, 1990:336). Goossens suggests the reason for this asymmetry is the tendency for metaphor to 'metaphorize' the expression in which it is found: "A metaphor inserted into a metonym would seem to metaphorize the whole, whereas a metonym integrated into a metaphor does not appear to have the power to metonymize the metaphor" (Goossens, 1990:338). At discourse level, however, a different picture emerges: on the larger scale of the whole text, Metaphor within Metonymy is common and the tendency to metaphorize is resisted.

[1] Metaphor within Metonymy is mistakenly given as Metaphor *from* Metonymy in the Abstract of Goossens' 1990 article, but appears corrected in the 2003 reprint (Goossens, 2003).

5. Conclusion

One lesson gained from the 'cognitivist turn' in metaphor scholarship is that metaphor is not just a text phenomenon but primarily about how we think. It follows that if metaphor is about thought, it can potentially have an impact on any size of unit of language, from the very small to the very large, from short word-strings to long stretches of language. I have offered an original framework for overviewing the various ways figurative thought manifests itself in speech and writing by looking at Metonymy in Discourse in terms of clusters, chains and extended metonymy and Metaphor in Discourse in terms of clusters, chains and extended metaphor[2]. I have then used this framework to demonstrate how metonymic reasoning and metaphoric reasoning combine in Text Metaphtonymy and the many forms it can take. Hierarchal metaphor–metonymy–metaphor organizations in text have also been discussed.

The different types of Text Metaphtonymy discussed above involve only three of the Metaphor and Metonymy in Discourse phenomena described in Sections 2 and 3, namely 'extended metaphor', 'metonymy clusters' and 'metonymy chains'. I suggest that many more metonymy-metaphor combinations are possible, though certain combinations offer greater opportunities for Text Metaphtonymy. We have seen that extended metaphor, metonymy clusters and metonymy chains have the capacity for setting up larger-scale structures within text and interactions at discourse level; but there is no reason in principle why the remaining three phenomena, 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metonymy', could not also form Text Metaphtonymies. As they operate on a smaller scale, the interactions will tend to be more along the lines of Goossens' clause-level examples.

I hope the contribution made by the present study may suggest the direction in which further research in this field might take and ways in which these ideas might be applied. Short, and often self-contained, examples have been given in this article for clarity of explanation but the phenomena discussed are to be found operating in longer texts, across whole books and between texts. Text Metaphtonymy is undoubtedly interesting in its own right as a meaning-making phenomenon, and the motivation for the present article has been to investigate it as such, but a further motivation for studying Text Metaphtonymy is to explore the implications it has for training language professionals. What the experienced practitioner does automatically, the novice needs to learn. Those training to be journalists, speech writers, copywriters, text editors, language teachers, translators and interpreters, among others, would benefit, I feel, from the explicit teaching of the figurative text-phenomena discussed in this article. Further research may then embrace more extensive studies which are both systematic and domain specific.

[2] Elsewhere (Denroche 2015) I have given four of these phenomena other names as my purpose there was different, to contrast the use of metonymy and metaphor in changing register with their use in patterning lexis. The terms correspond as follows (present article first, then the 2015 publication): Metonymy Cluster = Discourse Metonymy, Metaphor Cluster = Discourse Metaphor, Metonymy Chain = Textual Metonymy, Extended Metaphor = Textual Metaphor.

REFERENCES

Al-Sharafi, A. (2004). *Textual metonymy: A semiotic approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Barcelona, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Benczes, R., Barcelona, A., & Ruiz de Mendoza, F. (Eds.). (2011). *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brdar-Szabó, R., & Brdar, M. (2011). What do metonymic chains reveal about the nature of metonymy? In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona & F. Ruiz de Mendoza (Eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view* (pp. 217-248). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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: Continuum.

Cameron, L. (2008). Metaphor and talk. In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 197-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L. (2010). The discourse dynamics framework for metaphor. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities* (pp. 77-94). London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(4), 671-690.

Cameron, L., & Low, G. (2004). Figurative variation in episodes of educational talk and text. *European Journal of English Studies, 78*(3), 355-377.

Cameron, L., Low, G., & Maslen, R. (2010). Finding systematicity in metaphor use. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities* (pp. 116-146). London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (2010a). Identifying metaphors in discourse data. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities* (pp. 97-115). London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (Eds.). (2010b). *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities*. London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., Maslen, R., Todd, Z., Maule, J., Stratton, P., & Stanley, N. (2009). The discourse dynamic approach to metaphor and metaphor-led analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *24*(2), 63-89.

Cameron, L., & Stelma, J. (2004). Metaphor clusters in discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 107-136.

Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2014). *Figurative language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darian, S. (2000). The role of figurative language in introductory science texts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 163-186.

Deignan, A. (2005a). A corpus linguistic perspective on the relationship between metonymy and metaphor. *Style 39*(1), 72-91.

Deignan, A. (2005b). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Deignan, A., Littlemore, J., & Semino, E. (2013). *Figurative language, genre and register*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denroche, C. (2015). *Metonymy and language: A new theory of linguistic processing*. New York/London: Routledge.

Dirven, R. (2002). Metonymy and metaphor: Different mental strategies of conceptualisation. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 75-111). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Dirven, R., & Pörings, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London: Routledge.
Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics, 1*(3), 323-340.
Goossens, L. (2003). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 349-377). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
Hilpert, M. (2010). Chained Metonymies. In J. Newman and S. A. Rice (Eds.), *Experimental and empirical methods in cognitive functional research* (pp. 181-194). Stanford: CSLI.
Jakobson, R. (1956). Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbances. In R. Jakobson & M. Halle, *Fundamentals of language* (pp. 53-82). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
Kimmel, M. (2010). Why we mix metaphors (and mix them well): Discourse coherence, conceptual metaphor, and beyond. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 97-115.
Kimmel, M. (2012). Optimizing the analysis of metaphor in discourse. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics, 10*(1), 1-48.
Koller, V. (2003). Metaphor clusters, metaphor chains: Analyzing the multifunctionality of metaphor in text. *metaphorik.de, 5*, 115-134.
Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden shortcuts in language, thought and communication.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lodge, D. (1977). *The modes of modern writing: Metaphor, metonymy and the typology of modern literature.* London: Arnold.
Low, G. (2008). Metaphor and positioning in academic book reviews. In M. Zanotto, L. Cameron & M. Cavalcanti (Eds.), *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic approach* (pp. 79-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Musolff, A. (2000). Political imagery of Europe: A house without exit doors. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 21*(3). 216-229.
Panther, K., & Radden, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Panther, K., & Thornburg, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Panther, K., Thornburg, L., & Barcelona, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 22*(1), 1-39.

Reddy, M. (1993). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp.164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schön, D. (1993). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 137-163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Semino, E., Deignan A., & Littlemore, J. (2013). Metaphor, genre, and recontextualization. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 28(1), 41-59.
Steen, G. (2002). Identifying metaphor in language: A cognitive approach. *Style, 36*(3) 386-407.
Steen, G. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Steen, G. (2014). Why figurative thought and language are not enough: On the crucial role of metaphor in communication. Paper given at 1st International Symposium on Figurative Thought and Language. April 25-26, 2014, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
Steen, G., Dorst, A., Berenike Herrmann, J., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Stefanowitsch, A. & Gries, S. (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Stirling, L. (1996). Metonymy and anaphora. In W. de Mulder & L. Tasmowski (Eds.), *Coherence and anaphora* (pp. 69-88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.