Annotation Guidelines for Metaphoric Change

Dominik Schlechtweg, Stefanie Eckmann, Enrico Santus, Sabine Schulte im
Walde & Daniel Hole

dominik.schlechtweg@gmx.de

April 13, 2017

1 Introduction

Following the terminology from Koch (2016) *innovative meaning change*, as opposed to *reductive meaning change*, is where the existing meaning M_A of a word acquires a new meaning M_B (cf. p. 24), where this normally happens over a long period of time.

Metaphoric Change is, then, a subcategory of innovative meaning change (besides metonymic change, generalization...) where M_B is related to M_A by similarity or a reduced comparison (cf. p. 47). (cf. also Steen, 2010, p. 10)

Note that the annotation process described below is a combination and modification of the processes described by Pragglejaz Group (2007), Steen (2010) and Shutova (2015).

2 Annotation Process

You will be given an OpenOffice table document with approximately 560 lines. In every line you will see in columns 2 and 3 two uses of a word (the target word contained in column 1) with its surrounding contexts. The relevant word is marked in bold font in both contexts.

1. For each such use of a word establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the word. Note that the word might be used differently from what you are familiar with. Don't let yourself be confused by alternative spelling.

2. Try to find an interpretation where the meaning in the second context (M2) is related to the meaning in the first context (M1) in one or more of the following ways:

- M2 is less concrete than M1 (what it evokes is harder to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste);

- M2 is less human-oriented than M1;

- M2 is not related to bodily action in contrast to M1;

- M2 is less precise than M1 (precise as opposed to vague).

3. If M2 is indeed related to M1 in one or more of these ways, decide whether M2 contrasts with M1 but can be understood in comparison with it. (See below for an example.)

4. (i) If yes, <u>fill in 1</u> into the column headed by 'M2 is metaphorically related to M1', judging M2 as <u>being metaphorically related</u> to M1.

   (ii) If no, <u>fill in 0</u> into the column headed by 'M2 is is metaphorically related to M1', judging M2 as <u>not being metaphorically related</u> to M1.

   (iii) If you cannot decide, e.g., because the word marked in bold font doesn't match the word shown in column 1 in meaning or part of speech, you don't understand either of the contexts, one is too unspecific or other reasons, don't perform evaluation, <u>fill in a 1 into the comments column</u> and go on to the next test item.

5. Compare the two meanings in the other direction, i.e., decide whether M1 is metaphorically related to M2 by going through steps 2 to 4 and fill your judgment into the column headed by 'M1 is metaphoric compared to M2'.

Please make sure that you don't change anything in the file apart from column width, your judgments and comments. Finally, return the annotated document to the above-mentioned email address. If you have any further questions on the task, don't hesitate to ask.

3 Annotation Example

The following example illustrates how the procedure operates in practice. Consider table 1 as an example table similar to the one you will receive for annotation.

In line 1 you need to compare two uses of the word *umwälzen*. In context 1 *umwälzen* is used in the sense 'to turn around something or someone physically' (M1). This contrasts with its use in context 2 where it is used in the sense 'to change something radically' (M2). M2 is clearly less concrete than M1 and not necessarily related to bodily action. Moreover, M2 is less precise, since we may have greater disagreement about the question whether something 'changed radically' than we may have on the question

target word	Context 1	Context 2	M1 is metaphorically related to M2	M2 is metaphorically related to M1	comments
umwälzen	Ein Knecht vnd Tagelöhner hat doch auff den abendt sein Brodt / lohn vnd ruhe / Ein Kriegsman seinen Monat soldt / ich aber mus der elenden nächte viel haben / da mich mein außwendiger schmertz vnd inwendige hertzen angst nit schlaffen lest / ja ich bin der elendeste Mensch auff Erden / wann andere Leute / auch das tumme Vieh in jhrem Stalle jhre leibliche bequeme nachtruhe haben / muß ich mich **vmbweltzen**/ vnd kan keinen schlaff in meine augen bringen	Kinadon wollte den Staat **umwälzen**, weil er nicht, obgleich von starkem und thätigem Geiste, zu den Gleichen gehörte.	0	1	
umwälzen	Bey diesen und ähnlichen Handlungen ist das Auge entweder offen, oder verschlossen, aber in beyden Fällen der Augapfel krampfhaft **umgewälzt**, so dass nur der Rand der Iris unter dem obern Augenliede hervorscheint, die Pupille erweitert, und die Netzhaut unempfindlich selbst gegen die heftigsten Reitzmittel.	Und was sagestu? habe ich deinen so hochgerühmten Ritter dann auch vom Pferde gezaubert / da er sich im Sande **umweltzete**?	0	0	
...					

Table 1: Example Annotation Table

whether someone or something (was) turned around. (You may have a different intuition here, which should then be reflected in your judgment accordingly.)

Now, as we saw, M2 contrasts with M1. However, it can be understood in comparison with it: We can understand abstract change in terms of physical or local change. Consequently, we fill in 1 in the column headed by 'M2 is metaphorically related to M1', judging M2 to be metaphorically related to M1. And, for the same reasons as mentioned above, we fill in a 0 in the column headed by 'M1 is metaphorically related to M2'.

In line 2 both meanings of *umwälzen*, M1 and M2, are similarly concrete, human-oriented, related to bodily action and precise. They don't contrast with each other. (You may want to say that they are equal.) Hence, neither meaning has a metaphoric relation to the other. Consequently, we fill in 0 into both columns.

References

Koch, P. (2016), Meaning change and semantic shifts, *in* M. K.-T. Pänivi Juvonen, ed., 'The Lexical Typology of Semantic Shifts', De Gruyter Mouton.

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

Shutova, E. (2015), *Annotation of Linguistic and Conceptual Metaphor*, Springer.

Steen, G. (2010), *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, Converging evidence in language and communication research, John Benjamins Publishing Company.