

Discourse & Society

<http://das.sagepub.com>

Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk

Lynne J. Cameron

Discourse Society 2007; 18; 197

DOI: 10.1177/0957926507073376

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/18/2/197>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://das.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 3 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/18/2/197>

Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk



Discourse & Society
 Copyright © 2007
 SAGE Publications
 (Los Angeles, London, New Delhi
 and Singapore)
 www.sagepublications.com
 Vol 18(2): 197–222
 10.1177/0957926507073376

LYNNE J. CAMERON
 THE OPEN UNIVERSITY, UK

ABSTRACT. In a violent world, reconciliation between perpetrators and victims offers an alternative to revenge or retaliation. In such discourse, participants must make extended efforts to explain themselves to, and to understand, the Other. This article investigates emergent patterns of metaphor in reconciliation talk between an IRA bomber and victim, recorded over two and a half years. The analysis starts from identification of linguistic metaphors and works recursively between levels of discourse, revealing how micro-level negotiation of metaphors contributes to emergent macro-level metaphor systems. Metaphors frame the reconciliation process as A JOURNEY, as CONNECTION, as CHANGING A DISTORTED IMAGE and as LISTENING TO THE OTHER'S STORY. The metaphors vary in their lexicogrammatical patterns and in the degree to which they are extended and developed. Contrasting metaphors are shown to be particularly valuable, as is 'symbolic literalization' in which the use of words across metaphor, metonymy and the literal creates useful indeterminacy.

KEY WORDS: *dynamics, literalization, metaphor, metonymy, post-conflict, reconciliation*

Introduction

Twenty years ago, Jo Berry's father, Sir Anthony Berry, was killed in a bombing targeting the prime minister and members of her government. The bomb was planted by Pat Magee, acting on behalf of the Irish Republican Army. He was later caught and imprisoned for the crime until he was released in 1999 as part of the peace agreement. At Jo Berry's request, the two met in Ireland in late 2000. She wanted to understand what had led to the bombing and to her father's death. This first, private, meeting led to a series of further conversations, some of which were video recorded, and eventually to a television documentary and various joint public appearances in which they talk about the process of coming to understand each other and the importance of dialogue in avoiding and recovering from conflict.

The meetings between Jo Berry and Pat Magee had a profound effect on both of them. They began from very different starting points, politically and emotionally. Pat Magee came to the meetings in political mode, as 'a republican', to explain the political motivation of the bombing. His description of this starting point uses metaphors (underlined in the extracts) from the domain of theatre or lecture room:

Extract 1

I felt obliged
as a republican
to sit down and talk about that
and against the backdrop of the political reasons
given a platform
for a republican message
that had been censored for decades

Jo Berry's description of her starting point emphasizes her more personal perspective at that stage:

Extract 2

. . . my idea of Pat
was of someone
without much humanity
and I wanted to meet him
and hear his story
and discover his humanity
later on also came the idea that I wanted him
to hear my story

Two and a half years later, they refer to each other as 'a very close friend' (Pat about Jo) and 'a friend whom I care about' (Jo about Pat). They are also working together on a peace-building project in Northern Ireland, helping other victims of the conflict. The conversations have brought about increased empathy between the two and for Jo have been a 'healing journey' that has resolved some of the 'pain' caused by her father's death. This article examines the role of metaphor in the discourse of that reconciliation.¹

Understanding the Other

Reconciliation aims at increasing understanding between groups and individuals caused by, and connected to, conflict between them. The literature on reconciliation suggests that the process needs to work on both social and individual levels, and that it includes the re-negotiation of identities, the re-humanization of self and Other, and the development of empathy between people who previously perceived each other as enemies.

Conflict situations are usually accompanied by a process of dehumanization, the reduction of complex individuals to stereotypes that may allow polarization and escalation of violence between groups (Oberschall, 2000). While reconciliation requires action at social group level, such as the re-building of social networks and institutions destroyed by conflict, it must also involve encounters between individuals in which the past is acknowledged, so that trust can be re-established as the Other is rehumanized and empathy develops (Halpern and Weinstein, 2004; Lederach, 1997). The best known model of state-organized reconciliation through individual encounters is the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Gobodo-Madikizela, 2002; Martin, 2002). Staub (2001), looking at situations such as Rwanda, where mass killing has taken place, argues that a process, which he labels metaphorically as 'healing', is necessary at an individual level for reconciliation between communities to be possible. Halpern and Weinstein (2004) reinforce this argument that, even in contexts where there is state-level restorative justice, such as in South Africa, individual-level empathy is an essential aspect of reconciliation. From examples of reconciliation in the former Yugoslavia and South Africa, they show that developing an empathic understanding of former enemies in a post-conflict situation requires a reversal of the dehumanization process, through which the other person is again seen as a particular and complex individual. A first step in the development of empathy between former enemies is, they suggest, finding some commonality through identification with the Other. A second aspect of empathy is curiosity about the other person and their perspective. Curiosity and a sense of commonality also characterize sympathy; what takes empathy beyond sympathy is a third factor – the 'imagining and seeking to understand the perspective of another person' (p. 568) even when that perspective may be distasteful or lead to 'emotional ambivalence'. The work of understanding that Jo Berry and Patrick Magee undertake in their meetings includes this imaginative process of empathy, in which emotional and cognitive openness to the Other's perspective does not lead to rejection of the Other but allows the complexity of being human.

The model of talk adopted in the study is dynamic and dialogic. It is dynamic in that what happens locally and 'in the moment of talk' contributes to changes in perspective and attitude on the longer timescale of months and years (Cameron, 2003; Cameron and Deignan, 2006; Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, in press). A dialogic view of interaction sees a speaker as not just putting his or her ideas into words, but taking the Other into account when doing so, reaching across into 'the alien territory' of the Other and attempting to put themselves into the Other's perspective (Bakhtin, 1981: 282). The reconciliation conversations begin from a position of extreme Other-ness or 'alterity', as a result of differences in social identity and affiliation, in socio-cultural history and in experience, and the discourse acts as a semiotic space in which these opposing and dialogic voices can interact, as well as transfer information (Bakhtin, 1981; Cameron, 2003; Lotman, 1988; Wertsch, 1998). On a minute-by-minute timescale of utterances, alterity is managed contingently by speakers. On the scale of the discourse event or conversation, reduction of alterity acts as motivation for talk, for selection of topics and for positive outcomes of interactional episodes. At the scale of the

reconciliation process as a whole, emergent shifts in alterity reflect the development of empathy and the rehumanization of the Other.

It was hypothesized that metaphor would play a significant role in the discourse work of face-to-face reconciliation conversations since topics are often emotionally difficult to talk about and the task of explaining oneself to the Other was likely to require both indirectness and multiple analogies. Previous studies of educational, political, therapeutic and medical discourse have shown that speakers make use of metaphor to structure their talk, to explain unfamiliar ideas, and to carry affect, including values, emotions and attitudes (e.g. Cameron, 2003; Charteris-Black, 2004; Drew and Holt, 1995; Levitt et al., 2000; Musolff, 2004; Semino, 2005). In interactional situations, metaphors are negotiated and co-constructed across speakers.

A discourse dynamics approach to metaphor (Cameron, 2003) identifies patterns of metaphor use in discourse as evidence of thinking and perspective, while at the same time investigating how metaphors are negotiated between speakers at the moment of use. Metaphor is seen as linguistic, cognitive, affective and socio-cultural. Metaphor is linguistic in that the primary data available to discourse analysts are metaphors in the utterances of discourse participants, and variation in the lexicogrammar of metaphors is significant (Deignan, 2005). It is cognitive in that individual instances of metaphor may reflect larger conceptual metaphorical structures in which larger domains are mapped on to each other (Lakoff, 1993). It is affective in that linguistic metaphors often carry the perspectival dynamics of the speaker: they are evaluative, emphatic or act to position speakers relative to other people or to the content of which they talk (Cameron, 2003; Graumann, 1990). Metaphor is socio-cultural as well as cognitive because social interaction is the site of metaphor use and evolution, and because social groups develop particular metaphorical ways of thinking, together with ways of using metaphor in language, that may act as markers or constructors of social and role identity (Quinn, 1991). For example, Irish Republicans came to use the metaphorical phrase *the struggle* or sometimes *the armed struggle* to refer to their conflict with Protestant paramilitaries and with the British establishment. The phrase is not just a linguistic metaphor but is part of the way of thinking and talking (which could be called a model, schema or frame) that developed within the group about the conflict, its causes and proposed solutions, with a particular perspective and affect.

Metaphors may be used in talk with varying degrees of conscious choice. Some metaphors are so conventionalized that it would be difficult to avoid using them, as when we speak of understanding in terms of vision and seeing: *I see what you mean*. At the other extreme are newly-minted expressions, never uttered before, as when Jo Berry says: *it was like I was crying in a desert*. Between these extremes, speakers may have some choice about which metaphors are used, and may make that choice more or less deliberately. While remaining sceptical about strong versions of cognitive metaphor theory, which hold that conceptual metaphors are not just generalizations across a speech community but also structure an individual's mental representations (e.g. Kövesces, 2005; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), it does seem reasonable to assume that metaphorically-structured conceptualizations found in the speech and discourse patterns of socio-cultural groups reflect

and contribute to the language and cognitive resources that individuals draw on in conversation. We may also expect that speakers choose and use metaphors that are consonant with their own attitudes, emotions and evaluations, so that examining metaphors can reveal something of speakers' perspectives on what they are talking about, as well as about their social identities.

Systematic patterns of metaphor use are described by collecting together the individual linguistic metaphors used in discourse events and grouping them into larger semantically-connected domains, producing a kind of event-level 'super-metaphor' that can be given a label, for example *crying in the desert* might be placed with others in a group labelled GRIEF IS SEPARATION.² As I have argued elsewhere (Cameron, in press), emergent and evolving sets of connected metaphors gathered from actual discourse events are not necessarily the same constructs as the fixed and stable 'conceptual metaphors' of cognitive metaphor theory, and may be more appropriately labelled 'systematic metaphors'. In the context of social policy debates, Schön (1979) showed how generative metaphors develop within discourse communities, naming and framing issues or topics through particular perspectives: for example, URBAN HOUSING IS A DISEASE frames a social problem with a negative metaphorical labelling. The coherence among systematic metaphors may be of various types, including schematic, narrative (Keller-Cohen and Gordon, 2003), or thematic. Musolff, working with political discourse, has pointed out that systematic 'framing metaphors' often have a narrative or explanatory coherence about them. He calls these coherent and systematic sets 'metaphor scenarios': for example, THE EUROPEAN UNION IS A FAMILY RELATIONSHIP (Musolff, 2004). In the context of psychotherapeutic discourse, Angus and Korman (2002) note the coherence of systematic metaphors around key topics and call these 'metaphor themes': for example, RELATIONSHIP AS CONFLICT. Systematic metaphors 'distilled' from the discourse events may thus provide insights into how the speakers foreground certain aspects of topics while backgrounding other aspects, and how they construct coherent explanations and narratives around the topic of reconciliation and their experiences of coming to understand each other.

Data

The data used in this study are the recordings of conversations which took place during the second meeting between Jo Berry and Pat Magee in December 2000, and their fourth meeting in February 2001, together with a recording of a joint radio interview in March 2003. The first recorded conversation, from the second meeting, was 55 minutes long; the second, from the fourth meeting, was 115 minutes long. The recordings of the conversations were transcribed orthographically and very precisely, using intonation units as the unit of transcription (Chafe, 1996; du Bois et al., 1993; Stelma and Cameron, in press).³ Intonation units provide a standardized (or standardizable) unit of transcription that enables comparisons across empirical studies of metaphor in discourse, while also reflecting the idea that metaphor is both linguistic and socio-cognitive (Cameron and Stelma, 2004).

The conversation from the first recorded conversation has 2766 intonation units (7922 words of transcription); the second recorded conversation has 3951 intonation units (12,907 words of transcription). The third discourse event was the radio interview, which was 25 minutes long (6546 words of transcription). As a different type of discourse event, the interview's primary function was as a source of participants' summaries and reformulations of events, attitudes and feelings, as they looked back over their meetings up to this point. From here, the same topics could be tracked backwards through the conversations to see what had changed and to find traces of the change in the talk.

The participants were provided with a draft report of the research findings and invited to comment. A face-to-face meeting was also arranged to discuss the findings and further background information. Jo Berry attended the meeting, although Pat Magee was unable to, and her comments added much to our understanding of the findings.

Extracts are presented with a number indicating the discourse event and with intonation units numbered from the start of the conversations, allowing readers a sense of timescale. So, for example, 2:131 indicates intonation unit 131 from the second recorded conversation.

Metaphor analysis

The talk was analysed on several different, but interacting, timescales, from the micro-level of utterances, turns and exchanges through a level of episodes (minutes) to the level of the discourse event (a conversation), up to the macro-level of years and months.

Identification of linguistic metaphors

The basic identifying features of a linguistic metaphor is the occurrence of a lexical item from a domain or semantic field different from that of the topic of the ongoing talk, together with a potential transfer or change of meaning from the new semantic field to the ongoing topic. This lexical item, which may be a word or a phrase, is the Vehicle term of the metaphor. In the following extract, taken from the beginning of the first conversation as Jo explains her motivation for meeting Pat, metaphor Vehicles are underlined:

Extract 3

1:88	Jo	s- <u>something</u> I've wanted,
89		... almost since the moment the bomb <u>went off</u> .
90		.. I knew,
91		.. (2.0) <u>back in</u> the moment,
92		wh- what I wanted to do,
93		... was <u>bring</u> as much –
94		.. (2.0) <u>something</u> –
95		.. as much positive <u>out of</u> it as I could.

- 96 .. you know,
 97 Pat [hmh]
 98 Jo ... (1.0) [and] I –
 99 and I saw very clearly.
 100 ... (1.0) that the –
 101 .. the end of that journey.
 102 would be,
 103 .. sitting down and,
 104 ... talking to the people who did it.

Metaphor Vehicles are both single words (*saw*, *in*) and phrases (*end of the journey*, *bring . . . out of*). The identification of linguistic metaphor is most straightforward with nouns and verbs that have strong lexical content (like *journey* or *saw*), enabling a more concrete or basic sense to be contrasted with the metaphorical use. So, the Vehicle, *the end of that journey*, is used metaphorically to refer to the Topic *sitting down and talking to the people who did it*; *saw* is a Vehicle without an explicit Topic, but which can be inferred as metaphorically meaning something like *knew* or *understood*. Identification is more tricky with less ‘content-ful’ words and the analyst is required to make explicit decisions about words and phrases such as the prepositions *in*, *out of* or delexicalized verbs like *have*, *give*. Again, though, the main criterion is that there is a more concrete or basic meaning of the Vehicle that contrasts with, and contributes to, the use of the word or phrase in the discourse context. (For full discussion of these issues see Chapter 3 of Cameron, 2003.)

Identification was carried out by a research assistant after a process of rater training and intra-rater comparison of samples. Agreement on identification of metaphors was reached through discussion with the researcher.

In comparison with studies of other discourse contexts, high use of metaphor was found, with 1643 metaphors identified, yielding a density of 90.3 linguistic metaphors per 1000 words of transcribed talk. This figure was the same for both conversations. Metaphor is used in these reconciliation conversations more than three times as frequently as in classroom talk (27 per 1000 words), and twice as frequently as in talk between doctor and patient (55 per 1000 words) (Cameron, 2003, in preparation).

Analysis of the local discourse dynamics of metaphor

Tracking Vehicle terms through episodes of talk shows how metaphors evolve on a local timescale. The shifting of the Vehicle word or phrase allows speakers to negotiate, challenge or adapt metaphors. After its first use in the talk, a Vehicle term can be developed, re-deployed or dropped. Re-deployment is the use, by either speaker, of the same Vehicle term with a different Topic: for example, Jo’s metaphorical use of *healing* in talk about the Topic of recovering from the death of her father was re-deployed by Pat to talk about the different Topic of accepting responsibility for his actions and moving on from it.

In Vehicle development, the metaphorically used word or phrase, or a semantically close term, is used again with the same Topic. A limited set of Vehicle

development processes combine to produce a wide range of discourse outcomes: repetition, relexicalization, explication and contrast (Cameron, 2003, in press; Steen, 1994). Extracts 4–6 illustrate these processes. In Extract 4, as Pat Magee asks Jo Berry how she had thought about their meeting, the verb metaphor *see*, meaning *understand* or *think about*, is repeated in line 116, and repeated again in past tense form *saw* in line 128. In line 3, the phrase *the big political picture* explicates the *seeing* metaphor through elaboration.

Extract 4

- 1:115 Pat ... did you see it as like individuals,
 116 or did you see it as a sort of a –
 117 .. (1.0) the big.. political picture,
 118 the IRA,
 119 or,
 120 .. the war.
 121 .. (1.0) um you know what I mean,
 122 er,
 123 Jo yeah,
 124 Pat ... you were –
 125 you were aware that there's a –
 126 .. it's going to be an individual who you'd be sitting down with.
 127 Jo hmh
 128 .. (1.0) I saw it as both.

In Extract 5, Pat talks about the impact of meeting Jo and understanding the consequences of his actions, for which he uses further, contrasting, Vehicle terms from the domain of *seeing*. Within this domain, he first contrasts seeing close up (*coming face-to-face*) and not seeing (*lose sight of*), and a few seconds later, contrasts *a whole picture* with *a glimpse*:

Extract 5

- 2:704 Pat you only come face-to-face with it in a situation like that.
 705 there is –
 706 .. (1.0) it's so easy to lose,
 707 ... sight,
 708 .. (1.0) of,
 709 .. you know,
 710 the enemy's humanity.
 ...
 733 ... it's never the whole picture.
 734 ... that's why,
 735 you know,
 736 on reflection you –
 737 .. sometimes you get a –
 738 like a glimpse.
 739 even in the midst of –

740 er,
 741 a lot of struggle.
 742 . . of the other person's humanity.

Contrasting use of metaphor proved to be very significant in the reconciliation conversations, enabling the speakers to discuss and reject alternative responses to violence.

Extract 6 shows the relexicalization of metaphor. The first relexicalization of the initial metaphor *Vehicle come along that long journey* stays within the same 'journey' domain but changes the Vehicle to *reached* (1912); the second moves to a new Vehicle domain with *put a line under the past* (1913):

Extract 6

1906 Pat . . . but certainly you –
 1907 . . .(1.0) ha- –
 1908 . . .(1.0) you know,
 1909 totally come along that long journey.
 1910 you know,
 1911 you –
 1912 you'd reached some conclusion.
 1913 put a line under the past.

As findings are reported in the sections that follow, analysis of these processes of Vehicle development at local level are connected to acts of reconciliation at episode level and at discourse event level.

Analysing systematic metaphor use

Systematic metaphors connect the local level of metaphor use to the discourse event level. The metaphors were grouped by the basic or non-metaphorical meanings of their Vehicle terms. So, for example, *in a desert* was placed with other words and phrases relating to SEPARATION/CONNECTION. Systematic metaphors were then identified by bringing together the metaphors in a Vehicle domain that related to the same topic, and labels were chosen to describe the systematic metaphors, e.g. GRIEF IS SEPARATION.

The aggregating of metaphor Vehicles into groups or categories is an interpretive process that works recursively between data and categories. It is mainly inductive or 'bottom up', with metaphors emerging from the data, but can also make use of conceptual metaphors frequently found in the cognitive literature, such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY and UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING. Researchers adopting a discourse approach to metaphor have to accept that it is not possible to come up with a limited and precise set of categories into which each linguistic metaphor can be reliably placed. Given the ad hoc, contingent nature of online talking and thinking, it seems in fact unreasonable to expect it to be successful (Barsalou, 1989). A principled flexibility to the grouping of linguistic metaphors appears to be the most suitable approach with discourse data. The labelling of systematic groups

should be at a level of generality appropriate to the research goals and to the actual discourse evidence, and there may be nesting of groups within groups. Some metaphors may fit into more than one group, reflecting the indeterminacy of human meaning making: for example, *distorted* could fit into the group labelled as VIOLENT OR NEGATIVE ACTION or into the SEEING group.

This article focuses on metaphors used in talk about events leading up to Jo and Pat's meetings and about their meetings. Four major groupings of metaphors used systematically about these topics were identified:

- journeys
- connection
- seeing more clearly
- listening to a story.

The following metaphor scenario is constructed from participants' use of these systematic metaphors and offered as a summary of their experiences of the reconciliation processes. It is an interpretive synthesis constructed by the researcher from the results of the analysis that attempts to remain as close as possible to the words of the participants. The coherence of the scenario is partial, with incompleteness and some incoherences. It is negotiated, sometimes contested, and interim, presenting a fairly stable scenario that has emerged from the dynamics of the talk covered in this study, but a temporary stabilization that may change through further conversations, actions or events.

After the bombing, Jo and Pat complete separate journeys, long and on foot, until they meet face-to-face and try to connect across the gap between their experiences. Jo's journey has the aim of understanding the roots of violence and is a long, uphill journey on foot, sometimes following the path of journeys made by the bombers, sometimes stopping to meet other victims. The journey out of grief becomes a healing process. Pat does not talk much about his life up between the bombing and the meeting, but speaks of an earlier journey when, as a young man, he joined the IRA and agreed to use violence.

When Jo and Pat meet and sit down to talk to each other, it is, for both and in different ways, a momentous point in their journeys. It is not, however, where the journeys end, rather it is a new starting point. For Pat, meeting Jo is a confrontation with an unavoidable obstacle, the consequences of his actions. He has to face this and cannot walk away from it. He can however come through this dark phase of his journey.

When Jo and Pat meet, they need to open channels of communication between them. For Jo, and then also for Pat, connection comes through being open, which may require the breaking down of barriers. Jo wants to build bridges to cross the gap between them. Through careful listening to the story that the Other tells, each comes to know and understand the Other better – they can see the Other more clearly and more completely.

The next sections present more detailed findings about the use of metaphors, arranged by the temporal sequence of Topics, from before the first meeting

between Jo Berry and Pat Magee, through the meetings and what happens during the talk, to the longer term outcomes of the reconciliation process.

Reconciliation is a journey

JOURNEY metaphors are highly conventionalized and frequently occurring in English and in cognitive metaphor theory are seen as specific exemplars of the more general 'event-structure' metaphor in which events are metaphorically characterized as having the structure SOURCE-PATH-GOAL (Gibbs, 1994; Lakoff, 1993). Over 300 linguistic metaphors from the JOURNEY semantic field are used in the conversations. However, examination of the lexis of the conversations shows the linguistic metaphors do not range freely over all areas of the domain of JOURNEY but are mainly used at the JOURNEY level of specificity. Extract 7 shows the level of specificity of lexis, as, very early in the first recorded conversation, Pat alludes to Jo's explicit metaphorical understanding of the reconciliation process as a *journey*:

Extract 7

1:35	Pat	I was aware from speaking to certain people,
36		.. (1.0) how. . . y- you –
37		.. <u>saw</u> this as a <u>journey</u> etcetera.

Furthermore, JOURNEY metaphors are concentrated in particular corners of the possible semantic and lexical fields as they are drawn on to talk about a restricted range of reconciliation Topics. Jo applies journey metaphors to two interconnected Topics. She is engaged in an *inner journey* (2:1 306) of moving on from the grief caused by the death of her father. The way she chooses to deal with her grief is to undertake a second JOURNEY that she calls *walking the footsteps of the bombers* (1:202) in which she tries to understand the roots of violence and what motivated Pat's actions. This metaphorical JOURNEY involves literal, physical journeys from England to Northern Ireland to meet other victims and, eventually, members of the Irish Republican Army.

Jo uses JOURNEY metaphors to focus in particular on the manner of moving and on the various staging or stopping places. Both JOURNEYS are spoken of as *long* and difficult, e.g.:

1:1912	there's another <u>mountain to climb</u> now
--------	--

with frequent use of *steps* and *footsteps* suggesting a JOURNEY on foot, e.g.:

2:306	one <u>step</u> at a time
-------	---------------------------

Jo's journeys include a range of 'staging places', both metaphorical and literal, and encounters with people, the most important of which is her meeting with Pat Magee (see next section).

In Extract 1, Jo also refers to the purpose of her journey:

1:93–95 bring something – as much positive out of it as I could

In this metaphor, the experience of losing her father becomes a place to move *out of*, and she is not just walking but *bringing something (positive)*. At this early stage in their conversations, the *something positive* is rather vague but becomes clearer in later talk. In Extract 8, one of the positive things Jo brings out of her journey is the *transforming* of her grief into *compassion and empathy* (2:1307, 1318).

Extract 8

2:1302 Jo ..(2.0) well that's the journey that I've –
 1303 I've been on,
 1304 understanding that.
 1305 ..(3.0) I wo- –
 1306 ..(1.0) and the journey's . . . been an inner journey.
 1307 ..(1.0) of transforming the –
 1308 .. the feelings that were there at the beginning.
 1309 .. the pain,
 1310 and the loss.
 1311 and the anger.
 1312 ..(1.0) and the grief.
 1313 ..(1.0) and,
 1314 .. discovering that they can be transformed.
 1315 ..(1.0) ehm,
 1316 ... through the heart.
 1317 ..(1.0) into,
 1318 compassion and empathy.
 1319 ..(1.0) and,
 1320 ..(1.0) it's a journey that,
 1321 .. goes on and on.

She later speaks of this increased compassion and empathy as *gifts* that have come from the processes of recovering from grief and enquiring into the causes of violence:

2:2317 ..(1.0) I can see the gifts that Brighton's given me

Pat Magee speaks of Jo's experience as a *journey* and uses JOURNEY metaphors with several Topics relating to his own experience, including his decision to join the IRA as *the start of my journey* (1:319), meeting Jo, and his process of accepting responsibility.

Meeting face-to-face: Symbolic literalization

It is a highly significant moment when Jo and Pat come face-to-face for the first time, and a nexus of metaphors from three systematic groups – JOURNEY,

CONNECTION and LISTENING TO A STORY – combine in talk about the event and about the (ongoing) act of talking to each other. In addition, both speakers use lexical terms that shift back and forth across the fuzzy boundary between metaphor, metonymy and the literal that are considered in this section. The first of these appears in the last line of Extract 9, as Pat speaks of the inevitability of having to deal with the human consequences of political violence:

Extract 9

- 2:882 Pat . . . (2.0) but when you start losing sight of the –
 883 .. t- the –
 884 the fact that you're also harming a human being.
 885 . . . (1.0) you lose sight of that,
 886 or ignore it,
 887 or you find it easier to ignore it.
 888 . . . that's.. always had a price.
 889 . . . (1.0) and some way,
 890 well down the line.
 891 . . . (1.0) you know,
 892 you're going to come face-to-face with that price.

The consequences of violence are spoken of metaphorically as *a price* (888), with JOURNEY metaphors *some way*, *down the line* and *come* used to describe the passing of time. The phrase *face-to-face* could be both metaphorical and metonymic: metaphorical, because *come face-to-face* has a sense of a human journey towards another human that is employed to speak about a point in time when consequences have to be acknowledged; metonymic, because *face* stands for the whole of the human victim, including their grief and loss. In the re-humanization of the Other, meeting *face-to-face* emphasizes the individual as a human with emotions displayed primarily in the face.

Extract 9 also shows how JOURNEY metaphors interact with metaphors from other systematic domains of SEEING (*lose sight of*) and VALUE (*price*). The speakers effortlessly combine metaphors from different domains, even in one intonation unit (892). In the case of *lose sight of* and *come face-to-face* there is conceptual coherence between the metaphors, since we are usually obliged and able to see what is in front of our faces. In the last line, there does not seem to be coherence between *come face-to-face* and *price*. However, the 'mixed metaphor' does not cause a problem for speakers, and this I suggest is because there is coherence between the metaphor Topics (which is something like 'be forced to acknowledge the human consequences'). The coherence of Topics actively guides the choice and interpretation of metaphorically used words and phrases.

The metaphor/metonymy of *come face-to-face* also carries a sense of encountering an obstacle on a journey and is found in other metaphors describing what Pat has to acknowledge about the impact of his decision to use violence on Jo and her family. Extract 10 occurred immediately after Jo had spoken of her daughter's feelings about losing her grandfather (*that* in line 412). The talk about her daughter affected Pat quite strongly, evidenced by him referring to the episode in the second

recorded conversation and again two years later in the radio interview. Here Pat uses other metaphors from this specific part of the JOURNEY domain where movement is restricted by some obstacle: *the only way*; *no way around*; *fallback position*.

Extract 10

- 1:412 Pat how can you er express the poignancy of that.
 413 you know er,
 414 ..(1.0) there's no way around it.
 415 ..(1.0) and the only way –
 416 I suppose,
 417 the only fallback position I have.
 418 ..(1.0) that's what it feels like.

This theme recurs in Extract 11 with the metaphors carrying an even stronger negative evaluation – the confrontation with the obstacle is something that one would prefer to avoid by walking away or hiding from it but that cannot be avoided (see also Cameron and Deignan, in press):

Extract 11

- 1:1429 Pat but I can't walk away from the fact that it was –
 1430 ..(1.0) I was directly,
 1431 Jo [hmh]
 1432 Pat [responsible] too for that.
 1433 Jo .. [[hmh]]
 1434 Pat [[I can't]] hide behind the –
 1435 you know the –
 1436 ... sort of,
 1437 the bigger picture.

The second 'blurring of the literal-metaphorical distinction' (Goatly, 1997: 276) occurs throughout the discourse events and involves the verb *sitting*. In Extract 3, the blurring of metaphorical JOURNEY occurs when Jo says:

- 101 .. the end of that journey,
 102 would be,
 103 .. **sitting down** and,
 104 ... talking to the people who did it.

The verb *sitting*, often collocated as here with *down* and with *and talking*, is said to be a 'bridge term' (Kittay, 1987: 166): a lexical item which can apply in both Vehicle and Topic domains of a metaphor. People at the end of a journey might sit down for a rest and people involved in conciliation might sit down when they meet each other. When a bridge term is used, the Vehicle domain is collapsed into the Topic domain, and the metaphor is shifted into the literal (i.e. non-metaphorical) world in a process called 'literalization' (Goatly, 1997: 272). In the shift, the metaphor of the conciliation process as a journey collapses into the literal scenario of Jo *sitting down with Pat and talking*. Goatly's study of literalization in literary texts suggested

that the use of the same term both metaphorically and non-metaphorically leads to the transfer of symbolism to the non-metaphorical uses.

In Extract 12, from the radio interview, Pat describes his first meeting with Jo and contrasts the mundane physical act of *sitting* with the unexpectedness and importance of the fact that it is Jo Berry whom he is sitting beside. The literalization is here made more striking by Pat's description of the specific place where they sat, *this wee kitchen*:

Extract 12

3:558	I'm sitting there
559	beside the woman
560	whose father I have killed
561	and at that time
562	I was sitting in this wee kitchen
563	talking to this woman for the first time
564	whose father's dead

The movement, through the bridge term, from metaphor to literal reflects the course of the reconciliation process; metaphor is used in talk about the process leading up to the meeting but the meeting itself is described more literally. However, there is still use of a trope here, in that *sitting* acts as a metonymy for the larger event of the *meeting*. I contend that the phrases *sitting and talking to sitting down with* are not innocent; rather, when we examine the dynamics of use across the discourse events, they appear heavy with import – metaphorical import carried over from the connection to the *end of the journey* and non-metaphorical import deriving from real world social and physical experience. In the physical world, sitting down with someone: (a) is an intentional action; (b) is often face-to-face and unavoidably requires an acknowledgement of the person you sit with, who is a specific individual, not a stereotype or category; and (c) renders the participants vulnerable to each other. Furthermore, *sitting down* contrasts strongly with the upright, vertical, active stance of those engaged in conflict; murals on the streets of Northern Ireland vividly depict combatants in action (Rolston, 1992), only at the end of conflict do these men of action sit down. *Sitting down with the Other* thus works as a 'symbolic literalization', a potent metonymy to describe reconciliation between individuals and between groups:

Extract 13

3:129	Pat	after all these decades
130		we have <u>arrived at</u> a situation
131		<u>where</u> we can now sit down
132		across tables
133		and talk to each other

Understanding the other requires connection

When Jo Berry and Pat Magee talk about the processes of understanding each other through their meetings, they use the metaphor domain of CONNECTION,

which includes three, more specific, systematic metaphors. Two are ways of making connections: BUILDING BRIDGES, BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS. The third is a precondition to connection: BEING OPEN.

At a micro-level, metaphors from the domain of CONNECTION are frequently found in contrasting pairs alongside metaphors of SEPARATION, often lexicalized as *loss* or parts of the verb *lose* (31 uses in total). As the metaphor used to speak of the killing of Jo's father, *loss* is the starting point for the talk and for the reconciliation process, for both speakers:

1:174 Pat ... (2.0) you who've lost your father

For Jo, a consequence of the loss of her father is, paradoxically perhaps, a *connection* to others who had suffered in similar ways and to the Irish conflict:

Extract 14

1:139 Jo .. and it felt like my heart was broken,
 140 ... through the conflict.
 141 ... (1.0) and,
 142 ... the suffering was.. my suffering.
 143 I couldn't separate it.
 144 I couldn't be detached anymore.
 145 Pat hmh
 146 Jo .. and that –
 147 ... (1.0) that um,
 148 .. that pain,
 149 that loss,
 150 ... was shared by.
 151 .. by everyone.

The metaphor *shared by* (150) contrasts with the earlier relexicalized Vehicles *separate* (143), *detached* (144). The description of her grief at the death of her father is couched in violent and negative metaphors, including *broken* and *thrown into*; the violent act is echoed in the violent metaphors.

The *building bridges* metaphor entered the talk as a theme of a poem that Jo Berry had written before meeting Pat Magee and that she read aloud to him in both conversations. The poem conceptualizes reconciliation as *building bridges* and asserts the possibility of this process. As a metaphor, it emphasizes the gap between self and Other as what is in need of *bridging*; understanding is metaphorized as the *bridge*, and the reconciliation process is the act of *building the bridge*. In the talk outside of the poem, the metaphor is used 21 times. It is not much extended, remaining close to the form in which it was first used: *build* is only used once without being accompanied by *bridges*; *bridge* occurs in singular and plural form but other aspects of *bridges* are not found in the talk. Indeed, in our interview, Jo Berry, although able to recall clearly when the metaphor came into her mind, was unable to elaborate the metaphor in terms of what type of bridge this might be, suggesting that this was not primarily an image metaphor, but rather conceptual and linguistic.

The metaphor starts as the ‘property’ of Jo Berry in her poem, but is gradually used also by Pat Magee – four times in the first conversation and seven times in the second. Only Jo uses it in the interview. In one of his first uses in a response to the poem (Extract 15), Pat elaborates the Vehicle term *bridge* to emphasize their different starting points:

Extract 15

1:678 Pat ... (3.0) that's a very beautiful poem.\

679 and er –

680 ... (1.0) in the er –

681 the journey,

682 ... (1.0) coming... to a bridge./

683 ... you [know].

684 Jo [hmb]

685 Pat ... with two ends,

686 ... (1.0) er –

687 ... (2.0) that's –

688 ... that's why this is so important,

The Vehicle elaboration in line 685 of *two ends* is a move that enables Pat to distance himself slightly from Jo while at the same time maintaining alignment through repeating her *bridge* metaphor.

By the time of the second recorded conversation, Pat has adopted Jo's metaphor, extending it to talk about wider conciliation processes between other people caught up in violence:

2: 573 all those bridges are there to be built

In a further, and metalinguistically explicit, example of how speakers make use of metaphorical contrast, Pat moves from the *bridge* metaphor to metaphors of *distance* and *barriers* that emphasize SEPARATION rather than CONNECTION (Extract 16):

Extract 16

2:1633 Pat there's an inverse,

1634 to that er,

1635 ... (1.0) you know,

1636 er,

1637 ... (2.0) figure of speech

1638 you know,

1639 bridges.

1640 ... bridges can be built.

1641 ... and that is if you,

1642 .. actively –

1643 er,

1644 .. create,

1645 er,

1646 .. distances.

- 1647 . . . barriers.
 1648 . . . or what are they?
 1649 they are exclusions
 1650 . . . (1.0) and er,
 1651 . . . a thing I believe absolutely fundamentally,
 1652 is that er,
 1653 . . . (1.0) if you exclude anybody's voice,
 1654 . . . (1.0) you know,
 1655 . . . you're se- -
 1656 you're sowing the seed for later violence.
 1657 Jo . . . (1.0) hmh
 1658 Pat . . . and [er] -
 1659 Jo [I] would agree.
 1660 Pat . . . (1.0) the way to counter that,
 1661 . . . (1.0) is to build bridges.
 1662 Jo . . . hmh
 1663 Pat . . . (1.0) the way to ensure it doesn't happen,
 1664 is to build bridges.

He uses *distances* (1644–6) as a contrasting metaphor to *bridge* and immediately relexicalizes this to *barriers* (1647) and then to *exclusions* (1649). After explicating how exclusion can lead to violence, he returns via another set of contrasts to the metaphor of dialogue as to *build bridges*. The dialectic shifts in the talk are achieved and highlighted by the juxtaposition of the contrasting metaphors.

The metaphor of *breaking down barriers*, with 13 uses across the talk, can be seen as more violent alternative to *building bridges*, enabling CONNECTION through removal of a *barrier* rather than through making contact across a gap. There is a strong literalizing echo in the metaphor of the physical barriers constructed during the conflict on the streets of Irish cities, both the barriers of burning cars and of army road blocks.

Extract 17

- 1:2096 Jo <X where X> victims of all sides have been meeting,
 2097 . . . and -
 2098 er,
 2099 . . . (1.0) that is just about,
 2100 . . . er,
 2101 . . . br- breaking down barriers,
 2102 sharing stories,
 2103 and -
 2104 Pat hmh
 2105 Jo . . . and through.. experiencing each other's stories,
 2106 Pat hmh
 2107 Jo . . . there's a real feeling of,
 2108 . . . closeness and humanity of everyone,

The Topic of the *barriers* metaphor (2101) is the misunderstandings of the Other, including the dehumanization and over-simplifications characteristically made

by groups in conflict. Removal of barriers does not guarantee understanding but is necessary as a pre-requisite to it. The *barriers* metaphor collocates with *breaking down*, here and in all its uses in the talk except one (*let go*). While there are less violent options available, such as *removing* or *dismantling*, it is this stronger Vehicle that is chosen.

The final group of metaphors linked to CONNECTION cluster around the metaphor *open* and its contrasts. The Vehicle *open* was used 45 times across the discourse events, mainly as an adjective – *I find you very open* (Pat to Jo) – and with a positive evaluation, being *open* is a good way to be. People are described as being *open* without any complement term in the second conversation but in the later conversation they are also *open to each other; you; me; the other person's story; to the other's humanity*. In the radio interview, Pat again emphasizes how Jo was *very, very open* and how *Jo's openness* required him *to be open and frank too*. It is only in the interview that *open* is used as a transitive verb when Jo says that only some days does she find it possible to *open her heart enough to hear Pat's story*.

A series of metaphors that contrast with *open* are voiced by Jo in Extract 18 as she sets out a very negative alternative scenario to reconciliation in which she is not *open*.

Extract 18

2:2108	Jo	.. if I was –
2109		... was still angry.
2110		.. (1.0) the only person I'd be <u>hurting</u> .
2111		would be myself.
2112		.. (1.0) you know.
2113		.. (2.0) and,
2114		.. (1.0) I would be <u>stuck</u> ,
2115		I would be <u>closed down</u> .
2116		my heart would be <u>shut</u> .
2117		... and I [would've] <u>lost out</u> .

The metaphors in this extract are examples of Vehicle terms from a domain that can be labelled CAPTIVITY – *stuck*, *closed down* and *shut*. Together with *hurting* (2110), these terms have strongly negative valence. There are fewer metaphors from this side of the contrast, with 11 instances in the two conversations. The reformulation and summary in 2117 as *I would've lost out* connects CAPTIVITY to *exclusion* that we saw in Extract 16, lines 1649–53.

The various metaphors of CONNECTION used to talk about the experience of face-to-face conversations form a coherent pattern. Both speakers repeatedly invoke the metaphor of being *open* as a key to successful reconciliation. Being *open* allows connection and understanding, whereas being *closed* or *shut down* refuses connection and prevents understanding of the Other. Sometimes violent measures are needed to open up a situation – in the real world of Pat's justification of IRA activity and metaphorically in removing *barriers* to understanding. Once *open*, connection can be made by *building a bridge*. Although coherent amongst themselves, the CONNECTION metaphors were used alongside a quite different metaphor that is considered next.

Reconciliation happens through listening to the other's story

The LISTENING TO THE OTHER'S STORY metaphor appeared in the first recorded conversation (21 uses) but became more important throughout the second conversation (67 uses). In the radio interview (13 uses, e.g. Extract 2), it is Jo's preferred way of describing what she and Pat have done and what they hope to do for other people. The power of the metaphor LISTENING TO THE OTHER'S STORY comes not particularly from flexibility and productivity, which characterised the JOURNEY metaphor, but from its varied lexicalizations, its collocations, and its re-deployment from the Topic of reconciliation processes to the Topic of accounting for political violence.

Since to have a story is to be human, in a reconciliation context merely allowing that the Other has a story is in itself an act of re-humanization (Extract 19). Being prepared to listen to that story is a gesture of empathy. Listening to the Other's story serves the curiosity and finding commonality that build sympathy, and may assist the listener to move beyond sympathy towards empathy, by imagining themselves in the Other's position.

Extract 19

- 2:89 Pat but you are also,
 90 and I find you very open.
 91 . . . to my story.
 92 where I –
 93 .. er,
 94 . . . I feel there is more to me than just a perpetrator.
 95 . . .(1.0) and er,
 96 . . .(1.0) I suppose,
 97 . . .(1.0) what we're doing here.
 98 . . . is,
 99 .. exchanging our stories.

However, allowing the other to 'tell their story' remains distinct from giving validity to that story as 'truth', and it is likely that participants in post-conflict conciliation need to retain this distinction – victims in particular may need to be able to listen and hear, and thereby understand better, without completely accepting the Other's justification for violence.

The STORY metaphor created richness and potential by working across the metaphorical and the literal, being used with a range of degrees of metaphoricality. The word *stories* is used literally by Pat to describe things that happened in Ireland:

Extract 20

- 1:1272 Pat six killed –
 1273 people killed in one night.
 1274 Jo . . . hmh
 1275 Pat . . . I mean,
 1276 and there are so many other **stories** like that.
 1277 . . . in other areas all over.

In other places, *story* is used more figuratively as metonymy:

- 1:708 Pat: be open to . . . the other person's story
 1:596 Jo: you offer me the story
pain of your war

This use of *story* here is metonymic because it means more than just the tale of what happened; it also includes explanation of cause and effect, and justification. By choosing the word *story*, rather than a more neutral alternative such as *account* or *explanation*, speakers can be said to be doing something figurative. Interpreting *story* in its strictest sense as a plot-driven narrative, with an entailment of fictionality, would lead to classifying its use as metaphor rather than metonymy.

The word *story* is collocated with several different verbs – *listen/hear/tell/exchange/offer/share*. These verbs are also used metonymically, and sometimes metaphorically, to indicate something more than their literal, physical senses. Successful conciliation requires not just *hearing* or *listening* but attentive, empathic hearing and listening in which the hearer is *open* to what is heard and really tries to understand the perspective of the teller. Adding to the evidence of suggestive metaphoricity, the verbs *listen* and *hear* are used metaphorically with grammatical objects other than *stories*, including *pain/anger/struggles/inner voices*. The collocating and re-collocating of elements of metaphors contribute to a spreading 'affective climate' across the talking and thinking of speakers.

While positive aspects of the STORY metaphor are used to frame the reconciliation process, negative contrasts are drawn on to explain the roots of violence. A significant moment occurs in Extract 21 where Jo uses the STORY metaphor, in negative forms *the not listening . . . not hearing their story*, as she accepts some responsibility for the Irish situation:

Extract 21

- 1:764 Jo . . . as a daughter of a conservative MP,
 765 I . . . can sort of take responsibility for the –
 766 . . . (1.0) what the government.. didn't do.
 767 and,
 768 . . . the not listening,
 769 not hearing [their story].

In the dynamics of the conversations the metaphor of RECONCILIATION AS LISTENING TO THE OTHER'S STORY becomes more frequent and more shared between the speakers.

Reconciliation as changing a distorted image of the other

English (and many other languages) conventionally uses metaphors of SEEING to talk about UNDERSTANDING, as in

- 1:36–37 you saw this as a journey.

The metaphor was used 92 times in this way, as in Extracts 3 and 4:

1:117 did you see it . . . big political picture
1:128 I saw it as both

However, in talking about understanding the Other through reconciliation conversations, SEEING metaphors were also used negatively to create a contrast between the limited understanding of the Other before meeting and the fuller understanding that results from talking together (29 instances). Losing sight of the whole picture is used as a metaphor for the de-humanization of the Other in violent conflict:

2:907 Pat if you're not seeing a human being in front of you.
908 . . . if all you're seeing is an enemy.

Re-humanization and understanding is metaphorized as a move from a deficient image to a correct and complete image:

Extract 22

3:1131 Pat you present yourself
1132 in –
1133 in order
1134 you hope
1135 to break down misrepresentations
1136 because I–
1137 until we do see
1138 each other
1139 in our true light
...
1142 we're always going to be dealing with some reduction
1143 or a caricature

Other examples of SEEING metaphors that emphasise how people can have partial or wrong understandings of others are found in Extract 3, where the partial understanding is *a glimpse* and the fuller understanding is *the whole picture*, and in Extract 9, where *losing sight of* was contrasted with the full image entailed by *face-to-face*.

The outcomes of the meetings

There is not space in this article for detailed description of how Jo Berry and Pat Magee use metaphor in talking about the outcomes of their reconciliation meetings. In summary, there has been progress for each on their individual journeys: Pat Magee accepts responsibility for the human consequences of his act, although maintains that the political situation necessitated the use of violence; Jo Berry has been able to move on from her grief and loss, and speaks of experiencing *healing* through the process of talking with Pat:

Extract 23

2:3692 Jo and as... (1.0) you share,
 3693 ... (1.0) from that.. deep part of you,
 3694 that you have been sharing.
 3695 and,
 3696 ... and –
 3697 ... (2.0) you know,
 3698 there's something –
 3699 .. something –
 3700 something happens to me at the same time.
 3701 and,
 3702 .. healing happens.

Together Jo Berry and Pat Magee are working with other victims of violence. Jo describes how she sees this work:

Extract 24

3:1066 Jo creating safe places
 1067 for people to share their stories
 1068 and in a non-judgemental space
 1069 where they can share their pain
 1070 without feeling judged

In this extract we see more of the blurring between metaphor and literal; *places* (1066) is relexicalized and made more figurative as *spaces* (1067), and the metaphor *share* is collocated first with a metonymic use of *stories* (1067) and then metaphorically with *pain* (1069).

Conclusion

This article has considered metaphors in reconciliation conversations between perpetrator and victim. Metaphor plays a role in the re-humanization of individuals away from the limited stereotypes as 'enemy' and offers affordances for empathic understanding of the Other. Metaphor works cognitively and pragmatically at the micro or local timescale, as ideas are challenged, negotiated and accepted. The lexis of metaphors provides threads of continuity across long stretches of talk and gaps between meetings. Metaphors in the talk expressed pain, violence and many other feelings, emotions, reflexes and reactions, with striking metaphors contributing to the 'affective climate' of the meetings. Participants used the affordances of metaphor development to negotiate and shift perspective. On the macro timescale, emergent systematic metaphors contribute to participants' changing understanding of each other and of the violent events of the past.

Different metaphors were found working in different ways lexicogrammatically. While some metaphors remained close to their original lexicogrammatical form (e.g. *building a bridge; open*), others used a wide range of connected forms (e.g. JOURNEY metaphors). Some phrases were recombined with a range of collocations (e.g. *listen to your story*), while others had a restricted range (e.g. *sit down and talk*).

Contrast was an important metaphor dynamic. By using metaphors first in one sense and then in a contrasting sense, participants were able to do two key reconciliation actions: (i) at a micro level within a short episode of talk, they could consider and reject alternatives (e.g. *be closed*–*be open*) and (ii) at a more global level of the reconciliation process as a whole, they could describe the shift from dehumanized enemy to rehumanized individual (e.g. *not seeing*–*seeing in our true light*).

The phenomenon of symbolic literalization around use of metaphor was observed. Words and phrases that might appear simply literal (e.g. *sit down*, *story*), are not that when examined in the dialogic dynamics of talk. Rather they are constantly shifting between literal and metaphor, often through metonymy. This shifting creates an indeterminacy of meaning around the word or phrase that may be important in talk such as this, in post-conflict contexts and across alterity, where the formation of conceptual pacts (Brennan and Clark, 1996) through adopting the words of the Other may be resisted. Indeterminacy and metaphoric blurring may create a space around the meaning of the words that helps speakers feel more comfortable.

In their willingness to meet and be open with each other, Jo Berry and Pat Magee are in many ways extraordinary; a case study of their use of metaphor and language will not be representative of other people and other post-conflict contexts. However, it is hoped that the study illustrates how metaphor-led discourse analysis can help understand the processes of reconciliation through talk, and that the rich descriptions presented of the findings will support further work, both academic and in work for peace.

NOTES

1. The project, 'Using Visual Display to Investigate the Dynamics of Metaphor in Conciliation Talk', was supported by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Board (now Council) under its Innovation Award scheme. The author acknowledges that support, and also acknowledges the contribution of Dr Juup Stelma, project Research Fellow, in transcription and analysis. Special thanks to Jo Berry for providing the data and continuing support, and to both Jo Berry and Patrick Magee for giving permission for their conversations to be used as data in the study.
2. Small capitals are used for labels of connected groups of metaphors, in line with the convention in cognitive metaphor theory.
3. The ends of intonation units are marked with the following symbols:
 - , = continuing intonation contour
 - . = final intonation contour
 - = a truncated (incomplete) intonation unit
 - [] indicates an overlap
 - .. indicates a short pause
 - ... indicates a longer pause with time in seconds in brackets e.g. (2.0)

REFERENCES

- Angus, L. and Korman, Y. (2002) 'Conflict, Coherence, and Change in Brief Psychotherapy: A Metaphor Theme Analysis', in S. Fussell (ed.), *The Verbal Communication of Emotions: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, pp. 151–66. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barsalou, L.W. (1989) 'Intraconcept Similarity and Its Implications for Interconcept Similarity', in S. Vosniadou and A. Ortony (eds), *Similarity and Analogical Reasoning*, pp. 76–121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brennan, S.E. and Clark, H.H. (1996) 'Conceptual Pacts and Lexical Choice in Conversation', *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 22: 1482–93.
- Cameron, L. (2003) *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Cameron, L. (in preparation) *Metaphors in Doctor–Patient Talk*.
- Cameron, L. (in press) 'Metaphor and Talk', in R. Gibbs (ed.) *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L. and Deignan, A. (2006) 'The Emergence of Metaphor in Discourse', *Applied Linguistics* 27: 671–90.
- Cameron, L. and Stelma, J. (2004) 'Metaphor Clusters in Discourse', *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1: 7–36.
- Chafe, W. (1996) *Discourse, Consciousness and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004) *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deignan, A. (2005) *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Drew, P. and Holt, E. (1995) 'Idiomatic Expressions and Their Role in the Organisation of Topic Transition in Conversation', in M. Everaert, E.-J. v. d. Linden, A. Schenk and R. Schreuder (eds) *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, pp. 117–32. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Du Bois, J., Schuetze-Coburn, S., Cumming, S. and Paolino, D. (1993) 'Outline of Discourse Transcription', in J. Edwards and M. Lampert (eds) *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, pp. 45–90. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gibbs, R.W. (1994) *The Poetics of Mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goatly, A. (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*. London: Routledge.
- Gobodo-Madikizela, P. (2002) 'Remorse, Forgiveness, and Rehumanization: Stories from South Africa', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 42: 7–32
- Graumann, C. (1990) 'Perspective Structure and Dynamics in Dialogues', in I. Markova and K. Foppa (eds) *The Dynamics of Dialogue*, pp. 105–26. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Halpern, J. and Weinstein, H.M. (2004) 'Rehumanizing the Other: Empathy and Reconciliation', *Human Rights Quarterly* 26: 561–83.
- Keller-Cohen, D. and Gordon, C. (2003) "'On Trial": Metaphor in Telling the Life Story', *Narrative Inquiry* 13: 1–40.
- Kittay, E.F. (1987) *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövesces, Z. (2005) *Metaphor and Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993) 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor', in A. Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edn, pp. 202–51. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (in press) *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lederach, J.P. (1997) *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace.
- Levitt, H., Korman, Y. and Angus, L. (2000) 'A Metaphor Analysis in Treatments of Depression: Metaphor as a Marker of Change', *Counselling Psychology Quarterly* 13: 23–35.
- Lotman, Y.M. (1988) 'Text within a Text', *Soviet Psychology* 26(3): 32–51.

- Martin, J. (2002) 'Blessed are the Peacemakers: Reconciliation and Evaluation', in C. Candlin (ed.) *Research and Practice in Professional Discourse*, pp. 187–228. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
- Musolff, A. (2004) *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oberschall, A. (2000) 'The Manipulation of Ethnicity: From Ethnic Cooperation to Violence and War in Yugoslavia', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23: 982–1001.
- Quinn, N. (1991) 'The Cultural Basis of Metaphor', in J. Fernandez (ed.) *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, pp. 56–93. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rolston, W. (1992) *Drawing Support: Murals in the North of Ireland*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications.
- Schön, D. (1979) 'Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem-setting in Social Policy', in A. Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edn., pp. 137–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E. (2005) 'The Metaphorical Construction of Complex Domains: The Case of Speech Activity in English', *Metaphor and Symbol* 20: 35–70.
- Staub, E. (2001) 'Individual and Group Identities in Genocide and Mass Killing', in R.D. Ashmore, L. Jussim and D. Wilder (eds) *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Resolution*, pp. 159–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steen, G. (1994) *Understanding Metaphor in Literature*. London: Longman.
- Stelma, J. and Cameron, L. (in press) *Intonation Units in Research on Spoken Interaction. Text and Talk*.
- Wertsch, J. (1998) *Mind as Action*. New York: Oxford University Press.



LYNNE CAMERON is Professor of Applied Linguistics at The Open University (previously at the University of Leeds). Her research interests include the use of metaphor in talk, applications of complex dynamic systems theory to discourse and applied linguistics, and the development of language skills of pupils from minority ethnic communities. She is founder Chair of the international association for Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM), and a member of the Editorial Board of the journals *Applied Linguistics* and *Metaphor and Symbol*. ADDRESS: The Open University, Milton Keynes, MK7 6BJ, UK. [email: L.J.Cameron@open.ac.uk]