SOCIOLINGVISTIKA / SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Conceptualising Music: Metaphors of Classical Music Reviews

Inesa Šeškauskienė, Totilė Levandauskaitė

crossref http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.23.5268

Abstract. The present paper sets out to examine music-related metaphors in classical music reviews written in English. Previous researchers working in the framework of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory have identified several music metaphors. One of the key domains of music conceptualization seems to be motion. However, their methodology of research did not rely on actual language data and on many occasions was discussed as debatable. The second generation cognitive linguists have focused on corpus and corpus-related methodologies of metaphor identification, elaborated many crucial concepts and thus questioned many ideas of previous researchers. The present paper relies on MIP methodology, or metaphor identification procedure, elaborated by a group of cognitive linguists and further updated by the Amsterdam group in Vrije University. The findings suggest that the MOTION metaphor features in the collected data most prominently. This metaphor together with CONTAINER and LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphors account for almost two thirds of all linguistic metaphors. Presumably, they structure classical music reviews and underlie our reasoning about classical music to a very large extent. Also a large number of linguistic metaphors tend to be more innovative than dead. The more innovative the metaphor, the more evaluative it is. A rather explicit evaluation (positive or negative) is part of the review genre.

***Keywords**: metaphor, classical music, review, conceptualization, domain, genre.*

Introduction

Metaphor and music are not only related by a sheer coincidence of the first letters in the words ***m**etaphor* and ***m**usic*. As claimed by a number of cognitive linguists, our reasoning about abstract things is largely shaped by metaphors, which are grounded in bodily experience (cf. Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff and Johnson, 1999, 2002; Gibbs et al., 2004; Johnson, 2007, among others). Music in this respect is no exception. Music metaphor researchers Johnson and Larson (2003, p. 78) are of the opinion that "we cannot clearly separate our understanding and conceptualization of music from our experience of it". Thus music, one of largely abstract domains of human experience, is naturally conceptualized in terms of space, human body and many other more concrete experiential domains. An interesting overview of research into how the domain of music correlates with other conceptual domains is given by a music professor at the University of Chicago Lawrence Zbikowski (2008).

The idea about the inter-domain connections and the understanding of metaphor not confined to "decorative" language of literary people, belongs to the authors of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), one of major realms of research in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics, distinct from the traditional, classical school of Aristotelian framework (for more details about this development see Leezenberg, 2001). The authors of the CMT George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2003; Lakoff, 1999) and later metaphor researchers have on more than one occasion claimed that metaphor is not confined to language and is a matter of reasoning about one domain in terms of another. The idea about 30 years ago looked rather revolutionary; however, now it is gaining support from 'hard' sciences, for example, from current research into neurobiology and neurolinguistics. It has been established that human brain manifests structured interrelationship between different modalities, which shapes human cognition (cf. Barsalou, 2009). Joint work of neurobiologists and linguists has resulted in identifying that brain structures in the sensory-motor regions of the human brain are exploited to characterize abstract concepts (Gallese and Lakoff, 2005). Such findings help support the CMT and the principle of cross-domain mappings, in particular.

Language gives expression to or, metaphorically speaking, opens a window, to our thought and is closely linked with it. In terms of the CMT, linguistic expressions point to the underlying metaphors structured in terms of source and target domains. Thus, saying *I first fell in love when I was ten* signals the underlying metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER, where love, an abstract notion, is conceptualized in terms of a more concrete, experientially simpler, domain of a container. The first (LOVE) is referred to as target and the second (CONTAINER)—as source domain. One and the same metaphor could be manifested in numerous linguistic metaphors, or, in Lakoffian terms, metaphorical expressions (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2003).

The authors of the CMT and further metaphor researchers have pointed out at the distinction between the so-called dead, or entrenched, metaphors, which are usually part of our everyday reasoning and expression, like LOVE IS A CONTAINER, manifested in almost trite expressions like *to*

fall in love, and creative, or novel, metaphors, which are not numerous and are usually the result of a creative mind; often found in literature. The authors of the CMT seem to employ the theory for the explication of the first type of metaphor. Further researchers, however (see Deignan, 2005a; Semino, 2008; Cameron and Maslen, 2010, to mention just a few), are aware of the distinction but are interested in both types and often discuss them together. One of the reasons for such approach is their understanding that metaphoricity is gradable (cf. Deignan 2005a, pp. 36–47; Hanks, 2006). As a result, they often do not employ the term *conceptual metaphor.* It is usually replaced just by *metaphor.*

Many linguistic metaphors are so well-known to native speakers and so widely spread in language that they barely notice them. When writing or speaking about music, for example, we often use the expressions *high pitch, low pitch, scale, measure* etc. They all signal that we reason about music in terms of our bodily experience, first of all, in terms of space (cf. Jülich, 2012, 2013). To people raised in the spirit of Aristotle's understanding of metaphor, when it was restricted to language, mostly poetic, which is far from everyday expression, only very few outstanding linguistic metaphors would be categorized as metaphors. The CMT in this respect has given a very different perspective. It has actually expanded the field of research from poetic, elevated language to everyday language (and other human experiences) and eventually, to the language of all genres, modes, registers and discourses.

The researchers working in the field of music metaphors have identified at least three major music metaphors, resulting from our bodily experience: MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT (MOVING MUSIC, according to Johnson, 2007, pp. 248–250), MUSIC IS A LANDSCAPE (or MUSICAL LANDSCAPE according to Johnson, 2007, pp. 250–252) and MUSIC IS A MOVING FORCE (ibid., pp. 253–254). They all are related to motion, which, according to Johnson (2007, also cf. Johnson and Larson, 2003), is the result of human interaction with music, since music has the power "to move us, to give rise to feelings, and to enact changes in our body-mind" (ibid., p. 238). In the MOVING MUSIC metaphor music is perceived as a moving object, which is supported by the existence of such metaphorical expressions as *the strings slow down now, the music goes faster here* (ibid., p. 248; here and further in quoting Johnson's examples the italics are added). The MUSICAL LANDSCAPE metaphor is based on our understanding of music as a landscape, or as something through which the observer (and listener) moves. This, according to Johnson (ibid., p. 250), explains expressions like *we are coming to the coda* or *once you reach the refrain*; *the dissonant part is behind you.* The MUSIC AS FORCE metaphor is structured by conceptualizing music as a force which is capable of moving us and is manifested in expressions like *music blows you away, drags you down* etc. (ibid., p. 254).

Such observations are definitely very interesting and insightful. However, corpus linguists and "second generation" (the term has been suggested by Johnson, 2007, p. 264) cognitive scientists have noted that the above approach lacks objectivity; the linguistic data employed in the analysis is not verifiable (cf. Deignan, 2005a; Stefanowitsch, 2006; Cameron and Maslen, 2010; Steen et al., 2010, etc.; for an overview see Šeškauskienė, 2012). It is therefore natural that nowadays metaphor researchers base their investigation on actual language data collected by the researchers themselves or from such well-known corpora as the British National Corpus (BYU-BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) or corpora of other languages. The second generation metaphor researchers also employ corpus methodologies both in data collection and data analysis. A huge advantage of such studies is that they rely on naturally occurring data and complement the introspective observations of previous cognitivists thus making the once elusive metaphor research more objective and reliable.

The present investigation aims at identifying how music is conceptualized in classical music reviews written in English. For that purpose, the metaphors manifested in the highest number of metaphorical expressions will be identified and their key aspects of realization described. Presumably, the most prominent metaphors structure the genre of music reviews. Music in this paper is understood as one of experiential domains and includes not only pieces of music performed onstage, but also performers, audience, instruments, the atmosphere during a concert, etc.; they all participate in creating 'music events'. Supposedly, such interpretation does not contradict the primary meaning of music, which is confined to sounds arranged in a specific way and which are pleasant to listen to (cf. its definition in ODE (2010) or OED (2012)), or to the so-called naïve understanding of music.

The empirical research, the results of which are demonstrated in the present paper, to a large extent, helps verify some of the claims made by previous scholars. Presumably, conceptualization of one or another specific area is determined not only by a (culturally moulded) thought and understanding but also imposed by the genre of reviews, which, similarly to referee reports, are highly evaluative (cf. Ryvitytė (2005) on book reviews and Bromwich (2009) on referee reports). It is therefore likely that metaphor does not only have different dominant functions in different genres, as claimed by Semino (2008, p. 218), but each genre gives preference to its own, genre-specific, metaphors.

Data and Methods

The data for the present research has been collected from two databases: *Academic Search Complete* and *MasterFILE Premier* (EBSCO). Overall, 48 reviews come from 8 different journals published in the UK and the USA monthly, bi-monthly and quarterly: *The Strad*, *The Flutist Quarterly*, *Fanfare*, *American Record Guide*, *Clavier Companion*, *Classical Record Collector*, *Musical Opinion*, and *International Piano*. They are fairly well-known journals publishing professional reviews of new music performances and/or newly released music CDs and DVDs. The addressees of these journals are musicians, musicologists or simply people with interest in classical and jazz music.

To avoid the disparity of the results, the investigation has been limited to classical music reviews. Therefore, the

results obtained have to be interpreted with caution, without too broad generalizations extending beyond the scope of this particular genre of music.

All reviews were published in the period between 2007 and 2012. The length of the reviews varies from one paragraph to a couple of pages, with the total number of words amounting to approximately 23,000. The full list of reviews is given at the end of the present paper. They are listed chronologically from 2007 to 2012 and marked from R1 to R48, respectively (R stands for 'review'). The authors of the reviews include a large number of different musical professionals. An attempt was made to collect as few reviews by the same authors as possible. Still there are some reviews in the corpus which have been written by the same author(s). Any criticism that the resulting analysis might be limited to the analysis of the language and metaphors of individual authors has to be rejected on the grounds that those several reviews written by the same author are very short. For example, the number of words of seven reviews by M. Harrison review hardly exceeds 2000, whereas W. Bender's review, which is the only one in the whole corpus, is about the same size—slightly over 2000 words.

As already mentioned, metaphors are manifested at the level of (linguistic or any other) expression as metaphorical expressions, or, using later terminology, linguistic metaphors. Their identification in the text of the reviews was based on the so called Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) suggested by Pragglejaz group (Pragglejaz group, 2007) and modified by Gerard Steen and his colleagues at Vrije University in Amsterdam (Steen et al., 2010). Hence the later version of MIP is referred to as MIPVU, the last letters standing for Vrije University. The four steps of metaphor identification are as follows (Pragglejaz group, 2007, p. 3; also quoted in Steen et al., 2010, p. 769):

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, 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 lexical unit.

   (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be

   - More concrete [what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste];
   - Related to bodily action;
   - More precise (as opposed to vague);
   - Historically older.

   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

   (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

The methodology is in line with a number of corpus linguists, who are of the opinion that context is a foremost indicator of metaphoricity of a word or expression (see Deignan, 2005a; Stefanowitsch, 2006, among others). More precisely, one has to look into the immediate context, or collocation, of an item under study. Combinability is a fairly reliable criterion of metaphoricity (also see Šeškauskienė, 2013).

After carefully examining the review texts, all music-related metaphorical expressions were identified following the above identification procedure. Afterwards they were interpreted within the framework of the CMT, briefly discussed above.

Metaphors of Classical Music

Overall, 947 music-related metaphorical expressions have been identified in the analysed texts. In terms of normalized frequencies, 4 metaphorical expressions occur in 10,000 words of the collected corpus. The linguistic expressions account for 11 major metaphors. Some of them subsume several minor metaphors, which are varieties or specifications of the major metaphors. For example, under the best known and the most frequently represented MUSICAL MOTION metaphor three metaphors discussed by music metaphor researchers (cf. Johnson, 2007; Jülich, 2012, 2013) are subsumed, namely: MUSIC IS THE PERFORMERS/LISTENERS MOVING ALONG A LANDSCAPE, MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT and MUSIC IS A MOVING FORCE. Under the CONTAINER metaphor, such minor metaphors as MUSICAL WORK/WORKS IS A CONTAINER, CONCERT IS A CONTAINER, SOUND IS A CONTAINER and nine other metaphors are subsumed. MUSIC IS LINGUISTIC CREATION is another metaphor with two rather distinct varieties, namely: MUSIC IS LITERATURE and MUSIC IS VERBAL RHETORIC. MUSIC IS NATURE is specified as MUSIC IS A BODY OF WATER, MUSIC IS FLORA AND FAUNA and MUSIC IS ATMOSPHERE; however, the low number of occurrences of the metaphorical expressions rather decreases their role in structuring music reviews under study.

All metaphors are enumerated in Table 1 in the decreasing order of frequency of the linguistic metaphors for each metaphor. The overall number of linguistic metaphors, or metaphorical expressions (ME), per each major metaphor is given in the last column of the Table. Following the CMT, a major tool for interpreting the data, the metaphors in Table 1 and throughout this paper are written in small caps.

As seen from Table 1, the first four major metaphors account for more than 75 per cent of all metaphorical expressions. The next six metaphors seem to be much less important, whereas the last metaphor, which only accounts for 7 metaphorical expressions, is very marginal, at least in this genre. The MUSICAL MOTION metaphor, as rightly

pointed out by Johnson and Larson (2003; also see Johnson, 2007), is the most distinct in our reasoning about music. Let us discuss it in more detail.

Table 1. Metaphors and metaphorical expressions in music reviews

No.	Metaphor	No. of ME
1	MUSICAL MOTION MUSIC IS THE PERFORMERS/LISTENERS MOVING ALONG A LANDSCAPE, 104 MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT, 66 MUSIC IS A MOVING FORCE, 3	242
2	MUSIC IS A CONTAINER MUSICAL WORK/WORKS IS A CONTAINER, 107 MUSICAL MOVEMENT IS A CONTAINER, 45 CONCERT IS A CONTAINER, 30 KEY IS A CONTAINER, 12 SMALL PARTS OF A MUSICAL WORK ARE CONTAINERS, 10 MUSICAL STRUCTURE/ELEMENTS OF MUSICAL STRUCTURE ARE CONTAINERS, 9 INSTRUMENT IS A CONTAINER, 5 SOUND IS A CONTAINER, 5 INTERPRETATION IS A CONTAINER, 3 MUSICAL LIFE IS A CONTAINER, 3 MUSICIAN'S HANDS ARE A CONTAINER, 2 LISTENING IS A CONTAINER, 1 RHYTHM IS A CONTAINER, 1	233
3	MUSIC IS LINGUISTIC CREATION MUSIC IS LITERATURE, 101 MUSIC IS VERBAL RHETORIC, 60	161
4	MUSIC IS A PERSON	89
5	MUSIC IS FOOD	56
6	MUSIC IS AN OBJECT	44
7	MUSIC IS ARCHITECTURE	36
8	MUSIC IS NATURE MUSIC IS A BODY OF WATER, 12 MUSIC IS FLORA AND FAUNA, 10 MUSIC IS ATMOSPHERE, 6	28
9	MUSIC IS PAINTING	26
10	MUSIC IS RACE	25
11	MUSIC IS ELECTRIC CHARGE	7
TOTAL:		**947**

MUSICAL MOTION metaphor

The metaphor accounting for slightly more than 25 per cent of the data is directly linked to one of basic human experiences—that of motion. In music, it is quite understandable since first, motion is produced by the sound moving the air or people moving the strings of an instrument, hitting the keys, etc. and second, the body of a musician, since the body usually naturally moves, when the person performs music. The impact of music on humans is often also explained through the notion of motion, usually the moving body of the listener. Thus motion in the domain of music is ubiquitous. Motion is closely linked with space, since moving people often have to rely on certain signposts around them. The signposts usually refer to places, distances, directions, speed and so on. Therefore, in the realization of the metaphor we often come across spatial words and expressions.

The three metaphors subsumed under the MUSICAL MOTION metaphor are not equally represented. The most frequent seems to be the one where the listeners and the performers are perceived as moving along a landscape (MUSIC IS THE PERFORMERS/LISTENERS MOVING ALONG A LANDSCAPE) accounting for about half of the metaphorical expressions of musical motion. Interestingly, one of the key terms in musical language is *movement*, meaning a section of a symphony, sonata, etc. Another word referring to a section, part of a musical piece is *passage,* which in its first physical meaning refers to a specific, enclosed, location, cf.:

(1) (…) *the moonlight graciousness of the middle* ***movement.*** (R43)[1]

(2) (…) *the* ***passages*** *where the piano has more forceful material.* (R46)

Another frequently employed element referring to motion and travelling and which has long been fossilised as a musical term is *accompaniment*. The metaphorical meaning can be explained with reference to the primary, physical, meaning of the word. In the primary meaning of accompaniment the element of travelling together with someone stands out; this image seems to have been transferred onto our reasoning about music, when someone performing together is conceptualised as accompanying him/her, cf.:

(3) *The second-rank orchestra is well conducted by Victor Feldbrill and* ***accompanies*** *responsively.* (R20)

The musical landscape is also described employing spatial words and expressions referring to places, such as *way, midway,* to listeners, performers moving in those places, such as *entering, coming, returning, pounding away, leading*, *following*, to speed, such as *slow down*, *keep it moving*, *pace*, *are on the move*, *slow to a crawl*, to distance, such as *thus far,* etc. For example:

(4) (…) *in the Beethoven he seemed to be still* ***finding his way****.* (R42)

(5) ***Thus far*** *Piemontesi had played.* (R24)

(6) (…) *with the concluding* ***return*** *to A Minor in the final movement.* (R44)

In the following example there are at least three words referring to musical motion: *midway*, *movement* and *slow down*. The first seems to evoke the image of travelling, the second is a rather general motion-related word and the third gives an idea about the speed of motion, cf.:

(7) *There is one climatic moment* ***midway*** *through the first* ***movement*** *that Horowitz likes to* ***slow down****.* (R11)

Like in many MUSICAL MOTION and other metaphors, not only those in music or music-related fields, the above example demonstrates the fragmentation of the image. The fragmentation is understood in such a way that when (reasoning and) speaking or writing about a particular field, we at the same time select elements from more general and more specific, or basic, experiential domains. As a result, the metaphors are also either more general or

[1] The index in round brackets, for example, (R42), refers to the actual review from which the example has been taken. Their full list is available at the end of the paper.

more specific. For example, TRAVELLING, or JOURNEY, metaphor identifiable in the word *midway* in example (7) is more specific than MOTION metaphor (*movement* in example (7)). The latter is much less restricted as to the mode or trajectory of movement and, unlike JOURNEY metaphor, has no identifiable destination. *Slowing down*, as seen in example (7), has no clear reference to travelling, or JOURNEY, and is logically interpreted as realizing a more general MOTION metaphor.

The above examples, and especially (1), (2) and (3), are cases of entrenched, or dead, metaphors, which is natural in terminology. Researchers shall not create a new term for each phenomenon, because it would lead to massive confusion in the research community. However, in other situations creativity is not rare, cf. example (4). In example (8) the listeners are conceptualized as moving along the musical landscape and *following* the performers; *follow* is a rather frequent word in such context. However, the image is enriched by using the word *ear*, a human body part, which in this case, metonymically stands for the listener, cf.:

(8) (…) *the stereo separation between the two pianos in the Seventh Mot really helps* ***the ear to follow*** *their interactions.* (R38)

Another metaphor within the MUSICAL MOTION metaphor, underlying a large number of metaphorical expressions, is MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT. The emergence of such metaphor in our reasoning about music can be explained in reference to music as a temporal experience; i.e. as an experience located in time. As confirmed by researchers working in space→time metaphors (cf. Gentner, Imai and Boroditsky, 2000), in English, there are two space→time metaphoric systems: ego-moving system, where ego moves along the time-line towards the future, and time-moving system, where time is moving and events together with it (ibid., p. 538ff.). Time is perceived as coming towards us and past us. Thus TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT serves as a grounding metaphor for conceptualising music as a moving object (cf. Johnson and Larson, 2003); in other words, the metaphor MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT works along the same principles as TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT. At the linguistic level, we come across expressions referring to different ways of moving (9), temporal sequence (10), the speed of music (11), etc. For example:

(9) *The music* ***moves*** *in what I can best describe as a streamlined bump and jog style.* (R36)

(10) (…) *on the disc the sonata* ***comes first****.* (R44)

(11) (…) *the entire etude for sonorities, which is too* ***fast****.* (R35)

At first sight both MUSICAL MOTION metaphors, MUSIC IS THE PERFORMERS/LISTENERS MOVING ALONG A LANDSCAPE and MUSIC IS A MOVING OBJECT are realized employing similar linguistic expressions. However, the second metaphor focuses on the moving music (sounds, sonatas, preludes, etc.), whereas the first involves moving performers, the audience or both.

The third, MUSIC IS A MOVING FORCE, metaphor within the MUSICAL MOTION major metaphor is rather scarcely represented in the corpus. In it, music is perceived as a force influencing the listener or the performer, for example:

(12) *Diev also plays beautifully when so* ***directed*** *by the music.* (R2)

Any more detailed description of the realization of this metaphor is hardly possible. To prove or disprove its prominence in music discourse further research is needed.

Overall, the MUSICAL MOTION metaphor, as rightly pointed out by previous researchers (cf. first of all, Johnson and Larson, 2003; Johnson, 2007), who mostly relied on their linguistic intuitions, features prominently in our reasoning about music. Music is mostly conceptualized as performers or listeners moving along a landscape or as a moving object. Its manifestation is largely confined to verbs of motion, adjectives and adverbs giving extra information about many aspects of the motion and a number of spatial words and expressions. Some linguistic clues to a more organized motion, such as travelling or journey, are rather fragmentary. To prove the importance of the JOURNEY metaphor, which is particularly relevant in political discourse, further investigation is needed.

MUSIC IS A CONTAINER metaphor

CONTAINER metaphors are generally rather frequent in our experience. In language, they are often signalled by prepositions and prepositional phrases, such as *in, within* or *out of*, cf. *in love, within the constraints, within ambit, out of sight, out of trouble, out of mind,* etc. (also cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2003, p. 29–32). In classical music discourse, there are quite a few abstract entities which are conceptualized as containers, such as *musical work, concert, sound, listening,* etc. All of them can be viewed as different subdomains of music. Conceptualized as containers, these entities constitute a number of CONTAINER metaphors. Pieces of music, or musical works, seem to be most frequently thought of as containers. Their linguistic expressions account for almost half of metaphorical expressions of the CONTAINER metaphor and constitute more than 10 per cent of all metaphorical expressions in the music reviews under study. Other entities conceptualized as containers feature not so prominently.

The metaphorical expressions realizing the CONTAINER metaphor usually employ such verbs as *open, close, fill, contain, include,* the prepositions *in(to), out,* the adjective *full,* etc. For example:

(13) (…) ***a melody*** *also heard* ***in*** *the third movement.* (R14)

(14) *But Debussy* ***fills*** *this music [Debussy's Etudes] with detailed instructions for tempo, dynamics, touches, and moods, more than in any of his other piano music.* (R35)

(15) ***The opening*** *'Dusk' movement* (…). (R48)

(16) (…) *bring to the* ***closing*** *Allegro* (…). (R34)

(17) (…) *lovely middle piece,* ***in*** *A ♭*. (R20)

(18) *"Faun" is* ***flitting in and out*** *with 16th note passages.* (R33)

(19) *It [a symphonic suite] is a bit of a pastiche that does not **contain** much of his most personally individual music.* (R14)

The preposition *in* is among the most frequent indicators of the CONTAINER metaphor (cf. (13) and (17)). The collocation *in and out* also signals the same metaphor, but gives an impression of dynamism (example (18)). We are used to expressions referring to *opening* and *closing* parts, or movements (cf. (15) and (16) in music. Following the gradability approach to metaphoricity, such expressions are dead, entrenched in language (cf. Deignan, 2005a; Hanks, 2006). Example (14) demonstrates a lesser degree of petrification. According to the corpus linguist Deignan's classification (Deignan, 2005a, p. 39–47), it could be attributed to conventionalized metaphors.

Interestingly, a musical performance can also be conceptualized as fluid in a container, cf. the following example:

(20) (…) *this **frothy**, high-voltage, zesty performance.* (R43)

A frothy performance evokes an image of liquid with small bubbles on the surface. It is one of the expressions that is usually easily identified as metaphorical and is classified as innovative (Deignan, 2005a, p. 39–47). This specification of the CONTAINER metaphor is not so frequent in the collected data; however, at the conceptual level, it is interpretable in reference to emotion metaphors conceptualized as fluid in a container (cf. Kövecses, 2000). Since musical experience, both to the performers and the audience, is usually very emotional, the link between emotion and music is quite obvious. Thus EMOTION AS FLUID IN A CONTAINER could be treated as a grounding metaphor for MUSIC AS (FLUID IN) A CONTAINER.

Overall, the CONTAINER metaphor seems to exist in many shapes. Its linguistic realization usually foregrounds one or another element which helps identify it more precisely. However, drawing distinct boundaries between different 'containers' is not always easy. It seems that people tend 'to containerize' some entities more likely than others. As a result, pieces of music, musical movements or concerts are more readily thought of as containers, whereas instruments, musician's hands or rhythm are rather marginally represented in the corpus of classical music reviews.

MUSIC IS LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphor

Language seems to be a fairly frequent source domain in to metaphorically reason about many other experiential domains. Despite that language is itself an abstract domain, it has material manifestations of letters and sounds, which probably makes it more 'physical' than such abstractions as music, colour or emotion. If we search the BNC (BYU-BNC) and the COCA, two well-known corpora of British and American English (see BYU-BNC and COCA, respectively) for the collocation *universal language*, frequent in newspaper language and presumably signalling an underlying metaphor, we can come across expressions referring to painting and colour (21), vision (22), music (23), youth and beauty (24), even emotions (25) conceptualized in terms of language, cf.:

(21) *Crowe put in that the symbolists of Van Gogh's time had supposed **there was a universal language** of colour, a primary language, a divine alphabet of colours and forms.* (BYU-BNC)

(22) *The proper objects of **vision constitute a universal language** of the Author of Nature*. (BYU-BNC)

(23) *Music in fact is a **universal language** of a non-verbal nature which is rich in expression*. (BYU-BNC)

(24) *Instead, she and her portraitist trade in the **universal language** of youth and beauty*. (COCA)

(25) *But there is a **universal language** of sorrow, desire and loss expressed in Schnabel's—a painter turned remarkable filmmaker—adaptation of the Jean-Dominique Bauby's magnificently humane memoir.* (COCA)

In the collected data of music reviews, the two metaphors subsumed under the major metaphor MUSIC IS LINGUISTIC CREATION are concerned with the written production of language usually resulting in a specific genre of writing (MUSIC IS LITERATURE) and written and oral production of language meant for the public (MUSIC IS VERBAL RHETORIC). In the first metaphor, one mapping that stands out is the performer conceptualized as a reader (26) or translator (27), or interpreter (29) of a text. A piece of music can be perceived as a poem (28) or a story (30). For example:

(26) *Apekisheva gave the first two movements a virtually ideal **reading.*** (R26)

(27) (…) *allows her to **translate** these sparse scores into wide open sonic landscapes.* (R17)

(28) *The miracle, virtually a symphonic **poem** for a piano.* (R27)

(29) *Gulda's reputation as a Beethoven **interpreter*** (…). (R10)

(30) *It seems to have a tremendous musical **story** to tell you.* (R36)

Composers are usually thought of as writers of musical texts, even though there is not a single mention of words. However, musical works usually have *paragraphs, pages, commas, quotes*; some pieces are described as *idiomatic,* cf.:

(31) *The works are wonderfully **idiomatic** for flute.* (R31)

If there are changes introduced in the musical work, the result is usually referred to as *transcription* or *rewriting*. An individual version of performing can also be referred to as *paraphrase*, cf.:

(32) *Sgambati's **paraphrase** of a* Mélodie *from Gluck's* Orfée (…). (R25)

MUSIC IS VERBAL RHETORIC metaphor is realized through such linguistic expressions as *theme, introduction, conclusion, eloquently, fluently, fluency* etc. Such words as *eloquently, fluently* (also *fluency*) or *articulate, articulation,* often employed in the reviews, refer exclusively to spoken rhetoric and describe the high quality of the performance of a musical piece employing the vocabulary of verbal rhetoric, cf.:

(33) *Thus far Piemontesi had played with **fluency** and confidence.* (R24)

(34) *His style is modern and efficient, with crystal clear **articulation**.* (R38)

Interestingly, this metaphor employs the notion of *convincing* realized in a number of forms of the verb *convince* or the adjective *convincing.* Since rhetoric involves public communication and usually aims at persuading the audience, convincing naturally becomes part of rhetoric. In music the performers attempt to convey the message of a musical piece and convince the audience, cf.:

(35) *I remained **unconvinced** that I was hearing really "great" music-making.* (R18)

(36) *Set Svanholm (...) is still **convincing**, his voice never sounding forced.* (R10)

Describing the performance as convincing or unconvincing constitutes the expression of evaluation, which is the primary aim of a review as a genre. Unsurprisingly, a large number of metaphorical expressions in music reviews carry an evaluative load.

To conclude this section on the MUSIC IS LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphor, it should be noted that the distinction between its two varieties is not always clear. Some elements of expression are rather straightforward indications of one or another variety, for example, *story* in example (30) give reference to literature and *articulation* in example (34) leads to rhetoric. However, the use of *phrased* as given in example (37), could lead to both—literary and rhetorical interpretation:

(37) (…) *the way that Gould **phrased** and **articulated** this music.* (R42)

Such linguistic expression does not disprove the fact that our reasoning about music is to a very large extent shaped by our understanding about language, despite that some linguistic elements (such as *words*) do not feature at all.

MUSIC IS A PERSON metaphor

Personification, as noted by many authors, has been generally very well-known as a toll of our reasoning for a long time. In the CMT and later interpretation of metaphors, it often competes with metonymy (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/2003, p. 33ff.; Low, 1999; Deignan 2005b; Šeškauskienė, 2010). Depending on discourse type, presumably, the metaphor prominence at the linguistic level might vary. In educational discourse it seems to be paramount (cf. Low, 1999).

In classical music reviews the metaphor is among the four most frequent major metaphors, after MOTION, CONTAINER and LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphors; however, it only accounts for slightly more than 9 per cent of the data. At the linguistic level, it is characterized by such words and expressions referring to human body and appearance as *to have a spine*, *to see, to stand, to breathe*, *a heart, to clothe, [to be] manicured;* also to such character features as *furious*, *witty*, *self-conscious*, *dour*, *eccentric*, *passionate*, *vigorous*, *communicative*, *animated*, *sensitive*, *naive*, *busy*, etc. For example:

(38) *The Scherzo I has plenty of **spine**.* (R11)

(39) (…) *carefully **manicured** and highly edited studio work.* (R43)

(40) (…) *the concluding* Vivace *was at once brittle and **passionate**.* (R22)

Interestingly, in example (38) *spine* is characterized as being of a certain amount; the expression *plenty of* designates the metaphorical, rather than literal, meaning of the word: having a spine is understood as being strong and having a character; having *plenty of spine* must signal an extremely strong character. Interestingly, *having plenty of spine* carries positive evaluation of a piece of music and/or its performance; *being manicured* (39), however, is perceived as unnatural, hence negative.

Character features are mostly expressed through emotion-related words; they seem particularly well-characterizing many pieces of music. Hence a wide variety of such words are employed in the realization of the personification metaphor. A large number of linguistic expressions of this metaphor are innovative linguistic metaphors (cf. Cameron, 2005a, p. 39) and therefore are easily identifiable in the text as such.

MUSIC IS FOOD, MUSIC IS AN OBJECT, MUSIC IS ARCHITECTURE and some other metaphors

The remaining seven metaphors account for almost 24 per cent of the data. However, MUSIC IS FOOD, MUSIC IS AN OBJECT, MUSIC IS ARCHITECTURE metaphors feature more prominently in the data than the remaining NATURE, PAINTING, RACE and ELECTRIC CHARGE metaphors. Further in this section FOOD, OBJECT, ARCHITECTURE, NATURE and PAINTING metaphors will be dealt with. The last two, RACE and ELECTRIC CHARGE, metaphors, as rather marginally represented in the linguistic data, will not be discussed.

The food metaphor is realized through words like *taste, delicious, bitter, crisp, choppy, syrupy, appetite* even *salt* or *rhubarbs*. Some of them are part of our everyday diet (*delicious, bitter*), others are rather unusual, hence very much evaluative, e.g.:

(41) *Enger can further be commended for her **tastes** in music.* (R17)

(42) ***Our appetite is whetted** by the two Poulenc improvisations.* (R18)

A taste is one of the food- and eating-related words, which is frequently employed in many experiential domains. So people either have or do not have a taste for clothing, music, painting, etc. *Taste* used in reference to music is definitely an entrenched linguistic metaphor. *Having a taste* characterizes a musician or a performer positively. On the other hand, ***choppy** octave transfers* (R18) or *things becoming **syrupy*** (R45) signal a negative attitude of the reviewer. Both linguistic metaphors are innovative.

MUSIC IS AN OBJECT is another fairly well-known metaphor employed in many fields of human experience. To reason about abstract notions, we frequently employ such words as *give* (*an account*) and *take* (*a view*) and similar. What is given or taken is usually of the amount that could be put into our hands, like many concrete objects. In music

reviews, the verbs *give, take, hold, shape* are almost as frequent as the adjectives referring to some physical characteristics of objects, such as *tiny, brittle, soft, plush, metallic, silvery, lumpy, fragile*, etc. They all contribute to our understanding of music in terms of concrete objects surrounding us in everyday life. For example:

(43) *Her tone* (...) *is neither* ***plush*** *nor* ***rounded****; it has a* ***lean****,* ***silvery*** *quality.* (R36)

The sound is characterized as *plush,* which refers to a touch of objects like an armchair or a sofa; *lean* and *rounded* refer to measurements and size of objects; *silvery* is usually something light or of such colour. So in this case we witness the manifestation of the OBJECT metaphor employing words from two different sensory modalities, vision and touch, to characterize the third—sound. The synaesthetic transfer is not infrequent in language and thought (cf. Bretones, 2005).

Architecture seems to be another source of conceptualization in music. MUSIC IS ARCHITECTURE metaphor has been amply discussed by Larson and Johnson (2002–2003). They argue that architecture helps perceive music as a synchronic activity despite that, in fact, music only occurs as a sequence in time, or diachronically. You cannot experience any piece of music at a time. Therefore, architecture serves a tool to describe, analyse and evaluate musical performance as occurring all at a time.

In the collected data, linguistic clues to the metaphor are words referring to architecture, such as *buildings*, *bridges, passages* and *structures*. They are rather indirect references to architecture. In many contexts they could also be treated as indicators of a BUILDING metaphor. Such words as *ornament, embellishment* or *arch* used in reference to music more directly refer to architecture, to what can be viewed and admired, cf.:

(44) *Carmen Variations, an intended crowd pleaser from 1947 whose trills and* ***ornaments*** *obscuring the heart of the music* (…). (R11)

Synchronic in character, architecture is similar to painting, which in the collected data corpus is not very numerously represented. For some artists, cross-domain (synaesthetic) mappings are part of their professional life, since they were involved in both—music and painting. One such personality was the Lithuanian composer and painter Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis. He is known for his wonderful paintings of music.

A number of composers claimed to visualize certain sounds as colours (Messiaen, Scriabin, Ellington, etc.), some of them drew tables and schemas matching keys and intervals to colours. For example, Scriabin arranged such correspondences in a circle of fifths (Shaw-Miller, 2002, p. 67). Therefore, it is hardly surprising that performing music is conceptualized as *painting* or *colouring*; sounds are perceived as *colours, shades of colours* or *hues*. We also come across words like *palette(s), colourful (performance), glistening (colours)*, even *monochromatic (colour)*, all referring to sounds and music, cf.:

(45) (…) *conductor* (...) *conjured all of the work's* ***glistening colours*** *from the players of the London Symphony.* (R45)

As in many other cases, such innovative metaphors are not devoid of evaluation. People, able to produce all colours or shades/hues of colours, are very good performers; a palette usually carries a positive connotation having to do with the full range of musical sounds.

The conceptualization of human experience in terms of natural phenomena, such as water, atmosphere or flora and fauna is not new either. For music it is very natural, because nature is full of sounds. For many musicians and performers it is also a source of inspiration. However, music does not yield to such conceptualization very frequently; at least this has not been manifested in the genre of music reviews. In the data, rather indirect references to bodies of water seem to be given a slight preference over other natural phenomena. Music reviewers thus conceptualize pieces of music as *torrents*, something that *ebbs* and *flows,* has *depth* and *surface*, where you could *sink*, etc. *Clouds, thunderstorms* and *rainbows* are also elements of natural life employed in music reviews. Many of these expressions carry explicit evaluative connotations. Interestingly, the *depth* of sounds and *flow* of music are usually associated with positive evaluation; if there is no flow, there is something wrong with the performer or the piece of music.

Conclusions

The present paper has focused on the analysis of a rather specific genre—classical music reviews. They were chosen as linguistic material for the analysis of underlying music metaphors, which, presumably, are a clue to our reasoning about music. The investigation was carried out in the framework of the CMT and major works of further metaphor researchers. The works of corpus-linked branch of cognitive linguists helped set the methodology of research and identify the key metaphors.

As a result, the analysis confirmed the assumptions made by more traditional cognitivists, Johnson and Larson (2003; also cf. Johnson, 2007), that music discourse is structured by the MUSICAL MOTION metaphor to a very large extent. It seems that preference is given to the variety of the MUSICAL MOTION metaphor where music perceived as performers/listeners moving along a landscape. Music perceived as a moving object features less prominently, whereas MUSIC IS A MOVING FORCE METAPHOR is rather marginal.

The MUSICAL MOTION metaphor is one of eleven metaphors identified in the data and one of the three metaphors accounting for almost two thirds of the linguistic metaphors identified in the data. The other two top metaphors structuring (classical) music include CONTAINER and LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphors. The entities that seem to be most frequently perceived as containers include pieces of music and their parts, also concerts. The LINGUISTIC CREATION metaphor gives a clue to interesting tendencies in our reasoning. First, language seems to be perceived as more concrete than music and second, when reasoning about music, a highly abstract creative domain,

we resort to other, sometimes no less creative domains, such as language, literature, rhetoric, etc. Music is perceived as demonstrating a number of linguistic features—it can be read, translated, interpreted and clearly articulated; it can be fluent, eloquent and convincing.

Other, less prominent, possibilities of conceptualization include such source domains as humans, food, concrete objects and nature. Architecture and painting, not very frequent in the linguistic expression of music metaphors are nonetheless no less creative than music. However, being visual and synchronic arts, presumably, they are perceived as more concrete than music and therefore serve as source domains to reason about the more abstract diachronic domain of music.

Interestingly, most linguistic metaphors carry explicit evaluative connotations. Reasoning in the framework of the gradability approach to metaphoricity, linguistic metaphors vary from dead to very innovative, unique occurrences. We thus tend to conclude that the more innovative the metaphor, the more evaluative it is. The tendency has been observed in our data collected from music reviews. The evaluation ranges from very positive to very negative, but in each case the (positive or negative) value can only be identified in the context. Therefore, to identify a dead metaphorical expression it is sufficient to identify the discourse type and genre, for example, music review. To identify an innovative metaphor and particularly its (positive or negative) value, it is paramount to study the immediate context where it occurs.

The present investigation has been limited to slightly more than 20 thousand words, one music genre (classical music) and one verbal genre (reviews). It has also been limited to a single language (English). Further research could extend into larger corpora encompassing more genres and possibly, more languages. The latter would definitely trigger a study of cultural implications and open another fascinating aspect of study into metaphorical reasoning about music.

References

1. Barsalou, L. W., 2009. Simulation, Situated Conceptualization, and Prediction. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences,* no. 364. London: Royal Society Publishing, pp. 1281–1289.
2. Bretones, C. M., 2005. What's your Definiton of *Synaesthesia*: a Matter of Language or Thought? Available at: http://csjarchive.cogsci.rpi.edu/Proceedings/2005/docs/p337.pdf [accessed August 2013].
3. Bromwich, W., 2009. Identity, Anonymity and Appraisal: Discourse Processes in Double-Blind Peer Review. In: M. Gotti, ed. *Commonality and Individuality in Academic Discourse.* Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, pp. 349–366.
4. BYU-BNC—Davies, M., 2004. *BYU-BNC*. Based on the *British National Corpus* from Oxford University Press. Available at: http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/ [accessed September 2013].
5. Cameron, L. and Maslen, R., eds., 2010. *Metaphor Analysis*. London: Equinox.
6. COCA—Davies, M., 2008. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 450 million words, 1990-present*. Available at: http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/ [accessed September 2013].
7. Deignan, A., 2005a. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
8. Deignan, A., 2005b. A Corpus Linguistic Perspective on the Relationship between Metonymy and Metaphor. *Style,* no. 39 (1), Northern Illinois University: Department of English, pp. 72–91.
9. Gallese, V. and Lakoff, G., 2005. The Brain's Concepts: the Role of the Sensory Motor System in Conceptual Knowledge. *Cognitive Neuropsychology,* no. 22 (3–4). London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 455–479.
10. Gentner, D., Imai, M. and Boroditsky, L., 2002. As Time Goes by: Evidence for two Systems in Processing Space→Time Metaphors. *Language and Cognitive Processes,* no. 17 (5). London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 537–565.
11. Hanks, P., 2006. Metaphoricity is Gradable. In: A. Stefanowitsch and S. Th. Gries, eds. *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 19–35.
12. Johnson, M., 2007. *The Meaning of the Body.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 235–262.
13. Johnson, M. and Larson, S., 2003. "Something in the Way she Moves": Metaphors of Musical Motion. *Metaphor and Symbol,* no. 18. London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 63–84.
14. Gibbs, R. W. Jr., Lima, P. L. C. and Francozo, E., 2004. Metaphor is Grounded in Embodied Experience. *Journal of Pragmatics,* no. 36. New York: Elsevier, pp. 1189–1210.
15. Jülich, N., 2012. The Conceptualization of Music. In: *Researching and Applying Metaphor 9 Conference: Metaphor in Mind and Society. A book of abstracts*. P. 86. Available at: http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/events/RAAM/docs/ RaAM9BookofAbstracts.pdf [accessed September 2013].
16. Jülich, N., 2013. Metaphor in Musical Discourse—the Conceptualization of Music in Academic and News Texts. Available at: http://www.ualberta.ca/~iclc2013/ABSTRACTS/Julich.pdf [accessed September 2013].
17. Kövecses, Z., 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Lakoff, G., 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226471013.001.0001
19. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 1980/2003. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
20. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh.* New York: Basic Books.
21. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 2002. Why Cognitive Linguistics Requires Embodied Realism. *Cognitive Linguistics,* no. 13 (3). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 245–263.
22. Larson, S. and Johnson, M., 2002–2003. Architectural Metaphors in Music Discourse and Music Experience. *Yearbook of Comparative Literature,* no. 50.Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 141–154.
23. Leezenberg, M., 2001. Aristotle on Metaphor, Comparison and Similarity. In: M. Leezenberg, ed. *Contexts of Metaphor.* Amsterdam, New York: Elsevier, pp. 31–42.
24. Low, G., 1999. "The Paper Thinks…": Investigating the Acceptability of the Metaphor AN ESSAY IS A PERSON. In: L. Cameron and G. Low, eds. *Researching and Applying Metaphor.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 221–248. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524704.014
25. ODE, 2010—*Oxford Dictionary of English,* 2010. Second revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
26. OED, 2012—*Oxford English Dictionary*, 2012. Available at: http://oxforddictionaries.com/ [accessed September 2013].
27. Pragglejaz Group, 2007. MIP: a Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol,* no. 22 (1). London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 1–39.
28. Ryvitytė, B., 2005. Vertinimo raiška lingvistinių knygų recenzijose. *Žmogus ir žodis,* nr. 7 (1). Vilnius: Lietuvos edukologijos universitetas, pp. 96–101.
29. Semino, E., 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

30. Šeškauskienė, I., 2010. Who Discusses: the Paper or the Author of the Paper? Inanimate Subject + Active Verb in Lithuanian Linguistic Discourse as Compared to English. *Respectus Philologicus,* nr. 18 (23). Kaunas: Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, pp. 83–99.

31. Šeškauskienė, I., 2012. Metaforų tyrimo klausimu, arba kaip nustatyti metaforas. *Darbai ir dienos,* nr. 58. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, pp. 65–79.

32. Šeškauskienė, I., 2013. Metaphoricity of Academic Metadiscourse: what can be Raised in English and Lithuanian? In: I. Šeškauskienė and J. Grigaliūnienė, eds. *Anglistics in Lithuania: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Aspects of Study.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 93–120.

33. Shaw-Miller, S., 2002. *Visible Deeds of Music: Art and Music from Wagner to Cage.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

34. Steen, G, Dorst, A., Herrmann, B., Kaal, A. and Krennmayr, T., 2010. Metaphor in Usage. *Cognitive Linguistics*, no. 21/4. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 765–796.

35. Stefanowitsch, A., 2006. Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy. In: A. Stefanowitsch and S. Th. Gries, eds. *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1–16.

36. Zbikowski, L. M., 2008. Metaphor and Music. In: R. J. Gibbs, ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought.* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 502–524. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816802.030

Data

R1 Clark, Ph., 2007. Morton Feldman – An 80th Birthday Celebration. *International Piano,* no. 49. London: Rhinegold Publishing, p. 72.

R2 Harrington, J., 2007. SCRIABIN: Preludes. *American Record Guide,* no. 5(70). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 163.

R3 Harrington, J., 2007. SHOSTAKOVICH: 24 Preludes and Fugues. *American Record Guide,* no. 5 (70). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, pp. 163–164.

R4 Ivry, B., 2007. Jenny Lin. *International Piano,* no. 49. London: Rhinegold Publishing, p. 72.

R5 Kilpatrick, B., 2007. SEREBRIER: Symphony 2; String Fantasia; Violin Sonata; Winterreise. *American Record Guide,* no. 5 (70). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 163.

R6 Rucker, P., 2007. A PIANO EVENING WITH MARTHA ARGERICH. *Fanfare*, no. 31 (1). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 311.

R7 Vroon, D. R., 2007. SHOSTAKOVICH: Symphonies 2+12. *American Record Guide,* No. 5 (70). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 164.

R8 Vroon, D. R., 2007. SHOSTAKOVICH: Violin Concerto 1; TCHAIKOVSKY: Concerto. *American Record Guide,* no. 5 (70). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 164.

R9 Wigler, S., 2007. Helene Grimaud. *International Piano,* no. 49. London: Rhinegold Publishing, p. 72.

R10 Hornig, N., 2008. Waking the bats. *Classical Record Collector,* no. 52. London: Art Search, p. 61.

R11 Bender, W., 2009. Vladimir Horowitz. *American Record Guide*, no. 2 (72). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, pp. 232–235.

R12 Burwasser, P., 2009. MARTHA ARGERICH: EVENING TALKS. *Fanfare*, no. 32 (3). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, pp. 350–351.

R13 Kushner, K., 2009. Rafal Blechacz, piano. *American Record Guide,* no. 2 (72). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 232.

R14 Lintgen, A., 2009. PROKOFIEV. On Guard for Peace. *Fanfare,* no. 33 (2). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 258.

R15 Tuttle, R., 2009. PROKOFIEV. Piano Concertos: No. 2; No. 3 *Fanfare*, no. 2 (33). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 257–258.

R16 Auerbach, B., 2010. Horowitz in Berlin, 18 May 1986. *American Record Guide,* no. 5 (73). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, pp. 260–261.

R17 Auerbach, B., 2010. In Evening Air: Art of the Bagatelle. *American Record Guide*, no. 5 (73). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 260.

R18 Auerbach, B., 2010. Voyage a Paris. *American Record Guide*, no. 5 (73). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 261.

R19 Becker, A., 2010. Friedrich Gulda Recital 1959. *American Record Guide*, no. 5 (73). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 260.

R20 Kagan, S., 2010. HOROWITZ LIVE FROM TORONTO (1979). *Fanfare,* no. 2 (34). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 580.

R21 Hall, S., 2011. Bach: The Goldberg Variations. *Clavier Companion,* no. 3 (6). Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, p. 57.

R22 Harrison, M., 2011. Boris Giltburg. *Musical Opinion*, no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 50.

R23 Harrison, M., 2011. Edit Klukon and Dezso Ranki. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 50.

R24 Harrison, M., 2011. Francesco Piemontesi. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 51.

R25 Harrison, M., 2011. Helene Grimaud. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, pp. 50–51.

R26 Harrison, M., 2011. Katya Apekisheva. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 51.

R27 Harrison, M., 2011. Leslie Howard. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 50.

R28 Harrison, M., 2011. Rafael Blechacz. *Musical Opinion,* no. 1481 (134). London: Musical Opinion, p. 51.

R29 Hovan, R., 2011. Haydn: Divertimenti for the Salomon Concerts Solstice Ensemble. *The Flutist Quarterly,* no. 36 (2). Chicago: The National Flutist Association, p. 86.

R30 Lin, A., 2011. Gershwin: An American in Paris. *Clavier Companion,* no. 3 (6). Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, p. 57.

R31 Loewy, A., 2011. Flute Pieces with Piano Gary Schocker. *The Flutist Quarterly,* no. 36 (2). Chicago: The National Flutist Association, p. 87.

R32 Riner, N., 2011. Barn Dances Scott/Garrison Duo. *The Flutist Quarterly*, no. 36 (2). Chicago: The National Flutist Association, p. 86.

R33 Riner, N., 2011. Three Pieces Debussy (arr. for flute and piano by T. Smirnova). *The Flutist Quarterly,* no. 36 (2). Chicago: The National Flutist Association, p. 86–87.

R34 Rust, R., 2011. Bach: A Strange Beauty. *Clavier Companion,* no. 3 (6). Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, p. 57.

R35 Timbrell, Ch., 2011. DEBUSSY. 12 Etudes. *Fanfare,* no. 2 (25). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 403.

R36 Bayley, L. R., 2012. MOZART. Violin Concertos: No. 3; No. 5. Rondo in C. Adagio in E. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35).Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 404.

R37 Bayley, L. R., 2012. MOZART. Piano Concertos: Nos. 6, 13, 16. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 402.

R38 Dixon, G., 2012. BACEVIČIUS. Mots. *Fanfare,* no. 36 (2). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, pp. 250–251.

R39 Dubins, J., 2012. BACH. Well-Tempered Clavier, Book 1. *Fanfare,* no. 2 (36). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 185.

R40 Haller, S., 2012. Liszt: Piano Concertos 1+2; Ruins of Athens Fantasy. *American Record Guide,* no. 4 (75). Cincinnati: American Record Guide, p. 150.

R41 Homfray, T., 2012. Dante Quartet, Nicholas Daniel (oboe) Simon Goldhill (narrator). *The Strad*, no. 1465 (123). London: The Strad. p. 88.

R42 Orgel, P., 2012. ***. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, pp. 567–569.

R43 Rabinowitz, P. J., 2012. GLENN GOULD IN CONCERT, 1951–1960. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, pp. 565–567.

R44 Rothleder, B., 2012. MOZART. Piano Concertos: No. 14[1,3]; No. 17[2,4]; No. 25[1,5]; No. 26 "Coronation[1,5]". Piano Sonatas: No. 8; No. 18. Rondo, K 485. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, pp. 402–404.

R45 Rye, M., 2012. Leonidas Kavakos (violin) London Symphony Orchestra/Antonio Pappano. *The Strad,* no. 1465 (123). London: The Strad, p. 88.

R46 Talbot, J., 2012. Tim Lowe (cello) James Baillieu (piano). *The Strad,* No. 1465 (123). London: The Strad, p. 88.

R47 Ullman, M., 2012. MOZART. Piano Concertos: Nos. 13, 20. 6 German Dances. *Fanfare,* no. 4 (35). Tenafly: Ablaze Records, p. 402.

R48 Wise, B., 2012. Lara St John (violin) Marie-Pierre Langlamet (harp). *The Strad,* no. 1465 (123). London: The Strad, p. 88.

Inesa Šeškauskienė, Totilė Levandauskaitė

Muzikos konceptualizavimas: klasikinės muzikos recenzijų metaforos

Santrauka

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjamos muzikos metaforos klasikinės muzikos recenzijose anglų kalba. Ankstesni tyrėjai, dirbę pagal konceptualiosios metaforos teorijos principus, yra nustatę kelias muzikos metaforas. Viena iš ryškiausių muzikos konceptualizavmo sričių yra judėjimas. Tačiau vėlesni tyrėjai abejojo tokių tyrimų patikimumu, nes kokie bebūtų įdomūs pastebėjimai, jie tebuvo grindžiami tyrėjo introspekcija, o ne realiais kalbos duomenimis. Antrosios kartos kognityvinės lingvistikos atstovai daug dėmesio skyrė tekstynams ir tekstynų metodams, taikomiems metaforoms tekste nustatyti. Jie taip pat išgrynino dviprasmiškas sąvokas ir diskutavo dėl ankstesnių lingvistų idėjų. Šiame darbe remiamasi vadinamuoju metaforų nustatymo metodu (MNM), kurį sukūrė metaforos specialistų grupė *Pragglejaz* ir patobulino vadinamoji Amsterdamo grupė iš Vrije universiteto.

Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad ryškiausia metafora, realizuojama didžiausiu lingvistinių metaforų skaičiumi klasikinės muzikos recenzijose, yra minėtasis judėjimas. Ši metafora kartu su talpyklos ir kalbinės kūrybos metaforomis pasireiškia daugiau nei dviem kalbinių metaforų trečdaliais surinktame tekstyne. Manytina, kad jos didele dalimi struktūrina klasikinės muzikos recenzijas ir mūsų samprotavimus apie muziką. Be to, matyti tendencija, kad inovatyvių, originalių metaforų yra daugiau nei sustabarėjusių. Kuo originalesnė metafora, tuo didesnė tikimybė, kad ji turi vertinamąją konotaciją. Tai logiška, nes recenzijų žanrui būdinga eksplicitiška (teigiamo ir neigiamo) vertinimo raiška, kurios interpretacija neretai priklauso nuo kontekstu koduojamos informacijos.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2013 09
Parengtas spaudai 2013 12

About the authors

Inesa Šeškauskienė, Doctor in the Humanities (linguistics), Associate Professor of the Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Lithuania.
Academic interests: cognitive linguistics and the conceptual metaphor theory in particular, contrastive linguistics, English lexicology, legal English, learner language.
Address: Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: inesa.seskauskiene@flf.vu.lt

Totilė Levandauskaitė, Bachelor of English Philology from Vilnius University, Lithuania.
Academic interests: conceptual metaphor theory.
Address: Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: crimson_colour3@yahoo.com