Chapter 1 MIPVU in multiple languages

Susan Nacey (Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Norway), *Aletta G. Dorst (Leiden University, The Netherlands)*, *Tina Krennmayr (VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands)*, *W. Gudrun Reijnierse (*Centre for Language Studies*, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands) and Gerard J. Steen (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)*

1.1 Why MIPVU in multiple languages?

"Metaphor is booming business" (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b[1]: 1). This statement is as true today as it was years ago when it first appeared in the groundbreaking volume, *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification – from MIP to MIPVU*. The number of publications, conferences and workshops dedicated to metaphor only seems to be increasing, as do the number of contributions that are explicit about the metaphor identification method that has been applied. And, perhaps inspired by the emerging rigor in the field, additional explicit methods for identifying figurative language have emerged, such as methods for the identification of verbal irony (Burgers et al. 2011), hyperbole (Burgers et al. 2016), and deliberate metaphor (Reijnierse et al. 2017). Protocols or guidelines also now exist for identifying metaphor in visuals (see Negro, Šorm & Steen 2017; Steen 2018), gesture (Cienki 2017), and American Sign Language (Rousch 2018).

These developments have moved metaphor research forward. The academic community is clearly taking metaphor identification seriously, in the goal of producing reliable, replicable, and theoretically valid metaphor research. However, being both experienced metaphor

---

[1] For ease of reference, this publication is referred to as Steen et al. (2010b), even though one of the co-authors of Steen et al. (2010b) – Pasma – is not a co-author of Steen et al. (2010a).

identifiers and (native/highly proficient) speakers of languages other than English (Austrian German, Dutch, German, French, Norwegian), we have long felt that what has been missing so far are protocols for identifying metaphor in languages other than English. Seminal works on how to identify and analyze metaphor in discourse, such as Cameron & Maslen (2010), Charteris-Black (2004), Pragglejaz Group (2007), Heywood, Semino & Short (2002), remain heavily biased towards English.

Through our experiences with teaching courses in metaphor identification as well as other interaction with the scientific community, we have come into contact with students and colleagues who have already tried to systematically apply MIP or MIPVU to texts in languages other than English. Overall, such applications are quite successful because it has proven possible to apply the general principle of contrasting and comparing contextual and basic meanings of words to virtually every language. However, when it comes to the more nuanced details of the protocol, researchers found themselves struggling to adjust the method in ways that would address language-specific issues. Publications started to emerge where researchers explained how they adjusted MIPVU to other languages (e.g. Badryzlova et al. 2013 on Russian), but these appeared in piecemeal fashion. The time was ripe to systematically collect the experiences of a number of scholars who have applied MIP or MIPVU to a variety of languages and who have, in the process of so doing, adapted the original metaphor identification procedure to make it work for the languages they are researching.

The aim of this volume is to bring together adjustments and adaptations of MIP and MIPVU across a range of different languages and language families into one coherent overview. While some of the chapters provide a detailed account of an adjusted procedure in terms of reliability and application to a (relatively) large amount of data, other chapters have a more explorative, qualitative character. The chapters explicitly discuss how to handle both operational issues (e.g. the availability of dictionaries, tools for part-of-speech annotation, polyword lists) and language-specific features. Together, the contributions to this volume provide invaluable insight into the many different issues that require consideration when applying MIP or MIPVU to authentic discourse in languages other than English, as well as into some issues that arise when working with English as a Lingua Franca.

The present chapter provides background information about MIP and MIPVU and goes on to explain the structure of the volume. Section 1.2 discusses methods for linguistic metaphor introduction, beginning with a brief overview of the development of MIP and MIPVU in section 1.2.1 Section 1.2.2 then explains the main differences between MIP and MIPVU, while section 1.2.3 looks at some possible 'rival' metaphor procedures and contrasts them to MIP/MIPVU.

This section also touches on some of the different types of research that has hitherto been conducted through employing (some variation of) MIP or MIPVU. The chapter continues with section 1.3, which contextualizes the procedures through and interview with Gerard Steen where he reflects on the past, present and future of linguistic metaphor identification in an interview. We then explain in section 1.4 how we envisage readers will work with our volume: not necessarily by reading straight through from the first to the final page. Finally, section 1.5 concludes by providing an overview of the chapters that follow.

1.2 Methods for linguistic metaphor identification

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) observation that metaphor is a central aspect of our daily lives, both in language and in thought, created a widespread interest in the analysis of metaphor. As Johnson wrote in 1981,

> We are in the midst of a metaphormania. Only three decades ago the situation was just the opposite: poets created metaphors, everybody used them, and philosophers (linguists, psychologists, etc.) ignored them. Today we seem possessed by metaphor. As Wayne Booth has mused, judging from the jump in interest in metaphor between 1940 and the present, if we extrapolate to the year 2039, there will be more students of metaphor than there are people. (Johnson 1981: ix)[2]

Much recent research into metaphor still takes its starting point in the basic tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), according to which metaphors in language are reflections of underlying mappings between conceptual domains. However, the CMT's intuition-based approach to linguistic metaphor does not cater to the systematic identification of the manifestations of metaphor in authentic discourse (Semino 2008). In the absence of an analytical tool for metaphor identification, researchers therefore simply had to rely upon their own intuitions. Intuition is hardly a reliable instrument, as it leads to inconsistency; it necessarily varies from individual to individual, depending upon measurer bias, and it even varies in terms of decisions made by the same individual at different times. As a result, the need

---

[2] Johnson (1981: x) provides the following source for the Booth contention: Wayne C. Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation" *Critical Inquiry 5*, no. 1 (1978): 49-72.

for an explicit method for the identification of linguistic metaphor became more widely recognized (see e.g. Cameron 1999, 2003; Steen 2002; Charteris-Black 2004; Cienki 2008; Semino, Heywood & Short 2004).

1.2.1 The development of MIP and MIPVU

In the year 2000, ten metaphor researchers from different disciplines formed what became known as the Pragglejaz Group (Steen, 2002). The goal of this group was to discover whether a consensus could be reached about what constitutes metaphor, in order to subsequently develop a set of clear guidelines enabling researchers to identify linguistic metaphor in a valid, transparent and consistent way. Such guidelines are considered "essential toward placing interdisciplinary metaphor research on a firm empirical footing, which implies that the results of [the] analyses can be verified and replicated" (Gibbs 2010: 9). The Pragglejaz Group published the fruits of their collaboration in a 2007 article, *MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse*. Here, they introduced the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), a protocol also known as the *Pragglejaz procedure*. MIP is intended as a reliable, replicable, and theoretically valid procedure for identifying linguistic metaphors in contemporary language – that is, metaphorical expressions in the language of written and spoken discourse. The procedure details how to identify metaphorically used words, or *indirect metaphors*.[3] Specifically, MIP consists of a series of steps that help an analyst determine whether there is a contrast and comparison between the contextual and a more basic sense of a lexical unit (which typically corresponds to the orthographic word; Pragglejaz Group 2007: 3).

As an example, in Bruce Springsteen's lyrics *I'm om fire and born to run*, the word *fire* is classified by MIP as an indirect metaphor: the contextual sense of this lexical unit is 'strong feelings such as anger or enthusiasm', while a more basic, concrete sense is 'flames and heat from something that is burning in an uncontrolled way'. These meanings are considered sufficiently distinct by virtue of being listed as separate entries in the corpus-based, contemporary English *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners* (the procedure's primary recommended 'go-to' dictionary; Pragglejaz Group 2007: 16). In addition, these two senses are related through comparison: strong emotions can be compared to flames and heat.

---

[3] Note that the distinction between indirect and direct metaphor is made by MIPVU, but not by MIP (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a). MIP was developed to identify indirect metaphors only, and used the term metaphorically used words to refer to these (Pragglejaz Group 2007). For the sake of clarity and consistency, however, we already adopt MIPVU terminology here.

Later empirical studies showed that indirect metaphors are by far the most frequent type of metaphor, accounting for almost 99% of all metaphor depending upon text type (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010a: 784).

In a subsequent large-scale research project, MIP was applied to a corpus of texts from four different registers (fiction, academic discourse, conversations, and news). This work led to the development of MIPVU, an extended version of the original protocol, that was published in the 2010 volume *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU* (Steen, Dorst et al. 2010b). The MIPVU procedure is reproduced with permission as Chapter 2 of this volume (see Nacey 2013: 65-69; Steen 2002; Steen 2017: 73-74 for further accounts about the development of MIP and MIPVU).

1.2.2 MIP vs. MIPVU

The main difference between MIP and MIPVU is that, while the former is restricted to the identification of *indirect metaphor* only, the latter procedure also allows analysts to identify two additional types of metaphor: *direct metaphor* and *implicit metaphor*. In direct metaphors, there is no contrast between the contextual and basic senses of the word in question, even though an underlying metaphorical comparison is evident. In such cases, the metaphor is expressed through 'direct' language. Going back to Bruce Springsteen lyrics discussed earlier, consider the line about a man who *end[s] like a dog that's been beat too much.* Here, the contextual 'animal' sense of the lexical unit 'dog' is the same as the more basic sense of the word. Given that the line refers to a person, however, there is clearly an underlying cross-domain mapping at play, signaled here by the preposition *like* – what MIPVU terms a *metaphor flag* (*MFlag*; see Chapter 2, this volume: p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**).

The third type of metaphor that may be identified using MIPVU, *implicit metaphor*, consists of cohesive grammatical or semantic links that refer back to recoverable metaphors. Examples of implicit metaphors are demonstrative pronouns (e.g. *that, this*) that refer to an indirect metaphor that is used earlier in a text. Although they contribute to the overall metaphor density of any given text, they are arguably less interesting for most studies involving discourse analysis.

A further important innovation of MIPVU is the inclusion of additional terms needed for linguistic metaphor analysis (beyond the term *Mflag*). All indirect metaphors (i.e. those metaphors identified by both MIP and MIPVU) derive their metaphorical status from a comparative contrast between contextual and basic senses. For direct and implicit metaphors

(i.e. those metaphor types identified only by MIPVU), by contrast, an underlying conceptual metaphor is realized by words that are *not* used metaphorically themselves. As a result, the MIPVU protocol introduced the term *metaphor-related words* (MRWs), a term that encompasses all three types of metaphor.

Moreover, MIPVU introduced tags including *When in doubt, leave it in (WIDLII)*, and *Discarded for metaphor analysis (DFMA)*. WIDLII allows for the retention of borderline cases where ambiguity may prevent the precise determination of contextual meaning, as well as cases involving the sometimes fuzzy distinction between metaphor and metonymy. DFMA is reserved for those instances where metaphor identification is simply not possible; we occasionally find this in, for instance, disfluencies in (transcribed) speech, such as when a word is truncated and the analyst is unable to determine the intended lexis with certainty (see e.g. Nacey 2013: 69-79 for a more detailed description of the differences between MIP and MIPVU).

In addition to accounting for more types of metaphors (direct, implicit) and providing additional codes for metaphor flags and unclear cases (WIDLII, DFMA), MIPVU introduces a series of additional rules for the analysis of specific grammatical features. In contrast to MIP, MIPVU does *not* allow comparison of contextual and basic meanings across word class boundaries. Whereas the Pragglejaz Group (2007: 16) considered words belonging to different word classes a single lexical unit, the MIPVU protocol requires that contextual and basic meanings be compared *within* the same grammatical category. As an example, while MIP thus allows analysts to compare the sense entries of *dog* (noun) with *dog* (verb) for metaphor, MIPVU treats these two words as distinct lexical units whose senses cannot be compared. A parallel rule extends to different types of verbs (such as linking verbs, primary verbs, etc.), to transitive versus intransitive uses of verbs, and also to countable versus uncountable nouns. The basic justification for such modifications is that words in discourse need to be analyzed in the morphological and syntactic context in which they appear, rather than from which they are derived (which would entail a different type of research, into the morphological structure of the language; Steen, Biernacka et al. 2010: 175).

Furthermore, MIPVU also provides detailed criteria for determining whether a lexical unit is used metaphorically, by (for instance) giving detailed instructions for identifying contextual and more basic meanings, as well as for deciding about whether they are sufficiently distinct, yet similar at the same time. All in all, while the basic rules for deciding whether a word is used metaphorically are identical in both MIP and MIPVU, the later protocol is a more detailed, extended version of its predecessor.

1.2.3 Other methods for linguistic metaphor identification

Arguably the most common alternative to MIPVU for identifying metaphor, over time, has been reliance upon intuition (see e.g. Kövecses 2011), whereby a scholar proclaims what is (and is not) linguistic or conceptual metaphor. As pointed out in Section 1.2.1, such a situation is problematic, in part because "variability in intuitions, and lack of precision about what counts as a metaphor, makes it quite difficult to compare different empirical analyses" (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 2). Indeed, intuition does not actually constitute a method, and can neither be taught nor learned (Cienki 2008: 254). Nowadays, however, "the problem of metaphor identification in language is by and large under control. Linguists now have a range of methods to choose from..." (Steen 2017: 74). Apart from MIP and MIPVU, on which this volume focuses, other metaphor identification procedures are available to researchers that do not rely primarily on intuitive analysis. At the core of many of these various metaphor identification procedures is a shared understanding that metaphorical words involve some form of contrast between two semantic domains or areas – that is, a metaphorical word displays some sort of contextual 'incongruity' that may be examined against a set of defining criteria of linguistic metaphor.[4]

Kittay, for instance, proposed a metaphor identification procedure that predates the Pragglejaz work by nearly two decades, aiming to specify "what is required of an utterance and its accompanying circumstances for us to *correctly* characterize an utterance as a candidate for a metaphorical reading" (Kittay 1984: 191, italics in the original). Importantly, she observes that no word is inherently metaphorical, meaning that the only way to determine whether a word is metaphorically used is by considering the word in context. She proposes four necessary but sufficient conditions that have to be met for a word to be considered a metaphor, one of which is that "the utterance, taken along with its context, displays a discernible oddity or (...) is announced to be metaphorical" (Kittay 1984: 190). Such an oddity, she suggests, might arise out of, for example, an incongruity between first- and second-order interpretations of a word, i.e. between what MIPVU terms the contextual versus a more basic meaning. To the best of our

---

[4] Note, however, that Loewenberg (1981) attempted to develop a system from a philospher's viewpoint for identifying (some) metaphors, analyzing them as "statements without truth value". She also (correctly) predicted, "I doubt very much that this paper will be the last word on the problem of identifying metaphors" (Loewenberg 1981: 177).

knowledge, Kittay's (1984) procedure did not gain much ground in metaphor studies, and has not been tested empirically.

More recent methods that have attracted a fair amount of attention from metaphor researchers include Charteris-Black's (2004) and Cameron's (2003) approaches to metaphor identification (see Steen 2017). Charteris-Black's (2004) approach to metaphor identification involves a close reading of a small sample of text with the aim of finding metaphor candidates. These terms are then measured against specific criteria used to define metaphor, specifically "the presence of incongruity or semantic tension – either at linguistic, pragmatic, or cognitive levels – resulting from a shift in domain use – even if this shift occurred some time before and has since become conventionalized" (Charteris-Black 2004: 35). Words that have been identified in this way as being commonly used in a metaphorical sense are then classified as keywords, and utilized as search terms in a larger corpus, in order to find more examples of these metaphors. Other scholars have suggested variations of using key terms to aid in extracting metaphors from a larger corpus (see e.g. Koller 2004; Stefanowitsch 2006). Charteris-Black's approach differs from these approaches in that he also provides a means for deciding why a particular word is judged as a metaphor. However, his procedure lacks enough detail to be applied in a reliable and replicable way by different researchers.

Cameron's (2003) *Metaphor Identification through Vehicle terms procedure* (MIV), was developed more or less concurrently with the Pragglejaz Group's (2007) MIP protocol (see also Cameron & Maslen 2010). Some of the underlying tenets of MIV are based on and/or agree with those of MIP. For instance, the ultimate goal of both procedures is to develop an operational definition of metaphor ideally enabling researchers to identify all words in a particular piece of discourse that are metaphor. Moreover, as in Kittay's (1984) proposal, MIV aims to identify text that "can be justified as somehow anomalous, incongruent, or 'alien' in the on-going discourse, but that can be made sense of through a transfer of meaning in the context" (Cameron & Maslen 2010: 102). The main difference between MIV and MIP/MIPVU, however, is that MIV maintains that a metaphor may extend beyond a single word, while MIP and MIPVU takes the lexical unit as the unit of analysis. Grounded in a discourse dynamics approach, MIV finds metaphor in individual words, but also in chunks of language: contextually incongruous terms that function as *metaphor vehicles*. As an example, Cameron and Maslen (2010: 108) explain that a phrase such as *flaw in the system* would be analyzed as three metaphorical words by MIP (*flaw, in, system*), but as a single metaphor vehicle by MIV. The 'trick' with MIV then lies in deciding where a vehicle begins and ends – a borderline that is sometimes fuzzy.

While different other procedures for the manual identification of linguistic metaphor have thus been introduced over time, the MIPVU protocol currently offers the most thorough and well-tested guidelines (Steen 2017: 74). Since the publication of the Pragglejaz Group (2007) paper and Steen, Dorst et al.'s (2010b) book on MIPVU, the metaphor identification procedure has been adopted (or adapted) in a large number of studies. These include the investigations that were carried out during the development of MIPVU into the prevalence of metaphor in different registers: fiction (Dorst 2011), written academic discourse (Herrmann 2013), everyday conversations (Kaal 2012) and news (Krennmayr 2011). Others have used MIP or MIPVU to study the use of metaphor in a range of other settings or text types, including in corporate communication (e.g. Cornelissen 2012), health communication (e.g. Bates 2015; Semino et al. 2017), music discourse (Pérez-Sobrino & Julich 2014), university lectures (e.g. Beger 2011; Low et al. 2008), and foreign language learning (e.g. Littlemore et al. 2014; Nacey 2013). Further uses of the procedures have been to e.g. create valid stimulus materials for experimental research (e.g. Boeynaems et al. 2017; Reijnierse et al. 2015). In short, MIP and MIPVU have successfully addressed a need in the research community for a valid, replicable and transparent metaphor identification procedure – at least when it comes to English discourse. The time is now ripe to direct focus to their application to languages other than English.

1.3 Perspectives on the past, present and future of linguistic metaphor identification: An interview with Gerard Steen

You were the person who brought together the PRAGGLEJAZ Group (Peter Crisp, Ray Gibbs, Alan Cienki, Graham Low, Gerard Steen, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joe Grady, Alice Deignan and Zoltan Kövecses), 10 scholars from widely different backgrounds, disciplines and approaches to metaphor analysis that developed MIP in 2007. Why these particular people?

The Pragglejaz group were a mix of metaphor scholars who all shared one goal: to develop a reliable method for metaphor identification 'in the wild' given the promise and success of the cognitive linguistic approach since 1980. This goal was a methodological goal that aimed for maximum coverage of the phenomena involved: we wanted to cater to literary versus non-literary texts (e.g. Crisp, Semino, and myself), written versus spoken discourse (e.g. Cameron, Deignan, Low), patterns of metaphor use across different languages (e.g. Cienki, Deignan, Kövecses), while at the same time having expertise about metaphor as cross-domain mappings

(e.g. Cienki, Gibbs, Grady, and Kövecses), linguistic manifestations of metaphor in a wide range of linguistic forms (e.g. Crisp, Semino, myself), and about the way all of these phenomena could be observed, manipulated and even applied in production, reception, interaction, and cultural as well as historical processes (more or less all of us). It has been essential for the development of the tool as an instrument for the analysis of the semiotic structure and function of metaphor in language use and discourse to have this expertise round the table, in order not to conflate structure with process, one of the big problems in metaphor research.

Was it important to include people from different theoretical and methodological backgrounds? Did these differences lead to any particular hurdles or conversely, to interesting new insights into metaphor identification issues?

Different theoretical backgrounds needed to be represented, because the cognitive-linguistic approach was clearly dominant yet at the same time could not be taken as gospel truth. Its emphasis on the tight connection between language and thought, for instance, is just one way of looking at metaphor in language use and discourse that is not endorsed by all linguists and other researchers. Alternative views needed to be taken into account in order not to bias the development of the instrument into just one direction for just one part of the phenomenon.

Similarly, different methodological skills were needed to bring together all of these insights into one simple and generally acceptable tool as well. This was the reason we wanted expertise in lexicography (Deignan, Kövecses), text analysis (Crisp, Semino, myself), conceptual analysis (Cienki, Gibbs, Grady, Kövecses), conversation analysis (Cameron, Low), and psychological experiments (Gibbs, myself). With all of this variegated expertise, we guaranteed that we did not make unwarranted assumptions from just one perspective while trying to remain as maximally inclusive as was needed for the aim of the tool.

People who are new to MIPVU often think it is 'only a method' and remain unaware that it is part of a theoretical tradition and presupposes a particular approach to and definition of metaphor. Can you comment on how you see the relation between metaphor theory and MIPVU?

Methods are tools to measure theoretical constructs. MIPVU is an extension of MIP, which attempted to measure the linguistic manifestation of metaphor as a cross-domain mapping in thought, largely in the tradition of cognitive linguistics. This is theoretical starting point which drives all of MIPVU. For instance, MIP and MIPVU do not assume that metaphor as a cross-domain mapping in thought is necessarily conventional or systematic, as with conceptual

metaphor. It can be used in such work, but MIP and MIPVU do not make this assumption: they only assume that metaphor in discourse can be measured as a manifestation of cross-domain mappings in thought. In that sense, MIP and MIPVU measure something that is theoretically quite specific.

MIPVU also does this in a certain way: it relies on the contrast but comparability between distinct word senses as manifestations of different underlying concepts. When metaphors are defined as cross-domain mappings, they involve distinct concepts that are comparable across conceptual domains, as is clear from most cognitive-linguistic and related work on metaphor in language use. This means that the method makes quite a few assumptions about words, senses, and concepts as well as distinction and comparability; these assumptions need spelling out and operationalization in order to work as part of the tool for measurement. In that sense, again, MIPVU measures something that is theoretically quite specific.

Do you feel the use of MIPVU is equally relevant and necessary for all kinds of metaphor research?

Any analysis of language use or discourse that makes claims about the structure, function or processing of metaphor along the above theoretical lines needs to be able to show that the relevant expressions can be reliably identified as related to metaphor in the way spelled out by MIPVU or some comparable procedure. It helps researchers to be precise, explicit and consistent in their work, and it helps other researchers to be fair to previous work because they can apply the same criteria when attempting to check or replicate research. This does not mean that every research project needs to run a complete MIPVU analysis across all of the relevant data all the time. This depends on the goal and nature of the research. And if such a complete analysis is not conducted, then research reports should signal that their data collection and analysis may not be as reliable as is optimally possible, which in turn has consequences for the reliability and validity of the results and conclusions.

But comparisons of metaphor use across languages, for instance, need to take a stand on how metaphor can be found in those languages in the same way, for methodological consistency is crucial for any comparison across phenomena. MIPVU can alert researchers to the differences between the two sets of phenomena by forcing them to consider the data in exactly the same way. Something similar applies to any comparison of metaphor use between categories within one language, for instance between different kinds of language users, domains, registers, and so on. What counts as a distinct word, sense, concept, and so on in such comparisons needs to be stable in order to apply the same theory and method across different studies.

What are the limitations of MIPVU? What does the method* not *do for metaphor analysts?

The biggest limitation of MIPVU is that it makes assumptions about the relation between words, senses, and concepts from a limited linguistic perspective—precisely the reason why this book is so needed. But this is also its strength: MIPVU illustrates how metaphor research in the past four decades has taken languages like English, French, German and Dutch as a useful starting point for coming to terms with the big issue of how metaphor in thought is manifested in metaphor in language use. The challenge now is to see how the assumptions and findings for these languages can be compared with the situation with other, radically different languages.

What MIPVU also does not do is specify the nature and content of the underlying cross-domain mapping. All it delivers is the words that are presumably related to some underlying conceptual domain functioning as a source for a metaphor mapping – however, exactly what that source domain is and how it is related to the target is an open issue which requires additional analysis. For discourse analysis, this can be done by means of my five-step method, where the first of the five steps is MIPVU to identify the potential metaphor-related words (MRWs). The remaining steps uncover the underlying cross-domain mappings; in this way, the five-step method acts a wider theoretical framework for MIPVU. Since MIPVU does not deliver cross-domain mappings, it certainly does not produce manifestations of conceptual metaphors. The MRWs identified through MIPVU need to be independently sorted and grouped in terms of conceptual structures, as is for instance also done by Lynne Cameron's approach to systematic metaphor [Editors' note: see e.g. Cameron 2007].

What is more, MIPVU does not inform researchers whether the identified MRWs were processed by means of cross-domain mappings in the mind of the sender or the receiver. It only points to meaning structure in language use. Their relation to meaning structures in thought is already problematic and may pertain to structures in conceptual systems that are social and historical rather than individual – but even these are reconstructions of meaning, not of psychological processes. MIPVU cannot get near those phenomena because it simply looks at structures and function and does not examine psychological processes and products. And finally, MIPVU does not necessarily yield a reliable dataset either. It takes researchers a long time to learn how to apply the procedure, and when they have acquired it, they may still make quite a few mistakes – as is only natural. Therefore, reliability always needs to be checked and reported.

A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification *was published in 2010, after an investment of many years' work. What did you hope would result from its publication and has that result been realized? Any unanticipated results?*

My main hope was that metaphor researchers looking at language use would become aware of the methodological issues involved in this work. I also meant for the book to be a follow-up to the 2007 MIP article by the Pragglejaz Group: in the research project where we applied MIP, we found how many open issues there still were and we hoped that spelling them out would help other researchers and improve the state of the art. If we want to increase the quality of linguistic research into metaphor up to a level that is acceptable for social and cognitive science researchers (as was the goal of the Pragglejaz Group), we need to play the game with generally accepted rules of conducting good research, and this requires a generally accepted method for observing (measuring) this slippery phenomenon called metaphor. Judging by conference talks, journal publications, and references to the book, this goal has clearly begun to register with many metaphor researchers.

The biggest unanticipated result of the book is the fact that it forms an important theoretical and methodological basis for the development of what has come to be called Deliberate Metaphor Theory. The notion of direct metaphor, encompassing simile and other forms of direct expression of the source domain of cross-domain mapping, has been essential for postulating that some metaphors are expressed *as* metaphors while most others are not. This has led to the more general notion that some metaphors are used as metaphors in communication, while most metaphors are not, which in turn has led to the distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor. I am extremely happy that the methodological distinction between direct and indirect metaphor has proved to be autonomously productive in theory, method and research in this unanticipated way.

Another unanticipated result of the MIPVU book is that we now also have other identification procedures which have been developed along the same lines. There is VIP, the Verbal Irony Procedure developed by Christian Burgers, and HIP, the Hyperbole Identification procedure, developed by Christian and myself together with Kiki Renardel de Lavalette and Britta Brugman. Moreover, MIPVU has been the basis for what has come to be called Deliberate Metaphor Theory, and the brand-new Deliberate Metaphor Identification Procedure, developed by Gudrun Reijnierse. All of these are procedures that enlarge the toolkit of linguists and discourse analysts interested in the reliable identification of figuration 'in the wild' from one consistent and encompassing but specific perspective. [Editors' note: Cienki's 2017 metaphor identification guidelines for gesture as well as a procedure for visual metaphor

identification may be added to the list of MIPVU-inspired spin-offs. References for all these procedures are found at the end of this chapter.]

How would you sum up and characterize the reception that MIPVU has received in the scientific community, both positive and negative?

I see two main responses: one that is positive about the extension and refinement, and one that is a little hesitant about the laborious nature of the procedure. For instance, the refinement leading to the distinction between direct and indirect metaphor has clearly been useful to quite a few researchers, and it has generated new studies taking into account the function of the distinction. At the same time, most studies including a part involving metaphor identification seem to prefer MIP to MIPVU, simply because it looks easier to apply. My response to the latter tendency is critical: MIP leaves open many decisions to researchers, which in itself is fine, but then the research report should include how they have addressed these issues and in fact have applied MIP in their actual practice. Checking these decisions would almost naturally include running by the issues in MIPVU, so that the question arises why not apply MIPVU: after all, it has been shown to be potentially reliable and has produced results in a relatively bigger corpus on the distribution of metaphor that may serve as a basis for comparison with any other project.

Since 2010, many researchers have 'translated' the procedure to different languages—as we see in the current volume. What is the next step for MIPVU?

The next step is for MIPVU to be automated. It would be such a help if we can run bulk analyses of large data sets in the same way across many domains between different languages. I cannot wait until that day arrives …

[Editors' note: There have already been efforts exploring automatic metaphor identification, in particularly in computational linguistics and NLP research (Neuman et al. 2013; Veale et al. 2016), to speed up the process and allow for metaphor identification in a greater amount of text that has hitherto been possible. One example is Tony Berber Sardinha's Metaphor Identifier (see e.g. Berber Sardinha 2010), an online tool that works with Portuguese text and identifies words that are likely to be metaphor vehicles in a corpus. It calculates the average probability of a word being metaphorical, based on knowledge gained from a manually-coded training corpus. A second example is provided by Rai et al. (2016), who employed a Conditional Random Fields (CRF) classifier to detect metaphor with some degree of accuracy, testing their method on the VU Amsterdam Metaphor Corpus which has been already annotated using

MIPVU and is freely available online.[5] CRF requires further testing and does not yet seem user-friendly, in the sense that other researchers could easily apply it to their own texts. Nevertheless, such developments are promising. Programs that can identify metaphorical language automatically can be run on huge amounts of texts that cannot be realistically be coded by hand, which could add bulk to any statistical analysis. As such, we agree with Gerard Steen when he says that developing automatic metaphor identification is a pressing 'next step' in metaphor identification.]

1.4 How to read this volume

The contributions brought together in this volume are intended to help researchers to better understand MIPVU, and to increase awareness of issues related to its application to both English and to languages other than English. Although readers are welcome to read the entire volume, we envisage that researchers interested in particular languages or language families will skip directly to the relevant chapters, all of which therefore function as self-contained chapters. This means that all authors have been invited to introduce relevant terminology as if for the first time, rather than expect readers to be already familiar with MIP/MIPVU jargon. As an example, many chapters mention the *List of Multiwords and Associated Tags in BNC2* that Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b) advocate analysts to consult for the determination of polywords, and our contributors also provide its website address. As the editors of this volume, we chose to retain such information in each of the individual chapters, rather than to consolidate it in one location. Although this leads to some repetition in the volume as a whole, it provides convenient access to information for those readers mainly interested in one particular language, allowing them to avoid having to flip back and forth between the chapter(s) of greatest interest to them and a glossary of terms.

The heart of this volume consists of eleven chapters (4-14), all of which present adaptions of MIPVU to different languages. Some of the languages highlighted here were selected because they were the working languages of metaphor researchers who we knew actively worked with MIPVU and could contact directly. Others, by contrast, 'found' their way to us through a call for chapters that we released in early 2016, asking for contributions discussing theoretical or practical issues raised by application of MIP or MIPVU to any

---

[5] The VU Amsterdam Metaphor Corpus is available at http://metaphorlab.org/metaphor-corpus/.

language other than English. Rather than demanding any particular form, we offered a non-exhaustive list of potential topics or themes for authors to address:

- Demarcation of lexical units
- Choice of lexical tools (e.g. dictionaries, corpora)
- Identification of metaphor signals
- Metaphor identification in different text types
- Examples of MIPVU/MIP in practice in different languages
- MIP vs. MIPVU in different languages
- Adapted MIPVU guidelines
- Reliability testing

We fully acknowledge that reliability and replicability are the strongest features of MIPVU. Therefore, authors were invited to contribute a fully-fledged version of MIPVU for 'their' language, including adjusted guidelines and a demonstration of the application of those guidelines to discourse data. We also requested the provision of inter-rater agreement measures, whenever possible (a challenge especially in cases where researchers were working independently). Since once of our main goals for this volume was to show the reach of the method around the globe, and to encourage others to apply the procedure, we also welcomed more explorative attempts examining the possibilities of applying MIPVU to different languages.

Similarly, we acknowledge that MIPVU is a more detailed protocol than MIP. However, as the chapters in this volume show, most adaptations to the procedure are made regarding the identification of indirect metaphors – an issue that is relevant to both MIP and MIPVU. Given the overlap between the methods on this point, we accepted chapters that provide adapted versions of both MIP and MIPVU. Finally, we asked all contributors to provide illustrative examples of their adapted version of MIPVU to real-life discourse, and to provide additional information such as multiword lists, annotated texts, and so on. Information that might have been suitable for sices has instead been uploaded to this volume's website at the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/vw46k/).

1.5 MIPVU in multiple languages

This volume primarily focusses on the application of MIPVU to multiple languages. That said, four of the volume's chapters are more general, and intended for all readers: Chapter 1 (this introduction), Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and the afterword in Chapter 15. Our initial three chapters focus on various aspects of the original MIPVU protocol that was developed on the basis of, and for, the English language. While this first chapter sets the scene by contextualizing the development of MIP and MIPVU up to this point, Chapter 2 consists of a reprint of the MIPVU guidelines developed for English, originally published as the second chapter in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b), entitled *MIPVU: A manual for identifying metaphor-related words*. Here **Gerard J. Steen, Aletta G. Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krennmayr** and **Tryntje Pasma** guide readers through each of MIPVU's steps, showing how to apply it to English discourse. Although we envisage this book as a companion volume to Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b), it is also important that *MIPVU in multiple languages* function independently as a stand-alone volume. Chapter 2 therefore provides readers with a solid grounding in the procedural guidelines, necessary for fully understanding its adaptations to languages other than English.

Chapter 3, *What the MIPVU protocol doesn't tell you (even though it mostly does),* picks up where Chapter 2 leaves off by offering guidance on what have proven to be the some of the lesser commonly understood points of the identification procedure. Here **Susan Nacey, Tina Krennmayr, Aletta G. Dorst, and W. Gudrun Reijnierse** share many of the lessons learned from their experiences teaching MIPVU to students and researchers eager to apply it to their own data. They explain some of the main pitfalls encountered by those new to the procedure, and offer advice how to avoid them. This chapter is included in the present volume because it is crucial that researchers have a clear understanding of what MIPVU is and how it is intended to work on English discourse before they can adapt it for other languages. In addition, Chapter 3 discusses various considerations when deciding if MIPVU is the right tool for a research project, and in this way links neatly to Gerard Steen's contention in section 1.3 that the decision to use MIPVU on some or all of your data depends on the nature and aims of your research. This chapter is thus an 'outlier' in terms of the book as a whole because it is intended primarily as a guide for novice MIPVU users, facilitating their employment of the procedure. Alternatively, the chapter may also be employed by more experienced MIPVU users, either as an aid when teaching the procedure to others or as a check against which to compare their own understanding of MIPVU.

We begin our look at MIPVU applied to multiple languages in Chapter 4, where **W. Gudrun Reijnierse** develops the French version of MIP: *Procédure pour l'Identification de Métaphores* (PIM). One particular focus of her work is exploring the possible consequences of dictionary selection for metaphor identification in French discourse. We then turn to Germanic languages, first with a reprint in Chapter 5 of **Tryntje Pasma**'s work on applying MIPVU to Dutch, developed simultaneously with the original MIPVU protocol for English and also published in Steen, Dorst et al. (2010b: see also Pasma 2011). Chapter 6 continues with the development of MIPVU for German, written by **J. Berenike Herrmann**, **Karola Woll**, and **Aletta G. Dorst**, with most sections concluding with clear guidelines to help future researchers. Finally, **Susan Nacey, Linda Greve**, and **Marlene Johansson Falck** present Scandinavian MIPVU in Chapter 7 – that is, they present a single set of guidelines to apply MIPVU to Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, that varies only with respect to the polyword lists and selected dictionaries for these three closely related, mutually intelligible languages.

We then move on to Chapter 8, with **Justina Urbonaitė, Inesa Šeškauskienė** and **Jurga Cibulskienė**'s work on the application of MIPVU to Lithuanian discourse. Lithuanian is one of two surviving Baltic languages of the Indo-European language family, and is known for its extremely rich grammatical and derivational morphology – some of which presents challenges that are discussed here for MIPVU. Chapter 9 continues with **Joanna Marhula** and **Maciej Rosiński**'s development of MIPVU for Polish, a West Slavic language. Similar to Lithuanian, Polish too is a highly inflected language, also characterized by a rich derivational morphology, which Polish MIPVU has to tackle. In Chapter 10, **Ksenija Bogetić**, **Andrijana Broćić**, and **Katarina Rasulić** also deal with the application of MIPVU to a Slavic language – in their case, Serbian. Among other aspects, they focus on how MIPVU may be adapted for languages that have a rich nominal inflection and preposition-less realizations of case.

Chapter 11 turns to a language belonging to the Turkic language family, where **Sıla Gen Kaya** discusses the application of MIP to Uzbek. Here she discusses issues particular to Uzbek, such as how to employ MIP in a language with case markers rather than prepositions. Kaya's chapter is followed by Chapter 12, where **Ben Pin-Yun Wang**, **Xiaofei Lu**, **Chan-Chia Hsu, Eric Po-Chung Lin** and **Haiyang Ai** present their proposed adaptation of MIPVU to Mandarin Chinese discourse. They tackle challenges related to the Chinese morphosyllabic writing system in which the basic orthographic units are characters, along with its relatively simple morphology. Chapter 13 deals with a Bantu language, where **Nts'oeu Raphael Seepheephe**, **Beatrice Ekanjume-Ilongo** and **Motlalepula Raphael Thuube** discuss how to adapt MIPVU to the agglutinative language of Sesotho.

The volume then turns full circle in Chapter 14, with **Fiona MacArthur**'s contribution about modifications made to MIPVU when identifying metaphor in transcriptions of conversations between speakers of different first languages who use English as their language of communication. She is thus concerned with speaker interaction in English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) situations, and the role that metaphor may play to help or hinder successful communication. Finally, **Elena Semino** closes the volume with an afterword containing reflections upon the past and the development of MIPVU for English and a look at how the chapters in this volume further contribute to ensuring reliability and validity in metaphor analysis.

The end result of our search for MIPVU contributors thus yielded chapters for ten different languages (French, Dutch, German, Scandinavian [Danish, Norwegian, Swedish], Lithuanian, Polish, Serbian, Uzbek, Chinese, and Sesotho), together with reflections about applying MIPVU to English as a Lingua Franca. The analyses in this volume clearly show that linguistic metaphor identification with MIPVU can be accomplished in a wide variety of languages. We hope that this will inspire even more metaphor scholars across the globe to start using MIPVU in their research. We also hope that the analyses in this volume will inspire further research into the possibilities of streamlining the guidelines to carry out cross-linguistic comparisons of metaphor use within, as well as across, languages, language varieties, and language families. How to develop polyword lists, how MIPVU should treat case markers, and how to apply MIPVU to languages for which there is no adequate dictionary are among those issues worth further investigation, as is the application of MIPVU to more languages than just those represented here. With over 6,000 languages worldwide, this volume clearly will not be the final word said on the topic, although it does represent a solid start.

We are proud to have been part of producing this volume, allowing us to further contribute to increasing the validity and reliability of future metaphor research. We want to thank the other contributors to this volume, as well as the metaphor scientific community in general – a thriving group, who produces world-class research. We wish you all happy metaphor hunting, in any and all languages.

References

Badryzlova, Y., Isaeva, Y., Shekhtman, N., & Kerimov, R. (2013). Annotating a Russian corpus of conceptual metaphor: a bottom-up approach. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on*

Metaphor in NLP. Atlanta, GA, 13 June 2013, 77–86. http://aclweb.org/anthology/W13-09

Bates, C. F. (2015). "I am a waste of breath, of space, of time": Metaphors of Self in a pro-anorexia group. *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*(2), 189-204.

Beger, A. (2011). Deliberate metaphors? An exploration of the choice and functions of metaphor in US-American college lectures. *Metaphorik.de, 20*, 39-60.

Berber Sardinha, T. (2010). A program for finding metaphor candidates in corpora / Um programa para identificar candidatos a metáfora em corpora. *The ESPecialist 31*(1), 49-67. https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/esp/article/viewFile/6239/4585

Boeynaems, A., Burgers, C., Konijn, E. A., & Steen, G. J. (2017). The impact of conventional and novel metaphors in news on issue viewpoint. *International Journal of Communication*, *11*, 2861-2897.

Burgers, C., van Mulken, M. J. P., & Schellens, P. J. M. C. (2011). Finding irony: An introduction of the Verbal Irony Procedure (VIP). *Metaphor and Symbol*, *26*(3), 186-205.

Burgers, C., Brugman, B. C., Renardel de Lavalette, K. Y., & Steen, G. J. (2016). HIP: A method for linguistic hyperbole identification in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *31*(3), 163-178.

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. (2007). Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk. *Discourse and Society, 18*(2), 197-222.

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

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cienki, A. (2008). The application of conceptual metaphor theory to political discourse: Methodological questions and some possible solutions. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 241-256). London: Routledge.

Cienki, A. (2017). Analysing metaphor in gesture: A set of metaphor identification guidelines for gesture (MIG-G). In E. Semino, & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (pp. 131-147). London: Routledge.

Cornelissen, J. P. (2012). Sensemaking under pressure: The influence of professional roles and social accountability on the creation of sense. *Organization Science*, *23*(1), 118-137.

Dorst, A. G. (2011). *Metaphor in fiction: Language, thought and communication*. Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/19629

Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (2010). The wonderful, chaotic, creative, heroic, challenging world of researching and applying metaphor: A celebration of the past and some peeks into the future. In G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan, & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herrmann, J. B. (2013). *Metaphor in academic discourse: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations*. Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/43562

Heywood, J., Semino, E., & Short, M. (2002). Linguistic metaphor identification in two extracts from novels. *Language and Literature, 11*, 35-54. doi:10.1177/096394700201100104

Johnson, M. (Ed.) (1981). *Philosophical perspectives on metaphor*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Kaal, A. A. (2012). *Metaphor in conversation*. Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/32987

Kittay, E. F. (1984). The identification of metaphor. *Synthese, 58*(2), 153-202.

Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and gender in media business discourse: A critical cognitive study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kövecses, Z. (2011). Methodological issues in conceptual metaphor theory. In S. Handl & H.-J. Schmid (Eds.), *Windows to the mind: Metaphor, metonymy and conceptual blending* (pp. 23-40). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Krennmayr, T. (2011). *Metaphor in newspapers*. Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/19774

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Littlemore, J., Krennmayr, T., Turner, J., & Turner, S. (2014). An investigation in metaphor use at different levels of second language writing. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 117-144.

Loewenberg, I. (1981). Identifying metaphors. In M. Johnson (Ed.), *Philosophical perspectives on metaphor* (pp. 154-177). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Low, G., Littlemore, J., & Koester, A. (2008). Metaphor use in three UK university lectures. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(3), 428-455.

Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in learner English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Negro, I., Šorm, E., & Steen, G. J. (2017). General image understanding in visual metaphor identification. *Odisea, 18*, 113-131.

Neuman, Y., Assaf, D., Cohen, Y., Last, M., Argamon, S., Howard, N., & Frieder, O. (2013). Metaphor identification in large texts corpora. *PLoS ONE 8*(4), 1–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062343

Pasma, T. (2011). *Metaphor and register variation: The personalization of Dutch news discourse*. Doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. http://dare.ubvu.vu.nl/handle/1871/19630

Pérez-Sobrino, P., & Julich, N. (2014). Let's talk music: A corpus-based account of musical motion. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *29*(4), 298-315. doi:10.1080/10926488.2014.948800

Pragglejaz Group (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 22*(1), 1-39.

Rai, S., Chakraverty, S., & Tayal, D. K. (2016). Supervised metaphor detection using conditional random fields. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Metaphor in NLP*. San Diego, CA, 17 June 2016, 18-27. http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W16-1103

Reijnierse, W. G., Burgers, C., Krennmayr, T., & Steen, G. J. (2015). How viruses and beasts affect our opinions (or not): The role of extendedness in metaphorical framing. *Metaphor and the Social World 5*(2), 245-263. doi:10.1075/msw.5.2.04rei

Reijnierse, W. G., Burgers, C., Krennmayr, T., & Steen, G. J. (2017). DMIP: A method for identifying potentially deliberate metaphor in language use. *Corpus Pragmatics 2*(2), 129-147. doi:10.1007/s41701-017-0026-7

Rousch, D. R. (2018). *Event structure metaphors through the body: Translation from English to American Sign Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press.

Semino, E., Demjén, Z., Demmen, J., Koller, V., Payne, S., Hardie, A., & Rayson, P. (2017). The online use of violence and journey metaphors by patients with cancer, as compared with health professionals: A mixed methods study. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care*, *7*(1), 60-66.

Semino, E., Heywood, J., & Short, M. (2004). Methodological problems in the analysis of metaphors in a corpus of conversations about cancer. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1271-1294.

Steen, G. J. (2002). Metaphor identification: An introduction. *Language and Literature, 11*(1), 5-6.

Steen, G. J. (2017). Identifying metaphors in language. In E. Semino & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (pp. 73-87). London: Routledge.

Steen, G. J. (Ed.). (2018). *Visual metaphor: Structure and process*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Steen, G. J., Biernacka, E., Dorst, A. G., Kaal, A. A., López-Rodríguez, I., & Pasma, T. (2010). Pragglejaz in practice: Finding metaphorically used words in natural discourse. In G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan, & L. Cameron (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor in the real world* (pp. 165-184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., & Krennmayr, T. (2010a). Metaphor in usage. *Cognitive Linguistics, 21*(4), 757-788

Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010b). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy. In A. Stefanowitsch & S. T. Gries (Eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy* (pp. 1-16). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer.

Veale, T., Shutova, E., & Beigman Klebanov, B. (2016). *Metaphor: A computational perspective.* San Rafael, CA: Morgan & Claypool Publishers.