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Foreword

It is of course one of the great pleasures of academic life to watch a new generation of scholars emerging to build on and develop the work that has gone before. In the case of Monika Bednarek we have the pleasure of enjoying a scholar working at the interface of two complementary perspectives on language, corpus linguistics and systemic functional linguistic theory, and developing new insights into the language of evaluation at the edge of knowledge in both these interacting domains. The challenge here is on the one hand to enrich the counting which corpus linguists undertake, and on the other to quantify the qualitative discourse analyses in which systemic functional linguists engage. Bednarek rises effectively to this challenge, paving the way for a generation of transdisciplinary rapprochement across these two fields.

Initially trained in Germany, Bednarek has pursued her doctoral and post-doctoral studies as a visiting scholar at both the University of Birmingham, where she worked with Susan Hunston and Peter White, and later here at the University of Sydney, where she has been an active member of our functional linguistic research community. Her generous mentoring, collaborative style and zest for intellectual challenge have been a boon to all concerned. And we are delighted to see her research come to fruition in this, her second monograph, which for the second time establishes her as an inspiring intellectual leader as far as text based work on language and evaluation is concerned.

I am honoured to have been asked to write the foreword for this book, and commend it to all readers, who will be treated to a voice they will be enjoying many times in the future as her career unfolds.

Prof J.R. Martin
Sydney
August 2007
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System Network Notation

assertion ‘realized by’
domain ‘or’
domain ‘or’ (fuzzy system)
intersection ‘and’

Appraisal theory’s labels for systems are usually in (small) capitals (e.g. AFFECT, APPRECIATION), but to show that I am making use of appraisal in a more theory-neutral fashion (see Section 1.4) I have not used this convention in this book. Appendices to chapters from this book are available online at http://www.MonikaBednarek.com. The book can also be read without consulting the appendices, but researchers interested in more detailed comments on methodological and other issues might find them useful.
Analyzing Language and Emotion

1.1 Introduction

While I was preparing the manuscript for this book in November 2006, a youth in Germany shot and wounded several of his fellow students, a teacher and the caretaker at his former school, before killing himself. Coincidentally, just days earlier I had finished a novel by the American writer Lionel Shriver about a similar scenario at an American high-school, which includes the following speech by the shooter (Kevin), addressed to his father:

‘I don’t care how your camera works.’ he continued levelly. ‘I don’t want to be a location scout for a bunch of crappy products. I’m not interested. I’m not interested in baseball or the founding fathers or decisive battles of the Civil War. I hate museums and national monuments and picnics. I don’t want to memorize the Declaration of Independence in my spare time or read de Tocqueville. I can’t stand reruns of Tora,Tora,Tora! or documentaries about Dwight Eisenhower. I don’t want to play Frisbee in the backyard or one more game of Monopoly with a snivelling, candy-ass, one-eyed midget. I don’t give a fuck about stamp collecting or rare coins or pressing colorful autumn leaves in encyclopedias. And I’ve had it up to my eyeballs with heart-to-heart father–son talks about aspects of my life that are none of your business.’ (Shriver 2006: 425–6, italics in original).

This is Kevin’s response to his father’s patronizing and rather simplistic behaviour towards him, and comes on the very day that Kevin kills members of his family, a teacher and several pupils at his high school. What is interesting about his response in the context of this book is
that it contains a lot of ‘emotion talk’: *I don’t care, I don’t want* (three occurrences), *I’m not interested* (two occurrences), *I hate, I can’t stand, I don’t give a fuck about, I’ve had it up to my eyeballs with*. These function to position Kevin contrary to the activities endorsed by his father, his father’s desire for Kevin to be just like him, and, simultaneously, against his father himself. They provide evaluations of entities and behaviour, asserting Kevin’s indifference, dislike and distaste towards what his father so whole-heartedly believes in (i.e. mainstream American ideologies and values). At the same time, they provide a characterization of Kevin’s personality, rather than just pointing to momentary or transitional emotional states. The passage is about interests, likes and values, though tellingly these are only referred to in terms of what they are not, rather than in terms of what they are. The extract seems to represent Kevin’s final emotional reaction towards his father’s continual attempt to mould him, their relationship, and their family life into some idolized ‘All-American’ perfection, rather than accepting Kevin on his own terms. Crucially, Kevin’s parents do not challenge or take him up on his words, though his emotional outburst is very unusual and extremely significant in light of his later deeds, indicating something of his ‘true’ state-of-mind and foreshadowing what later happens. His *emotion talk* is indeed very noteworthy.

Although this book is in no way about high-school killings or related phenomena, it is about emotion talk (using emotion terms) and its functions in discourse. It seeks to investigate how we use emotion talk in different types of text (the four registers of casual conversation, fiction, news reportage, and academic discourse) to position ourselves, to express evaluations and to provide information, and is aimed at all researchers interested in the use of emotion talk in naturally occurring discourse.

1.2 Emotion talk

Arguably, our emotions and how we talk about them are an essential part of what makes us all human. Even if animals may also have emotional experiences (Ekman 1992), humans can reasonably be regarded as the most emotional of all sentient beings (Mees 2006: 3). The study of human discourse about emotion therefore probes one of the most fundamental human characteristics.\(^1\)

However, our attitudes towards emotions themselves have in fact always been rather mixed, oscillating between the negative and the positive, with diverging dichotomies emerging in Western culture (Table 1.1 on p. 3).\(^2\) The view of emotions as irrational probably goes back
Table 1.1 Attitudes towards emotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion regarded as negative (distrust)</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Non-emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>ratio/intelligence/cognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrational</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passion</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaotic</td>
<td>ordered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective</td>
<td>universal, objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td>mental/intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintended</td>
<td>intended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncontrollable</td>
<td>controllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td>not dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>alienation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life</td>
<td>death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal connection</td>
<td>estrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free nature</td>
<td>shackling civilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic</td>
<td>artificial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


as far as Plato’s and Darwin’s observations on emotions and emotional expression (Oatley et al. 2006: 58). Their conception as dangerous and uncontrollable is reflected in frequent talk about emotional control in interviews (Lutz 1990, Parrott 1995), and psychological discourse (for example, Fiehler 1990: 60, Ekman 1992: 189). The aspect of control is also very important in the metaphorical construction of emotions, with a focus on attempt at control, loss of control and lack of control (Kövecses 2000: 43). It is embodied in the ‘master’ metaphor for emotion, emotion is force (Kövecses 2000: 17), which is exemplified by fixed expressions such as:

- He was seized by emotion.
- He was struggling with his emotions.
  (Kövecses 2000: chapter 5)

Further, Kidron & Kuzar (2002) point out that different cultural opinions about correct emotional behaviour are associated with the conceptualization of control with respect to emotional experience. The Anglo-American culture tends to emphasize ‘self-restraint and control of emotions’ (Kidron & Kuzar 2002: 134), which, as they argue, is reflected
by the way emotions are syntactically encoded in English. More specifically, for Americans, *being emotional* has negative connotations, and is linked to ‘losing control, confusing or mixed emotions, becoming irrational’ (Parrott 1995: 78). Males in Western culture appear reluctant to *accredit* (de Beaugrande 1992: 247) emotions, that is, accept and express emotional experience (but see Galasiński 2004).

Our attitudes towards, and thoughts and feelings about, emotions have been described as *meta-emotion philosophy*, and vary among cultures as well as individuals (Gottman *et al.* 1996: 243–5). From a different, more general perspective, the sociologist Arlie Hochschild talks of cultural ‘*emotion ideologies* about appropriate attitudes, feelings, and emotional responses in basic spheres of activity.’ (Turner & Stets 2005: 36). Meta-emotion philosophies and presumably also emotion ideologies, are reflected in discourse, with statements such as *Getting angry can be a relief* opposed to remarks like *Her shouting scares me* (Gottman *et al.* 1996: 267). Emotion talk can also reveal *emotional culture* (Gordon 1990) – what Stearns (1994, 1995 in Bamberg 1997b) calls the *emotional style* of a culture. Our ‘emotion talk’, then, may reveal our personal and cultural attitudes towards emotional experience but what else is its function? How do we talk about emotion in different situations, when do we do so and what is the purpose of this ‘emotion talk’? These are all questions that will be discussed throughout this book. The following sections give an overview of emotion research and outline the framework of analysis.

1.3 A brief history of emotion research

Emotions have been subject to a large number of empirical and theoretical studies, and it is impossible to do justice to all. Instead, only the most important ones (mainly in psychology, sociology and linguistics) are briefly reviewed. Concise overviews of many aspects of emotions can be found in Davidson *et al.* (2003) and Oatley *et al.* (2006), and there are also a myriad of handbooks and encyclopaedias of emotion research.

2006); neuroscience (for example, Davidson et al. 2003: part 1); anthropology (for example, Abu-Lughod & Lutz 1990, Goodwin & Goodwin 2000, Milton & Svašek 2005); sociology (for example, Gordon 1990, Turner & Stets 2005); communication studies (Planalp 1999); linguistics (see below) and so on.

Some recurring issues in emotion research are:

- What is an emotion? How can emotions be defined?
- What is the structure of emotions?
- How can emotions be distinguished from each other?
- How can emotions be studied, measured, and described?
- Are emotions innate (biological) and universal, or acquired and culturally construed?
- Are there ‘basic’ (innate, universal, primary, cognitively salient) emotions and what are they?
- What is the relation between linguistic resources (providing labels for emotions) and emotional experience?

To review discussions of these aspects in detail would take us too far: for instance, there are more than a hundred definitions of emotion (Jahr 2000: 7; see for example, Mees 2006, Oatley et al. 2006 for overviews) and heated discussions on most of the other questions can be found as well. However, it is interesting that several definitions note that emotions include ‘an eliciting condition, a cognitive evaluation, physiological activation, a change of action readiness, and finally an action’ (Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989: 82). The current consensus in emotion research seems to be that emotions are neither wholly universal nor wholly culturally determined, and that these two views are not completely incompatible (Parrot & Harré 1996: 2, Planalp 1999: 195). Some aspects of emotional behaviour are universal and rooted in biology (for example autonomic and central nervous system activity, facial expression) with the limbic system (the amygdala), the neocortex, subcortical regions of the brain, as well as hormones, neuromodulators, and transmitter substances related to emotional experience and emotion regulation (Turner & Stets 2005: 4–9, Oatley et al. 2006: chapter 6). At the same time, there is no doubt that other aspects of emotional experience are determined by socialization and cultural construal (even with respect to universal aspects such as facial expression), and there is both cultural, subcultural and individual variation (Ekman 1997, 1999b: 14, Ellsworth & Scherer 2003: 584, Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 282, Oatley et al. 2006: 68–9, 97, 180). While there is a wealth of research on cultural constructivism
and emotions (for example Harré 1986, Fiehler 1990, Abu-Lughod & Lutz 1990, Harré & Parrott 1996, Oatley et al. 2006: 70–2), the most well-known (non-linguistic) research probably relates to Goffman’s *dramaturgical/cultural theory*, Hochschild’s establishment of *feeling rules* and Ekman’s *display rules* (Ekman 1997, Turner & Stets 2005: 36–7). Dramaturgical theories see human behaviour as a scripted on-stage performance which is influenced by cultural norms and beliefs about emotional experience and expression, including feeling rules as generated by culture (Turner & Stets 2005: 23–4). These rules regulate emotional experience and management. *Emotion rules, manifestation rules, correspondence rules*, and *coding rules* regulate which emotions are to be expected in which intensity in social situations, how they are conventionally manifested, and how to react with the appropriate emotion – varying depending on social roles, gender, situation, culture (Fiehler 2002: 82–3). In Downes’s words, ‘culture specifies “what you are supposed to feel” ’ (Downes 2000: 108).

Aspects that seem to have an influence on the socialization of emotions are the development of *Über-ich*, conscience and ratio (Wilk 2005: 132), art (van Meel 1994: 163), as well as parent–child interaction and other microsocial interpersonal relationships through which macrosocial structures work (Gordon 1990: 147). Emotional intelligence, it seems, is learned in childhood, and emotion talk plays a crucial role in the socialization of emotions (Planalp 1999: 142–3). The talk of emotions and events that evoke them:

> teach children about what events appropriately elicit emotions in their community, inducting the child into the cultural rules of emotional expression. Emotion talk also structures the child’s own internal experience, and lets the child know about the internal experience of others

(Oatley et al. 2006: 302).

Though the connection between language and emotion had, for a long time, been neglected in linguistics (cf. Lyons 1982: 103, Finegan 1995: 2, Scheibman 2002: 7), by now a great variety of linguistic studies on language and emotion exist. However, while we may indeed talk of a new interest in emotive language, or the ‘ecology of subjectivity’ (Bublitz 2003: 389), there is, as yet, no unified theory of affect or emotion. Instead, we find a range of at times widely-differing approaches to the expression of emotion in general. One reason for this may be that the relation between language and emotion is itself quite complex: we
can express feelings that we have, we can have feelings that we do not express, and we can express feelings that we do not have (Daneš 1987: 174f, Caffi & Janney 1994). The feelings may be expressed consciously or subconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally, spontaneously (automatically) or strategically (Marty 1908, Daneš 1987, Planalp 1999: 71ff), and may relate to various aspects of the communicative context (Arndt & Janney 1987: 78–9). We can look at them in terms of the speaker’s (self-) expression, the potential of language to express emotion, or the presumable influence on the hearer. All these different perspectives can be found in the various approaches to affect/emotion in linguistics, which furthermore adopt different viewpoints according to the sub-discipline of linguistics in which they can be situated:3

- **The cognitive approach**: cognitive-linguistic research on words that refer to emotions, that is, the ‘emotion-lexicon’ (Palmer & Occhi 1999: 15). This approach examines how emotions are conceptualized (for example in terms of emotion schemata) and is concerned with the question of the universality of emotions, the origin of linguistic expressions of emotions, and the relation between emotions and their linguistic labels. This strand of study is sometimes called emotionology (Athanasiadou & Tabakowska 1998b: xii) and is exemplified by Athanasiadou & Tabakowska (1998a), Harkins & Wierzbicka (2001), and Kövecses (for example Kövecses 2000).

- **The cross-linguistic approach**: the study of emotion terms across languages. This approach seeks to demonstrate that the expression of emotions relies on culturally determined notions of emotions. In this context, Wierzbicka’s (for example 1992b, 1999) concept of ‘semantic primitives’ is most well-known (for a critique see Bamberg 1997b, Weigand 2004b). Other studies are Athanasiadou & Tabakowska (1998a), Ochs & Schieffelin (1989), Ungerer (1997), Harkins & Wierzbicka (2001), Kidron & Kuzar (2002), Dem’jankov et al. (2004) and Teubert (2004a, b).

- **The linguistic-anthropological approach**: studies in this area (for example Lutz & Abu-Lughod 1990, Irvine 1990, Palmer & Occhi 1999, Goodwin & Goodwin 2000) include work on language acquisition and ethnographic research on poetics and performance (Bensner 1990: 420ff). Studies of emotion in linguistic anthropology are also interested in ‘[t]he problem of how emotions are conceptualized, described, expressed, and realized in purposive actions in each language and culture’ (Palmer & Occhi 1999: 2). Another focus is on emotion as social practice (Goodwin & Goodwin 2000).
The diachronic approach: the attempt to trace the diachronic development of language that is associated with emotion. For example, Hübler (1998) explores the evolution of some grammatical means of expressivity in English; Győri (1998) is interested in semantic change concerning the conceptualization of emotions in different languages; and Teubert (2004a) tries to trace the origin of the feeling of guilt.

The functional approach: many modern studies on emotion can be traced back to the historical tradition of research on the functions of language (for example, Marty 1908, Bühler 1934, Jakobson 1960, Stankiewicz 1964; see also Sarangi 2003 for research by Richards in the 1920s), and some more recent approaches to emotion also deal with the notion from a functional point of view (for example, Šabršula 1982, Péter 1984, Daneš 1987, Stankiewicz 1989, Martinet 1991, Foolen 1997). Related to these are approaches to affective/expressive language (for example, Charleston 1960, Leech 1974, Schneider 1991) or studies which are concerned with the specific status of signs with emotive meaning (usually in terms of the difference between indexical and symbolic meaning as elaborated by Peirce 1978: for example, Volek 1977, 1987, Konstantinidou 1997).

The syntactic approach: studies concerning the syntax of emotion terms, for example the use of different prepositions (Dirven 1997, Osmond 1997, Radden 1998) or emotion verb complementation (Werth 1998).

The conversation analytic approach: studies taking up the legacy of researchers such as Schegloff and Sacks to focus on the display of emotion in discourse, specifically talk in interaction, with an interest in turn-taking and other types of structural organization (Jefferson 1988, Sandlund 2004), and the ‘embodied performance of affect’ (Goodwin & Goodwin 2000: 254, original emphasis).


The psycholinguistic approach: research concerning the development of emotions and related language in childhood – the ontogenetic perspective – for example, studies on the variation of emotional talk in different social strata (Burger & Miller 1999).

The pragmatic/textlinguistic approach: Studies in this area are interested in many aspects of language and emotion. Some examine ‘the conventional displaying of affect through linguistic means [for example pronouns, mood, tense/aspect/voice, intonation, lexis, discourse structure, affective speech acts]’ (Ochs & Schieffelin 1989: 7). Others are interested in emotive communication, where the notion is related to strategic uses of language, and is regarded as interactional, interpersonal, and other-directed (Caffi & Janney 1994: 328f). Arndt & Janney (1987) deal with the general influence of attitude on communicative decisions and regard emotive communication as a complex verbal, vocal, and kinesic phenomenon; Janney (1996) establishes emotive ‘strategies’ such as approach and avoidance (Janney 1996: 343ff). Ungerer (1997), on the other hand, looks at how emotions can be evoked in hearers, and Bublitz (2002, 2003) is interested in the ‘emotive prosody’ of texts, which express the speaker’s attitudes and emotions. Daneš focuses on how the expression of emotion is organized in text, in what he calls ‘the global emotional course (profile)’ of discourse (Daneš 1987: 177). Other studies analyze the connection between emotions and speech acts (Weigand 2004b: 16–18), and are interested in social constructivism (Bamberg 1991, 1997a, b) or ideological uses of emotion terms (Stubbs 1996: 85ff). Galasiński (2004) studies male emotion talk in connection with masculinity.

A special strand within the pragmatic approach is the intensity/involvement approach: involvement is the speaker’s ‘emotional engagement in the interaction, or ego-identification with the topic or partner of conversation’ (Janney 1996: 136f). Besnier (1994), Daneš (1994), Caffi & Janney (1994) and Watson (1999) give an overview of approaches to involvement (the classic reference is Chafe 1982). Intensity is defined as ‘the emotional expression of social orientation toward the linguistic proposition: the commitment of the self to the proposition’ (Labov 1984: 43f). Intensity markers are concerned with the degree of personal involvement of the speaker towards the described states of affairs (Dorfmüller-Karpusa 1990). Studies on intensity markers, or intensifiers, have focused on all aspects of speech that are capable of being modulated in terms of a higher on lesser degree of force. For examples see Janney (1996: 154, 160).
• **The systemic-functional approach:** systemic-functional linguistics is interested in affect in connection with *appraisal theory*, an approach to the interpersonal function of language (Martin & White 2005).

These approaches differ according to whether they concern the *language about emotion* (linguistic expressions denoting emotions) or *language as emotion* (linguistic expressions as conventionalized reflexes or indices of speakers’ emotions) (Grondelaers & Geeraerts 1998: 357). Different terms have been used by researchers for these two aspects (Figure 1.1).

![Figure 1.1 Language and emotion](image-url)
Simplifying the matter slightly, the language about emotion or *emotion talk* is constituted by all those expressions in the dictionary that denote affect/emotion, for example *love, hate, joy, envy, sad, mad, enjoy, dislike* and so on (as well as fixed expressions such as *He had a broken heart*). Language as emotion or *emotional talk* relates to all those constituents (verbal, non-verbal, linguistic, non-linguistic) that conventionally express or signal affect/emotion (whether genuinely experienced or not, whether intentional or not). Examples that are mentioned in the relevant literature (see above) include intonation, mental process verbs, grading (intensifiers, comparison, quantifiers, mood, modality, negation), repetition, interpersonal metaphor, figurativeness, punctuation, interjections, affective derivation (diminutives/augmentatives), inversion, exclamation, syntactic markedness, pronoun use, emphatic particles, intensifiers, expletives, vagueness, affective connotations, evaluative adjectives, and many more. Paralinguistic devices are facial expressions, vocal cues, gestures, body posture, body movement, and physiological cues (see for example, Planalp 1999: 44ff).

However, approaches to language and emotion cannot neatly be classified according to these two broad categories, since ‘the two [talk/writing about emotions and the interweaving of emotions and discourse] are related in a complex manner’ (Besnier 1990: 437). Hence, emotional talk also often involves the first person usage of emotion terms (*I love*) – which on a *functional* level can be linked to expressing emotion (see also Kövecses 2000: 2) – whereas emotion talk comprises *all* usages of emotion terms, but excludes other emotional talk devices (Figure 1.2 on page 12). Consequently, some studies of affect/emotion only deal with emotional talk (sometimes including, sometimes excluding the usage of emotion terms); others deal only with emotion talk (for example the cognitive approach), and in others both approaches are combined (Harkins & Wierzbicka 2001, Lutz & Abu-Lughod 1990).

To make matters less complicated I shall from now on work with a strict definition of *emotional talk* as including all sorts of human behaviour that signal emotion *without* the recourse to linguistic expressions that explicitly denote emotion (*emotion talk*). I will thus use a strict dichotomy between signalling and denoting affect. This means that all expressions that denote affect whether they refer to the self or the other will be considered as part of emotion talk (rather than as part of emotional talk):

- affect: signal (*Oh, fuck*)
- affect: denote (*I’m really angry*)
affect: other (non-1st person) \{affect: signal (And then he goes ‘Oh, fuck’) 
affect: denote (And he was very angry)

Whereas much research on affect (outside cognitive linguistics) concentrates on affect: self: express (that is, indications/signals of the emotions of the speaker), this study focuses on affect: self/other: denote. The main starting point of the analysis is thus simply lexis that denotes affect. The focus is on the usage in discourse of emotion terms (emotion talk) in British English, and no claims are made concerning a general (universal) theory of emotion or human psychology or languages other than English. The theoretical approach that is adopted here for the investigation of emotion terms is appraisal theory.

![Diagram showing emotional talk vs. emotion talk]

**Figure 1.2** Emotional talk vs. emotion talk

### 1.4 Appraisal theory

Even though appraisal theory works within systemic functional linguistics (SFL), it can also be adopted in a more theory-neutral way to the analysis of language. This is the aim of my analyses in this book,
which – while being sympathetic to systemic functional linguistics (SFL) – is nevertheless not rooted in SFL as such, and is aimed both at the systemic functional (appraisal) analyst as well as any researcher interested in emotion talk (specifically, corpus linguists). It adopts appraisal theory as one of its methodological tools, with corpus and cognitive linguistics and pragmatic analysis as complementary tools. For this reason, the following discussion of appraisal theory ignores considerations of SFL as a theory of language in general (for outlines, see Halliday & Matthiessen 2004, Eggins 2004, Martin & Rose 2007).

But why adopt appraisal theory, if I do not consider myself a systemic linguist as such? It does seem to me that its classification of resources of interpersonal meaning lends itself in particular to discourse analytical purposes. Its focus is on language in its social function, rather than on language and the mind (as in cognitive linguistics), and it is based on the analysis of naturally occurring discourse, in line with corpus linguistic and textlinguistic principles. In contrast to the pragmatic approaches mentioned above, which focus more on general emotive strategies or on the broad concepts of intensity/involvement, it is also specifically suited to the analysis of emotion talk, since one of its sub-systems (affect) specifically describes this aspect of social meaning.


Appraisal is divided into three sub-systems: attitude, engagement, and graduation, with further sub-divisions:
Graduation and engagement concern the modification of the intensity or force of an utterance (graduation) as well as the degree of speaker commitment towards the utterance (engagement) and are not particularly relevant in the context of this book. Much more important for the analysis of affect is the attitude system. **Attitude** is concerned with evaluations relating to emotion, morality/ethics and aesthetics, consisting of the three sub-systems of affect, judgement and appreciation. (Incidentally, the relation between affect and appraisal had already been noted by the philosopher Bedford in the 1950s: see Bedford 1956/57.)

**Affect** has to do with describing positive and negative emotions, both of the speaker (authorial affect: *I love*) and third parties (non-authorial affect: *s/he loves, you love, they love*). Affect can be realized by adjectives (*a sad person*), verbs (*he cried, he loved him*), nouns (*his grief*) and adverbs (*desperately*). Affect can furthermore be classified according to six factors:

The feelings are culturally construed as positive or negative: positive affect (*the boy was happy*) vs. negative affect (*the boy was sad*).

The feelings are realized as a surge of emotion involving para- or extralinguistic manifestation or are more mentally experienced as an ongoing emotional state: behavioural surge (*the boy laughed, the captain wept*) vs. mental disposition (*the boy liked the present/felt happy, the captain disliked the present/felt sad*).

The feelings are construed as directed at/reacting to some external agency or as a general mood: reaction to other (*the boy liked the teacher/the teacher pleased the boy*) vs. undirected mood (*the boy was happy*).

The feelings are graded in terms of a cline of intensity: low (*like*) – median (*love*) – high (*adore*).

The feelings relate to future states or existing ones: realis (*the boy liked the present*) vs. irrealis (*the boy wanted the present*).

Emotions are grouped into three major sets: in/security (*the boy was anxious/confident*) – dis/satisfaction (*the boy was fed up/absorbed*) – un/happiness (*the boy was sad/happy*).

These factors will be described in more detail in Chapter 5, which deals with a modification of appraisal theory. It remains to be noted at this stage that whoever experiences the emotion is classified as the **emoter**, and what evokes the emotion as the **trigger**, for example: The
boy [emoter] liked the present [trigger]. This will become important in Chapter 3.

Judgement systems consist of resources for morally evaluating human actions, behaviour or character, by reference to a set of ethic norms. Judgement is subdivided into two broad categories: judgements of social esteem (normality: standard–odd, capacity: clever–stupid, tenacity: brave–cowardly) and judgements of social sanction (veracity: honest–deceitful, propriety: moral–immoral). These can be positive or negative (admiration vs. criticism).

Appreciation systems include resources used to evaluate the (aesthetic) quality of processes, things and products (and human beings when they are seen as entities), for example It’s a fantastic book. Like affect and judgement, appreciation also has a positive and negative dimension, and is organized around three variables: reaction, composition, valuation. Reaction concerns the impact of the text/process on our attention (impact: captivating–dull) and its attitudinal impact (quality: beautiful–ugly). Composition concerns perceptions of proportionality/balance (balance: harmonious–discordant) and detail (complexity: intricate–simplistic) in a text/process. Valuation has to do with our assessment of the social significance of the appreciated entity (profound–shallow).

As becomes evident, not all sub-systems of attitude are of relevance here; rather, it is only the system of affect that concerns us. However, since there are some connections between judgement, appreciation and affect (White 2001: 3–4), and the borders between them are far from clear (Martin & White 2005: 57–61), both appreciation and judgement will at times come up in subsequent discussions. It must also be pointed out that both judgement and appreciation are considered as institutionalizations or recontextualizations of affect in appraisal theory:

AFFECT can perhaps be taken as the basic system, which is then institutionalized in two major realms of uncommon sense discourse. As JUDGEMENT, AFFECT is recontextualized as an evaluation matrix for behaviour, with a view to controlling what people do. As APPRECIATION, AFFECT is recontextualized as an evaluation matrix for the products of behaviour (and wonders of nature), with a view to valuing what people achieve.

(Martin 2000a: 147)

Appraisal has so far predominantly been applied to individual texts or relatively small corpora (for example Miller 2006), with the help of detailed manual analyses. (More recently, slightly larger

In contrast, I shall use both large- and small-scale corpus data in investigating affect in this book. The study will consider affect in four different registers, adopting this vantage point from the register analyses by Biber and his colleagues (for example Biber et al. 1999) with respect to stance analysis, described in the following sections.

1.5 Stance analysis and register variation

Since his seminal study of variation in spoken and written language (Biber 1988), Biber has been identified with the corpus-based study of linguistic variation. Of particular concern here are studies that analyze the expression of stance in different registers. Stance is similar to appraisal and can be defined as ‘the expression of personal feelings and assessments’ (Conrad & Biber 2000: 57). The notion of stance includes three broad categories: epistemic stance (certainty/doubt), style stance (discourse comments), and attitudinal stance (positive/negative attitudes/feelings). Epistemic and style stance are not relevant here, but attitudinal stance is. This conveys speakers’ attitudes, feelings or value judgements, including both emotion vocabulary (happy, love), and evaluative expressions (wonderful, lovely, good) (Biber et al. 1999: 968). Consequently, attitudinal stance is a broader notion than affect, making no distinction between the systems of affect, judgement and appreciation, and is more or less equivalent to attitude rather than affect. Furthermore, in some analyses of attitudinal stance no difference is made between emotion talk and emotional talk, so that, for example, expletives (God, damn) are included (Precht 2000: 67).

At the same time, analyses of attitudinal stance pick up only a small percentage of emotion talk, since the number of expressions considered as emotion terms is very low. This is because few emotion verbs, adjectives, adverbs and nouns are frequent enough to be included in a factor analysis, the corpus linguistic methodology most often used (Precht 2000: 68–71). Dry even argues that 60 per cent of emotion nouns in academic discourse are ignored by Biber & Finegan’s (1989) methodology (Dry 1992, cited in Precht 2000: 13). Additionally, many studies of attitudinal stance are limited to the analysis of first person usage of emotion terms, since only these are said to be ‘direct and explicit expressions of speaker attitude’ (Biber & Finegan 1989: 97; for criticism see...
Watson 1999). In any case, ‘affect is the least-thoroughly analysed aspect of stance’ (Precht 2000: 12).

Unfortunately, these three aspects (attitudinal stance equals the system of attitude rather than that of affect; only some emotion terms are included in the analysis; third-person references to emotion are disregarded) mean that the results of stance analyses are not directly comparable to the results undertaken here. What this study owes to stance analysis, and the analysis of register variation in general, is the insight that ‘[l]inguistic variation is central to the study of language use’, that it is systematic, depends on many contextual factors, and that it should be analyzed with the help of corpora (Reppen et al. 2002a: vii). In this respect, I assume that emotion terms vary across registers, that only a corpus-based analysis can tell us about the details of this variation, and that the usage of emotion terms is related to the characteristics of the given registers. The analysis must include more than individual words, however, since much corpus linguistic research (for example Sinclair 2004a,b, Hoey 2006) has shown the importance of lexico-grammatical patterns such as collocation and colligation. With respect to this, Chapters 3 and 4 will take up the notions of local grammar (Hunston & Sinclair 2000) and FrameNet (http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/), and will move beyond the investigation of individual emotion terms which is the focus of Chapter 2. The aims and methodology of this investigation will be outlined in the following sections.

1.6 Bringing it all together

1.6.1 Aims

As mentioned, the aim of this book is to study the usage of emotion terms (emotion talk) in four varieties (or registers) of British English in a large corpus including casual conversation, fiction, news reportage and academic discourse. An emotion term is defined as a lexical item that denotes emotion in a broad sense, namely affect, feelings, emotional states, moods, and so on (see Note 1). Prototypical examples are adjectives such as happy, sad, nouns such as joy, anger, adverbs such as happily, and verbs such as love, hate. Together, such lexical items make up the resources for emotion talk in British English.

More specifically, this book aims firstly at the quantitative establishment of emotion profiles for each register. This includes:

- **Lexical** variation: frequency and distribution of emotion terms (emotion profile 1)
Emotion Talk Across Corpora

- **Part of speech** variation: frequency and distribution of word classes (*emotion profile II*)
- **Syntactic** variation: frequency and distribution of choices in grammatical paradigms (*emotion profile III*)
- **Lexico-grammatical** variation: frequency and distribution of syntactic lexico-grammatical patterns (*emotion profile IV*)

This large-scale corpus study of emotion terms (making use of a 19.5 million word corpus) is followed by an exploratory **pragmatic/discourse-analytic** analysis of emotion talk in a small subset of the corpus (~85,000 words). As a background to these analyses, I use a modified version of appraisal theory which is developed with the help of corpus linguistic data and insights from cognitive linguistics/psychology (Chapter 5).

Summing up, this book combines both large-scale and small-scale empirical studies, and takes up three important current approaches to the study of language, offering complementary perspectives: the systemic, the corpus linguistic, and the discourse-analytic. As Partington has pointed out as late as in 2004, discourse analysis and corpus linguistics are still rarely combined (Partington 2004: 11). The same is true to some extent for the combination of SFL and corpus linguistic data (Butler 2004: 147; for existing research see Thompson & Hunston 2006, Kaltenbacher 2007). The main focus will be on human discourse about emotion in actual, naturally-occurring language, and its polyfunctionality.

### 1.6.2 The corpus

The corpus used for the analysis of affect is a register-sensitive corpus of British English. *Register* is here used in Biber et al.’s (1999) sense, defining a variety of language that is based on external, non-linguistic, situational criteria:

> Register distinctions are defined in non-linguistic terms, with respect to situational characteristics such as mode, interactivity, domain, communicative purpose, and topic. For example, newspaper editorials are distinguished as being (a) written, (b) published in a newspaper, and (c) primarily intended to express an informed opinion on matters already in the news.

(Biber *et al.* 1999: 15)

The chosen registers also broadly correspond to those analyzed by Biber and his colleagues (but see below): conversation, fiction, news, and academic discourse. As they note, ‘[t]hese registers have the virtue of being
(a) important, highly productive varieties of the language, and (b) different enough from one another to represent a wide range of variation' (Biber et al. 1999: 15–16). For the analysis of the four chosen registers, I used a custom-made corpus of British English compiled from various parts of the British National Corpus (BNC) with the help of Lee's (2002) classification of this corpus (see also Lee 2001). The aim was to compile a corpus that was as big as possible (to increase the reliability of the language data) while being as representative of the chosen registers as possible (within the limitations imposed by the contents of the BNC and based on language-external criteria). The main advantage of an approach that uses a publicly available classification system (Lee 2002) and corpus (the BNC) is its replicability (Oakey 2002: 115) – ‘the scientists’ favourite criterion’ (Kilgarriff 1997a: 147). This corpus will from now on be referred to as British Register Corpus (BRC). (I will only give a brief outline of the corpus here, but its design is described in detail in Appendix A 1.1 online). The BRC consists of a conversation sub-corpus, a news reportage sub-corpus, a fiction sub-corpus and an academic discourse sub-corpus:

- **Conversation**: 4,206,058 words of casual conversational British English;
- **News reportage**: 2,613,399 words of British tabloid and broadsheet news reports, including arts/cultural material, commerce/finance, home/foreign news, science, lifestyle/leisure/belief and thought, and sports;
- **Fiction**: 6,688,459 words of adult fiction by male and female authors from 1985 to 1994 in book form;
- **Academic discourse**: 5,960,933 words of different types of written academic discourse from the humanities, medicine, natural sciences, politics/law/education, social/behavioural sciences, and technology/computing/engineering.

Although the chosen registers are roughly equivalent to those investigated by Biber, the equivalences are not total. For instance, the BRC sub-corpus of news reportage does not include (persuasive) editorials, and is thus more narrow than Biber’s register of News. The corpus is also restricted to British English. (For further differences between the two corpora compare the design of the BRC as described in Appendix A 1.1 online, and Biber et al.’s 1999 description of the LSWE corpus). In total, the BRC consists of about 19.5 million words (Table 1.2 on p. 20).

The BRC is a parallel or contrastive corpus, since it aims to investigate differences between externally-identified varieties of British English.
Table 1.2  The BRC (British Register Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>4,206,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News reportage</td>
<td>2,613,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>6,688,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic discourse</td>
<td>5,960,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,468,849</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sinclair 2004c: 3). The four registers are differentiated by a variety of contextual/situational factors, as visualized in Table 1.3 (on p. 21).

As Biber et al. (1999) have outlined, conversation is characterized by the individual, local and personal, by immediacy and interactiveness; news reportage, in contrast, is more public, appeals to the nation as a whole, and has low degrees of interactiveness and immediacy. Fiction is mainly distinguished from news reportage by its communicative purpose, and its even more global appeal. Finally, academic discourse is much more specialist than all other registers, but shares some features with news discourse (low degrees of interactiveness and immediacy, providing information). These and other situational differences among the registers will be taken up again later when relating the findings of the analyses to a functional interpretation.

1.6.3 Emotion terms

In examining emotion talk in a large corpus the first task is to compile a comprehensive list of lexical items to be included in the analysis. After surveying much of the existing research on and lists of emotion terms (for example Wallace & Carson 1973, Nissenbaum 1985, Ortony et al. 1987, Storm & Storm 1987, Biber & Finegan 1989, Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989, Nöth 1992, Janney 1996, Dirven 1997, Osmond 1997, Moore et al. 1999, Precht 2000), and consulting different dictionaries and thesauri, I decided to base my list of emotion terms on the classification provided by the 2001 *Encarta Thesaurus (ET)*, since this is, on the one hand, corpus-based, and, on the other hand, seemed the most comprehensive and accessible. Since the relevant thematic section (labelled *Emotions and States of Mind*) in the ET does not differentiate between emotions and states of minds, only a subset of this category was used for establishing the list of emotion terms (focusing solely on adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs), including the following semantic categories:

- Feelings about the past (n)
- Feelings about the future (n)
Table 1.3  Major situational differences among the BRC registers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>Written (+ reported dialogue)</td>
<td>Written (+ fictional dialogue)</td>
<td>Written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactiveness and online production</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only in reported dialogue</td>
<td>Only in fictional dialogue</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared immediate situation</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main communicative purpose</strong></td>
<td>Personal communication</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Pleasure reading</td>
<td>Information/ argumentation/ explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Wide-public</td>
<td>Wide-public</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialect domain</strong></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Biber et al. 1999: 16).
• Pleasure, excitement, and elation (adj, adv, n) & Please and amuse (v)
• Appreciation and gratitude (adj, adv, n)
• Positive impatience, enthusiasm, and alertness (adj, adv, n)
• Sadness, distress, and despair (adj, adv, n) & Upset, distress, and humiliate (v)
• Confusion, anxiety, and worry (adj, adv, n) & Confuse and bewilder (v)
• Irritation and anger (adj, adv, n) & Anger and annoy (v) & Dislike and hate (v)
• Embarrassment and humiliation (adj, adv, n)
• Fear and panic (adj, n) & Frighten and shock (v)
• Insecurity and loss of composure (adj, adv, n)
• Surprise, shock, and amazement (adj, adv, n) & Surprise and impress (v)
• Envy and jealousy (adj, n)
• Love, respect, and goodwill (n) – Like, love, value, and enjoy (n, v)
• Compassion and forgiveness (n)
• Antagonism (n)
• Be concerned and care (v)
• Desire and want (adj, adv, n, v)

The result was a list of over 1500 lexical items, of which some items were excluded after careful scrutiny for a variety of reasons. Even though the final list of 1060 potential emotion terms (see Appendix A 1.3 online) is more comprehensive than many other lists, it is not argued that it is exhaustive, but rather that it contains a large selection of British English emotion terms.

The second step in the analysis of affect lies in determining which of these potential emotion terms actually occur and in which meaning, since it is only the ‘emotion’ meaning of a given form that is relevant. This issue – the problem of polysemy and homonymy (see for example Kilgarriff 1997b on polysemy) – lies at the heart of specifically lexical sense-sensitive corpus analysis: ‘if a corpus is not annotated for sense it is not possible to quantify sense distributions and if the corpus is a large one, annotating each polysemous item for sense is not practical.’ (Neale 2006: 147). Since computer software (in my case the Zurich BNCweb interface http://escorp.unizh.ch/, which allows different types of searches of the BNC, and my subset of it, the BRC) does not recognize meaning when searching for words, it will list all occurrences of a given word form, regardless of its meaning. For example, a computer
program looking up *afterglow* will come up with all occurrences of the form *afterglow*, referring to:

1. the light that is left in the sky after the sun has set
2. a pleasant feeling after a good experience

(*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*, henceforth *OALD*).

Only meaning 2 would be included as denoting affect/emotion, whereas all occurrences of meaning 1 would need to be excluded. Since automated tools simply cannot reliably recognize semantic differences at present,8 the classification of all words according to meaning had to be done manually. In other words, all occurrences of the 1060 emotion terms were classified by me as denoting emotion (or not). This is a rather cumbersome method, but comes much closer to finding out about what we are interested in than would a purely automatic computer analysis. As Kilgarriff notes:

A computer word count program defines a word as any string of characters separated by blanks or punctuation. … [T]hat makes counting easy and has the advantage that everyone knows where they stand and will arrive at the same numbers. The disadvantage, of course, is that it doesn’t tell the truth. … Any step towards the truth (as linguists strive to define it) tends to be a step away from anything that is computationally straightforward.

(Kilgarriff 1997a: 144).

At the same time, this means that the analysis is less easily replicable than a computationally straightforward, automated corpus study, and retains some elements of subjectivity in the interpretation of the meaning of emotion terms. The result of this manual analysis is a sense frequency list, not a word frequency list.

Concerning cases where the same word form can realize different parts of speech (for example *love*, *hate* as noun or verb), this was only a small problem since all of the BNC (and therefore also the BRC) is POS-tagged using the CLAWS system (Garside 1987). This tagging has an accuracy rate of 96.5 per cent (Leech et al. 2001: 14), which means that about 3.5 per cent of mistakes remain (see Sinclair 2004d: 81 on this problem). In any case, my interest lies more in reporting tendencies than exact figures, taking into account the subjective nature of the meaning-sensitive analysis reported above.
It remains to be pointed out that emotion terms and emotion talk do not necessarily stand for or represent the speaker’s or others’ ‘real’ internal affective state; rather emotion talk represents what Galasiński (2004: 6) calls a discursive practice (compare also Edwards 1999), and ‘reflects what one displays to others either in a conscious and deliberate manner, or as a result of habit of expression that accumulates with experience’ (Anderson & Leaper 1998: 410). To give an example from contemporary culture, film critic Philip Lopate has pointed out (in an interview included on the DVD) that in Noah Baumbach’s 2005 film The Squid and the Whale, the father (Bernard Berkman) keeps using emotion talk – statements such as That hurt me or I feel bad now – to manipulate others, while remaining strangely detached from his own emotional experience.

1.7 Outline of this book

To sum up the most important aims of this book again, these are:

- to examine emotion terms and their patterns in terms of register variation (emotion profiling);
- to develop appraisal theory;
- to analyze the functions of emotion talk in the different registers.

The hope is that the combination of a functional approach (Martin’s systemic-functional appraisal theory) with two corpus-linguistic approaches (Biber’s theories concerning register variation, and Hunston’s local grammar approach, which will be described in Chapter 3) will result in a development of present studies on emotion talk.

Chapter 2 outlines the results of the large-scale corpus investigation of emotion profiles in the four registers in terms of lexical variation, part of speech variation and syntactic variation. Chapters 3 and 4 deal with the local grammar approach to affect, and outline the most important affect patterns and their functions in conversation, news reportage, fiction and academic discourse (lexico-grammatical emotion profiling). Chapter 5 develops the modified version of appraisal theory that was applied in the manual analysis of the 85,000-word subset of the BRC. The results of this exploratory analysis are described in Chapter 6. Hence, corpus linguists may be particularly interested in Chapters 2 to 4, and systemic functional linguists in Chapters 5 and 6.
Notes

1. In this book I use the terms emotion and affect more or less interchangeably as referring to emotional experience. I will, however, consistently employ the terms emotion talk, emotional talk and emotion terms (rather than, say, affect talk, affective talk and affect terms). Nevertheless, it is also necessary to use affect, because this book makes reference throughout to the system of affect as recognized in appraisal theory (Section 1.4). In more narrow definitions, distinctions are made between affect and emotion, emotions and feelings, moods, emotional attitudes, emotional traits, emotional disorders, emotional plots, emotion-related states and so on (Ortony et al. 1987, Ekman 1992, Caffi & Janney 1994: 327–8, Anderson & Leaper 1998: 426, Jahr 2000: 9–10, Downes 2000: 102–3, Mees 2006: 15–16, Oatley et al. 2006: 29–30).

2. Dichotomies always simplify and emotions involve many aspects at the same time: they are both biological and cultural, personal and social and so on (see for example Planalp 1999: 134). It may be worth noting that neurological research has shown that the juxtaposition of emotion vs. ratio is misguided, with human rationality depending crucially on emotion (Turner & Stets 2005: 21–2). For a discussion of the debate concerning emotion vs. ratio see Milton & Svašek (2005: 2–4).

3. Since there is such a wealth of studies on language and emotion (for extensive bibliographies, see Arndt & Janney 1987, Besnier 1990, Janney 1996, van Dijk 2001), it was necessary to exclude from this overview: (a) studies that focus on aspects such as intonation, prosody, pitch, facial expression, gazing patterns, gesture (for example Arndt & Janney 1987, Selting 1994); (b) most studies that focus on languages other than English (for example Fiehler 1990, Haviland 1991, Fries 1995, Günther 1997, Jahr 2000, Koven 2004); (c) much non-linguistic (for example psychological, philosophical, sociological, anthropological) emotion research. It must also be noted that there are many overlaps, and that only the most important approaches are covered; more recently, corpus-based methodology has been used in some of these studies (Teubert 2004a, b, Dem’jankov et al. 2004).

4. The term stance is also closely associated with analyses of academic discourse (for example Hyland 1999 and references in Bednarek 2006a), and there is also a research project on analyzing stance in spoken American English (http://www.ekl.oulu.fi/stance/index.html, accessed 27 September 2005), with a focus on intersubjectivity and conversation analysis. Such studies usually include more than the analysis of affect (for example modality, evidentiality, evaluation), and are therefore only partly relevant to the research undertaken here.


6. Nöth (1992) gives an overview of lists of emotion terms from psychological research. Most such research is intuition- and/or informant-based (for example using elicited or free-listed emotion terms), with some also using information from dictionaries and thesauri or previous research. The number of emotion terms identified by this research varies depending on how an
emotion term is defined: Moore et al. (1999) mention 415 emotion terms, Johnson-Laird & Oatley (1989) list 590 words, and Storm & Storm (1987) use 787 different terms, while Wallace & Carson (1973) and Oatley et al. (2006: 183) both mention a list of over 2000 emotion terms, and other figures also appear in the relevant research. In a corpus linguistic study, Precht (2000) included 366 different word-forms indicating attitudinal stance, but these include both expressions with evaluative meanings (for example awful, bitch) and emotion terms (adore, angry). In a sense, any list of emotion terms will to a certain extent remain subjective, as emotion terms – like other lexical items – make up a fuzzy set with prototypical, core, and marginal members (Section 5.3.2.2).

7. Words in the ET that were on the border of affect were excluded (for example alert, alive, be sure of) – see Appendix A 1.2 online. Similarly, references to behaviour associated with emotion were not included, since the focus was on mental disposition terms rather than behavioural surge terms (see Section 1.4 above). Others had to be excluded for purely methodological purposes; for instance, they were too polysemous, too difficult to analyze objectively, or occurred too often to analyze manually (for example the modal verb will as indicating volition vs. other modal meanings).

8. One possible solution would be to use corpus analysis in order to identify the most common words that occur in the context of afterglow when used in meaning 2, a methodology similar to the one used by Teubert (2004a), or to use a collocation dictionary for the same purpose when the number of words analyzed is too large to investigate separately. It would then become possible to search only for occurrences of afterglow in the context of these common collocates. However, not all emotion terms are listed in all their meanings in collocation dictionaries such as the Oxford Collocations Dictionary, and the analysis would still not be completely reliable. Watters (2002) shows that cluster analysis (grouping word senses on the basis of their collocates) works in 69 per cent of classifications for primary word senses, but only in 25 per cent of classifications for secondary word senses. See also Kilgarriff (1997b) for an overview of word sense disambiguation in natural language processing. A related approach is to identify the grammatical frame in which a lexical expression is used to exclude non-affective meanings (Precht 2000, 2003). For example, afraid + prepositional phrase (I'm afraid of spiders) indicates fear, whereas afraid + that-clause (I'm afraid that's impossible) refers to the speaker’s thoughts (Precht 2000: 43) and is a more formulaic usage. But see Werth (1998) who argues that the usage of emotion terms as indicating either ‘genuine’ emotion or as a conventional expression does not depend on grammatical frames alone.
2
Emotion Profiling

In this chapter I discuss the results of the analysis of the emotion profiles of the registers of academic discourse, conversation, fiction and news reportage with respect to lexical, part-of-speech (POS) and syntactic variation concerning emotion terms. I use the term emotion profiling to refer to the process of investigating these frequency profiles. As mentioned in Section 1.6.3, this is based on a combination of automated computer analysis (using the Zurich BNCweb interface at http://escorp.unizh.ch/) and careful manual scrutiny of the data. It must also be emphasized that the research reported in this chapter is more corpus-based than corpus-driven, in Tognini-Bonelli's (2001) terms.

Recent research has shown that linguistic choices (including lexico-grammatical patterns or chains of word-forms) are mainly motivated by function, resulting in many linguistic differences between registers (Biber et al. 1999, Reppen et al. 2002b, Stubbs & Barth 2003). However, little systematic linguistic research has considered the question of register variation in the usage of emotion terms (with the exception of stance analysis, for example Precht 2000, 2003). At the same time, it is noted that linguistic affect may differ across social groups (Besnier 1990: 435), discourse types (Daneš 1987: 177) and ‘sub-cultures’ (Daneš 2004: 30). As Daneš suggests, ‘it is just this “sub-cultural” research that could represent a very interesting and rewarding field of study’ (Daneš 2004: 30). Similarly, Hyland notes that ‘[o]ur knowledge of how evidentiality and affect are typically expressed in different registers is limited’ (Hyland 1999: 105). This chapter aims to shed some light on these issues by means of an emotion profiling of casual conversation, news reportage, fiction and academic discourse.
2.1 Key words in the registers

Before describing the results of the emotion profiling, let’s look more closely at the contents of the BRC with the help of a key word analysis. A key word analysis (Scott 1997, Scott & Tribble 2006) allows the researcher to compare corpora in terms of their key words, that is, words that are statistically significant in terms of frequency. Usually, a smaller corpus (the node corpus) is compared with a larger corpus (the reference corpus). A key word analysis highlights register-specific features: it provides information about content and other characteristics of the corpus (for example style features, cultural background) that may be relevant when interpreting corpus findings. Here we are mainly concerned with content, in order to ascertain whether any of the sub-corpora are unusual (‘skewed’) in terms of content and thus not suitable for analysis. A preliminary key word analysis was thus undertaken before the emotion profiling. In each case, the respective node corpus (academic discourse, news reportage, fiction and conversation) was compared against the BRC (used as reference corpus). In Table 2.1 (on pages 29 to 30) the most frequent key words (see also Appendix A 1.1.6 online) are sorted according to part of speech, though in some cases this is not clear (for example study can be both noun or verb, like can be preposition, conjunction, verb, or pragmatic marker). Such key words are enclosed in brackets in Table 2.1.

As can be seen from the table, the respective corpora do not appear to be greatly skewed in terms of content, and conform very much to what we would expect to find in the respective register (compare for example the descriptions in Biber et al. 1999): academic discourse includes both words from the hard and the soft sciences, though there is perhaps a slight preponderance of key words belonging to medical discourse (patients, cells, disease, acid, gastric). It does, however, include a large number of words relating to academic discourse in general (shown, described, associated, figure, analysis, study, data, information, different, important, particular, specific, possible, significant, similar, general). (Note also that there is a large overlap with the top word-forms listed for academic discourse by Stubbs & Barth (2003: 65), based on different corpora of academic language.) News discourse is dominated by nouns and adjectives referring to cities, countries and people (Britain, Germany, American, Soviet, Europe, west, east, David, John, London, Hong Kong) as well as by nouns that are part of commercial and sports discourse (pound, cent, million, market, shares, sales, season, team, league, players, club, game, champion), and words from the world of entertainment (TV, star). These represent different sections of the news such as home/foreign
### Table 2.1  Key words in the BRC sub-corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Grammatical words</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic discourse</td>
<td>of, the, in, which, by, or, these, such, between, also, however, this, as, thus, therefore, an, within, both, each, per</td>
<td>patients, formula, example, data, (study), system, (form), fig, analysis, language, cells, disease, (figure), information, (studies), (results), section, (effect), (number), treatment, development, (act), cases, areas, level, (state), groups, (function), evidence, process, systems, education, DNA, structure, (order), (control), (use), activity, case, acid, (values), species, population, women, chapter</td>
<td>is, are, may, be, has, shown, using, described, associated, required</td>
<td>social, different, important, particular, specific, possible, significant, gastric, individual, similar, general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News reportage</td>
<td>by, per, for, the, after, who, its, against, their</td>
<td>pound, Mr, year, government, cent, million, Britain, world, market, (shares), company, London, England, European, season, city, chairman, team, union, David, Minister, President, league, dollar, players, John, spokesman, (profits), (party), companies, Hong, month, Kong, labour, director, secretary, club, game, (match), Europe, tax, (bid), (star), sport, TV, (bank), years, conference, page, week, price, Germany, manager, correspondent, edition, sales, cup, corpus, (cash), leader, industry, university, Smith, police, (share), investors, group, (final), billion, Tory, Champion</td>
<td>has, will, win</td>
<td>last, new, former, west, international, east, united, first, German, British, American, Soviet, financial, national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Grammatical words</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>her, she, he, his, him, my, me, (back), herself, into, at, away, himself, down, out, again, never, nothing, too, behind, across, up, around, beside, someone, towards</td>
<td>eyes, face, man, (head), room, door, voice, father, hand, hands, mother, moment, woman, (smile), hair, feet, sir, mouth, bed, Corbett, house, lips, arms, window, silence, floor, girl, Mrs, Athelstan</td>
<td>had, was, looked, said, knew, turned, could, felt, seemed, asked, would, stood, smiled, came, sat, thought, took, nodded, saw, shook, began, stared, walked, heard, told, looking, laughed, am, replied, rose, tell, opened, pulled, wondered, wanted, glanced, hadn</td>
<td>dark</td>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>I, you, yeah, it, oh, well, what, no, that, they, yes, cos, we, there, so, your, one, then, me, them, up, here, twenty, if, five, all, hundred, anyway, why, now, aye, my, he, something, (like), (er, mm, erm, m, ah, ooh, mhm, eh)</td>
<td>bit, mum, (sort), thing, lot, dad</td>
<td>t, s, got, know, don, ve, do, re, get, ll, go, think, gonna, (like), mean, can, want, going, put, see, didn, haven, come, isn, look, say, have, did, gotta, doing, goes, d, doesn, won, wanna, innit, done, says, said, ain, wouldn</td>
<td>right, alright, nice, okay, bloody, good, fucking</td>
<td>just, really, actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
news, commerce/finance, and sports discourse, arts/cultural material, lifestyle/leisure/belief. **Fiction** is characterized by first and third person singular pronouns (*her, she, he, his, him, my, me*) – reflecting the fact that most fiction contains either first- or third-person narrative. It also includes words referring to human appearance (*eyes, face, head, voice, smile, hair, feet, mouth, lips, arms*) and human behaviour (specifically interaction), such as: *looked, said, knew, turned, felt, asked, stood, smiled, came, sat, thought, took, nodded, saw, shook, begun, stared, walked, heard, told, looking, laughed, replied, rose, tell, opened, pulled, wondered, wanted, glanced*. This is probably attributable to the fact that the physical appearance of characters needs to be described in order for readers to get a mental ‘picture’ of them. Furthermore, human interaction seems to be a key feature of most narrative fiction, and both verbal and non-verbal behaviour are an important part of its description. (Note again the considerable overlap with the most frequent word-forms listed by Stubbs & Barth 2003 for their FICTION corpus.) Finally, in **conversation**, we find personal pronouns referring to speaker and listener (*I, you*), a range of words belonging to evaluation in a broad sense, some of which may function as response words (*yeah, yes, right, alright, nice, okay, good, bloody, fucking*), many hesitation/response phenomena (*er, mm, erm, ah, ooh, mhm, eh*), discourse markers and downtoners/upgraders (*well, anyway, just, really, actually*), vague language (*sort, thing, lot, bit, something*), contracted forms (*t, s, ve, don, didn, haven, isn, re, ll, did, doesn*), colloquial/informal words (*mum, dad, gonna, gotta, wanna, innit, ain*), words referring to mental and verbal processes (*know, think, mean, say, says, said, possibly goes*) and modality (*can, want, possibly going (to)*), and what we may call basic words referring to human behaviour (*put, see, come, look, have, doing, done*). Again, none of the words are particularly unexpected. This indicates that the corpus is fairly well balanced in terms of content, and that there is, presumably, no great bias towards a particular topic/content which might influence the findings to any significant extent.

### 2.2 Lexical variation

Let’s now move on to considering lexical variation of emotion terms, both in terms of their frequency and in terms of their distribution.¹

#### 2.2.1 Frequency of emotion terms

The first analysis concerns the frequency of emotion terms in each sub-corpus. As said, this is an examination of frequency of meaning rather than form since ‘non-affect’ meanings of lexical items were excluded...
from the analysis (Section 1.6.3). No cut-off level was used below which occurrences were to be disregarded. Rather, all occurrences of emotion terms (if denoting emotion) contributed to the overall sum of emotion term occurrences in the given sub-corpus. This figure is thus a ‘composite variable’ (Precht 2000: 53–4; compare also Kaltenbacher’s 2007 virtual frequency ranks). This decision was taken because I am interested in how frequent affect is in general, and each individual emotion term contributes to this overall picture. Even though fewer occurrences render results less reliable from a statistical point of view, this is outweighed by the fact that as many as 1060 words were included in the quantitative analysis. Likewise, dispersion could not be investigated systematically, meaning that some frequency findings might be partially distorted (see Appendix A 1.2 online). Bearing these caveats in mind, Table 2.2 shows the distribution of all 1060 emotion terms in each sub-corpus (ppm = occurrences per million).²

Table 2.2  Emotion terms in the BRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,570</td>
<td>9,645.6</td>
<td>15,917</td>
<td>6,090.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>2,179.4</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>2,179.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2.2, it initially appears that emotion terms are most frequent in fiction, followed by conversation, news reportage and academic discourse. However, it must be pointed out that three emotion terms are uncharacteristically frequent in conversation and skew the analysis to a very large extent: the verb want (13,060 occurrences), the adjective sorry (10,787 occurrences) and the verb like (6,353 occurrences) (see Table A.8 in Appendix A 2.1 online). Furthermore, these terms are so frequent that even a manual analysis based on extrapolation (see Appendix A 1.2 online) was not possible (10 per cent of all occurrences for each of these terms still make up more than 500 occurrences), and no manual analysis could therefore be undertaken. This means that no meaning distinctions were taken into account. Moreover, it might be argued that these terms are, as it were, ‘bleached’ (Martin & White 2005: 85) to a certain extent, in that they are not really – or at least not primarily – used to talk about our emotions, but rather to be conventionally polite, for example to apologize, to disagree or to introduce bad news (see OALD entry for sorry), to make offers, invitations or demands (see OALD entry for want) or to make polite demands and express evaluations (see OALD entry for like). For these reasons, and since the interest is not so much in
these conventionalized usages of emotion terms, but rather in their more ‘literal’ emotive uses, *sorry*, *want* and *like* were excluded. The results for this re-calculation are shown in Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,370</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>54,402</td>
<td>11,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,465.5</td>
<td>4,963.6</td>
<td>8,133.7</td>
<td>1,919.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2.3 suggests, news reportage includes more emotion terms than conversation, in contrast to the calculation above, where the opposite was true. The rank order for fiction and academic discourse remains stable: fiction contains the most emotion terms (ca 8000 per million), followed by news reportage (ca 5000 per million), conversation (ca 2500 per million) and academic discourse (ca 1900 per million). This is in stark contrast to the findings of Biber & Finegan (1989), where 90 per cent of General fiction, 92 per cent of Adventure fiction, 85 per cent of Mystery fiction, and 100 per cent of Science fiction are included in the cluster named ‘faceless stance’ (Biber & Finegan 1989: 103), because they exclude non-authorial affect from their analysis (for criticism of this see Watson 1999: 226–7). It is therefore in the realm of fiction that the language of emotion seems to be most alive. This is not surprising since fiction deals with the description of human characters, the relationships and interactions among them, their emotions and emotional reactions. This also suggests that prose fiction constitutes an important arena for the mediation of emotions in English (together with newspaper stories, films, TV shows, and other popular media outlets which cannot be analyzed here). Arguably, it is through these cultural constructs that we at least partly come to make assumptions (in our adult life) about how we ought to behave emotionally, what kinds of emotions we are ‘supposed’ to feel in certain situations, what an emotional experience entails and so on. In cognitive linguistic terms, fiction contributes to our construal of *emotion schemata* (see Sections 1.3; 5.3.1). In sociological terms, works of fiction are cultural products that play a part in construing *feeling rules* (Section 1.3). Our emotional responses are thus to a certain extent not naturally given but rather culturally mediated, and fiction certainly plays a role in this cultural mediation. However, much more research is necessary to determine the extent to which emotional responses are socialized (or culturally transmitted) through the personal (face-to-face interaction)
rather than through the impersonal (fiction, mass media\(^3\)), and to what extent they are innate (Figure 2.1).

As mentioned in Section 1.3, there is a large body of research on the question of innateness vs. cultural construal of emotional experience, which seems to allow the conclusion that emotions involve both aspects. A significant body of research has also investigated emotion and art (van Meel 1994, Oatley 2003, Robinson 2005), but without paying specific attention or systematically investigating the role of cultural artefacts (such as novels, paintings, films) in the socialization of affect, though Painter argues that the reading of children’s literature helps children to learn ‘the conventions of visual representations of affect as well as gaining experience in the role of affect construal in story telling’ (Painter 2003: 197), and that literacy is influential in children’s development of an emotion vocabulary (Painter 2003: 206). More informally, Planalp states that:

… the love each of us feels seems to fit, more or less, the expectations of the dominant culture. Somehow most people ‘fall in love’ with someone of the appropriate sex, age, social class, and marital status; exceptions are unusual, frowned upon, or viewed as decidedly immoral. We are engulfed in messages about love – love songs on the radio, talk about love with friends, lectures about love from parents, TV sitcoms, magazines, romance novels, love stories at the movies… All these messages shape our own unique love.

(Planalp 1999: 135)

However, in general terms, we need more precise investigations of how emotion cultures are learned, and ‘a better explanation of how [the
elements of emotion cultures] are used strategically in the micropolitics and microeconomics of all encounters’ (Turner & Stets 2005: 297).

Moving on to news reportage now, the relatively high frequency of emotion terms in this register was also to be expected: after all, references to emotions contribute to the news values (Galtung & Ruge 1965, Bednarek 2006a: 16–18) of personalization and colour. In fact, an even higher frequency of emotion terms might have been expected, since the corpus contains tabloid as well as broadsheet newspapers, and the former are characterized in particular by their frequent references to news actors’ emotions (Bednarek 2006a: 194). Concerning the relatively low frequency of emotion terms in conversation, this is somewhat surprising: after all, it could be intuited that speakers choose to reveal more about their emotional reactions in face-to-face conversations than in written discourse. On the other hand, Planalp does suggest that people rarely communicate feelings in Western cultures (Planalp 1999: 211). However, it must also be mentioned that speakers may resort to a variety of other means of communicating emotionality, that is, expressing rather than denoting affect/emotion (emotional rather than emotion talk; compare Section 1.3). For example, in Burger & Miller’s data, speakers employ ‘emotion state words in only one-third of their anger narratives’ (Burger & Miller 1999: 137), even though this may vary across social class (Burger & Miller 1999: 154–5). The fact that speakers have access to many different means of signalling emotionality may explain the relatively low frequency of emotion terms in conversation. With respect to academic discourse, the finding that this register contains the least frequent use of emotion terms of all registers is not unexpected, although the fact that it contains as many as 1900 words per million is something of a surprise, as an even lower frequency might reasonably have been expected. For instance, the analyses by Hood (2005: 32) show that research articles strongly prefer appreciation over affect.

2.2.2 Most frequent emotion terms

Again excluding want, sorry and like, the ten most frequent emotion words in each sub-corpus are listed in Table 2.4. With regard to these lexical items, conversation has a clear verbal–adjectival affect style (six of the ten most frequent emotion terms are verbs, four are adjectives), and academic discourse has a distinct nominal affect style (nine nouns), whereas both news reportage (five nouns, two verbs, three adjectives) and fiction (four verbs, four nouns, two adjectives) are more varied in their affect style, with news reportage nevertheless tending towards a nominal, and fiction tending towards a verbal–nominal, affect style. However, if we
Table 2.4  Ten most frequent emotion terms in the BRC sub-corpora (raw frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   love (V)</td>
<td>fear (N)</td>
<td>love (V)</td>
<td>feeling (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   hate (V)</td>
<td>happy (A)</td>
<td>love (N)</td>
<td>fear (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   mind (V)</td>
<td>love (V)</td>
<td>happy (A)</td>
<td>concern (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   worry (V)</td>
<td>hope (N)</td>
<td>enjoy (V)</td>
<td>anxiety (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   enjoy (V)</td>
<td>love (N)</td>
<td>fear (N)</td>
<td>expectation (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   happy (A)</td>
<td>enjoy (V)</td>
<td>feeling (N)</td>
<td>desire (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   care (V)</td>
<td>concern (N)</td>
<td>worry (V)</td>
<td>stress (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   glad (A)</td>
<td>surprise (N)</td>
<td>hate (V)</td>
<td>love (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   worried (A)</td>
<td>prepared (A)</td>
<td>surprised (A)</td>
<td>hope (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  surprised (A)</td>
<td>angry (A)</td>
<td>pleasure (N)</td>
<td>concerned (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


extend the analysis to the 50 most frequent emotion terms in each corpus (see Appendix A 2.2 online), it appears that although the findings for the other registers remain more or less the same, fiction is in fact characterized by a nominal–adjectival affect style (Table 2.5). These tendencies will be explored in more detail later on in this chapter, based on the analysis of all emotion terms (Section 2.3.1).

Table 2.5 Part of speech distribution of 50 most frequent emotion terms in each sub-corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>No. of Adjectives</th>
<th>No. of Nouns</th>
<th>No. of Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News reportage</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic discourse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ten most frequent emotion terms none occurs in all four corpora, but love (V), enjoy (V) and happy (A) occur in three sub-corpora (conversation, news reportage, fiction) as do the nouns fear and love (news reportage, fiction, academic discourse). Conversation and fiction share the verbs hate and worry as well as the adjective surprised; news reportage and academic discourse share the nouns hope and concern; and fiction and academic discourse have in common the noun feeling. Frequent only in conversation are mind (V), care (V), glad (A) and worried (A); in news discourse we can find surprise (N), prepared (A) and angry (A); pleasure (N) is common in fiction, and in academic discourse the nouns anxiety, expectation, desire, stress and the adjective concerned occur frequently (Table 2.6 on page 38).4 (Note that horizontal lines here group items shared in three corpora, two corpora, or appearing only in one corpus.)

Even though some emotion terms occur in three of the sub-corpora, there is a considerable amount of lexical variation concerning the ten most frequent emotion terms in each corpus. If we again extend the analysis to the 50 most frequent words in each sub-corpus, the lexical variation hypothesis is confirmed: only one noun is shared among all four corpora (shock), and only eleven adjectives, ten nouns and two verbs are shared among three of the four corpora (of 39 adjectives, 49 nouns, 24 verbs, and 0 adverbs). For now, I want to postpone the discussion of possible reasons for this variation, but I shall come back to this below when exploring part-of-speech variation.5
### Table 2.6  Shared emotion terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion term</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>love (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoy (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hate (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprised (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hope (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care (V)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glad (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worried (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise (N)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry (A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3  Part-of-speech variation

#### 2.3.1 Distribution of POS

Since the BNC, and therefore also the BRC are tagged corpora, it is relatively straightforward to analyze part-of-speech variation, even though an error margin remains (Appendix A 1.3 online shows the POS classification of all terms). Comparing the overall occurrences of all emotion terms (excluding *sorry*, *want*, *like*) we find the distribution in Table 2.7. Looking at all analyzed emotion terms in Table 2.7 (on page 40), it now becomes possible to identify a distinct POS affect style for each register: conversation is characterized by a verbal–adjectival affect style (with more verbs than adjectives); both news reportage and fiction have a nominal–adjectival affect style (with more nouns than adjectives but also a considerable number of verbs, particularly in fiction); and academic discourse has a clear nominal affect style.
It may be instructive to compare these findings with some related research. The findings for conversation stand in contrast to the adjectival stance style described for conversation by Precht (2000) (but note again that the results are not directly comparable in terms of methodology, corpus design and investigated features), but they are in line with Biber et al.’s findings that ‘it is more common for the spoken texts to refer to mental states as verbs and adjectives [rather than using nouns]’ (Biber et al. 1998: 64). The results for fiction also compare with Biber et al.’s finding that -ness nominalizations (which include but are not limited to emotion nouns, for example bitterness, happiness) as well as -ment nominalizations (which often describe emotions, for example amazement, astonishment, disappointment, embarrassment, excitement) are quite common in fiction, even ‘though fiction has the lowest frequency of nominalizations overall’ (Biber et al. 1998: 65). The analyses of the BRC have shown that fiction in general has a nominal–adjectival affect style beyond the particular kinds of nominalizations investigated by Biber et al. However, these data should be related to what we know about register POS variation in general: this will tell us whether the identified affect style simply reflects a general POS style or not. Table 2.8 (on page 40) shows some findings for the POS preferences of different registers.

Viewing the findings in Table 2.8 comparatively, it would seem that the news and academic affect style partly reflects a general POS style, whereas the affect style in fiction and conversation reflects this to a lesser extent. However, since these findings are based on different corpora, these conclusions must remain preliminary – an investigation of all POS distributions in the BRC was not undertaken. (Data reported for the distribution of mental verbs, stance and so on in Biber et al. 1999 cannot be compared directly because they include more than emotion terms. Biber 2006 was not available at the time of writing.) The following sections describe the frequencies of emotion nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs in more detail.

2.3.2 Nouns
We start by looking at the ten most frequent emotion nouns in the BRC, as visualized in Table 2.9 (on page 41). Here we can find some overlap between the four registers: hope, love, fear and feeling are amongst the ten most frequent emotion nouns in all four corpora; shock and surprise occur very frequently in three corpora (conversation, news reportage and fiction), and worry, pleasure, concern and expectation in two. Characteristic for the conversation register are the nouns joy, nerves, panic; for news
Table 2.7  Part of speech variation in the BRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>2,192.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>928.2</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>1,718.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>1,292.2</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>1,007.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,370</td>
<td>2,465.5</td>
<td>12,972</td>
<td>4,963.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8  Register preferences for part of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London-Oslo-Bergen (LOB)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>most frequent: lexical verbs, but nouns also relatively frequent</td>
<td>learned and scientific English dominated by nouns and adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Johansson 1981: 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Frown, LOB, FLOB</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>fiction: verbal style (past tense)</td>
<td>learned English: nominal style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stubbs &amp; Barth 2003: 79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSWE corpus</td>
<td>–nouns</td>
<td>+nouns</td>
<td>+verbs</td>
<td>+nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Biber et al. 1999: 65–66; 359)</td>
<td>–adjectives</td>
<td>+adjectives</td>
<td>+adverbs</td>
<td>+adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+verbs</td>
<td>nouns &gt; verbs</td>
<td>–verbs</td>
<td>–verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>nouns &gt; verbs</td>
<td>nouns &gt; verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nouns = verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC (key word analysis)</td>
<td>many modal</td>
<td>many nouns</td>
<td>many nouns in key words list; lexical verbs also frequent</td>
<td>many nouns in key words list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and lexical</td>
<td>in key words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verbs in key</td>
<td>list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>words list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC (affect style)</td>
<td>verbal–adjectival</td>
<td>nominal–adjectival</td>
<td></td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>shock</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>shock</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>joy</td>
<td>horror</td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>shock</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>nerves</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>excitement</td>
<td>hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>panic</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>pain</td>
<td>wish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.10  Shared emotion nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hope</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shock</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nerves</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horror</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reportage it is horror; for fiction anger, excitement, pain and for the academic register it is anxiety, desire, stress and wish (Table 2.10, on page 42; here and in Table 2.15 horizontal rules group items shared between four, three, two corpora, or appearing only in one corpus).

Since hope, love, fear and feeling are common in all corpora, they represent common emotion nouns in English in general. It seems important for speakers/writers to talk about what emoters hope for or not, what they love or not, as well as what they fear (or not). Both hope and fear can also be used to introduce (project) speech and thought representation:

(1) The family’s hopes that Caroline was alive slumped when her visa expired three weeks ago. (CH2 6513, BRC news reportage)

(2) Authorities have themselves acknowledged fears that ‘counter-revolutionaries’, still at large despite a nationwide crackdown on dissent, might try to sabotage the anniversary. (A1G 165, BRC news reportage)
Feeling is a general noun that can be employed in all sorts of constructions (see OALD), and is therefore potentially very useful for speakers. It does not refer to a particular emotion but can be used to introduce a variety of emotions (as well as other feelings), for instance:

**a feeling of/ feelings of**


(from BRC fiction sub-corpus)

The nouns shock and surprise are also very frequent in conversation, news reportage and fiction but less frequent in academic discourse (which presumably expresses unexpectedness meanings differently). In news reportage this almost certainly relates to the news value of unexpectedness (Bednarek 2006a: 171), but the usage of these terms in conversation and fiction invites further research.

### 2.3.3 Adjectives

Moving on to the analysis of emotion adjectives, the ten most frequent emotion adjectives (excluding sorry) in the BRC are presented in Table 2.11 (on page 44). Of these adjectives, some are again shared among the different sub-corpora: happy, worried and surprised occur frequently in all corpora; sad, keen, anxious and angry occur very commonly in three sub-corpora, whereas glad, pleased, frightened, proud, prepared, concerned and disappointed occur in two. Conversation has frequent occurrences of fed up and scared; fiction likes afraid and academic discourse prefers willing, unhappy and content (news reportage has no particular preferences: all its ten most frequent adjectives occur in at least one other corpus as well). Compare Table 2.12 (on page 45).

It is interesting to note that the three adjectives that are shared between all four corpora as most frequent can be classified as positive (happy), negative (worried) and neutral (surprised), so it appears that all options are covered: using just these three adjectives allows speakers/writers to express positive and negative emotional responses, and to make reference to unexpectedness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 happy</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 glad</td>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 worried</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>glad</td>
<td>willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 surprised</td>
<td>worried</td>
<td>pleased</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pleased</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 fed up</td>
<td>keen</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sad</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>worried</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 keen</td>
<td>sad</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 frightened</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disappointed</td>
<td></td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 scared</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.11 Ten most frequent emotion adjectives in the BRC (raw frequency)*
Table 2.12  Shared emotion adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worried</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleased</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disappointed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fed up</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.4  Adverbs

Adverbs are in general the least frequent word class concerning emotion terms. The occurrences of even the ten most frequent emotion adverbs may therefore be too low to be considered indicative of register variation. I nevertheless want to report on them here for the sake of completeness. The ten most frequent emotion adverbs are listed in Table 2.13 (on page 46).

The figures in Table 2.13 (on page 46) point to a general preference for happily, desperately and passionately across corpora. However, since the raw occurrences are very infrequent, these tendencies require much more research, so no more shall be said about emotion adverbs here.

2.3.5  Verbs

In contrast to adverbs, verbs are relatively frequent in all sub-corpora, and the findings are therefore more indicative of register variation. Table 2.14 lists the ten most frequent emotion verbs (excluding want and like) in the BRC. Let’s again compare which verbs are shared among the four
### Table 2.13  Ten most frequent emotion adverbs in the BRC (raw frequency at least 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> happily</td>
<td>happily</td>
<td>happily</td>
<td>happily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>happily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> desperately</td>
<td>desperately</td>
<td>desperately</td>
<td>desperately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> cheerfully</td>
<td>passionately</td>
<td>sadly</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passionately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> cheerfully</td>
<td>cheerfully</td>
<td>cheerfully</td>
<td>gratefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>furiously</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> miserably</td>
<td>sadly</td>
<td>gratefully</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>desperately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unhappily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> miserably</td>
<td>miserably</td>
<td>furiously</td>
<td>joyfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gloomily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> gratefully</td>
<td>gratefully</td>
<td>excitedly</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> blissfully</td>
<td>blissfully</td>
<td>gloomily</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>miserably</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>expectantly</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fearfully</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.14  Ten most frequent emotion verbs in the BRC (raw frequency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>enjoy</td>
<td>enjoy</td>
<td>enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>647</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>enjoy</td>
<td>care</td>
<td>care</td>
<td>worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>care</td>
<td>admire</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>fancy</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>admire</td>
<td>dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>miss</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>miss</td>
<td>admire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>bother</td>
<td>shock, surprise</td>
<td>hurt</td>
<td>resent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>annoy</td>
<td>impress</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>appreciate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sub-corpora of the BRC: love, worry, enjoy and care occur in all registers; hate and admire occur in three sub-corpora; and mind and miss are amongst the ten most frequent verbs in two sub-corpora (conversation and fiction). Fancy, bother and annoy are characteristic for conversation, upset, shock, surprise, impress and anger are particularly frequent in news reportage; fiction prefers long and hurt and in academic discourse we find a frequent usage of desire, value, dislike, resent and appreciate (Table 2.15).

On closer inspection, it becomes apparent that, when using emotion verbs, speakers talk about someone ‘loving’ or ‘enjoying’ something/someone (positive) or perhaps caring about something/someone (neutral) as well as ‘worrying’ (negative). These verbs are used to indicate likes and dislikes, preferences and anxieties – key emotions that may be relevant to a variety of circumstances, and which are also used in conversational formulae.

2.4 Summary of lexical and POS variation

Summing up the findings so far, it appears that a number of emotion terms are frequent overall, occurring in all or at least three of the sub-corpora of the BRC, and also seem frequent in the BNC overall. These are listed in Table 2.16 (Appendix A 2.3 online details which of their meanings were included). These overlap partly with emotion labels that have
Table 2.15  Shared emotion verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fancy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bother</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a high ‘psychocultural salience’ (Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 274) (meaning that they are free-listed by subjects) – for instance happy, sad, angry, love, hate – but more research is necessary to explore systematically the connection between frequency of usage and psychocultural or psychological salience. Neither is it clear how the findings can be compared to frequency data based on elicited emotion words (for example Wallace & Carson 1973), and space does not permit a discussion of this complex issue here.

The terms represent common emotion terms in the (British) English language in general: these are the words that speakers/writers use to talk about their own and other’s emotional experience. They can be grouped together as representing emotions such as love/admiration (love – N, V, admire), happiness (happy, happily, cheerfully, enjoy), sadness (sad, sadly), fear/worry (fear, worried, worry, anxious), hate/anger (angry, hate), desire (hope, keen) and surprise (shock, surprise, surprised). Of these, happiness,
Table 2.16  Frequent emotion terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All sub-corpora (sense-based)</th>
<th>Three sub-corpora (sense-based)</th>
<th>Frequency (ppm) in BNC (based on Leech et al 2001: 271ff) (Not sense-based)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>hope, love, fear, feeling</td>
<td>shock, surprise</td>
<td>love (150), feeling (126), fear (93), hope (80), surprise (51), shock (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>happy, worried, surprised</td>
<td>sad, keen, anxious, angry</td>
<td>happy (129), surprised (47), angry (43), worried (38), keen (38), sad (36), anxious (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>happily, desperately</td>
<td>cheerfully, gratefully, sadly</td>
<td>sadly (19), happily (18), desperately (20),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>love, worry, enjoy, care</td>
<td>hate, admire</td>
<td>love (150), enjoy (146), care (81), worry (62), hate (50), admire (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sadness, fear, anger and surprise are recognized by a large number of emotion researchers as basic (possibly universal) emotions (Turner & Stets 2005: 13–15; compare also Section 5.3.2.2 below). Some of these terms refer to (culturally) ‘positive’ rather than ‘negative’ emotions (compare the suggestions made by appraisal theory and stance analysis) whereas others are not as easy to classify or are more ‘neutral’:

positive:  
  hope (N), love (N), happy, happily, love (V), enjoy, cheerfully, gratefully, admire

neutral/ambiguous:  
  feeling (N), surprised, care (V), surprise (N), keen

negative:  
  fear (N), worried, desperately, worry (V), shock (N), sad, anxious, angry, sadly, hate (V)

If only those terms that occur in all four sub-corpora are taken into account, it seems that speakers talk more about positive than negative emotions; otherwise, the situation is more balanced. If we extend the analysis to the 50 most frequent emotion words in general, we find the distribution of ‘positive’, ‘negative’ and ‘neutral/ambiguous’ emotion terms (no. of different emotion terms) as shown in Table 2.17.6

Table 2.17  Positive, negative, neutral emotion terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral/ambiguous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News reportage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic discourse</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All corpora prefer negative emotion terms over positive ones, even though this tendency is most striking in conversation. Disregarding neutral/ambiguous terms, about 75 per cent of the 50 most frequent emotion terms in conversation are negative, about 61 per cent in news reportage, about 56 per cent in fiction, and about 57 per cent in academic discourse. This preference is roughly in line with the general preference for negative emotion terms in language found by Nöth (1992: 82), with about 40 per cent positive vs. 60 per cent negative emotion terms (types). It is also supported by Schrauf & Sanchez’s (2004) finding that the *working emotion vocabulary* – defined as ‘the set of psychologically salient emotion words to which an individual has immediate access when asked to make a list of emotion words’ (Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 270) – consists of more negative (50 per cent) than positive (30 per cent) emotions. These combined findings show that there are more negative emotion labels than positive ones in the language as such (system); there are more negative emotion labels than positive ones in the working emotion vocabulary (psychological salience); and there are more negative than positive emotion labels (types) in actual discourse (use). It has been suggested that this ‘does not imply that humans have more negative than positive emotional experience’ (Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 280), but rather, that it has to do with the importance of negative cues (for example in registering danger) (Turner & Stets 2005: 12) or with different types of cognitive processing (Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 266).

These findings concern affect types, but what about tokens? In other words, how often are positive emotion terms actually used in comparison with negative and neutral ones? In Table 2.18 below we can see the frequencies for the occurrences of the 50 most frequent emotion terms.

As can be seen from the table, only in fiction are positive emotion terms used more often than negative emotion terms; in the three other sub-corpora, negative emotion terms are the most frequent. (However, it must be pointed out that these figures and the figures above do not tell us how often these terms are negated.) This supports Shimanoff (1985) and Anderson & Leaper (1998), who found that negative emotion terms were used more frequently by college students in conversations than positive ones, but stands somewhat in contrast to Nöth’s findings that positive emotion words are more frequently used in the LOB corpus (Nöth 1992: 83). (However, it is unclear if Nöth’s analysis of emotion tokens takes into account polysemy and non-emotion meanings, and the analysis does not investigate differences between the text types that make up LOB.)
It is also interesting to note which registers are similar to each other with regard to the frequency of emotion terms (excluding words that occur in all registers). Considering only the ten most frequent words in each POS category, news reportage (N) and fiction (F) are the most similar registers (13 terms in common), followed by news reportage and academic discourse (A) as well as conversation (C) and fiction (11 terms), conversation and news reportage (8 terms), fiction and academic discourse (6 terms). Conversation and academic discourse are furthest apart, sharing only one term (Table 2.19 on page 52).

These similarities shown in the table might be interpreted as follows: both news reportage and fiction are concerned with story telling, both report on emotional reactions (of news actors or characters) and both have a nominal–adjectival affect style. Both also include features of spoken conversation when representing (news actors’ or characters’) dialogue, explaining also the similarities between conversation–fiction and conversation–news. In a sense, both fiction and news reportage are ‘composite’ texts, inheriting features of (mediated) spoken discourse. As noted in Section 1.6.2, academic discourse and news reportage have in common some situational features (low degrees of interactivity and immediacy, providing information), accounting perhaps for the shared emotion terms in these registers. Conversation and academic discourse are furthest apart both situationally (1.6.2) and with reference to their POS style (verbal–adjectival vs. nominal).
### Table 2.19 Sharing of emotion terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-N (8)</th>
<th>C-F (11)</th>
<th>C-A (1)</th>
<th>N-F (13)</th>
<th>N-A (11)</th>
<th>F-A (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>worry (N),</td>
<td>pleasure (N),</td>
<td>keen (A)</td>
<td>concerned (N),</td>
<td>anxious (A),</td>
<td>angrily (A),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passionately (Adv),</td>
<td>glad (A),</td>
<td></td>
<td>expectation (N),</td>
<td>angry (A),</td>
<td>gloomily (Adv),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shock (N),</td>
<td>pleased (A),</td>
<td></td>
<td>prepared (A),</td>
<td>angry (A),</td>
<td>gratefully (Adv),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise (N),</td>
<td>frightened (A),</td>
<td></td>
<td>disappointed (A),</td>
<td>anxious (A),</td>
<td>gratefully (Adv),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad (A),</td>
<td>mind (V),</td>
<td></td>
<td>keen (A),</td>
<td>angry (A),</td>
<td>sadly (Adv),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keen (A),</td>
<td>miss (V),</td>
<td></td>
<td>anxious (A),</td>
<td>angry (A),</td>
<td>hate (V),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerfully (Adv),</td>
<td>shock (N),</td>
<td></td>
<td>angry (A),</td>
<td>gratefully (Adv),</td>
<td>gratefully (Adv),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hate (V),</td>
<td>surprised (N),</td>
<td></td>
<td>passionate (Adv),</td>
<td>sad (Adv),</td>
<td>hate (V),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sad (A),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>happy (Adv),</td>
<td>admire (V),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keen (A),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grateful (Adv),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheerfully (Adv),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sad (Adv),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hate (V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Syntactic variation

In this section I am interested in syntactic variation concerning different parts of speech, in particular:

- Nouns: singular vs. plural
- Adjectives: positive vs. comparative (more) vs. superlative (most) (but not: less, least)
- Verbs: base form (love) vs. -ed form (loved) vs. -s (loves) vs. -ing form (loving)

Since it was not possible to analyze syntactic variation with respect to more than 1000 emotion terms, this section concentrates on a subset of these. Methodologically, the simplest solution was to examine in one register all emotion terms that: (1) occur at least twice, (2) do not just occur in (idiomatic) phrases (for example in a huff) or have alternative spellings (for example demoralisation – demoralization), and (3) require no further (sense-sensitive) manual analysis. Altogether, 146 lexical items were included in the analysis: a subset of 46 nouns from each register comprising 12.5 per cent of all emotion nouns; a subset of 65 adjectives from each register comprising 16.2 per cent of all emotion adjectives, and a subset of 35 verbs from each register comprising 14.2 per cent of all emotion verbs. The verb hate was excluded from the analysis because of its high frequency, in order not to skew the results. The necessity of restricting the analysis of syntactic variation to these subsets becomes apparent when noting that even with only 146 emotion terms, 584 individual searches had to be carried out for the analysis of syntactic variation in the four registers (46 × 4 + 65 × 4 + 35 × 4), corresponding to about 20,000 occurrences.

2.5.1 Results

Let’s start by looking at the results for all types of syntactic variation investigated here, as listed in Table 2.20. Starting with emotion nouns, we can see that 92–96 per cent of all nouns in the four registers are used in the singular form and only 3.5–6.9 per cent in the plural form. The differences between the registers are negligible, and the focus is on tendencies in any case. As for adjectives, 96–99 per cent are used in the positive form, 1–3 per cent in the comparative form and only 0.2–0.5 per cent in the superlative form. Again, the distribution is very similar in all four registers. Moving on to verbs, the occurrence of the -ing form...
Table 2.20  Syntactic variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>291 92.1</td>
<td>683 95.1</td>
<td>5,341 96.3</td>
<td>1,256 92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>14 4.4</td>
<td>34 4.7</td>
<td>195 3.5</td>
<td>93 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316 –</td>
<td>718 –</td>
<td>5,546 –</td>
<td>1,354 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1,850 98.6</td>
<td>952 98.2</td>
<td>5,866 98.5</td>
<td>878 96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>more</em></td>
<td>19 1.0</td>
<td>12 1.2</td>
<td>73 1.2</td>
<td>27 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>most</em></td>
<td>8 0.4</td>
<td>4 0.4</td>
<td>14 0.2</td>
<td>5 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,877 –</td>
<td>969 –</td>
<td>5,953 –</td>
<td>913 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>185 41.9</td>
<td>178 32.1</td>
<td>841 28.9</td>
<td>207 36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ed</td>
<td>119 26.9</td>
<td>246 44.3</td>
<td>1,549 53.3</td>
<td>237 42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>87 19.7</td>
<td>55 9.9</td>
<td>117 4.0</td>
<td>33 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>48 10.9</td>
<td>60 10.8</td>
<td>308 10.6</td>
<td>56 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>442 –</td>
<td>555 –</td>
<td>2,907 –</td>
<td>564 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>2,635 –</td>
<td>2,242 –</td>
<td>14,406 –</td>
<td>2,831 –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is roughly the same in all four registers (circa 10 per cent), but with the other forms (base, -ed, -s) there are more differences: conversation is distinguished from the other three registers in that the base form is most frequent (~40 per cent), in contrast to the -ed form in news reportage, fiction and academic discourse (~40–50 per cent). In conversation, the s-form also has the highest percentage of all four corpora (~20 per cent). News reportage has a similar distribution of the base form to fiction, and of the -ed form to academic discourse. It has the highest percentage of the -s form of the three written corpora. Fiction is characterized by the highest frequency of the -ed form, and the lowest frequency of the -s form of all four corpora. Finally, academic reportage is distinguished by having the smallest difference in distribution between the base form and the -ed form of all four registers.

2.5.2 Interpretation

On the one hand, the fact that plural occurrences for emotion nouns are less common than singular occurrences corresponds to an overall tendency of the language system in which singular is the norm: ‘The higher frequency of singular nouns agrees with their status as the unmarked form (which generally has the widest distribution)’ (Biber et al. 1999: 291). This also becomes apparent from the frequencies of singular and plural common nouns in the BNC (Leech et al. 2001: 295):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical word classes</th>
<th>Frequency per million tags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>common noun, neutral for number, for example sheep</td>
<td>2896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular common noun</td>
<td>121078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural common noun</td>
<td>41320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the fact that no differences in the percentage of singular and plural occurrences are found among the four registers (which differs from findings for nouns in general by Leech et al. 2001 for the similar but not equivalent corpora ‘Imaginative’, ‘Informative’ and ‘Conversation’) relates to the specific character of emotion nouns. Nouns denoting emotion are usually non-count/uncountable nouns, and the low frequency of the plural form is hence not surprising. Those nouns that do allow the plural often have different affect meanings for the non-count and the count usage. Nouns that occur in the plural include (f > five in plural in one of the corpora): whim, worry, disappointment, affection, antagonism, leaning, surprise, regret, resentment, apprehension, sorrow, anxiety, frustration, humiliation, jealousy, grudge. Many of these
have different affect meanings typically associated with the plural form: for example, *worry* is usually ‘the state of worrying about something’ (*OALD*) whereas *worries* often refers to ‘something that worries you’ (*OALD*). Similarly, *disappointment* typically means ‘sadness because sth has not happened or been as good, successful, etc. as you expected or hoped’ (*OALD*), whereas *disappointments* are ‘[persons or things] that [are] disappointing’ (*OALD*).

With verbs – where the occurrence of the -ing form is about the same in all registers – there is a similar grammatical restriction: many verbs denoting emotion typically do not allow the progressive (for a list of exceptions, see Biber *et al*. 1999: 472). In ‘traditional’ grammar, they belong to the so-called *stative verbs* (Biber *et al*. 1999: 471); in SFL grammar, they belong to the category of *mental processes*, where the simple present is the unmarked tense (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 206).10

As with plural occurrences for nouns, the progressive form for emotion verbs ‘is less frequent and ... carries a special interpretation’ (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 207) or relates to different meanings of emotion terms. For example, *admire* (1 ‘to respect sb for what they are or what they have done’; 2 ‘to look at sth and think that it is attractive and/or impressive’, *OALD*) in the progressive will usually be used in meaning 2 rather than 1. Here are some examples from the fiction sub-corpus of the BRC:

(3) And I noticed Otley was *admiring* himself in the mirror a lot these days (BRC, ACK 490)
(4) He was *admiring* the dexterity of a young street orderly (BRC, ANL 738)
(5) Anneliese was *admiring* the cut and style with a practised European eye for fashion (BRC, GUE 2066)

Both emotion nouns and emotion verbs are thus restrained grammatically in terms of plural occurrences and the progressive form, even though there are exceptions, with some emotion nouns more frequent in the plural, for example *leaning*.

With adjectives, the situation is slightly different in that there is no restriction on their gradability: emotion adjectives are in fact potentially gradable (*happy – happier – happiest*) but are not often used as graded forms (*happier, happiest*). Again, this reflects a general tendency for adjectives to be used in the positive, rather than in the comparative or superlative form, with the comparative being more frequent than
the superlative. Here are some figures (Leech et al. 2001: 295) from the whole BNC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical word classes</th>
<th>Frequency per million tags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>general adj</td>
<td>56336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general comparative adj</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general superlative adj</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the fact that there is little inter-register variation in terms of comparative and superlative forms is partly explained by the specific nature of emotion adjectives: since such adjectives relate to ‘private’ states into which only the emoter has insight, it would be very marked to say I’m happier/angrier/more surprised than he is (whereas it is possible to say I’m happier now than I was then). Therefore, there is less opportunity for using graded forms with emotion adjectives.

The close correspondence in syntactic variation in the four registers as far as emotion nouns and adjectives (and the -ing form of emotion verbs) are concerned is thus only at first sight surprising, taking into account the fact that it was not the same subset of lexical items that were analyzed in the different corpora. There is simply something in the nature of emotion terms as such that explains these findings: the similarities between the registers become explicable by the nature of the lexical items investigated, and partly by general language tendencies.

Table 2.21  Variation in verb form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ed</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With verbs there is more inter-register variation, as we have seen. For reasons of convenience Table 2.21 above lists the percentages again. If we assume that the base form and the -s form are associated with the present tense or with tense-less (modal and so on) usages, and that the -ed form is associated with the past tense or the passive voice, we can make the following hypotheses:

- In conversation speakers use emotion verbs less frequently to refer to their emotions in the past (that is, in narratives), and more frequently ‘to refer to current [for example emotional] states’ (Biber et al. 1999: 458). Conversation in general is characterized by the present tense, by
‘speakers’ general focus on the immediate context’ (Biber et al. 1999: 457). Compare also Shimanoff’s (1985) finding that college students have a tendency to refer to their present emotions more than to their past ones.

- **In news reportage**, which uses the past tense to report narrated events as well as to represent indirect speech, and the present tense when quoting news actors, it seems that emotion verbs are more frequently used in indirect speech or descriptions of news actors rather than in direct speech (though news actors’ speech may also include emotion terms in past tense). Some -ed forms might also be associated with the passive voice, since news is characterized both by the present and past tense as well as the occurrence of passives (Biber et al. 1999: 456, 476).

- **In fiction**, which is associated with the past tense in narration, and where the present tense often only occurs in the direct representation of characters’ speech (Biber et al. 1999: 458), many emotion verbs are used to describe characters rather than in characters’ speech, though the latter also occur. Fiction and news reportage appear similar in this respect.

- **In academic discourse**, it is hypothesized that the base form is used mainly in tense-less forms (with modal verbs and so on modifying the emotion verbs) rather than in quoted speech. Even though academic prose, like conversation, is characterized by the present tense, this is here used ‘to imply a lack of time restriction, with the present subsuming past and future time’ (Biber et al. 1999: 458). Of course, academic discourse is also associated with the passive voice (Biber et al. 1999: 476). Thus it may be that both tense-less use of emotion verbs and the use of emotion verbs for descriptions of past emotions or in the passive voice are perhaps equally common.

These assumptions must necessarily remain hypotheses because without further investigation it is simply not clear how many base forms are associated with the present tense rather than non-tense, and how many -ed forms are associated with the passive voice rather than past tense. Such investigation was beyond the scope of the analyses undertaken in this book. The hypotheses above are made on the basis of what is known about the registers already, as well as from a general impression formed by the analysis of the concordance lines, but will be confirmed to some extent by the analyses of patterns for 15 emotion terms presented in Chapter 4.

In order to complement these analyses, and to look into the difference between authorial and non-authorial affect (Section 1.4), a rough
Table 2.22  Distribution of emoters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoter</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
<td>Raw freq %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I’</td>
<td>211 47.7</td>
<td>67 12.1</td>
<td>419 14.4</td>
<td>35 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you’</td>
<td>59 13.3</td>
<td>7 1.3</td>
<td>156 5.4</td>
<td>15 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘we’</td>
<td>5 1.1</td>
<td>14 2.5</td>
<td>21 0.7</td>
<td>32 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘3rd’</td>
<td>154 34.8</td>
<td>408 73.5</td>
<td>2,248 77.3</td>
<td>392 69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>442 –</td>
<td>555 –</td>
<td>2,907 –</td>
<td>564 –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

count for different emoters (for emotion verbs) was also undertaken.12 As can be seen in Table 2.22, ‘I’ and ‘you’ references are most frequent in conversation, whereas in news reportage, fiction and academic discourse third person references occur most often. This confirms the assumptions made above: that conversation is the only register in which speakers frequently refer to their own and, to some extent, to interlocutors’ emotions, whereas in news reportage and fiction verbs are much less frequently used in dialogue (that is, involving the usage of I and you).

The results of this analysis can also be compared with the findings by Scheibman (2002: 65–105) for subject types of feeling verbs in American English conversation, based on a smaller corpus and hence lower frequencies overall. She found that first person singular subject types are most frequent (42.2 per cent), followed by third person subject types (33.3 per cent if singular and plural are added) and second person singular subject types (20 per cent). And Shimanoff (1985) as well as Anderson & Leaper (1998) note that college students refer more frequently to their own emotions in conversations.

The findings are also not surprising given what we know about these registers as such, namely that the pronouns I, me and you are far more common in conversation than in the other registers ‘because both participants are in immediate contact, and the interaction typically focuses on matters of immediate concern’ (Biber et al. 1999: 333). It must be noted however, that emotion verbs in conversation are in fact used more frequently to refer to a third party’s emotion than to refer to the hearer’s emotion. This is because emotions are conceptualized as private states (see above), and belong to the so-called A-events (as do mental states in general) – events that are ‘[k]nown to A [the speaker], but not to B’ (Labov & Fanshel 1977: 100). A-events have a special status, since they cannot easily be challenged or attributed to someone in ordinary conversation. For instance, it would be somewhat marked or noticeable to
say *You are not sad*. It seems very challenging indeed to attribute a private state to someone other than yourself, in particular when that someone is your interlocutor. It is much less challenging to attribute a private state to a third party (who is not present and who cannot object) than to claim that the hearer feels/felt a certain emotion at a certain time. But such attributions can of course occur in questions (examples from BRC conversation sub-corpus):

(6) **Were you disappointed** when you put it back on? (BRC, KCP 2728)
(7) it’s, I mean like Tracey said **are you disappointed**? (BRC, KBF 12205)
(8) **Was you disappointed**? (BRC, KCT 828)
(9) **Were you frightened** trying to get in? (BRC, KBL 1266)
(10) **Are you frightened** you will er swear? (BRC, KD2 12)
(11) **Who d’ya hate** really really hate? (BRC, KP3 1751)
(12) **You hate** her? (BRC, KNY 1778)
(13) **You hate** it **don’t you**? (BRC, KCT 4506)
(14) What animal is it that **you hate**? (BRC, KBF 731)
(15) Oh dear **you were pleased** to get off **weren’t you**? (BRC, KB0 388)
(16) Bet you were **surprised** to hear Monsignor on the phone **weren’t you**? (BRC, KE2 8659)
(17) **Are you surprised**? (BRC, KB1 4509)
(18) Yeah why, why **are you surprised**? (BRC, KBX 522)

This does not mean that such attributions do not occasionally occur in statements since the frequencies for this were not systematically examined:

(19) **You hate** carrot cake or whatever it is. (BRC, KC4 370)
(20) I told him **you hate** Chris. (BRC, KNY 1441)
(21) Oh, **you hate** her hair (BRC, KNY 1780)
(22) **You hate** that. (BRC, KDH 12)
(23) Well I’ll tell you what er, Liz Taylor was on, you know the Oprah Winfrey show that **you hate**? (BRC, KD8 513)
(24) Last time he flew out, **you were frightened**. (BRC, KB1 2042) (from BRC conversation sub-corpus)

The basis of such attributions may be the assumption of feeling rules (Section 1.3), the projection of one’s own experience, or one’s knowledge of the other (Fiehler 1990: 141). Also, we may of course choose to share our emotions with others, and they can pick up on this. Communication in this sense can be seen as ‘a way of bridging the gap between the personal
and the social sides of emotion’ (Planalp 1999: 134; on the social sharing of emotions see also Rimé et al. 1998). However, this is up to the emoter: Wowk (1989) notes, with respect to the counselling of breast cancer patients, the existence of ‘certain acknowledged rights of the recipient to define and disclose his or her personal state’ (Wowk 1989: 60).

The status of emotions as A-events also helps to explain the fact that ‘we’ references are very rare in all four registers. Since emotions are conceptualized as private states, it becomes difficult to talk about more than one person’s experienced emotion at the same time. To talk about our love/hate of linguistics implies both an insight into someone other than yourself, and furthermore claims that that person experiences the same kind of emotional reaction – it de-individualizes the subject to a certain extent. It claims solidarity, coupledom, unity. In academic discourse such references are more frequent because of its specific usage of we as authorial voice, either referring to a single researcher, to a group of collaborating researchers or to the writer and the reader/readers.

2.5.3 Summary of syntactic variation

If we assume that language is at least partly responsible for construing reality, the usage of emotion terms in the English language with respect to syntactic variation seems to contribute to the Western conceptualization of emotions as prototypically:

- non-comparable (see adjectives)
- non-countable (see nouns)
- stative (see verbs)
- private rather than public/shared (see emoters)

As Biber et al. have noted, the contrast between noun types (for example count/non-count) ‘is not a simple reflection of reality, but rather reflects how we choose to conceptualize the entities which we want to talk about’ (Biber et al. 1999: 242), and similar assumptions have been made by explicitly constructivist approaches to language: ‘experience is the reality that we construe for ourselves by means of language’ (Halliday & Matthiessen 1999: 3, original emphasis).

Research has in fact noted that cultures can be described as individualist (Western) or collectivist (East Asian and South American): see Planalp (1999: 223). Individualist cultures emphasize personal individuality, whereas collectivist cultures value family and community structures. Members of individualist cultures place high value on their independence, including the subjectivity of their emotional experience.
as supporting their unique identity, whereas in collectivist cultures emotional experience is less subjective and more shared (Gordon 1990: 153, Mees 2006: 10). The similarities in the syntactic variation of emotion terms in all registers seem to derive from this specific conceptualization of emotion terms (as well as general language tendencies), whereas the differences can be explained in terms of the general characteristics of the respective register (Section 1.6.2).

Notes
1. The results that are given in Chapter 2 (and Appendix E1 online) show key tendencies in variation, without necessarily representing exact and stable figures that will always be found in the different registers (even if exact figures are reported rather than rounded ones). This is because of (1) the limitations of the corpus, (2) classification errors, (3) the ‘failings’ of the human analyst (see Appendix A 1.2 online). Unfortunately, ‘when working with large corpus files, there will always be some variability due to error, depending on occasional human mistakes or inaccuracy of methodological tools’ (Biber et al. 1999: 39). Furthermore, there may be difficulties in comparing the distribution of lexis across corpora of different size. A discussion of this issue is provided by Biber (2006: 251).

2. All results are statistically significant using the $\chi^2$ test unless otherwise noted. I used the chi-square statistic ($\chi^2$) because this seems to be the most frequently used in corpus linguistics, but am myself skeptical as to the relevance of such tests for linguistic analysis. Although Leech et al. (2001: 16) argue that the $G^2$ log-likelihood-statistic performs better than $\chi^2$, Moore (2004) points out that ‘Agresti (1999, p. 246) cites studies showing $X^2$ is valid with smaller sample sizes, and more sparse tables than $G^2$,’ and either $X^2$ or $G^2$ can be unreliable when expected frequencies of less than five are involved, depending on circumstances’ (Moore 2004: 1). For further discussion, see Dunning (1993), Oakes (1998), Leech et al. (2001), Moore (2004), and Kilgarriff (2001). $\chi^2$ was calculated with the help of a perl program kindly written by Michael Oakes; any mistakes in its application are mine.

3. Planalp (1999) cites Meštrović (1997) as arguing that emotions are shaped to a large extent by the media, which tell us how to feel about war, crime or people. The strong view is that ‘emotions have been transformed from personal, moral passions into “synthetic, quasi-emotions” manipulated by the culture industry’ (Planalp 1999: 239, referring to Meštrović 1997: xi).

4. In Table 2.6 and all following ✓ indicates that the emotion term is among the ten most frequent emotion terms in the respective corpus. Where ✓ is not present, this does not mean that the emotion term does not occur at all in the corpus; merely that it is not amongst the ten most frequent emotion terms in the given category. This also relates to the discussion of occurrences.

5. It is worth mentioning that previous research into emotion words supports my findings to some extent. For instance, Stubbs found that happy and happiness are both frequent and evenly distributed in the LOB corpus (Stubbs 1996: 89).
My analysis showed that this is true also for three of the four BRC sub-corpora even when meaning distinctions are taken into account (which Stubbs does not): *happy* is very frequent in conversation (119.8 ppm), news reportage (147.7 ppm), and fiction (172.2 ppm), but much less frequent in academic discourse (22 ppm). Precht’s (2000: 130–48) analysis of stance found no register variation concerning factor five (‘Opiniated affect/person-oriented’: *afraid, fear, drawn, interested, love, lucky, should have, wrong* in a variety of grammatical frames), but concluded that factor eight (‘Adjectival affect/social ties’: *nice, glad* in different grammatical frames) occurs primarily in spoken language and more in female speakers, and that factor ten (‘Intimate affective expression/private’: *funny, god, hate, have to, know, like, predAFF1, want* in a variety of frames) is typical for American conversation (more females and more younger speakers than in other registers). Even though the findings cannot be compared directly in terms of methodology, corpus design and investigated features (see Section 1.5), it is interesting to note that some of my findings (the high frequency of *glad, like* and *hate* in conversation) support her analyses.

6. Appendix A 2.4 online shows the classification of emotion terms as ‘positive’, ‘negative’ or ‘neutral’ (also Section 5.3.4).

7. Consequently, it was not the same subset of nouns/adjectives/verbs that were investigated in each sub-corpus, because different emotion terms required a manual analysis in the four registers. The only lexical items that were analyzed in all four corpora are: *admiration, affection, desperation, gratitude, impatience, jealousy, regret, sadness* (nouns), *annoyed, anxious, appalled, apprehensive, delighted, disgruntled, dismayed, ecstatic, enthusiastic, envious, puzzled, surprised, terrified* (adjectives), *admire, delight, despise, disapprove, dislike, frighten, humiliate, intimidate, panic, resent, surprise, terrify* (verbs). However, to make the analysis more comparable, the same percentage (subset) was used in all registers. For instance, only 46 nouns in the conversation corpus fulfil the three criteria above and could therefore be included in the analysis of syntactic variation in conversation. This in turn means that in the three other corpora only 46 nouns were analyzed, even if more nouns fulfilled the three criteria. In such cases, the least frequent nouns were excluded from the analysis to make the findings more representative, some randomly whenever necessary. A list of all items analyzed for syntactic variation can be found in Appendix A 2.5 online.

8. The reason why the percentages for singular and plural nouns (and so on) do not add up to 100 per cent is that some occurrences are classified as the wrong part of speech by the automatic POS tagger. These were excluded in the manual analysis.

9. Some occurrences of *more* preceding on adjective, which did not indicate a ‘true’ comparative, were not counted (for example *all the more grateful*).

10. But note that the -*ing* form can also be used in non-finite structures rather than in the progressive.

11. Incidentally, although the -s form is associated with third person subjects, this does not automatically indicate non-authorial affect, since usages with a ‘dummy’ it can also express authorial affect: *it surprises me, it annoys me*, it contrast to the non-authorial *X admires me, X hates me*.

12. It must be noted that in this rough calculation (which involves both pronoun usages and lexical NPs), no meaning-based analysis of the data was
possible because of time constraints. That is, occurrences classified as ‘you’ also include those that mean ‘one’ (in general) rather than the interlocutor(s) and so on (see Biber et al. 1999: 328–32 on different usages of personal pronouns). It must also be mentioned that the ‘I’ is not necessarily the speaker/author (when the I occurs in quoted/attributed speech), and that in fiction issues of point of view (Simpson, 1993, Toolan 2001, Rimmon-Kenan 2002) can be quite complex. There is hence no direct correlation between ‘I’ and authorial affect, especially in the written registers.
This chapter is about the analysis of lexico-grammatical patterns that are associated with emotion terms, that is, about words and word classes that precede or follow them. As in Section 2.5 (syntactic variation), a subset of emotion terms is used for this purpose because it was not feasible to analyze the patterns of more than 1000 emotion terms. Altogether, 15 emotion terms were analyzed in detail in the four sub-corpora: nine emotion adjectives (four ‘positive’, three ‘negative’ and two ‘neutral’), three emotion nouns (one ‘positive’, one ‘negative’ and one ‘neutral’) and three emotion verbs (one ‘positive’, one ‘negative’ and one ‘neutral’). Table 3.1 lists the terms that were analyzed.

These terms were chosen from the list of 146 emotion terms that were used for the analysis of syntactic variation in Section 2.5 (see Chapter 2, Note 7), on the basis that they occurred reasonably frequently in all four sub-corpora. This chapter gives an overview of patterns that can realize affect, mainly involving the attempt to sketch a ‘local grammar’ of affect, which is based on a combination of Hunston’s (for example 2003) local grammar approach and Fillmore’s FrameNet approach (http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu). Though space does not permit an extensive discussion of both approaches in this chapter, brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion terms</th>
<th>‘Positive’</th>
<th>‘Negative’</th>
<th>‘Neutral’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>delighted, enthusiastic,</td>
<td>anxious, disappointed,</td>
<td>surprised, willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impressed, pleased</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>affection</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>admire</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
overviews will be given in the following Sections (more detailed information can be found in the cited publications by Hunston and her colleagues as well as on the FrameNet website).

3.1 The local grammar approach

As many linguists have pointed out, the relationship between linguistic form and meaning is far from arbitrary (see Hunston 2003: 342). For instance, the different meanings of a polysemous word are distinguished by the various grammatical patterns in which the word occurs, whereas words that have similar meanings can share grammatical patterns (Figure 3.1). This behaviour can either be explained as ‘meaning causes behaviour’ or as ‘behaviour causes meaning’ (Hunston 2003: 342), and is examined in more detail in Hunston & Francis (2000) and Francis et al. (1996, 1998). It is also the basis on which the concept of local grammar was developed (Hunston 2003: 347–8) – a concept that I have found useful for describing the behaviour of emotion terms in the BRC.

The concept of local grammar goes back to the finding that software for the grammatical analysis of corpora (parsers), which are based on traditional grammatical models, find it hard to deal with specific areas of language, and that ‘there is still a lot left over’ (Hunston & Sinclair 2000: 76). Hunston & Sinclair (2000), following Gross (1993) and Barnbrook & Sinclair (1995), have suggested the use of parsers that are based on local grammars for such cases. Local grammars are essentially descriptions of particular areas of language (rather than the language as a whole), such as dictionary definitions, newspaper headlines, the language of cause and effect or the language of evaluation. In other words, a local grammar describes ‘one meaning only’ (Hunston 2002: 178), even if meaning is defined rather broadly. Local grammars typically work with transparent category labels referring to functional categories that are characteristic for the area of language that is to be described (Butler 2004: 158), for example Definiens, Definiendum for definitions, Evaluative category, Thing evaluated for evaluative language. Local grammars are then used to describe and

Figure 3.1  Words and patterns
analyze sentences. The resulting description ‘is “functional” in a different way from the tradition of functional grammars, and incorporates some valuable pragmatic parameters’ (Hunston & Sinclair 2000: 79).

The approach has similarities with the FrameNet project (http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/) developed by Fillmore and others (these similarities are investigated by Hunston 2003), and there are also connections to other theories such as construction grammar (for example Fillmore 1997), which are discussed by Stubbs (2001). Both FrameNet (FrN) and local grammar are corpus-based, and involve the semantic mapping of categories onto sentences. Taking two examples from FrameNet, let’s very briefly compare the two approaches:

(1) She subsequently attended the genetic counselling clinic, and was very **anxious** about the situation. (FrN)
(2) George felt **anxious** that he had no opportunity to be alone with Tamar. (FrN)

A local grammar analysis would presumably parse these sentences as indicated in Table 3.2 (with categories merged from Hunston & Sinclair 2000, and Hunston 2003). A local grammar approach would collect other examples of words that use these patterns and sort them into meaning groups (Table 3.3). It would also identify other patterns (for example **ADJ at n**) that are used to attribute emotions to experiencers (Hunston & Sinclair 2000, Hunston 2003), that is, patterns that share this function. Local grammars are thus motivated by ‘the function of the sentence, not the words it has in it’ (Hunston 2003: 345).

FrameNet on the other hand, involves more than patterns: it identifies semantic–syntactic frames that are associated with a particular sense of a word, notes their elements, and how they are realized lexico-grammatically in the corpus. It also identifies senses of other lexical items that share this frame. Ultimately, ‘[t]he aim is to document the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 Local grammar analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3  Patterns and meaning groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Meaning groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ <em>about</em> n</td>
<td>‘passionate &amp; cool’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘happy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘unhappy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘philosophical’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘nervous’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘angry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘curious’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘cynical &amp; serious’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ <em>that</em></td>
<td>‘surprised’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘angry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘horrified’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘glad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘anxious’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from Hunston 2003: 354–5)

range of semantic and syntactic combinatory possibilities – **valences** – of each word in each of its senses, through computer-assisted annotation of example sentences and automatic tabulation and display of the annotation results’ (http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/book/book.html#intro).

For example, **anxious** is described by FrameNet as belonging to the Emotion_directed frame, which is defined as follows on the FrameNet website:

The adjectives and nouns in this frame describe an Experiencer who is feeling or experiencing a particular emotional response to a Stimulus or about a Topic. There can also be a Circumstances (sic) under which the response occurs or a Reason that the Stimulus evokes the particular response in the Experiencer.

The entry for **anxious** also lists the structure of core and non-core frame elements in sentences in the corpus (including a quantification). The parsing of a sentence with **anxious** thus involves a lot of detail about the structures in which it occurs, with extra elements such as Degree, Circumstance, State, Reason and the listing of typical copula (Cop) or other support (Supp) verbs (examples from FrameNet):

(3) She [Experiencer] subsequently attended the genetic counselling clinic, and was [Cop] very [Degree] **anxious** [Target] about the situation [Topic].
(4) George [Experiencer] felt [Supp] anxious [Target] that he had no opportunity to be alone with Tamar [Stimulus].

FrameNet hence provides a description of particular frames in which different lexical items participate, whereas a local grammar tries to provide a description of one area of meaning (based on function) realized by different lexical items. Local grammars involve patterns in the CCED (Collins Cobuild English Dictionary) sense (Hunston 2003: 356), whereas FrameNet includes other types of contextual information.

3.2 Combining local grammar and FrameNet: affect patterns

For the analysis of emotion terms undertaken here I combined some aspects of the local grammar and the FrameNet approach. Like local grammar, my starting point is one area of meaning: the system of affect, in particular how words denoting affect/emotion are used to attribute emotions (to self or other) in discourse.

As a first step, the semantic elements that are involved in affect were identified and labels for them were chosen. The crucial question is ‘Which elements of emotional experience are important and should be identified in an analysis of affect?’ For example, Hunston (2003) includes the labels Experiencer, Emoter, Cause, Target, and Action/Phenomenon, without, however, explicitly defining them (but they are relatively self-explanatory). FrameNet describes 12 different frames that use an overall Emotions Frame (see Table A.10 in Appendix A 3.1 online),¹ most of which include an Experiencer (who is in some frames called a Cognizer or a Judge), and some element that provokes the emotion or tells us what the emotion is about or at what/whom the emotion is directed. The name of this element differs, and is called Stimulus, Topic, Event, Content, Valuee, Action, Reason or Means (Appendix A 3.2 online). Even though there may well be reasons for distinguishing between these elements within the framework of FrameNet, for our purposes it is better to focus on the similarities between them, namely that they all describe an entity, situation, state-of-affairs and so on that causes an emotion or at which an emotion is directed. It then seems reasonable to suggest treating these different terms (Reason, Topic, Stimulus, Content ...) as belonging to the same overall category (trigger). The coding of diverse elements as trigger emphasizes the similarities between emotion terms, and examples that are classified differently in FrameNet with respect to their frames.
Table 3.4 Coding of affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoter</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>admire</td>
<td>you for your intellect (FrN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td>loves</td>
<td>compliments (FrN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>worries</td>
<td>… about the house (FrN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>forgives</td>
<td>repentant sinners (BRC, A07 388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>desires</td>
<td>that you take over the keepership of the royal castle of Berwick (BNC, CD8 1292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O]ne Soviet and one Afghan citizen…</td>
<td>repented</td>
<td>their actions against the Soviet Union (BRC, A95 103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Whiskers</td>
<td>is upset</td>
<td>that there are no more cat treats (FrN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modigliani</td>
<td>was anxious</td>
<td>because of the difficulty of finding models (BNC, ANF 1504)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Table A.11 in Appendix A 3.3 online) and frame elements would consequently all be described equally as in Table 3.4.

Thus, I distinguish between three main elements for describing emotional experience: the one experiencing the emotion, the emotion itself and the cause or target of the emotion. Galasiński similarly notes that only three aspects of emotional experience are important: the emoter, the emotion and the object of the emotion (Galasiński 2004: 48). In accordance with appraisal theory, I will use the following terms to label these three categories:

- **Emoter**: the one to whom an emotional response is assigned: who is said to ‘feel’ an emotion;
- **Emotion**: the particular emotion involved;
- **Trigger**: what causes the emotional response; what is ‘evaluated’ emotionally; what the emotion is about; the cause, reason or target of an emotion.

As a second step (after the identification of the three main affect categories), corpus examples from Francis *et al.* (1996, 1998 – from the Bank of English), Hunston (2003 – from the Bank of English), and FrameNet (from the BNC) as well as the detailed analysis of the 15 emotion terms in the BRC were used to establish how emoters, emotions and triggers are realized lexi-co-grammatically in patterns. Some exploratory corpus research of other emotion terms in the BRC was also undertaken to prove or disprove the existence of certain patterns for affect.
This approach led to the inclusion of structures that are non-obligatory, and can also occur with other patterns, structures that are what Hunston has labelled “‘free-floating’ [elements] that [need] to be labelled as a local grammar or frame element wherever [they occur]’ (2003: 357). For example, in many but not all cases when-clauses realize triggers:

(5) I jump with **surprise** when a dog suddenly barks at me (BRC, AM6 1032)
(6) he was **pleased** when you agreed to this (FrN)
(7) He seemed **disappointed** when the dispute was settled at higher levels (FrN)
(8) We were confused and **anxious** when we were not understood (FrN)

The patterns **N when-cl** and **ADJ when-cl** (emotion when trigger) were hence included to take into account the fact that when-clauses following emotion terms often describe the trigger of an emotion – information which would be useful for a parser to have.

Similarly, I included elements even when they are dependent not on the emotion term but on one of its co-occurring lexical items. An example of a pattern that is included because of a co-occurring item (here *bestow*) of an emotion term is **N on n** (emotion on trigger): *bestow affection on his slightly wayward children* (BRC, CHG 1570). This takes into consideration that *his slightly wayward children* are clearly the trigger for the emotion.2

Additionally, it was found helpful in some cases to employ three further category labels in the description of sentence elements. These are:

- **Expressor**: ‘a body part, gesture or other expression of the Experiencer that reflects his or her emotional state’ (FrameNet);
- **Empathy target**: ‘the individual or individuals with which the Experiencer identifies emotionally and thus shares their emotional response’ (FrameNet);
- **Action**: an action contextually associated with an emotion term. There is no clear dividing line between expressors and actions.

Section 3.3 describes the generalized patterns that make up the local grammar of affect. Even though this local grammar needs to be elaborated by more corpus-based research regarding the patterning of additional emotion terms, the detailed analysis of the 15 chosen emotion terms was complemented by corpus material from Francis et al. (1996),
Biber et al. (1999), and Hunston (2003) so that the description applies to more than just the analyzed emotion terms.

3.3 Patterns and meaning

In a local grammar approach, pattern elements are described with the help of labels that reflect their function. Different patterns can also be grouped together if they realize similar functions. Thus, in the following sections, patterns of affect are grouped first according to function, then according to part of speech, illustrated with one or two corpus examples. The examples are from all the corpus-based sources mentioned above, including but not limited to the BRC. Rather than listing each specific pattern individually (for example ADJ about, ADJ with) I will generalize as far as possible (for example ADJ prep).

3.3.1 Unemoted affect

In a number of examples, emotion nouns seem to occur without an emoter:

(9) When the two women set off to Berlin together in search of Roswitha’s past, the film becomes an exploration of the power of affection to transcend boundaries of age, background and sexual orientation. (BRC, AJF 36)

(10) Books: The sorrows of love and the joys of political hate (BRC, AK4 521)

Such ‘unemoted’ affect can be realized through a (usually abstract) noun followed by a prepositional phrase (Table 3.5). Emotion is here conceptualized as an abstract entity (Lutz 1990: 84) rather than as an emotional response of specific emoters at specific triggers. However, the same pattern may also be used to attribute affect to an emoter:

(11) Yeats watched, with an appalled fascination, as she [emoter] threw herself into ‘a joyous and self-forgetting condition of political hate’ [emotion]. (BRC, AK4 547)

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(abstract) n prep</td>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>the power of affection (BRC, AJF 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of) N</td>
<td></td>
<td>the joys of political hate (BRC, AK4 521)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether or not we deal with unemoted or emoted affect thus crucially depends on the context, and the pattern \( n \text{ of } N \) can in fact realize emoted affect. Since in appraisal theory affect is concerned with ‘how people express their feelings in discourse’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 25, emphasis mine) rather than with how emotions are referred to in discourse, it is perhaps best not to consider such unemoted instances as affect in a strict sense. In any case, such examples have a very weak evaluative power. That is, the emotion terms are not used to evaluate emoters or triggers, but are part of more general statements. For instance, in the examples above, they are used to outline characteristics of human artefacts. The film is described as ‘an exploration of the power of affection to transcend boundaries’ and the book is said to deal with ‘the joys of political hate’ – the emotion terms are used to describe entities rather than to evaluate emoters or triggers. Examples of such abstract references can also be found in much academic literature (for example psychology), where statements are made about emotions as such.

3.3.2 Undirected affect

More interesting for affect are patterns that do involve the attribution of emotions to particular emoters, even if they do not involve triggers. We might call this category undirected affect (see also Section 5.3.2.1). Patterns in this group specify emotion and emoter but not trigger. They can realize both authorial (attribution of emotion to self) and non-authorial affect (attribution of emotion to other).

Verb patterns

Starting with verb patterns, only some emotion verbs can be used in undirected affect patterns. Some examples are presented in Table 3.6. While in utterances such as I don’t mind or Don’t panic the trigger is certainly to be retrieved from the context, an utterance such as I don’t scare easily makes a statement about a general emotional disposition (no matter what the trigger).5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V       | emoter emotion | I don’t mind. (BRC, KCS 2157)  
Don’t panic. (BRC, B20 3174)  
I don’t scare easily (V adv) (Francis et al. 1996: 137) |
Emotion Talk Across Corpora

Adjective patterns

With the adjective pattern **ADJ n**, the emotion adjective can directly modify a head noun describing a person (the emoter), as in Table 3.7. But in some cases the emoter is only *metonymically* related to the modified head noun. This is the case with adjectives modifying an expressor (body part, gesture and so on of the emoter – see above), with a part–whole relation between emoter and expressor (Table 3.8).

### Table 3.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ n</td>
<td>emotion emoter</td>
<td>In one room, a <em>frightened</em> man bared his back which was a mass of scabs and bruises. (BRC, CH5 4286)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ n</td>
<td>emotion expressor</td>
<td>She smiled at Meredith's <em>surprised</em> expression. (BRC, CEB 933)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A metonymic relation also exists in examples where the emotion adjective does not directly modify an emoter or an expressor, but rather an event or process. For example:

(12) According to a **disappointed** editorial in *The Economist* (BRC, A6F 1390)

Here readers have to infer the emoter by establishing the contiguity relation existing between the head noun (*editorial*) and a potential emoter, here the unnamed author of the editorial in the *Economist*.

This relates to the more general question of how emoters can be identified. The distinction between metonymic and non-metonymic emoters may be of interest here (Table 3.9), with further sub-distinctions within metonymic emoters (compare also Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 202–3 on ‘Sensers’ in mental clauses).

The final example (*a disappointed editorial*) might be argued to include a fusing of both affect (an emotional response is attributed to the author of the editorial) and appreciation, since a semiotic phenomenon is evaluated (compare Section 1.4), though to me affect seems to be what is really at issue here, with the emoter having to be inferred by the reader.
Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-metonymic emoter</td>
<td>conscious participants (persons, animals)</td>
<td>a frightened man (BRC, CHS 4286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expressor (body part, gesture)</td>
<td>Meredith’s surprised expression (BRC, CEB 933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their anxious faces (BRC, FAJ 2626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonymic emoter</td>
<td>human collectives/institutions/countries</td>
<td>there was surprise in Whitehall (BRC, A4X 247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and so on</td>
<td>television is admired abroad (BNC, HMK 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semiotic phenomenon: product of emoter</td>
<td>a disappointed editorial (BRC, A6F 1390)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a second pattern of undirected affect – ADJ prep – the prepositional phrase (with for) indicates an empathy target, that is, a person with whom the emoter identifies (Table 3.10). The prepositional phrase refers to a second hypothetical emoter: the empathy target. The speaker assumes that this empathy target shares his/her emotion, for example in the examples in Table 3.10 that ‘he’ is happy and that ‘Jimmy’ is disappointed. In a sense, two emoters are construed: one actual (I) and one imagined (him, Jimmy).

Table 3.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ prep (for) n</td>
<td>emoter is emotion for empathy target</td>
<td>I’m happy for him (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m very disappointed for Jimmy (BNC, AHC 662)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun patterns

It is usually the non-count usages of emotion nouns that are used to attribute emotions to emoters, as shown, for instance, in Table 3.11. As previously mentioned (Section 2.5), emotion nouns are actually almost always non-count, and if they can be used as count nouns they have different meanings. In some cases, however, (for example with the noun affection), even count usages of emotion nouns do realize emotional responses (Table 3.12). With these two basic noun patterns, the emoter is realized by a pronoun (my, his), adjective (for example filial, parental) or
Table 3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adj N (non-count)</td>
<td>emoter’s emotion</td>
<td>his childlike affection (BRC, HGL 1451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his not unappealing surprise (BRC, CJF 619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his murderous hate (BRC, B1X 2559)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adj N (pl)</td>
<td>emoter’s emotion</td>
<td>my affections (BRC, B1X 3669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>men’s affections (BRC, KCA 421)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N prep (from, of) n</td>
<td>emotion from/of emoter</td>
<td>affection from her dear old Agnes (BRC, ASE 996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the frank astonishment from his agent (BNC, HGV 4809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the hate of the evil terrorist minority (BRC, AC2 149)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N prep (in/on) n</td>
<td>emotion in/on expressor</td>
<td>genuine surprise in his voice (BRC, FRF 2234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a lot of hate in their eyes (BRC, KC6 2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the look of surprise on his face (BRC, B20 1201)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

genitive noun (men’s). The emoter can also be realized by a prepositional phrase following the emotion noun (as in Table 3.13). We can also find patterns where the emoter is metonymically realized in the form of an expressor through a prepositional phrase (with in or on) following the emotion noun (as in Table 3.14).

In patterns where the preposition precedes rather than follows the emotion noun, it is the prepositional phrase that realizes the emotion, with a preceding noun or verb indicating an expressor or an action (Table 3.15).
Table 3.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n prep *(of) N</td>
<td>expressor of emotion</td>
<td>a look of clownish surprise (BRC, CJF 2159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an expression of absolute astonishment (BRC, FPM 2700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/a prep *(with/in) N</td>
<td>action/expressor with/in emotion</td>
<td>Giuseppe Patana conducts the score with obvious affection (BRC, A35 307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He squealed in ... surprise (BRC, FPX 1301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gideon Eddy laid an arm across the shoulders of Charlie Smith in mock affection (BRC, HHC 2031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was frozen with fear (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relation that is expressed by the preposition may vary as in the example in the table: in a look of clownish surprise, the look is specified in more detail; in squealed in surprise and frozen with fear, the emotion is the cause for what happens; in laid an arm across the shoulders of Charlie Smith in mock affection and in conducts the score with obvious affection the specification is one of manner. The preposition seems to depend on the adjective, noun or verb preceding the emotion noun, rather than the emotion noun itself (for example frozen with fear is classified as the pattern ADJ with n by Hunston 2003), but the emotion noun is here taken as the node, since my concern is not with valency/dependency as such (compare my comments above). As Hunston & Francis point out, ‘the same pattern can be described in terms of any one of its major elements’ (Hunston & Francis 2000: 45). It is worth emphasizing that adj with N is therefore not a pattern in Hunston’s definition (though ADJ with n is), but that it nevertheless can be included in a local grammar (S. Hunston, email communication). Typical actions and expressors that are involved in this pattern are:

- cognitive processes (*remember, notice, reflect*)
- linguistic processes (*reiterate, greet, say, squeal, gasp*)
- descriptions of eyes/face (*face was scarlet and twisted, eyes blazing, eyes smouldering, smile*)
- descriptions of eye contact (*looking, staring*)

### 3.3.3 Directed affect

Patterns that specify explicitly the emotion and its trigger, and usually also the emoter, can be classified as directed affect.
Table 3.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V n</td>
<td>(emoter) emotion trigger</td>
<td>He <em>hates</em> days when he can’t get straight into his workshop. (BNC, HA6 1149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you’d <em>like</em> a copy of those recipes, we can easily let you have one (Francis et al. 1996: 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(trigger) emotion emoter</td>
<td>These stories <em>surprised</em> and <em>moved</em> me (Francis et al. 1996: 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cats could easily <em>panic</em> the birds (Francis et al. 1996: 486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was a sight that never failed to <em>thrill</em> her (Francis et al. 1996: 506)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verb patterns**

Starting with verbs, the first, basic pattern is V n (with the emoter realized through a preceding or following noun phrase) as listed in Table 3.16. The verb can also be followed by an -ing clause (V - ing: *He likes* walking his dogs, *He resented* her doing well) or a wh-clause (V wh: *I hated* what Horatia Manners did to Andrew and Virginia). Depending on the meaning group of the verb, the mapping of affect categories onto the sentence elements is emoter emotion trigger or trigger emotion emoter (compare also Ortony et al. 1987: 357–8 on English causative and noncausative affective verbs).

The passive variation of this pattern (nP V) changes the order of the elements, but is used for similar purposes. With passives, the emoter need not be expressed but may remain implicit (often retrievable from the context):

(13) But emotionally, the non-people are *hated* or at least *detested*. (BRC, A07 243)

If the emoter is expressed, it is either realized by an adverbal:

(14) Another Early music reviewer has criticized an Austrian performer (much *admired* in France) (BRC, J1A 1547) [PV prep (in) n: metonymically → ‘people in France’]

or through a by-structure:

(15) He . . . was respected and *admired* by all of his colleagues in the *forces* (BNC, FR0 4141) [PV prep (by) n]
We can also find prepositional verb patterns, with the PP expressing the trigger. There are two variations of prepositional patterns: one where the preposition follows the emotion verb directly (V prep n), and one where it follows a noun phrase following the emotion verb (V n prep n). With V prep n patterns the mapping is emoter emotion trigger (Table 3.17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V prep n</td>
<td>emoter emotion</td>
<td>He still <strong>hankers</strong> after high office (Francis et al. 1996: 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(after, about, at, for, in, of, on, over, towards, with)</td>
<td>trigger</td>
<td>Science fiction fans in Britain have been <strong>rejoicing</strong> at the return of ‘Thunderbirds’ to their TVs. (Francis et al. 1996: 167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I <strong>yearned</strong> for something new (Francis et al. 1996: 180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He did not <strong>care</strong> for the place (Francis et al. 1996: 181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I <strong>despair</strong> of her (BNC, CEE 288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marie’s parents <strong>dote</strong> on her (Francis et al. 1996: 218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students . . . are encouraged to <strong>strive</strong> towards a high level of achievement (Francis et al. 1996: 257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David thought she had <strong>cooled</strong> towards him (Francis et al. 1996: 257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I really <strong>sympathize</strong> with the two officers (Francis et al. 1996: 263)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preposition can also be followed by an -ing clause (V prep -ing: he still **worries** about me being the youngest, He **delights** in stirring up controversy and strife), a wh- finite clause (V prep wh: Maureen decided to live for the day and not **worry** about what the future would bring for them), or a wh- infinitive clause (V prep wh-inf: Many **agonized** over whether to take the offer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V prep n</td>
<td>trigger emotion</td>
<td>He has <strong>impressed</strong> as stand-in for the injured Tommy Wright (BNC, CBG 498)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A special case of the V prep n pattern is where the trigger is split, and the mapping of the elements differs from that listed above. For instance,
Table 3.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V n prep n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n about n</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger trigger</td>
<td>that’s what I hate about it (BNC, CAE 1087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n as n</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger trigger</td>
<td>Rotha Lintorn Orman admired Mussolini as a man who had dealt firmly with the socialist menace (BNC, CS6 364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n by n</td>
<td>emotion emoter trigger</td>
<td>YASSER Arafat, the chairman of the PLO, long scorned as a proponent of terrorist tactics (BNC, K35 1476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n for n</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger trigger</td>
<td>I hated Mandeville for his arrogance (BRC, H90 606)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n in n</td>
<td>trigger emotion emoter trigger</td>
<td>We admire this characteristic in others (BNC, B19 1079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined but polite efforts were made to interest her in the purchase of tomatoes (BRC, ASN 2500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n on n</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>The white-bearded campaigner prided himself on blunt, outspoken views. (BNC, A1W 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n with n</td>
<td>trigger emotion emoter trigger</td>
<td>The compact circuit ... has surprised owners Ladbrokes with its robust evening trade (BRC, CH7 2099)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with impress (in Table 3.18). With V n prep n patterns, the mapping is either emoter emotion trigger (trigger) or trigger emotion emoter (trigger), as shown in Table 3.19. Again, the preposition can also be followed by an -ing -clause (V n prep -ing: You probably hate me for saying that, Some salesmen tried to interest me in buying property here) or wh-clause (V n prep wh: But he has hated Paul for what happened to Johnny). The mapping of the affect elements depends on the meaning group of the verb (for example ‘surprise’ vs. ‘hate/admire’), and often involves two triggers: for example someone is hated for doing something, someone is admired for having a certain characteristic. In other words, the emotion is directed at someone (trigger1) because of something (trigger2). Arguably, in an example such as I admire you for your diligence the speaker is saying that s/he admires the fact ‘that you are so diligent’ (that is, both
you and for your diligence can be analyzed as making up the phenomenon that is admired). This occurs with other patterns, too (see below).

Again, there are passive patterns:

(16) [Taylor] [trigger1], admired [emotion] as the author of Holy Living and Holy Dying [trigger2] (PV as) (BNC, CFF 1233)
(17) waterlilies [trigger1] have been admired [emotion] for generations due to their exquisite blooms [trigger2] (PV due to) (BNC, CLT 177)
(18) Hazel [trigger1] was admired [emotion] for her cheerful efficiency [trigger2] (PV for n) (BNC, HBH 774)

Moving on to clausal patterns, a finite clause following an emotion verb can realize the trigger of the emoter's emotion. Again, two patterns can be found – V fin cl and V n fin cl. Let's first look at V fin cl (Table 3.20). The pattern V that seems to occur often with affective mental process verbs (for example hope, fear) that project clauses (on projection with mental clauses see Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 206). This also occurs commonly in the passive (Table 3.21). The pattern V n fin cl with the elements emoter, emotion and trigger has a number of variations (Table 3.22).

Table 3.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V fin cl (V that)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>I hate that I cause her so much pain (BNC, HUA 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The students fear that the government does not intend to fulfil this demand (Francis et al. 1996: 99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it be V-ed that</td>
<td>emotion trigger</td>
<td>it was feared that a bomb had caused the blast (Francis et al. 1996: 527)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, we can find two triggers with verbs such as admire (with the object of admire as trigger1 and the adverbial clause with because, cos and so on, as trigger2), whereas it in I hate/appreciate it functions as a dummy object rather than as a second trigger, with the finite clause realizing the notional trigger. The emotion may not have occurred yet, as in the last example, where ‘we’ will only be surprised if ‘Trevor’ does in fact ‘stay on
the park until the end of the season’. This pattern seems to function in a way similar to an if-clause, and can be paraphrased as ‘we’ll be surprised if Trevor stays on the park...’.

The trigger can also be realized by a non-finite clause following an emotion verb and a noun group (V n to inf) or simply an emotion verb (V to inf) (Table 3.23).

Table 3.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V n fin cl</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger trigger</td>
<td>I admire her because she is an actress who can also sing (BNC, ADR 1686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n because</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>I hate it when people talk about me rather than to me. (BNC, G36 1624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V it fin clause (that, when, if)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>I really appreciate it that you raised me in such a warm and happy family (Francis et al. 1996: 543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n and cl</td>
<td>emotion emoter trigger</td>
<td>Li Yuan would hate it if she spoiled his surprise. (BRC, G04 1351)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V n to inf</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>They would prefer the truth to remain untold (Francis et al. 1996: 290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V to inf</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>He wanted her to go and buy some presentable clothes she could wear to the sort of smart restaurants he was taking her to. (BRC, CH1 1840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He hated to disappoint her (BNC, ACW 340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She hoped to find an English audience receptive to her watercolors (Francis et al. 1996: 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas preferred to do his own driving (Francis et al. 1996: 92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... surprising himself to find that he actually believed it. (BRC, EVG 2184)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final example in Table 3.23 involves a projected trigger: that is, the surprise is really caused by ‘his’ believing (he actually believed it), not by ‘his’ realization (find) of this belief.

Finally, a number of verb patterns have an empty subject it preceding an emotion verb with a finite or non-finite clause following the emotion verb, which indicates the trigger. The emoter is usually the object of the emotion verb. Again, there are patterns where a noun (It V n cl) or a prepositional phrase (It V to n cl) is between the verb and the following clause, in contrast with (rarer) patterns where the clause directly follows the verb (It V cl); see Table 3.24 on page 84.

In some cases, ‘to n’ realizes the emoter rather than ‘n’ (for example It matters to everyone that the killer is still around, It didn’t matter to her what happened to us). Again, the trigger may be projected with a verb such as find as in the last example of Table 3.24, with the trigger being the fact that the nail was vacant rather than the realization of this fact. With if-clauses the emotion need not have happened yet, for example it wouldn’t surprise me if. Whether the pattern It V fin cl occurs with many emotion verbs (other than hurt indicating a general emotional pain rather than labelling a specific emotional response) is doubtful, as is the question if the pattern It V non-fin clause occurs commonly and exists with other emotion verbs. (It hurts followed by an -ing or to-inf clause is only attested very rarely in the BRC but, as an example, a search for the phrase It hurts knowing came up with 547 google™ hits on 7 November 2006.)

Adjective patterns

Moving on to adjective patterns, the first pattern is ADJ n. Rather than the noun indicating the emoter of an emotion (as above), the head noun (or -ing form) here indicates the trigger of the emotion (Table 3.25). Although the noun also points metonymically to the emoter (for example Jon Hallworth, as the one facing the battle), the battle to be fit in time for Saturday’s big Premier League kick-off seems to be what is causing the anxiety and hence functions as a trigger. Similarly, in the unutterably sad sound, the sound seems to cause sadness, is a trigger.

Directed affect can also be realized through adjective complementation patterns with prepositional phrases (Table 3.26). Alternatively, the preposition can be followed by a wh-clause (ADJ prep wh: The next morning I awoke anxious over what had happened, I . . . was worried as to how my death would affect them, pleased with how it’s going) or -ing clause (ADJ prep -ing: pleased about continually having to clean his porch roof, the wary fox, who is frightened at seeing all the footprints pointing towards the
| Table 3.24 |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Pattern**     | **Elements**    | **Examples**   |
| It V fin cl     | emotion trigger | It *hurts* that you cannot see this ([Francis *et al.* 1996: 520]) |
| (*that*)        |                 | it *hurts*, being around someone who’s just killed someone (BNC, BN1 1333) |
| It V fin cl     | emotion trigger | I know from personal experience how much it *hurts* to lose one so close. (BNC, HD2 492) |
| (*-ing, to*)    |                 |                |
| It V n fin cl   | emotion emoter  | It hardly *surprised* her that the goldfish pool had spread so much (BNC, HA0 2505) |
| (*that, if, wh, when*) | trigger        | It *annoyed* me that I didn't have more time to do more ironing ([Francis *et al.* 1996: 530]) |
| It V n non-fin cl | emotion emoter | ... it wouldn’t *surprise* me in the least if ... you discovered it had nothing to do with being at school (BNC, HUL 433) |
| (*to, -ing*)    | trigger         | It *surprised* her how little public knowledge of Jonathan’s behaviour affected her. (BNC, H8H 2222) |
| It V n          | emotion trigger | It *amazes* me how many plastic shopping bags are given out by cashiers in large supermarkets ([Francis *et al.* 1996: 534]) |
| non-fin cl      |                 | It *saddened* me how these children have accepted life in detention as normal ([Francis *et al.* 1996: 534]) |
| (*to, -ing*)    |                 | It *irritates* me when I’m asked to do things that are not part of my job ([Francis *et al.* 1996: 535]) |
| It V n          | emotion trigger | It *disturbs* me to see you unhappy (Francis *et al.* 1996: 532) |
| ADJ n           |                 | It *worries* me seeing him so helpless (Francis *et al.* 1996: 536) |

| Table 3.25 |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Pattern**     | **Elements**    | **Examples**   |
| ADJ n           | emotion trigger | OLDHAM keeper Jon Hallworth is facing an *anxious* battle to be fit in time for Saturday’s big Premier League kick-off. (BRC, CH7 869) |
|                 |                 | The unutterably *sad* sound of the sparrow lingered in his ears (BNC, G0Y 2062) |
Table 3.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ prep n (about, as to, at, because of, by, for, in, of, on, over, to, towards, with)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You needn’t sound so <strong>surprised</strong> about it (BRC, F9C 1038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modigliani was plagued and <strong>anxious</strong> because of the difficulty of finding models (BNC, ANF 1504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He was definitely <strong>impressed</strong> by Karen’s lovely grey mare (BNC, KS9 487)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So Regan, <strong>anxious</strong> for an alternative theoretical platform from which to put into orbit his conviction (BRC, CM8 491)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Noriega tried to isolate opposition within the military after a similar coup attempt last year by . . . retiring those thought to be less <strong>enthusiastic</strong> in their support of him. (BRC, A2X 306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was never more <strong>disappointed</strong> in anyone (BNC, CDS 944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they’re not so <strong>frightened</strong> of people (BNC, K1E 1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It looks as if he’s not very <strong>keen</strong> on the price we want to pay (BRC, KB7 1605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Haig was <strong>wedded</strong> to his profession (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I’ve always felt very <strong>affectionate</strong> towards Karen (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to say how <strong>delighted</strong> I am with your magazine (BNC, HAC 5840)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*den and none the other way*). With these prepositional patterns the usual order is emoter emotion trigger, with the trigger expressed by whatever follows the preposition. As usual, the relation between trigger and emotion varies according to emotion and the patterns can be used both to attribute emotions directed at triggers to others (non-authorial affect) and to oneself (authorial affect). With the pattern **ADJ with n for n** (*I was very disappointed with Trevor for retaliating*) the trigger is again split into two, the person at whom the emotion is directed (trigger1: *Trevor*) and the cause for provoking this emotion (trigger2: *retaliating*). It is an alternative for the structure **ADJ that** (see below), paraphrasable as ‘*I was very disappointed [emotion] that Trevor retaliated [trigger]*’.
Table 3.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ADJ fin cl (because, if, lest, that, when, wh/wh) | emoter emotion trigger | And they were all very **impressed** because she’d done twenty different dinners, in twenty days. (BRC, KPV 5705)  
She was continuously **anxious** lest Mitzi upset coffee all over them (BRC, AEA 1515)  
He was very **angry** that she had spoken to people about their private affairs (Francis *et al.* 1998: 401)  
[T]he people are **terrified** that . . . they may be killed (Francis *et al.* 1998: 402)  
He seemed **disappointed** when the dispute was settled at higher levels (BNC, GT6 1413)  
They are **afraid** what their neighbours and children will think (Francis *et al.* 1998: 404)  
Cathy was **surprised** how ill she looked (BRC, HWP 259)  
. . . your father and mother . . . may well be **pleased** if your boyfriend takes the time to have a chat with them (BNC, BPF 740) |

Table 3.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ADJ non-fin cl (to, -ing) | emoter emotion trigger | You’ve got to be very **thankful** to win once (Hunston 2003)  
you would be **surprised** to find an STE actually on sale. (BRC, A8R 185)  
she had been **happy** working for Graham (BRC, A6J 404) |

As with verbs, there are a number of cases where a finite clause following the emotion adjective indicates the trigger (Table 3.27). Depending on the emotion adjective, the trigger may be something that has not happened yet but which is feared or desired (for example *anxious lest*, **terrified that**, **afraid what**) (cf. the discussion of irrealis triggers in Section 5.3.2.1). Depending on the clause type, the emotion may also not have been experienced yet (*if*-clauses). There are also adjective patterns with non-finite clauses (Table 3.28).

The trigger may be an event that has already happened/is happening (*We are **pleased** to see the Canadians do so well in the World Cup, telling*...
him how delighted she was to meet him), or not (she became frightened to be left alone, The Democratic leadership in the Senate is anxious to reverse the handsome victory by Mr Bush in the House of Representatives last week). The to-infinitive clause often involves projection (cognition/perception): They were puzzled to find the kitchen door locked; you would be surprised to find an STE actually on sale; I was disappointed to find that accommodation was scarcer...than I thought it would be; We are pleased to see the Canadians do so well in the World Cup. As suggested above, this means that the projected events actually cause the emotion (that the door is locked, that an STE is on sale, that accommodation was scarcer, that the Canadians did so well) rather than the cognitive process.

Finally, there are adjective patterns with an empty it subject. Even though these all involve the verb make and could be classified as verb patterns, it is the adjective that carries the affect meaning and is therefore taken as the node. I follow Hunston (2003) in including such cases as adjective patterns (Table 3.29). One of these examples (It makes me sad to see all the good work we have done devalued) yet again involves a projected trigger, with the ‘real’ trigger the ‘devaluing of the good work’ (rather than the ‘seeing’).

Table 3.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It v n ADJ fin cl</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>It makes me sick that anybody should doubt my commitment (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It v n ADJ non-fin cl (to, -ing)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>It makes me sad to see all the good work we have done devalued in this way (Hunston 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It makes me nervous not knowing what they are using it for and to potentially harm others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun patterns

Finally, let’s briefly look at noun patterns: as with adjectives, there are noun complementation patterns with prepositions, with the PP realizing the trigger (Table 3.30). The preposition may depend on the collocating verb: the preposition to is used with show, give and so on, whereas on is used with bestow; other prepositions depend on the emotion noun (surprise at/about, hate for). The preposition may also be followed by an -ing clause (N prep -ing: his surprise at becoming Prime Minister, She had given up all hope of ever bringing Oreste over) or wh-clause...
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(N prep wh: For a time the eagles were speechless with surprise at what had happened).\textsuperscript{8}

Looking at prepositions preceding the emotion noun, a specific pattern in this group is to N (‘astonishment’) used as an adverbial inserted in a clause at different positions:

(19) to my surprise about 99 per cent of them came back in (BRC, AK4 1023)

(20) By 27 April, the problem was solved, to the surprise of the Americans (BRC, A64 1174)

(21) Ricket, to the surprise of the gallery, turned the match round (BRC, A9H 56)

(22) Sonia and Helen flung themselves into my arms, to Joe’s great astonishment (BNC, AC6 1306)

This pattern functions as a ‘stance adverbial’ (Biber et al. 1999: 856), and is used to indicate the emoter’s surprise at the propositional content of the clause, as an alternative to the structure $X$ was surprised that $p$.

Table 3.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N prep n (about, at, for, on, to, towards)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>surprise … about her reference to a referendum (BRC, APE 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>full of hate for England and your church (BRC, B1X 1376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bestow affection on his slightly wayward children (BRC, CHG 1570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>showing … affection to members of the opposite sex (BRC, A8M 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they … express affection towards Pamela (BRC, B30 762)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another example involving a preceding preposition is shown in Table 3.31. This is similar to undirected noun patterns (see above); with an additional specification of a projected trigger.

Table 3.31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v prep (with) N that</td>
<td>action with emotion trigger</td>
<td>She realised with astonishment that he was actually pleading (BRC, K8R 1649)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are also noun patterns with finite and non-finite clauses, with the clause realizing the trigger (Table 3.32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N fin cl (that, when)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>astonishing that so many hotels border on Fawlty Towers (FrN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a degree of surprise was expressed when McEnroe showed up here after a knee injury (BRC, A33 498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N non-fin cl (to, -ing)</td>
<td>emoter emotion trigger</td>
<td>with one of her smallest smiles she glanced at Caroline as if affecting surprise to see her there (BRC, GUE 1348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the initial wave of guilty surprise, finding that the beautiful girl she’d seen at the market had been Roman’s younger sister (BRC, GUE 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undirected vs. directed affect patterns

It must be noted that many patterns for undirected affect can simply be turned into directed affect by adding more elements, for example I jump with surprise can become I jump with surprise when a dog suddenly barks at me and the frank astonishment from his agent can be turned into the frank astonishment from his agent at/that. I also assume that in many cases of presumably ‘undirected’ affect, the trigger can in fact be found in the context of the pattern or can be retrieved by the reader/hearer via inference.9

Listing a pattern as ‘undirected’ hence does not mean that the emotion is undirected – it only means that the trigger is not explicitly realized in the affect pattern. The difference from directed affect patterns is that a potential slot for the trigger of the emotion is not filled. (Vice versa, some ‘directed’ affect patterns can be shortened and turned into ‘undirected’ affect: I was shocked at his lie – He had lied. I was shocked [trigger mentioned in preceding co-text].) Real ‘undirected’ affect can occur:

(a) when an ‘undirected affect’ pattern is used and
(b) a trigger is not explicitly mentioned in the co-text and
(c) a trigger cannot be inferred from the co-text or world knowledge.

That is, in terms of the presence/absence of triggers, distinctions have to be made as in Figure 3.2.
‘True’ undirected affect is probably rare, though Martin & White suggest that with feelings that are construed as undirected mood, ‘one might pose the question “Why are you feeling that way?” and get the answer “I’m not sure”’ (Martin & White 2005: 47). And one of the factors that distinguish moods psychologically from emotions is that they do not have an object (for example, Planalp 1999: 13). However, the very fact that one actually is provoked to pose that question (‘Why are you feeling that way?’) is a clue as to the normal expectations of people that emotions are usually caused by triggers. This is an area delineated for future research: when and how often do speakers explicitly refer to triggers (use ‘directed affect’ patterns), when and how often are the triggers explicitly mentioned in the context (anaphorically or cataphorically) rather than in the pattern, and when and how often do they need to be inferred by readers from the context or co-text? And, finally, when and how often do we refer to ‘true’ undirected emotions, and how often does this indicate some sort of deviation from the norm, such as a disease or illness (for example depression, PMT)? Does the very fact that the emotion is not caused by a trigger mean that the emoter and/or the emotion is evaluated as ‘not normal’ in some way? For example, patients suffering from temporal lobe epilepsy experience emotions that are not attached to any kind of trigger (Oatley et al. 2006: 146, citing research by Maclean 1993).

3.3.4 Covert affect

From the outline above, three basic patterns emerge for the expression of directed affect that are valid for adjectival, nominal, and verbal emotion terms (ET):

- ET PP: emotion trigger
- ET fin/non-fin cl: emotion trigger
- It ET fin/non-fin cl: emotion trigger
### Table 3.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>It v N (sg) non-fin cl (to)</em></td>
<td>emotion trigger</td>
<td>It comes as a <strong>surprise</strong> to find him boasting (BRC, AHG 582)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it was as much of a <strong>surprise</strong> to find they had sausages (BRC, ACK 2921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it was really a pleasant <strong>surprise</strong> to have your letter (BRC, H9N 2559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It v N (sg) fin cl (when, if, that)</em></td>
<td>emotion trigger</td>
<td>It was no <strong>surprise</strong> when ... they created a fine goal (BRC, CH3 7390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It came as a very pleasant <strong>surprise</strong> to me when I learned that (BRC, HHC 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It will be a considerable <strong>surprise</strong> if they fail to win (BRC, A9H 987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is no <strong>surprise</strong> that parliament should have approved a conservative plan (BRC, AAK 453)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, as observant readers may have noted, no examples have so far been given for the pattern *It N fin/non-fin cl* (that is, noun patterns with a dummy *it* subject). The patterns can be found in Table 3.33. These have not been discussed so far because *surprise* as a count noun does not name an emotional response but rather denotes ‘an event, a piece of news, etc. that is unexpected or that happens suddenly’ (*OALD*). *Surprise* in such examples can thus be paraphrased as ‘surprising thing/event etc’, and is similar in its usage to the adjective *surprising*:

It was as much of a surprise to find they had sausages – It was surprising to ...  
It was no surprise when they created a fine goal – It was not surprising when ...  
It will be a considerable surprise if they fail to win – It will be very surprising if ...  
It came as no surprise that parliament should have approved a conservative plan – It was not surprising that parliament ...
But such usages arguably do imply the emotional response of an emoter and can also be paraphrased by using the adjective *surprised* or the verb *surprise*:

It comes as a surprise to find him boasting – I was surprised to find him boasting – It surprised me to . . .

it was really a pleasant surprise to have your letter – I was pleasantly surprised to have your letter

It will be a considerable surprise if they fail to win – I will be considerably surprised if . . . – It will surprise me if . . .

Even though it looks at first glance like the emoter is absent in such patterns, s/he is implied, and can in fact be explicitly referred to with the help of a PP in the pattern *a N to n*, as in Table 3.34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (sg) prep (to) n</td>
<td>emotion to emoter</td>
<td>that is not a surprise to me (BRC, AE0 2656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the triumph came as a surprise to many fans (BRC, CH6 381)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they can hardly come as such a surprise to Daum (BRC, CH3 7112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his attitude to sex will come as a surprise to most unenlightened adults (BRC, CH1 7466)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But patterns involving *surprise* (and some other emotion nouns) as count noun (*a/the surprise, surprises*) denote events, or situations that cause or trigger surprise in emoters, and thus have a different meaning from the non-count patterns described above denoting emotional responses. I therefore propose to treat these as only indirectly indicating emotional responses of emoters, and will call this type of affect ‘covert affect’ (cA) in contrast to ‘overt affect’ (oA).

Apart from the patterns already noted, other patterns also involve such covert affect. With some, the trigger is the entity that is referred to as a *surprise* (endophorically or exophorically), and the covert emoter can be explicitly realized with a PP with *for* in the pattern *N (sg) for n*:

(23) What a lovely surprise/what a surprise [covert emotion of S] (BRC, KDE 239, KDA 7560)
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(24) fans of his macho Dylan in Beverly Hills, [emoter] are in for a 
**surprise** [covert emotion] (BRC, CH1 2055)
(25) you’ [emoter] re sure to meet a fiendish **surprise** [covert emotion] 
(BRC, CH1 2666)
(26) she [emoter] had an even bigger **surprise** [covert emotion] in store 
(BRC, CH1 8250)
(27) the **surprises** [covert emotion] of the ‘alternative’ Nobel prizes 
(BRC, A2M 198)
(28) there were no **surprises** [covert emotion] (BRC, A22 231)
(29) research has revealed some great **surprises** [covert emotion] in the 
natural world (BRC, A1M 155)
(30) the analysis produces one further **surprise** [covert emotion] (BRC, 
H8K 1430)
(31) the **surprise** [covert emotion] is the lack of drama [trigger] (BRC, 
A3G 630)
(32) His axing [trigger] is a **surprise** [covert emotion] (BRC, CH7 2429)
(33) the **surprise** [covert emotion] of key change [trigger] (BRC, J1A 809)
(34) it was a lovely **surprise** [covert emotion] for everyone [emoter] 
(BRC, CH6 4233)
(35) that would be a **surprise** [covert emotion] for your da [emoter] 
(BRC, KDN 4008)
(36) tomorrow is a nice **surprise** [covert emotion] for you [emoter] 
(BNC, KDE 90)

Finally, there are patterns where the emotion noun is used to 
modify another noun (the pattern N n), for example a **surprise** 
attack/defeat/visit/decision or a **hate figure**. The relations between the emotion 
noun and the modified noun may differ, but often the modified noun realizes the trigger of the emotion. For example, a **surprise** attack 
is an attack that causes surprise, is surprising (similarly: a **surprise** 
buying rush/consolation goal/defeat/visit/ending) and a **hate figure** is someone who causes the emotion of hate in many. But there are also more lexicalized N n combinations such as **surprise** party (a party that is surprising/unexpected), **surprise** bag (a bag which is filled with unknown goodies), **surprise** element (which causes surprise). With **hate**, there are also different relations: **hate propaganda**, **hate campaign** and **hate mail** are motivated by hate, a **hate trap** is a trap caused by hate (you are trapped by hate), **hate comedy** can refer to comedy that is made up of hateful remarks about other people or social groups, **hate symbols** are symbols of hate (symbols showing someone’s hate), a **hate group** advocates
hate and so on. There may also be two triggers in sentences with N n patterns:

(37) Robert Owen [trigger1] . . . became a surprise [covert emotion] semi-finalist [trigger2] (BRC, A9R 126) = ‘It was surprising that Robert Owen became a semi-finalist’

(38) East Germany’s embattled government resigned last night [trigger 1] in a surprise [covert emotion] step [trigger 2] (BRC, A7W 90) = ‘the . . . government’s step in resigning last night was surprising’

This is very much newspaper language, and lexical items like step or move appear delexicalized, almost like thing: a surprising step ∼ a surprising thing ∼ surprising. Arguably, it would also be possible to paraphrase this example as ‘the government’s resignation was surprising’ (with one trigger only). And we also find patterns involving projection:

(39) the surprise [covert emotion] announcement of British entry into the Exchange Rate Mechanism [trigger] (BRC, APE 60) = ‘the announcement that Britain would enter the Exchange Rate Mechanism was surprising’

where it is perhaps not the announcement as such but rather the projected event (Britain’s entering the exchange rate mechanism) that is surprising.

I propose to analyze such (N n) combinations according to their meanings and contexts. Combinations like surprise attack and hate figure do seem to imply the caused emotion of emoters, and should be included in the analysis of affect (as cA). But lexicalizations such as surprise party and surprise bag do not truly indicate affect, and should consequently be excluded from the analysis of affect. Lexicalization can ‘bleach’ evaluative (here affective) meaning (Martin & White 2005: 85). To investigate the relation between different emotion nouns, the head nouns they can modify, and the relations between the two would fill a book on its own. Clearly, more research is needed in this area of word formation and syntactic analysis: what is the role of appraisal here? On relations between nouns in noun + noun sequences, see also Biber et al. (1999: 590–4), who note (p. 590) that such sequences ‘are used to express a bewildering array of logical relations.’
3.3.5 Summary

To briefly sum up the findings so far, we can describe affect patterns according to three factors: (1) is an emoter present or absent (emoted versus unemoted affect); (2) is a trigger present or absent (directed versus undirected affect) and, (3) is an emotional response implied or directly expressed (covert vs. overt affect)? We can also use these three factors to describe sentences with affect patterns, for example:

(40) His axing is a surprise: emoted, directed, covert affect (emoter = speaker; trigger = his axing; a surprise = something that causes surprise) (BRC, CH7 2429)

(41) She realised with astonishment that he was actually pleading: emoted, directed, overt affect (emoter = she; trigger = that he was actually pleading; astonishment = emotional response) (BRC, K8R 1649)

(42) Books: The sorrows of love and the joys of political hate: unemoted, undirected, overt affect (no emoter; no trigger; hate = emotional response) (BRC, AK4 521)

(43) Oh mummy I’m sad: emoted, undirected, overt affect (emoter = I; no trigger; sad = emotional response) (BRC, KC3 2183)

However, it must be kept in mind that undirected affect patterns may in fact be used in the context of triggers or that the triggers can be deduced by the reader/hearer. That is, the ultimate decision of what kind of affect is present in discourse depends on more than just the pattern. Furthermore, the description of affect patterns needs to be complemented by additional corpus research.10 (In particular, adverbs were excluded from this account because of lack of data. These have no complementation patterns, but are nevertheless patterned in certain ways (Hunston & Francis 2000: 42).) More theorizing is also necessary on patterns and associated theories, as there are still many problematic areas (Stubbs 2001: 460).

However, importantly for the purposes of this book, local grammars can be used to ‘[quantify] ways of expressing meanings in different registers’ (Hunston 2002: 178). The advantage of such an approach lies in the fact that the resulting frequencies of patterns can be related to the meanings or functions of these patterns. This allows us to look at affect patterns that are most frequent in a given register, and make informed guesses about the typical usage of emotion terms in that register. Rather than, say, looking at hundreds of concordance lines individually, the frequent presence of a pattern as deduced from the collocates of an
emotion term will tell us that a particular function is most typical for a given register. For example, let’s imagine that the adjectives happy, delighted, pleased, frightened, disappointed frequently occur with the right-hand collocate for in a given register, indicating the presence of the pattern ADJ for. This pattern, as we know now, is used in sentences such as:

He’s had a great career and I’m happy for him.
I am delighted for you, Alexandra.
I’m pleased for you, that I am.
I’m frightened for him.
I’m very disappointed for Jimmy.

With these adjectives the pattern ADJ for is used to express empathy with someone, and this function appears particular important in our (hypothetical) register. The point is that we can assume this without needing to look at all concordance lines individually, though there is of course a margin for error. This type of analysis proceeds from the assumption that ‘meaning belongs not to the word but to the phrase’ (Hunston 2003: 349), and that focusing on the word as unit is not enough. This means moving beyond the analysis of individual emotion terms and concentrating instead on patterns of affect. This is the aim of Chapter 4, where I will look at patterns and their functions in the different registers in more detail.

Notes

1. The following discussion omits the frames Predicament, Emotion_Heat, and Subject_Stimulus. The words participating in the Predicament frame (for example bind, fix, jam, mess, misfortune, pickle, pinch, plight) do not generally denote emotions, and are not part of affect. Strictly speaking, the words in the frame Emotion_Heat (boil, burn, chafe, fume, seethe, simmer, smoulder, stew) also do not denote emotions but are metaphorical or metonymic references to emotions, and also have other non-affect related meanings (water boils). Furthermore, they often occur with supporting emotion terms. Looking at the examples given in FrameNet, we can find that boil occurs 12 times out of 12 with a supporting emotion term, burn 15 out of 15, chafe 1 out of 8, seethe 11 out of 21, simmer 15 out of 18, smoulder 13 out of 17, and stew 0 out of 6. With the exceptions of stew and chafe (the latter included in my list of emotion terms), the majority of these terms usually seem to co-occur with emotion terms, which means that the reference to an emotional response is captured in the analysis in any case. Finally, almost all words participating in the Subject_Stimulus frame (for example alarming, disturbing) were excluded.
since they are classifiable as appreciation: reaction (Martin & White 2005: 58). This means that affect patterns involving these words are not described.

2. I have excluded from the description word-specific patterns (be a rival/a competition/connive for someone’s affections, replace/supersede someone in someone’s affections, hold in affection, shower with affection, spring a surprise, take by surprise, catch by surprise, and patterns involving the additional Degree element mentioned by FrameNet (for example too ADJ to-inf; so ADJ that). This means that the outline of affect patterns in this chapter does not offer a complete description of all patterns of the individual lexical items. However, I do mention even relatively rare patterns if they are needed for the sake of completeness.

3. Annotation: capital letters refer to emotion terms, that is, N n means emotion noun followed by another noun. They indicate that this is the term that I am focusing on, rather than signalling that this is the term that the other elements in the pattern depend on. So n = noun phrase/group (often including -ing forms), v = verb phrase/group, adj = adjective phrase/group, pv = passive verb phrase/group, prep = prepositional phrase/group, to-inf = to-infinitive clause, that = that-clause, -ing = ing-clause, wh = wh-clause, fin cl = finite clause, non-finit cl = non-finite clause (similar to Hunston & Francis 2000). Patterns that involve ‘n’ often have alternatives with nominal/complement clauses (that, -ing, wh-, to-infinitive). According to Biber et al. (1999: 8.12–14, Chapter 9) that-clauses occur commonly with emotion verbs (for example hope, wish, fear, worry that), adjectives (for example annoyed, glad, sad that), and certain emotion nouns (for example hope, fear that). Wh-clauses also occur with emotion verbs (for example like, hate, loathe, respect) and adjectives (for example amazed what they do, amazed at how). To-infinitive clauses appear in structures with emotion verbs (for example hope, wish, love, want, hate to), adjectives (for example reluctant, keen, afraid, glad to), and nouns (for example desire, wish, willingness to). Finally, -ing -clauses occur mostly with emotion verbs (for example hate, prefer, worry about, admire, delight in) and adjectives (for example afraid of, interested in, sorry for).

4. On prepositions used with emotional states in English from a cognitive linguistic point of view, see for example Dirven (1997), Osmond (1997) and Radden (1998). The kind of preposition used depends both on the nature of the emotion term and on the nature of the trigger (Osmond 1997: 112) or on the image schemata associated with prepositions (Radden 1998).

5. Another possible verb pattern candidate is n PV (She has . . . the look of a woman surprised), but the -ed participle of surprise might also be classified as an adjective. There are cases in which it is difficult to differentiate between adjective and V-ed patterns (compare also Martin & White 2005: 47 and Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 224).

6. The finite clause and the it are co-referential in such patterns (Biber et al. 1999: 662). Other affect patterns with co-referential it are:

(i) I love it here. (V it adv) (BRC, CK9 1666)
(ii) My family hated it in Southampton (V it prep) (Francis et al. 1996: 557)

7. This example is from a google™ search of the internet, because a BRC search (using the node ‘it makes’ and looking for it makes + n + emotion adjective + -ing -clause) came up with no results, pointing to the limitations of the corpus where rarer patterns are concerned.
8. There are also patterns where a PP following the emotion term realizes the emoter and the trigger is realized by a preceding noun, a following PP or a *that*-clause:

(iii) **The move** (trigger) caused some **surprise** in **Whitehall** (emoter) (N *in* n) (BRC, A4X 247)

(iv) there is **surprise** among outsiders (emoter) at **his rapid rise** (trigger) (N *among* n) (BRC, AHJ 897)

(v) **Within Whitehall** (emoter), therefore, there was **surprise and concern that evacuation should have revealed so many symptoms of inner-city poverty** (trigger) (N *within* n) (BRC, HP2 270)

This seems to occur most often with the phrase **THERE BE emotion** as well as passive verb patterns.

A special case involving PPs as trigger is also:

(vi) **real affection** between foster parents (emoter/trigger) and the children (emoter/trigger) (N *between* n) (BRC, HP2 312)

Here we are dealing with a reciprocal emotion, meaning that the affection is directed by the foster parents at the children, and by the children at the foster parents. Both are thus simultaneously emoters and triggers. **Between ... and** thus construes a reciprocal emotion, a construal which is presumably possible also with other emotion terms like **animosity** and **love** that can involve reciprocal emoters.

9. Since speakers’ knowledge of emotions (**emotion schemas**) includes knowledge about prototypical and potential **antecedent events** or **eliciting conditions** that cause a specific emotion (see Section 5.3.1), triggers can be inferred by readers with the help of co-textual (and other) information. White puts it like this:

> Once the emotion portion of a scenario is instantiated, the listener may draw inferences about how the events leading to or following from that emotion are to be interpreted. In other words, the listener fills in other portions of the schema through inference, even though the speaker has not been explicit about those aspects of the events (White 1990: 60).

10. Some other patterns, which seem to be specific to individual emotion terms, are presented in Table N.1 below:

There are also instances of V *n in* n and n PV realizing a very distinct meaning of **surprise**:

(vii) She was quite sure she had **surprised** them in the act of carrying out the next stage of the deception (BRC, GV2 3526)

(viii) No one ... likes being **surprised** in the shower (BRC, BMR 1223)

The verb **feel** additionally involves patterns such as V *n towards*, V adj *about*, It V adj to-inf (He feels no bitterness towards the British, He felt good about the show, It feels good to have finished a piece of work), though it is not the verb itself that carries the affect meaning but the noun or adjective functioning
as subject complement/predicative (bitterness, good). Such patterns are hence listed as adjective or noun patterns rather than verb patterns. Furthermore, particle verbs (fall for, look down on) are to be included in all patterns (patterns are V particle . . . or V particle particle . . . rather than V). And some verb patterns can involve a substitute (I hope so/I hope not). Finally, bear in mind that the grammatical context can change patterns (Francis et al. 1996: 611–15, Hunston & Francis 2000: 59–66).

Table N.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V n n</td>
<td>(emoter) emotion trigger</td>
<td>She envies him the opportunities he will have to become big and powerful (Francis et al. 1996: 276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V n to n</td>
<td>(emoter) emotion trigger to trigger</td>
<td>The goalkeeper seemed to prefer dribbling the ball up the field to defending his goal (Francis et al. 1996: 427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an N for n</td>
<td>emotion for trigger</td>
<td>She felt an affection for Alison (BRC, APM 2598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of n for n</td>
<td>emotion of emoter/trigger for emoter/trigger</td>
<td>Baby Sousan had been a gift from Allah, a blessing, a reward for the affection of two people for each other (BRC, CEC 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the emotion profiles described in Chapter 2, the focus was solely on individual emotion terms. This means that these profiles include occurrences for all sorts of different types of affect (emoted, unemoted, directed, undirected and so on), as there is no way of automatically knowing how an emotion term is used in discourse by looking at its frequency. As suggested in Section 3.3.5, it is only by looking at context and patterns that we can make some hypotheses about the meaning and functions of emotion terms. This is the aim of this chapter, which reports some of the findings of an analysis of the lexico-grammatical patterns of 15 emotion terms (see Table 3.1) in the BRC. The description focuses on L1 and R1 patterning, and is limited to detailing those patterns that are most frequent in each sub-corpus. For example, 'm is the most frequent L1 collocate of surprised in conversation, but not, be and was are also common. Nevertheless, the main focus is on 'm surprised. Furthermore, I only mention functions of emotion terms that seem to cut across the usage of several terms – meaning that for example the noun affection is not discussed in detail in news reportage and academic discourse because it seems to have a distinct patterning.

Three aspects of this analysis should thus be kept in mind:

• The patterns/functions that are outlined as particularly important for a given register are not the only patterns/functions to occur in that register.
• A pattern/function that may be characteristic for a given register may also occur (more infrequently) in one of the other registers.
• Patterns/functions that occur very commonly across all corpora are mostly disregarded.
Additionally, the findings represent only tendencies, since in some cases the frequencies are not high enough to warrant general conclusions. In the following, I describe each of the four sub-corpora in turn in terms of its affect patterns: conversation (4.1), news reportage (4.2), fiction (4.3) and academic discourse (4.4). I also compare affect triggers across the four corpora (4.5).

4.1 Conversation

The first common function of emotion terms in conversation is to express overt authorial affect (usually in the present tense). This is either realized by a directed or by an undirected affect pattern (with undirected affect patterns, the trigger has to be retrieved from elsewhere). This function is especially common with four emotion terms: the adjectives surprised and disappointed, and the verbs surprise and hate. Thus, the most frequent L1 collocate of surprised is 'm, followed by not. Typically, we find:

- I'm surprised + that-clause (usually without that)
- I'm surprised
- I'm not surprised

(1) David Dad! You’re not allowed to <pause> to talk like that to people's dog. And especially dogs we know.
    Jane I’m surprised the boys let it run their garden [sic].
    David What <pause> well it was David <pause> David’s idea, don’t blame me. (BRC, KCH 6395)

(2) Albert he had a <pause> Honda Civic engine in it! <voice quality: laughing> Oh, oh dear <end of voice quality>!
    June I shouldn’t think anybody’d insure it!
    Albert I’m surprised! (BRC, KB1 4164)

(3) well I mean I’m not surprised they don’t wanna take a picture of our garden cos it’s a mess but er I’d have thought he would have taken a picture of yours and sold you one. (BRC, KBG 1094)

(4) None My cat scares the dogs. <laugh>
    Cherrilyn I’m not surprised! (BRC, KBL 3446)

It becomes clear that some of these imply some sort of negative evaluation, as shown in (1) by the answer ‘don’t blame me’, but others seem more neutral in this respect, for example (4).
Another emotion adjective where authorial affect is common is *disappointed*, which collocates frequently with *(a) bit* at L1. The most common pattern with *a bit* is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I'm} & \quad \text{a bit} \quad \text{disappointed} \\
\text{I was} & \quad \text{(in)} \\
\text{(that)} & \quad \text{(with)}
\end{align*}
\]

That is, the pattern realizes either directed or undirected overt present or past affect, with the past more frequent than the present. Some examples are:

(5) **I was a bit disappointed** in those Laura Ashley dresses, they were to [sic] tight for a start. (BRC, KCD 2234)
(6) **I'm just a bit disappointed** that there really is a lot of money's worth of Lego and you're not playing with it. (BRC, KCH 2338)
(7) **Hm, I was a bit disappointed with** that dress. (BRC, KCD 1127)
(8) **I was a bit disappointed.** (BRC, KC9 4828)

The collocation with a graduation resource (Martin & White 2005) or evaluative modulator (Bednarek 2006a: 44) here downscales (rather than upscales) the amount of disappointment that is attributed to the self in conversation, that is, it mitigates the negative evaluation that is expressed with regards to the trigger.

Authorial affect is also common with the verb *surprise*, where the most frequent R1 collocate is *me* (and the most frequent L1 collocate is *n't, followed by it*). The following patterns are important for conversation:

- **X (often it) SURPRISE (lemma) me (because/cos)**
- **It/that wouldn’t surprise me (at all)**
- **X (that/which/it) doesn’t surprise me**

(9) **He surprised me**, he was the first one down them great big shutes. (BRC, KBG 2205)
(10) **But you know it surprises me** I mean I know the church is, is closed and it’s been closed for a couple of years now (BRC, KCC 272)
(11) **That wouldn’t surprise me** at all, the things I’ve seen them try to eat. (BRC, KB8 2912)
(12) **I mean my mother's trying to book my holiday which doesn’t surprise me**, but then again she usually tries to anyway, where you going?, what you doing? (BRC, KD6 4444)
Again, note the (negative or positive) evaluation that is implied with some of these examples, for instance (9) and (12).

Connected to this function is the usage of the noun *surprise* in conversation, which collocates at L1 most frequently with the indefinite article *a*. This indicates a covert affect pattern, namely *a surprise* as something that causes surprise in implied emoters. The exclamation *What a surprise* is very frequent, and clearly realizes authorial affect (with the self as implied emoter):³

(13) **Amanda** Is one of those yours?  
**Kathleen** No wa–, the bottom one’s Jenni’s? But **what a surprise**!  
(BRC, KCW 1301)

Authorial affect is also important with the verb *hate*, which collocates at L1 with *I* (and at R1 with *it/to*). That is, *hate* is clearly used to make statements about the speaker hating something or hating to do something, overwhelmingly in the present tense, with various triggers (often *it* with the trigger to be retrieved from the context):

(14) *I hate* the police (BRC, KBE 6520)  
(15) *I hate* this babysitting job (BRC, KDN 3995)  
(16) *I hate* you (BRC, KB8 250)  
(17) *I hate* Vegemite (BRC, KPH 1)  
(18) *I do hate* to cough (BRC, KBE 4947)  
(19) **Paul** What do you do with the onion then?  
**Arthur** Throw it at the cat <unclear>  
A. loves the onion and she always eats the onion  
**Arthur** It happens when you’re <unclear>  
**Arthur** when you’re brought up in the war you see, waste not, want not  
A. *I hate* it (BRC, KP1 2513)

In some cases the trigger is conceptualized as a re-occurring event or activity that keeps happening, to the annoyance of the emoter, when *I hate it* is accompanied by a *when*-clause specifying the trigger:

(20) That is it and I *hate it when* you keep on and on nagging. (BRC, KDT 366)  
(21) *I hate it when* we sit around and sit around. (BRC, KC6 224)  
(22) *I hate it when* I have my hair permed. (BRC, KBC 4586)
I hate to can also be used with verbal processes as a disclaimer accompanying statements that are thereby construed as negative to the hearer (sometimes jokingly):

(23) Dad they’re not gonna be looking at your legs, I hate to tell you this. (BRC, KP6 1833)
(24) They’re out for <-> a laugh, I mean Charlie [...] he said you’ve got to be really stupid to tell <pause> anyone anything in this place and I said yeah but I’m not a proper Haileyburian I’ve just come in, you know <pause> he goes yeah but you’re gonna get that way I mean you are, you know, you are now <pause> I hate to te– I hate to break it to you but you are. (BRC, KP6 2300)

However, hate to also occurs frequently in the phrase I’d hate to, with the to-infinitive clause realizing hypothetical triggers:

(25) I’d hate to live that close to, to the river (BRC, KB8 7885)
(26) I’d hate to end up like that. (BRC, KBC 6330)
(27) I’d hate to have a broken jaw (BRC, KCE 6542)

In general, I hate (authorial affect) is clearly related to expressing negative affect with respect to triggers (though it is a dislike rather than a ‘hate’ as such that is expressed).

A second common function in conversation is the intensification of affect, signalled by the collocation of an emotion adjective with an amplifier – a resource of graduation (Martin & White 2005) or modulation (Bednarek 2006a: 44). This is the case with the adjectives impressed and pleased which both have very as their most frequent L1 collocate in conversation (in contrast to disappointed which collocates with (a) bit):

(28) And they were all very impressed because she’d done twenty different dinners, in twenty days. (BRC, KPV 5705)
(29) Yes mind you I had to admit, you know me, I know, never have been very impressed with him (BRC, KE2 6804)
(30) I’m very pleased about that. (BRC, KB8 11760)
(31) He didn’t look very pleased did he? (BRC, KB8 4085)

The third usage of emotion terms that is important in conversation is the expression of authorial and non-authorial past affect – a collocation
with was at L1. This occurs with both delighted and frightened. On the one hand, was delighted is used to refer to authorial and non-authorial (mostly directed) affect:

(32) so yes yesterday I was delighted I was only nine stone thirteen (BRC, KD8 8761)
(33) And he was delighted that he learnt how to say, I’m having a lie-in tomorrow morning. (BRC, KPU 2940)
(34) Oh her mum was delighted to see me. (BRC, KD9 1808)
(35) She was delighted with it. (BRC, KPU 143)
(36) She, she was delighted. (BRC, KB3 454)

As can be seen, directed affect with delighted can be realized by a that-clause, a prepositional phrase (with) or a to-infinitive clause. However, as the collocation analysis shows, to-infinitive clauses are most frequent in conversation (the most frequent R1 collocate of delighted is to). Contrary to expectation, this is not only used in the conversational formula I’m delighted to (for example meet you), but also occurs with second and third person emoters, in the past and in the future:

(37) I know that Bob and Glynis will be delighted to have some because he’s been out of work. (BRC, KBF 5714)
(38) Good I’m delighted to hear that. (BRC, KPY 1012)
(39) Oh her mum was delighted to see me. (BRC, KD9 1808)

Was frightened realizes more often non-authorial (15 instances) rather than authorial (7 instances) affect. With non-authorial affect this is often mitigated (signalled here by underlining):

(40) I think he was frightened of <unclear> a little bit too far on the edge I think. (BRC, KD0 4519)
(41) Course he was frightened to death weren’t he (BRC, KBE 2319)
(42) I felt really guilty about that, because I, the thought that he was frightened of me shouting at him (BRC, KDW 6513)
(43) I think she was frightened that she was gonna get <pause> be bitten. (BRC, KBF 12444)
(44) Perhaps she was frightened that <pause> she’d gotta (BRC, KCT 9247)

When non-authorial affect is not mitigated, it is assumed that the speaker must have some knowledge concerning the third party emoter.
In fact, such references can allude to a common experience in the past that involve the speaker and the emoter:

(45) Well from when you first had the operation and you was frightened keep bumping into you, and it’s, I mean that’s taken an awful lot of confidence away and you still got <unclear> <pause> (BRC, KC8 1710)

(46) Last time he flew out, you were frightened. (BRC, KB1 2042)

(47) Raymond I loved it! <pause> Perversely! <pause> But, to me Margaret Mm.

Raymond it was er er exciting <unclear>
Margaret Terrifying, yeah of course it was! It was
Raymond And my
Margaret different, yeah.
Raymond my sister didn’t, she was frightened (BRC, KDM 16630)

In conversation people are also typically said to be frightened of something (realizing overt directed affect):

(48) But, eh listen, if, don’t be frighten if there’s anything that you don’t know don’t you be frightened of asking him how to do it (BRC, KB9 686)

 Whereas authorial affect in conversation seems most often related to the positive or negative evaluation of triggers on the part of speakers, the other usages have more varied functions, for example the sharing of emotional experience (on this aspect of social behaviour see Rimé et al. 1998), contributing to the evaluative part of a narrative (Labov 1972), explaining people’s behaviour in terms of their emotion or reporting on other people’s evaluations (in terms of their emotional responses). We will look at these functions in slightly more detail in Chapter 6.

4.2 News reportage

As in conversation, the usage of emotion terms in news reportage is associated with a number of different functions. Six main functions can be identified. Firstly, emotion terms frequently realize first person affect. Although this is an authorial affect pattern, more often than not this occurs in quotations, and is hence attributed to emoters other than the news writer. Emotion terms that have I as most frequent L1 collocate are
the verbs *hate* and *admire* but first person also occurs commonly with other emotion terms (see below).

Concerning *hate*, this is used to realize overt and directed affect with the trigger often expressed by definite noun phrases (for example *hate the film/programme/word/Mogadishu government/ANC/literary critic*) or a *to*-infinitive clause (often with *see*):

(49) ‘I love animals and **hate to** see them killed,’ said Clara McKay (BRC, CH2 2138)
(50) I’d **hate to** see throw-away goals like that on a regular basis (BRC, CH7 3820)
(51) I **hate to** see them do that (BRC, CH1 2298)
(52) I would **hate to** see Midland go (BRC, AKL 333)

*Admire* in news reportage is most often followed at R1 by *the*, indicating the trigger of the emotion (for example *admire the play/the old classical musicals/the courage/the portrait/the ingenuity*), that is, with directed affect. But other structures also occur as triggers:

(53) Husband Anthony, 47, said: ‘I **admire** her guts.’ (BRC, CH2 1171)
(54) Javier Clemente, Spain’s new manager, says: ‘Everybody knows how I **admire** English football…’ (BRC, CH7 4421)

First person affect is also frequent with *was surprised* (a common pattern in news reportage), which occurs 15 times in the news sub-corpus. Nine of these occurrences collocate with *I*, usually in quoted speech (and often in sports reporting), for example:

(55) In an astonishing outburst on the Barnet Clubcall line, Flashman said: ‘I **was surprised at** the stupidity of people having a go at me. [. . .]’ (BRC, CH3 4972)
(56) Angry Jemson suffered the embarrassment of coming on as substitute and then being substituted himself at Carrow Road. Now he is gunning for Wednesday boss Francis for showdown talks about his on-off move back to Nottingham Forest. ‘I was **surprised** to be taken off,’ said fans’ favourite Jemson. (BRC, CH3 3918)

Secondly, emotion terms also occur commonly in news reportage realizing non-authorial (non first person) affect; that is, statements are made by news writers about emoters’ emotions (sometimes in reported speech). For example, the verb *surprise* is most often followed at R1 by
the (indicating a definite noun phrase realizing the emoter). The emoter is often metonymic:

(57) NAMIBIA’S seven political parties in the Constituent Assembly surprised the country by announcing their agreement on a constitution with ‘only technical and minor amendments’ outstanding. (BRC, AAK 247)

(58) The Chancellor said the British people had responded to privatisation, trade union reform, deregulation and tax reform with a dynamism that had surprised the world. (BRC, A59 161)

(59) He surprised the nation with the announcement, made in a radio and television broadcast on Saturday night, that his government has refused registration to any of the 13 political associations that applied for it. (BRC, A3U 163)

(60) MICHELIN, the world’s largest tyre maker, which sounded a warning of the depths of recession when it plunged £527 m into the red last year, yesterday surprised the market with an operating profit throughout 1991. (BRC, AKL 196)

Clearly, this contributes to the news value of unexpectedness (Bednarek 2006a: 171) as well as intensification: emoters are not just some news actors, but rather the whole country, world or nation.6

Concerning the verb hate, he hates/d is also a relatively frequent collocation in news reportage (often in reported speech):

(61) Eubank never stops telling us he hates boxing. (BRC, CH3 4470)

(62) Greenaway has said he hates the idea of a shot in a film being only a preposition, linking what went before and after (BRC, A5B 56)

In other (non-reported) instances, the reader has to assume that the news writer’s (usually unmitigated) attribution is based on some sort of evidence. Often, this can be found in the wider context:

(63) He had fled the invading Germans, only to find himself in a society he hated for its philistinism and prudery. ‘Here there is no such thing as art, only business,’ he wrote to a friend. (BRC, AJX 658)

(64) What a blinding man, and I’m so very pleased that Michael is seeming to make an amazing recovery. ‘I’ve spoken to him a few times and he’s the epitome of a true warrior. He still wants to fight, believes he still has it in him to fight…’ ‘He’s still sharp, has a sense of humour, he’s witty. He’s bitter about what happened – he didn’t want to lose. He hated that…’ (BRC, CH3 3732)
Where this is not the case, readers have to take the writer’s word for it: instances of she hates and he hates are not preceded by mitigators such as seem/appear.

With delighted, the most frequent L1 collocate is was and the most frequent R1 collocate is to, though with occurs also reasonably frequently at R1. This indicates most often non-authorial affect (21 occurrences) (sometimes in indirect speech). Here are some examples for was delighted:

(65) He told them: ‘I was delighted and over the moon to hear that I was the father of a blue-eyed, black-haired baby girl. (BRC, CH2 131) [authorial, direct speech]

(66) Mr Kinnock said he was delighted at Mr Prescott’s election, adding he was ‘a dear and close friend’. (BRC, A1Y 291) [non-authorial, indirect speech]

(67) Francis was delighted at landing Bright –; even if it was at the third time of asking. (BRC, CH3 2186) [non-authorial]

With the collocation delighted to, no pattern clearly dominates. Instead, delighted to occurs both as authorial (first person) and non-authorial affect, in the present, past, future and hypothetical:

Authorial: Non-authorial:
I am/I’m delighted to (3) X was delighted to (5)
We are delighted to (2) X were delighted to (2)
I’d be delighted to (1) X are delighted to (2)
I was delighted to (1) X would be delighted to (1)
I shall be delighted to (1) X will be delighted to (1)

With authorial affect (I/we), non-past is more frequent than past, but with non-authorial affect past is more frequent than non-past.

Non-authorial affect is also common with anxious, where the most frequent L1 collocate is is, and the most frequent R1 collocate is to. Concerning is anxious, instances are also always used with a following to-infinitive clause (apart from one exception, anxious for). A common pattern is thus X is anxious to-infinitive clause, realizing non-authorial overt and directed affect, making statements about news actors’ present (not past) wishes. Typical examples are:

(68) the Soviet Union is anxious for matching changes on the Nato side. (BRC, A88 79)

(69) So President Bush is anxious not to have a crisis. (BRC, A2X 133)
(70) The Democratic leadership in the Senate is anxious to reverse the handsome victory by Mr Bush in the House of Representatives last week (BRC, A1G 457)

(71) The striker is anxious to shake off a thigh strain and said: ‘I trained today, and I shall see how it reacts. (BRC, CH7 1102)

Finally, frightened collocates commonly at L1 with are:

(72) Russian souls are ‘unsure, doubting, vulnerable, continually on the look out for deception’ and are frightened by choice. (BRC, AHT 422)

(73) What people are frightened of is buying a property, finding the tenant goes bankrupt and leaves them with the running cost (BRC, AHJ 585)

(74) Blackpool tourism boss Barry Morris said: ‘People are frightened of spending money.’ (BRC, CH6 9462)

(75) ‘Grizzlies are much faster than men, and when they are frightened there are very few more dangerous creatures.’ (BRC, CH2 5864)

(76) ‘My greatest impulse was to hug them –; but you are afraid to do so because they are so fragile, you are frightened they might break.’ (BRC, CH2 10468) (referring to the speaker as emoter as well as people in general)

It is worth pointing out that those that are truly non-authorial (72–75) are all based on ‘experts’ comments: (72) is based on a study after 18 months of research of the market, (73) is an analyst’s comment, (74) is a tourism expert’s comment, (75) is uttered by Jasper Park warden Gerry Israelson.

A common function, too, in news reportage is the usage of emotion nouns to premodify another noun (the pattern N n), for instance with surprise and hate. In fact, the noun–noun pattern is characteristic of news discourse in general: ‘News has by far the greatest number of premodifying nouns that are productive in combining with many head nouns’ (Biber et al. 1999: 592).

As in conversation, a is most frequent at L1 position with surprise, indicating covert rather than overt affect. However, in contrast to conversation, this occurs most often in the pattern a surprise N, for example: a surprise addition/ attack/ choice/ entry/ gift/ move/ selection/ defeat/ visit/ victory, that is, as a premodifying noun.

(77) THE IDEA that the Warsaw Pact would be able to mount a surprise attack on Nato will shortly be ‘barely plausible’ (BRC, A2X 501)
The noun *hate* occurs relatively infrequently in news reportage, but among the 14 instances that do occur the use of *hate* to premodify another noun is common: *hate symbols, hate comedy, hate mail, hate trap, hate figure, hate campaign* occur. (Less frequently, *hate* occurs as unemoted affect or as emoted directed/undirected overt affect.) This is similar to the usage of *surprise* above and realizes covert affect. Examples can appear in headlines in newspapers as an emotional ‘flash’, signalling to the reader that the following text is interesting to read in terms of some emotional significance:

(78) **THE HATE TRAP**
Homes can’t be sold
Couples can’t split
Families live in hell
ROGER TODD
THOUSANDS of couples who hate each other are trapped together in a living hell because of the slump.
The tormented partners have had to put off their divorce actions as they can’t sell their homes.
Now they are stuck with each other, locked in violence and misery with no end in sight, lawyers revealed yesterday.
MEN explode in frustration and batter their wives.
WOMEN strike back with anything that comes to hand – including knives and rolling pins.
SOME have nervous breakdowns and suffer stress and high blood pressure.
(BRC, CH2 9181–9191)

Here the affect indicated in the headline (*hate trap*) is picked up several times in the text, for example: *families live in hell, couples who hate each other, a living hell, tormented, misery, frustration, nervous breakdowns* and so on. In fact, both parts of the noun phrase *hate trap* re-occur in some form in the body of the text, with *trap* referred back to with modality (*Homes can’t be sold, Couples can’t split, can’t sell their homes*) and lexical items (*trapped together, stuck with each other, locked*). This textual patterning confirms White’s finding that news reports typically have two phases: ‘an opening nucleus containing the text’s core informational and interpersonal meanings; a subsequent development stage which acts not to introduce new meanings but to qualify, elaborate, explain and appraise the meanings already presented in the opening “nucleus”.’ (White 1997: 111).
The intensification of affect, realized by the collocation of emotion adjectives with an amplifier (noted with respect to the conversation sub-corpus above), also occurs in news reportage, here with the adjectives *disappointed, impressed, and pleased*. *Disappointed* in fact occurs equally frequently at L1 with *be* and the adverb *very*. All of the modulated/graduated affect instances occur in quotations (mostly with first person and present tense), for instance:

(79) Maggie Mukasa, 39 and a schoolteacher, said: ‘Although I will be better off, I am very disappointed by the outcome…’ (BRC, AJX 336)

(80) ‘I’m obviously very disappointed for the players,’ said the manager, Bobby Graham. (BRC, A9R 116)

(81) He said: ‘Naturally I am very disappointed, especially as I felt that the evidence and explanations produced would be accepted…’ (BRC, CH7 404)

(82) Hammam said: ‘Vinny is like an adopted son to me and I’m very disappointed…’ (BRC, CH3 6439)

The adjective *impressed* similarly collocates with an amplifier (*so*), which is part of a pattern: someone is reported to be *so impressed that* they do something:

(83) Milton ward Tories were so impressed by his la-de-da-accent and gold-plated walking stick that they made him social secretary. (BRC, CH1 6180)

(84) Manchester United manager Alex Ferguson revealed last night he is so impressed by Wallace’s comeback that he is considering making room for him in his team’s title push. (BRC, CH3 4688)

In other words, the attribution of overt affect is used to give a motivation for news actors’ behaviour towards the trigger or the person metonymically responsible for the trigger.

Finally, *pleased* also collocates most commonly at L1 with *very*. Typical examples are:

(85) ‘I am obviously very pleased about winning but it was also great that my parents were here…’ (BRC, A9R 660)

(86) The officer added: ‘We’re very pleased he has been caught…’ (BRC, CH2 5397)
(87) He is very pleased with the ‘good meaty topics’ departments have been suggesting for scrutiny this year (BRC, A1J 167)

(88) Downing Street said the Cabinet were ‘very pleased’ that interest rates had been reduced to 10 per cent. (BRC, CH2 5797)

Another common function in news reportage – hedging, hypothesizing or predicting affect – is realized by the colligation of affect with modality, often becoming apparent through a left-hand collocation with be (surprised, disappointed, willing). Looking at the larger patterns in which be surprised occurs we find as most frequent the following phrases:

- I would be surprised if...
- I would not/wouldn’t be surprised if...
- I would not/wouldn’t be surprised to see/hear...

Some of these are similar to conversation (if-trigger) and in fact occur in quotations, often judging the likelihood of events happening:

(89) ‘I would be surprised if it doesn’t test 2,200,’ says Mr Tora, a view shared by others. (BRC, A3J 18)

(90) Park – like Gloucester, Bristol and Saracens – are unbeaten in the league so far. ‘Don’t be surprised if we get a good result,’ Colin Horgan, a spokesman for the club, said yesterday. (BRC, A5U 400)

(91) ‘I would not be surprised to see Footsie (FT-SE 100 index) off another 50 points,’ says Fred Carr (BRC, A3J 19)

Similarly, the collocation of disappointed with be, which (in addition to very) is also frequent at L1, results from a colligation with modal verbs, most frequently will (‘ll, won’t) (other L1 expressions are can’t, only to be, want to be, was not to be, is likely to be, would). That is, the most common pattern here is: [second or third person] WILL be disappointed, for example:

(92) Cheap-thrill seekers will be disappointed: the result is realistically dull and unpleasant. (BRC, AHA 768)

(93) But I fear she ... will only be disappointed by what Mr Davy has to offer. (BRC, CH1 1679)

(94) But if you fancy a spot of luxury, too, you won’t be disappointed. (BRC, CH1 1118)

(95) EVEN if you haven’t read the enchanting novel on which THE POWER OF ONE (Cert PG; General) is based, I think you’ll still be disappointed (BRC, CH1 846)
Most of these seem clearly to be used to evaluate things, for example the film in (95), in terms of the emotional responses they will produce in emoters (for example the reader).

With *be willing*, in the majority of examples it is used in cases where a speaker says that an emoter *would be willing* to do something:

(96) Shah declined, but said he would be **willing** to help finance it for a fee. (BRC, A2S 492)

(97) Earlier, Geoffrey Shaw, for Mrs Sutcliffe, said she would be **willing** to accept whatever damages figure the court substituted for the £ 600,000 award. (BRC, A30 409)

(98) His friends have also suggested that he would be **willing** to sell on a stake in MK Trafford Holdings (BRC, A33 64)

(99) Peter Ashman, legal secretary of Justice, said: ‘... When you talked to judges in the Sixties, they might have told you they didn’t happen at all or *would be* **willing** to concede that a miscarriage might take place once every 10 years.’ (BRC, AHM 126–127)

Other instances of *be willing* are also modalized (*X were unlikely to be willing to*, *X will eventually be willing to*, *X may be willing to*). That is, a frequent use of *willing* is to make statements about what news actors are (un)likely to be willing to do or will be willing to do (in reported speech, with time shift realized by *would*).

Finally, the pattern *A n* is also common in news reportage, realizing undirected overt affect. This occurs for example with the adjectives *anxious*, *delighted* and *enthusiastic* (but not with *impressed* and *pleased*), with the noun often denoting an emoter directly:

(100) **BIG SHOT:** delighted Andrew clinched the match (BRC, CH6 5747)

(101) ‘... you’d better have one to remind you what a foetus looks like at 12 weeks,’ an **enthusiastic PR** said. (BRC, A1Y 423)

*Anxious* (while also occurring with human participants as emoters, for example *anxious Hong Kong citizens*) has a semantic preference for nouns indicating ‘time duration’ (for example *moment, time, week*), which seems to be particularly important in news discourse (though *anxious moment(s)* also occurs in fiction):

(102) The 26-year-old midfielder, who played in all three of England’s European championship games, now faces an **anxious wait** for Taylor’s verdict. (BRC, CH7 2804)
JONATHAN SPEELMAN gave his supporters an anxious day in the sixth round of the Pilkington Glass World Chess Championship semi-finals yesterday. (BRC, A4K 729)

What these examples are saying is that these times (moments, days and so on) are spent by emoters in a state of anxiety because of something that happens during them. It is not the days themselves that cause the anxiety, but the happenings during these days.

Enthusiastic also occurs frequently with nouns (though this is in fact common in all the written registers not just in news reportage):

(104) an enthusiastic 15-handicap golfer (BRC, CH3 33)
(105) an enthusiastic American super-star (BRC, AA9 217)
(106) an enthusiastic bargain hunter (BRC, AJP 234)
(107) the enthusiastic and emotional crowd (BRC, A9M 5)

Here, there is a difference between examples such as (106) and (107). With the latter, the noun only realizes the emoter (the crowd), with the former (106) the noun simultaneously realizes the emoter and the trigger: enthusiastic bargain-hunters are people [emoter] who are enthusiastic about bargain-hunting [trigger]. The noun can also realize an emoter metonymically:

(108) an enthusiastic response (BRC, AKB 355)
(109) the enthusiastic admiration (BRC, CH1 5835)
(110) the enthusiastic applause (BRC, AA9 184)

Since there is a contiguity relation between the pre-modified noun and the one ‘responsible’ for the action described by the noun, the emoter is realized metonymically (Section 3.3.2).

Concerning the function of emotion terms in news reportage in general, a safe speculation is that this is related to the news value of colour. This stipulates that newspaper articles should highlight emotionally relevant aspects (Ungerer 1997: 318). We can safely assume that many statements of authorial and non-authorial affect are the result of reporters’ questions concerning news actors’ feelings:

We ordinarily take our naïve desire to know the emotions of others as natural. In American popular culture, conscious emotional experience is a focus of interest that shows up in the themes of TV talk shows, melodramas, and even broadcasts of so-called hard news. ‘Can you put into words what you are feeling right now?’ Such are the urgent
questions with which nosy news reporters badger victims of tragedies, harass bereaved relatives, and fawn on winners of sporting events (Palmer & Occhi 1999: vii).

This has also been nicely captured in a Doonesbury cartoon by Garry Trudeau (December 13, 1985), which cannot be reproduced here for copyright reasons. This features a horde of journalists at a press conference asking about a character's (Zonker) feelings:

Journalist 1: Zonker! How did you feel when you heard the good news?

Journalist 2: Yeah, what were your feelings? Could you describe them?

Zonker: Well, at first I didn't feel anything. I just went numb. Then I felt a rush of giddiness, followed by feelings of disorientation, queasiness, shortness of breath... hunger, rage, sexual longing, vertigo, boredom, and finally, a tingling sensation.

Journalist 3: What about after the news sunk in?

Additionally, negative emotions contribute to the news value of negativity (the negative makes the news) and emotion terms relating to (non-negated) surprise have to do with the news value of unexpectedness (Bednarek 2006a: 171). The intensification of affect (via amplifiers) might be related to the news value of superlativeness, that is, the fact that 'the bigger, the better, the more x, the more newsworthy' an event (Bell 1991, Bednarek 2006a: 17) as well as the importance for intensification in news reportage in general (White 1997: 109).

### 4.3 Fiction

Fiction uses emotion terms mainly to describe character emotion in narrative and dialogue (mimicking conversation), and is also characterized by the frequency of references to expressors.

Describing character emotion can be achieved through overt authorial (either with a first person narrator or in the depiction of character's speech) or non-authorial affect. Such descriptions are very much associated with the past tense: eight of 15 emotion terms have was as their most frequent left-hand collocate: surprised, delighted, anxious, disappointed, frightened, impressed, pleased, and willing.
Patterns of Affect Across Corpora

Starting with *was surprised*, this occurs most often in the patterns:

- *and* emotion adjective (**surprised and touched**)
- *at/by/that/to-*inf clause (with mental process verbs as a large sub-class)
- ... *and was surprised* ...
- emoter (name or pronoun) *was surprised*

For example:

(111) Anne was **surprised and fascinated** by Penny’s earthy language, delivered in the same plummy voice. (BRC, G16 1428)

(112) In the full light she was **surprised to see** he was much younger than his bulky, overcoat-clad figure had led her to believe. (BRC, BMW 535)

(113) On the day of which we are speaking, the mother came home from work **and was surprised** to find her daughter not yet in from school. (BRC, H9G 158)

(114) **I was surprised**, but she said Bill had given her a list to be a help with messages. (BRC, BP9 805)

Moving on to *delighted*, **was delighted** is used mostly realizing non-authorial affect (with third person emoters). It occurs both in directed and undirected affect patterns, with a variety of different patterns realizing directed affect (PP with *at, by, with, that*-clause, *to*-infinitive clause, *when*-clause). Examples for both directed and undirected affect patterns in fiction are:

(115) She was **delighted** **at** having achieved her aim and made her mother notice her. (BRC, APU 234)

(116) Elizabeth Mowbray was **delighted by** the marked change in her daughter that followed Joan’s arrival. (BRC, CCD 170)

(117) Jay was **delighted with** the compliment and intrigued to see inside Lucy’s flat. (BRC, A0L 149)

(118) He was **delighted that** it was already, even before he did this, addressed to him. (BRC, AR2 858)

(119) Mother Francis was **delighted** to see the new friendship developing (BRC, CCM 606)

(120) She had to admit ... that she was **delighted when** old Lady Lassiter moved to the Dower House (BRC, C98 2032)

(121) The whole community was **delighted** **for** her. (BRC, CCM 204) [undirected, with empathy target]
There was no reason to be afraid; on the contrary, he was delighted. (BRC, A6N 2048) [undirected]

Concerning was anxious, this occurs predominantly realizing ‘volition’ and directed affect, but also (rarely) realizing ‘anxiety’ and undirected affect:

She was anxious that Swire Sugden should not be allowed to spread himself around like a malignant tumour. (BRC, ACK 24)

As he drove through the night, heading back to London, Newman was anxious to get clear of Hauser’s ‘province’. (BRC, CN3 2694)

Her face was anxious and sweet. (BRC, GUK 90)

Vi was anxious. (BRC, CEH 1910)

Some common patterns with the ‘volition’ meaning (anxious to) are:

- X was anxious to
- ... , anxious to
- and anxious to
- I’m anxious to know how/when
- X BE so anxious to
- X link verb very anxious to
- X were anxious to

Looking at was disappointed, was frightened, was impressed, and was pleased, these are also used simply to describe characters’ emotions (often directed at triggers) – that is, for overt, directed or undirected affect. They also occur in character dialogue. Some typical examples are:

Anne was disappointed that her plan was dismissed but suggested inviting Chris for meals. (BRC, G16 2521)

Taking care not to damage the fish, Yanto withdrew it from the trap. He was disappointed, ‘just a babee’ he muttered to himself; still, it would keep him in cigarettes and cider for a week. (BRC, B3J 52–53)

Joey was disappointed not to be able to wear a ‘monkey suit’ as he called it, but Carmella was adamant. (BRC, ATE 3165)

‘I don’t know where she is!’ he admitted, reluctantly. ‘I was disappointed when I found you didn’t either . . .’ (BRC, AB9 199)

She was frightened and she was sick. (BRC, FSF 1690)

He was frightened of touching her. (BRC, GWF 66)
(133) Suddenly George was frightened that the man would think him mean. (BRC, FAB 1579)

(134) ‘Sir John, I was frightened. . .’ (BRC, K95 3401)

(135) As he entered she was impressed by his appearance. (BRC, C98 2430)

(136) Preston was impressed. (BRC, F9C 1746)

(137) I could see what went on through the two front windows despite the 4p off Whiskas stickers, and I have to admit I was impressed. (BRC, HW8 471)

(138) She was pleased an’ all. (BRC, CK9 1541) [undirected]

(139) He was pleased for his Dad, and things were better between them. (BRC, ALJ 1964) [undirected, with empathy target]

(140) He could see that Elizabeth was pleased by his attempts to describe it all (BRC, C98 1851)

(141) Athelstan was pleased he had judged the moment right (BRC, K95 3567)

(142) In answer to one such question, he replied that he was pleased to say that he was now being given full support by the unions (BRC, AC2 572)

(143) Miss Kenton did not attempt to introduce further flowers into my pantry, and in general, I was pleased to observe, she went about settling in impressively. (BRC, AR3 618)

(144) Elinor was pleased to see him. (BRC, ASS 1422)

Finally, let’s have a look at willing. Almost all instances of was willing co-occur with a to-infinitive trigger (was willing to), and are used to make statements about the extent to which characters are willing to do something:

(145) She intended to stay there, and was willing to retrench in other ways so that she could continue to live in Thrush Green among her friends (BRC, ASE 1723)

(146) Cecilia was willing to do anything to make up to Tina for the deprivations of her childhood, though what these deprivations were she hardly knew. (BRC, EDN 1336)

(147) He was willing to be persuaded. (BRC, GV2 288)

(148) Even Rachel was willing to share the subterranean joke. (BRC, A6J 351)

A small subset of occurrences can be characterized as a grammatical metaphor of (epistemic) modality, expressing the subject’s certainty
that a proposition is true. The lexical item is: (X was) willing to bet (that) \( p \):

\[(149) \text{ She was willing to bet} \text{ Hugh Puddephat had never suffered similar doubts. (BRC, HTR 2372)} \]

These statements are not predominantly about characters’ wishes, rather they are about their certainty that something is the case.

Apart from these emotion adjectives, which collocate with was at L1, other emotion terms are also strongly associated with the description of character emotion, for instance the verbs surprise, hate and admire, and the noun hate.

Firstly, analyzing the R1 collocates of surprise we find me and him, followed by her. Surprise is thus clearly used to describe characters’ surprise with emoters as objects of the verb. Frequent patterns here are:

- \( X (\text{had}) \text{ surprised him/her} \)
- \( \text{It/that/X did not surprise him/her} \)
- \( \text{that surprises me} \)
- \( \text{It/which/this didn’t/doesn’t surprise me (that)} \)
- \( \text{It wouldn’t/would not (adv) surprise me (if)} \)
- \( \text{Surprise me} \)

Again, this occurs in narrative description or dialogue, for instance:

\[(150) \text{ Yet one aspect of the speech had surprised him} \text{ (BRC, EF1 2662)} \]
\[(151) \text{ For some reason this did not surprise him at all. (BRC, ASN 2402)} \]
\[(152) \text{ They were also well bred, and that surprises me. (BRC, H9C 2029)} \]
\[(153) \text{ ‘It wouldn’t surprise me,’ Masha said, ‘if Likud carried out the massacre.’ (BRC, AE0 471)} \]
\[(154) \text{ ‘... Take me somewhere I’ve never been before. Surprise me.’ (BRC, C8S 1788)} \]

Be is also frequent as an L1 collocate of surprise, with similar patterns as in conversation – You’d be surprised, I’d be surprised, I shouldn’t/wouldn’t be surprised (if) – occurring in character dialogue.

Secondly, considering hate, although the is most frequent at R1, to and it also occur often. At L1, I is most frequent, but she and he are not as far off as in conversation. In other words, hate is used for describing
the emotions of characters, and also occurs in quoted speech. Common triggers with the are:

- groups of people: the Communists, the queers, the Germans, The English, the Scots
- mental processes: the thought that, the thought of, the idea of
- other: the pills, the city, the work, the things, the authorities, the telephone

The usages of hate with to and it are similar to the ones described above for conversation and news reportage:

(155) He hated it when she was tactful (BRC, AC3 740)
(156) Maire Carroll, serving in the shop and hating it (BRC, CCM 2505)
(157) ‘I hate it, I hate it, I hate it!’ (BRC, FRS 1550)
(158) I’d hate to end up in a French jail (BRC, GV2 814)
(159) And more than half of them, I hate to say, are mine. (BRC, HGN 2448)
(160) And I hate to see you unhappy (BRC, APU 2226)

Thirdly, moving on to admire, we find to at L1 and the at R1. A common phrase (an idiom schema in Moon’s 1998: 161 sense) is:

\[
\text{STAND BACK} \quad \text{to admire} \quad \text{the effect} \\
\text{STEP OUTSIDE} \quad \text{his handiwork} \\
\text{the sights}
\]

\(Stand\ back\ to\ admire\ the\ effect\) is most frequent among these variations. Other common phraseologies are:

- pause/come (out) here to admire + concrete noun
- ‘willingness/ability’ (able to, eagerness to, happy to, wanted us to, willingness) + admire

Some examples from the corpus:

(161) She buckled a stiff hard belt around Alexandra’s waist and stood back to admire the effect. (BRC, H8X 542)
(162) He didn’t pause to admire the car (the car seemed like new: great!) but hurried inside (BRC, FYV 459)
(163) Lydia had to admit that Betty’s eagerness to admire and approve of people, while annoying, was a good characteristic (BRC, G0X 1724)
Finally, looking at the noun *hate*, its most frequent R1 collocate is *for*. That is, the noun is used to describe an emoter’s hate for someone, that is, realizes overt, directed affect, for example:\^10

(164) Then Johnny saw and understood the reason for Luke’s attitude towards Una O’Malley, the reason for his murderous *hate for* any man that desired her. (BRC, B1X 2559)

The second function that is very common in fiction is the description of characters’ expressions, actions and behaviour in terms of their emotion (realized by the pattern prep N), with the nouns *surprise* and *affection*. For instance, *surprise* occurs most often at L1 with *in*. As we know from Section 3.3.2, *in surprise* either modifies expressors or actions. For example:

(165) He looked at her *in surprise*, spoke brusquely. (BRC, CB5 3403)
(166) She shrugged, and then giggled *in surprise* as the rounded shoulders of the spacesuit ascended like blunt-nosed rockets on each side of her helmet. (BRC, F9X 2825)
(167) Rostov saw the Adjudicator’s eyes widen *in surprise* as he recognised the same colouring in the skin around the admiral’s high cheekbones. (BRC, FSE 56)
(168) The high, arched eyebrows in the long bony face rose slightly *in surprise*, but no more. (BRC, AB9 410)
(169) Then the door clanged open and she thought *in surprise*, *We’re down*! (BRC, FP0 2486)
(170) Li Yuan’s lips parted slightly *in surprise*. (BRC, GUG 3638)
(171) Cleo’s jaw dropped open *in surprise*. (BRC, GW2 3033)
(172) ‘We’re the laundry,’ he said *in surprise*. (BRC, H9N 481)

Considering left-hand collocation with *affection*, *of* and *with affection* are very common patterns. With *of affection*, a frequent pattern is N of *affection*, most nouns belonging to a number of distinct semantic subsets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘showing’</th>
<th>‘quantity’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>display of affection</td>
<td>his lack of affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show(s) of affection</td>
<td>a lot of affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign of affection</td>
<td>(he felt) a murmuring of affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>token(s) of affection</td>
<td>a finite quantity of affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the hints of affection</td>
<td>a scattering of affection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning *with affection* we know from Section 3.3.2 that this pattern is used to characterize actions or expressors. Particularly frequently we find:

- verbal processes (for example *say, speak, greet*)
- mental processes (*look back, remember, dream of*)
- ‘look’ (for example *look at someone, watch someone, observing his pleasure*)
- ‘smile’ (*smile (at) with affection*)

Finally, the pattern *A n* (common in news reportage, as noted above) also occurs frequently in fiction. (Table A.12 in Appendix A 4.1 online gives more information about this pattern in the BRC, allowing further inter-register comparisons as far as semantic preference and types of pre-modified nouns are concerned.) The modified noun either indicates a conscious participant, an expressor or a linguistic/mental phenomenon. Expressors are particularly characteristic for fiction (and occur rarely in news reportage/academic discourse where emoters or linguistic/mental phenomena prevail). For example:

- *anxious + expression, eyes, face (5), faces (2), features, expression (3), neck, tone, voice*
- *delighted + cackle, cascade [of laughter], countenance, face, kisses, laugh (2), laughter, squeal, whoop*
- *enthusiastic + expression, laughter, pummel, tone*
- *frightened + crying, expression, eyes (4), face (2), faces, leap, look, voice*
- *surprised + expression, fingers, look, voice*
- *willing + body, hands*

Most often, emotions in fiction seem to show themselves in the eyes, the face, the expression or the voice, mirroring reality. The collocation...
Emotion Talk Across Corpora

anxious face(s) is particularly frequent in fiction, indicating a metonymic emoter and undirected, overt affect:

(173) Jim could nonetheless tell by his anxious face that something was wrong. (BRC, ATE 2513)

(174) He walked slowly into Blue Horizons, longing for deep, knowing that he had first to face six anxious faces. (BRC, H8A 1451)

Concerning nouns realizing emoters, two further tendencies in fiction become apparent, relating only to the adjectives frightened and willing. Frightened occurs frequently with ‘young’ or ‘vulnerable’ (including female) emoters as well as ‘animals’:

- frightened + animal, boy (3), child (3), creature, horse (2), little scribe, mother, mouse, nervous wretch, rabbit, servant, sheep, woman, young Pole

The collocation with animals is used for comparisons, with the phrase-ology like a frightened ['animal': animal, mouse, horse, rabbit]. Willing co-occurs with ‘female’ and ‘vulnerable’ emoters:

- willing + females, land army girl, slave, subjects, wenches, young secretary

Moving briefly away from the analysis of patterns, it is interesting to note that fiction is in general characterized by its frequent reference to behavioural surge expressions (Section 1.4) – as has already become apparent by looking at patterns involving expressors. Tables A.13–A.15 in Appendix A 4.2 online give examples for bodily symptoms and behaviour that are associated with 11 emotion terms in the fiction sub-corpus in detail. Summing up, we can see that some (bodily) behaviour is shared among different emotions, while other behaviour is more specifically associated with one emotion only:

- kissing, hugging: delight, affection
- squeals: delight, surprise
- laughter, smiles: delight, pleasure, affection, surprise
- eye contact (looking/staring): affection, surprise, hate
- pale face: anxiety, fear
- wide eyes: fear, surprise
- screams, shouts: fear, surprise
- freezing: fear, surprise
- biting one’s lips, sighing, shaking head, downwards/turning away movement: disappointment
• red eyes, clenched hands, shivering, rubbing fingers through hair: anxiety
• crying, clinging/squeezing, high pulse: fear
• dark eyes, twisted mouth/face: hate
• blinking/flickering eyes, grunts, gasps, raised eyebrows, open mouth, shaking head, sudden movements: surprise

In fact, these descriptions partly reflect what actually happens in human beings when they experience an emotion – the reactions of their bodily system, including their blood vessels, somatic muscles, tear ducts, facial muscles, breathing apparatus, sweat glands, dermal apparatus, and vocal apparatus (Oatley et al. 2006: 6 and passim; for extensive studies on facial expression see Ekman 1992, 1999b). For instance, the fact that laughter and smiles are associated in fiction with a variety of positive emotions (delight, pleasure, affection) mirrors the fact that all positive emotions share what Ekman calls ‘the Duchenne smile’ (Ekman 1992: 190), and are not distinguished by their own distinctive signal, maybe because ‘it has not been relevant to survival to know which positive emotion was occurring, only that it was a positive emotion rather than anger, fear, disgust, or sadness’ (Ekman 1992: 190).

The fact that at least some bodily behaviour is shared among different emotions in linguistic descriptions, and that not all such behaviour (for example smiles and laughter) relates to emotion at all (Oatley et al. 2006s: 84–5, 102, cf. also Martin & White 2005: 90) means that such descriptions should perhaps not be considered (as Martin & Rose 2003: 26 seem to do) as a direct reference to emotion. Rather, I agree with Dijkstra et al., who argue that such references are less explicit than emotion terms, and involve ‘inferences … in order to reconstruct a character’s emotional reaction’ (Dijkstra et al. 1994: 140). At the same time, it is true that non-verbal cues play a large role in human attempts to interpret experience (van Meel 1994: 166) and ‘[t]o give his characters real life the author has to add a nonverbal dimension, and he does this, paradoxically, by describing non-verbal behavior in a verbal medium’ (van Meel 1994: 166). Such descriptions then contribute to helping readers visualize and mentally imagine fictional characters and their behaviour, making them more lifelike, and either intensifying or contradicting already mentioned characteristics (van Meel 1994: 171).

Descriptions of symptoms and behaviour associated with emotional experience and using emotion terms are only two of many ways in which fiction writers can describe characters’ emotional reactions (compare 5.3.1). That these are considered extremely important in fiction can
also be seen from the fact that in interpreting literature, school children are encouraged to ‘[focus] on the reactions of characters to events and the reasons for their reactions is an important aspect of reading and interpreting stories’ (Rothery & Stenglin 2000: 223). Such descriptions of emotional reactions provide characterizations, create imagery, cause empathy or suspense in readers (cf. Dijkstra et al. 1994: 142) and establish point of view or focalization (Toolan 2001: 59–63). Through the usage of emotion terms fiction writers may influence us in our like or dislike of characters, and manipulate the degree of identification that we feel with them as readers (see Section 6.3 for more detail).

4.4 Academic discourse

Finally, concerning the use of affect in academic discourse, this is associated with authorial (plural) overt and covert affect, as well as with a colligation with modality.11

Authorial overt affect seems important for the adjective surprised and the verb surprise. Surprised collocates at L1 with be, and is associated predominantly with the phrase we should not be surprised (at, by, that):

(175) Furthermore, we should not be surprised by the extent of learning and imitation that can be found, particularly in complex animals. (BRC, CMA 859)

(176) Signs in use for many referents reflect one or two of these properties, and thus we should not be surprised that comparisons of sign lists result in such a high degree of similarity, as the appearance, movement, and use of an object can be expected to be similar across different cultures. (BRC, CLH 123)

(177) It is the same – and we should not be surprised at this – in ordinary discourse. (BRC, J7G 229)

(178) If we consider Braybrook and Powell’s (1980) surprise at finding 22 children with acceptable, natural speech abilities, and apply it to Conrad’s (1979) national study of school leavers, we find that we should not be surprised at all. (BRC, CLH 1116)

This is clearly an expression of (directed and overt) authorial affect on the part of the academic writers, paraphrasable perhaps as ‘it is not surprising that’ whatever is reported in the research is the case. It is used to evaluate the research in terms of what researchers already know about
the object of study, but does not seem to carry any particular positive or negative evaluation.\textsuperscript{12}

The verb \textit{surprise} (with only 19 occurrences) has \textit{us} as a frequent R1 collocate:

(179) What must have surprised him, as it still \textit{surprises us}, was the sheer variety of court life, its different rhythms, its stately ceremonial in buildings still primitive both by Carolingian and later standards, and the unique character bestowed on each court by the personality of its prince. (BRC, EA7 290)

(180) It might \textit{surprise us} to find such superstitious attitudes in modern society (though of course, conservatives set their face to the past). (BRC, CGF 1524)

(181) That such traditions continued in the early 17th century not only in Italy but also in France should hardly \textit{surprise us}, but the possibility that they might have persisted even to the end of the century and beyond may seem sufficiently improbable not to merit further investigation. (BRC, J1A 473)

(182) What did \textit{surprise us} was that the blame was put on our diet and in particular our greasy fish suppers and general lifestyle. (BRC, FBH 195)

These are very similar to the occurrences of \textit{surprised}, with the ‘us’ often including the reader and commenting on research findings (or historical facts). Related to this usage are patterns with mental process verbs:

(183) It would not \textit{surprise} most linguists \textit{to find} them in women’s speech (BRC, CGF 182)

(184) It will probably not \textit{surprise} the reader \textit{to learn} that . . . (BRC, ALP 134)

(185) It might \textit{surprise us} \textit{to find} such superstitious attitudes in modern society (BRC, CGF 1524)

Covert authorial affect relates to the usage in academic discourse of the noun \textit{surprise} (which has \textit{no} as most frequent L1 collocate). Academic texts use the following patterns with \textit{no surprise}:

- \textit{X COME as no surprise}
- \textit{It BE/COME as no surprise that}
- \textit{It COME as/BE no surprise to learn/discover/realize that}
This realizes covert affect, with the implied emoter seemingly either the writer or the writer and the reader (in particular through the phrase *it will be/come as no surprise*):

(186) That a taxonomist from Mars, armed with a DNA hybridisation machine, would classify men, chimpanzees, and gorillas in the same family **comes as no surprise**. (BRC, HWW 1288)

(187) **It comes as no surprise that** Brazil’s rural credit policy actually encourages farmers to follow bad farming practices and there is no countervailing influence to change it. (BRC, APN 569)

(188) Given that Singer and his supporters deliberately cast the manifesto for animal liberation in the image of these two charismatic originals, to benefit from their impetus, *it is no surprise that* complaints about second-class citizenry, or unequal rights justifiably voiced on behalf of blacks and women, surface in the other arena of cats, dogs, apes, and dolphins. (BRC, CM8 807)

(189) **It comes as no surprise to discover** from another source that in 1921 the Kursk gubernia party committee had tried to deal with these problems; ‘the purge of the party was the first basic step towards the strengthening of the personnel of the party and yielded enormous results. (BRC, A64 705)

(190) **It will, however, be no surprise to learn** that the Government is protected against that risk. (BRC, ASB 1225)

(191) **It will come as no surprise to learn**, however, that this experiment has never been conducted. (BRC, B16 1259)

These can variously be paraphrased as ‘it is not surprising that’ or ‘it will not surprise you that’. Again, these are often used to evaluate research results or facts. *BE/COME AS no … surprise that* also occurs, for instance in:

(192) **It therefore comes as no great surprise that** these systems are not easily linked up to talk to one another. (BRC, J0V 1006)

(193) Hence *it should be no surprise that* ordinary policemen and women come to feel that the police management and the government do not care that the risks associated with routine policing in a divided society are borne primarily by them (BRC, A5Y 1775)

(194) **It may come as no surprise that** the Canadian Court turned to an analysis of the game of ice-hockey to address this issue. (BRC, HWW 1450)
Thus, statements are frequently made about facts/research findings as *not* being surprising. It seems as if evaluations of (non-)surprise carry little positive/negative evaluation – instead, the evaluation is in terms of the writer’s or reader’s expectations.

Let’s now move on to the colligation with modality, which becomes apparent by the tendency of five emotion terms to collocate most frequently with *be* at L1: *surprised* (discussed above), *disappointed, impressed, pleased* and *willing*.

Modal verbs that occur with *be disappointed* are: *will* > *may* > *would/must/are going to*. They are used to make predictions or mitigate statements of non-authorial affect:

- [third person] *will be disappointed*
- [third person] *may be disappointed*

(195) The reader may be **disappointed** by the standard of what is written (BRC, A04 933)

(196) Supporters of the Public Service Ideal **will be disappointed** by our finding that television news is biased towards the incumbent government (BRC, A62 1082)

(197) The class between the virtuosi **will** however *not be disappointed* in finding good instruments to fit every taste and every pocket. (BRC, GWM 259)

(198) anyone who expects this book to be a treatise on the history of landscape painting **will be disappointed**; in spite of copious rewriting, lectures these pages remain. (BRC, A04 648)

As already noted above, a common use is to provide evaluations of triggers in terms of the emotional reaction they produce (195, 197, 198).

With *impressed*, the attribution of affect also often seems hedged in some way, though *refusing to* and *it is hard not to be* also occur (pointing to the unwillingness of a potential emoter to be impressed by something):

(199) Those who pursue comparisons of the kind I am referring to are likely to be **impressed** by the staying-power of a literary preoccupation (BRC, A05 945)

(200) Young intellectuals eager for knowledge, progress and a better future, were bound to be **impressed** by new solutions to the problems facing contemporary China. (BRC, CG0 269)

(201) Conversely, we would be **impressed** by another yogi who could alter these processes in his intestines on a word of command (BRC, CM2 881)
Common patterns with *be pleased* are:

- Emoter *must be pleased*
- Emoter *will be pleased*
- Emoter *would be pleased*

(202) Supporters of the Libertarian Ideal *must be pleased* by the degree of public satisfaction with the press despite public perceptions of press bias. (BRC, A62 1071)

(203) Nevertheless, the basic guidelines are sound and pupils with visual handicap *will* for the most part *be pleased* to co-operate in working out their own best visual environment. (BRC, CJG 1076)

(204) Of those interviewed 52 per cent reported that they *would be pleased* to enter a general ward (BRC, ECE 1762)

(205) Any reader worried by the prospect of such formality *will be pleased* to see how [...] the more informal notation to which he is more accustomed is soon restored. (BRC, EV9 1183)

(206) The author *would certainly be pleased* to hear from any such great grandfather! (BRC, EV9 1213)

Finally, of 22 occurrences of *be willing*, emoter (not author) *may be willing to* occurs most frequently (8 occurrences), followed by emoter (not author) *would be willing to* (6 occurrences), and emoter (not author) *might be willing to* (3 occurrences). Here are some examples:

(207) A man *may be willing to* believe another who claims that a particular woman has a liking for sado-masochism or has other sexual preferences. (BRC, GW1 1069)

(208) Such an approach also assumes that management *would be willing to* pay for a large project, accept the risks involved and get little reward in terms of information systems for a number of years. (BRC, HRK 536)

(209) president Kennedy [sic], interviewed by Jean Daniel of L’Exproaves [sic], hinted that the United States *might be willing to* make some concessions. (BRC, G1R 1090)

The remaining instances are mostly co-occurrences with deontic modals (*X must/should/needs to be willing to*).

Summing up, a common function of emotion terms in academic discourse is to evaluate research findings or provide other kinds of
evaluations. Non-authorial affect is commonly hedged, hypothesized or predicted, rather than simply stated, presumably to maintain the ‘objectivity’ of scientific discourse.

4.5 Trigger comparison

Most of the discussion so far has not systematically considered triggers of emotion in the different registers. Although a comprehensive discussion of this is beyond the scope of this chapter, some comments will be made on five emotion terms (enthusiastic, frightened, impressed, pleased and willing) which are strongly associated with directed affect, collocating in at least three registers with about, of, by and to respectively.13

Triggers of enthusiastic are very varied, but predominantly appear to be non-human things. For example, in the BRC people are enthusiastic:

(210) about AIX (its version of Unix) and OSI (N: A8U 172)
(211) about extensification (N: AAG 52)
(212) about the project (N: AHG 1194)
(213) about At Play in the Fields of the Lord (N: AJV 105)
(214) about a new kind of ‘pop’ music (F: CHG 119)
(215) about such lovely slippers (F: CKD 1025)
(216) about successful performances (F: H7H 157)
(217) about her job as interior designer (F: C8T 2382)
(218) about dealing with attempted suicide patients (A: B30 1673)
(219) about pressing ahead with further restructuring of the economy (A: CG0 620)
(220) about the press (A: A62 126)
(221) about the quality of television (A: A62 209)

Similarly, with frightened of (common in conversation, news reportage, and fiction), triggers can be things (for example school, heights, scandal, the law), sentient beings (for example our spaniel, dentists, the press, Charlotte) or activities/behaviour (losing, asking him, telling the truth).

Moving on to triggers with impressed by, triggers in news reportage are often behaviour that is associated with people (though things and people themselves also occur as triggers), for instance:

(222) you winning the order of merit (BRC, A2S 297)
(223) the fertility of his futuristic imagination. (BRC, AHL 101)
(224) the professionalism of the Jockey Club.” (BRC, A2E 431)
her portrayal of a fading actress – even though critics were lukewarm. (BRC, CH2 10857)

the amount of space that the Independent devoted to the exhibition (BRC, AK4 995)

Wallace’s comeback (BRC, CH3 4688)

the local music-types (BRC, AA9 603)

the low rates (BRC, AKD 613)

the launch of the organisation (BRC, AA5 665)

In fiction, typical triggers concern people (the Governor-General, him) and their behaviour or character (his bravery, his skill, his ability, Charlie’s big con trick, what she did, her honesty, his choice of wife), people’s performance or appearance (the striking resemblance between his Uncle Julian and his father, my appearance, the high-powered performance, my singing), things (often associated with people) (the new apartment, the pullover, your sketches, my appearance, the high-powered performance, my singing), and states-of-affairs (how happy they always were together, what he’d heard so far, the turn-out, what he had seen).

Finally, in academic discourse, triggers concern semiotic things (the argument, this fact, that fact, a reply, this passage, the picture, sacred images), – sometimes associated with their producers – people and their behaviour (another yogi, the role of Mrs Thatcher as a dominant figure, politicians’ energy), as well as things and qualities associated with things (the work, the quality of the work, market prices, the first performance of At the Hawk’s Well, new solutions).

In contrast to the three written registers where impressed by dominates, conversation prefers impressed with. Triggers in conversation are most frequently people and associated behaviour:

- it (4)
- her (2)
- the warnings
- her immaculate assets
- Haweswell
- that
- Tammy Girl
- the man and his wife
- the Underground
- him
- Mick
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- the engineering on that
- his ideas
- his how he didn’t disregard one you know

Pleased collocates with to in the three written registers but with with in conversation. In news reportage, the following patterns are common:

- pleased to [semantic preference: ‘gain knowledge’]: know, learn, hear, read, come across, be proved wrong
- pleased to see
- pleased to have

In fiction, common collocations are:

- pleased to find
- pleased to hear it/that
- pleased to meet you
- pleased to say (that)
- pleased to see so/sth

In terms of semantic preference, the following subsets can be found in fiction:

pleased to ['gain knowledge']: find, know, hear, discover, learn, observe, rediscover, read
pleased to ['linguistic'] agree, announce, call, tell, say
pleased to ['move'] abandon the country, be back, be as far away, be back, come, enter
pleased to ['help'] help, serve
pleased to ['meet']: see, meet, attend
pleased to ['get rid of']: getting rid off, get off their hands, have got this off her chest

Finally, in academic discourse the most frequent semantic preference is for ‘gain knowledge’ (find, explore, hear from, see how), though other lexical items also occur (for example tell you that, call, co-operate, help you, enter, print). In other words, the most varied triggers are clearly found in fiction, with the semantic preference for ‘gain knowledge’ cutting across the three registers.

Conversation differs from these three registers in that the emotion is usually directed at entities: in other words, people are pleased with
something, rather than pleased to do something. More specifically, *pleased with* often occurs with anaphoric reference items:

- *it* (11)
- *that* (5)
- *them* (4)
- *you* (3)
- *him* (2)
- *me* (2)
- *this*

Other triggers are things (*the house, her bathroom, t-shirt, my Citroen, my tickets, that clock, that watch, that cupboard, the parcel, the compact disc, my body, something*), people (*myself, herself, Sister*), people’s behaviour/actions (*the amount of work I’d done, what I’m doing, what Gerald’s done, the way the tiling’s been done*), and results (*the results, the result, the result*).

Finally, let’s look at *willing*. In all four registers *to* is the most frequent R1 collocate, with a *to*-infinitive clause realizing the trigger of the emoter’s volition. Some of the triggers can be grouped into different semantic subsets such as ‘correct’, ‘give, help’, ‘try, risk’, ‘linguistic’, ‘cognition/perception’, ‘pay’, ‘responsibility, participation’, ‘give up’, ‘go, move’, and ‘admit, accept, agree’. Others are less easily classifiable. Most of these semantic subsets occur across all four corpora, but some semantic subsets seem more important to one register than to another. For example, ‘go, move’ seems most important in conversation; ‘linguistic’ and ‘give up’ are frequent in news discourse, ‘give, help’ and ‘give up’ are important to fiction, and ‘correct’ only occurs with some frequency in academic discourse (which also likes ‘try, risk’, ‘give, help’, ‘linguistic’, ‘cognition/perception’, ‘pay’ and ‘responsibility/perception’). Some examples from the BRC are:

(231) There’s quite a lot of second hand if he’s willing to travel around for them. (C: KD5 1962) ['go, move']

(232) ... factors that may have influenced the findings, such as the declining proportion of people willing to answer interviewers' questions. (N: AKL 52) ['linguistic']

(233) ... as evidence that the international community is not willing to make the kind of sacrifices needed to confront the social and economic roots of Latin America’s drug problem. (N: A2M 366) ['give up']
(234) Six nappies, even wet ones, did not weigh that much, and there were others who were **willing to help**. (F: A6J 212) ['give, help']

(235) But would Angharad Morgan be **willing to give up** her own independence? (F: CKD 2084) ['give up']

(236) ... this is a widely recognized deficiency which no research funding body seems **willing to rectify**. (A: B1G 1258) ['correct']

These trigger differences are clearly associated with inter-register variation in terms of content: in conversation, people talk about different things than do news writers (who are often concerned with reporting news actors’ utterances) and academic writers (who often discuss matters related to truth). More differences between the corpora in terms of semantic preference relating to triggers can be read from Table A.16 in Appendix A 4.3 online. But there is also significant overlap between all four registers, suggesting a strong semantic preference of **willing to** for certain semantic subsets (often associated with ‘giving something up’, either literally, linguistically or metaphorically).

In terms of triggers, while some differences may exist between registers, most triggers across corpora seem to be either sentient beings, their behaviour, things, states-of-affairs or activities. With respect to mental processes, Halliday & Matthiessen have pointed out that while Sensers [~emoters] are ‘highly constrained’ (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 203), Phenomena [~triggers] are not: ‘That is to say, the set of things that can take on this role in the clause is not only not restricted to any particular semantic or grammatical category, it is actually wider than the set of possible participants in a ‘material’ clause’ (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 203). It should be noted, though, that in some cases specific (semantic subsets of) triggers are associated with particular emotion terms, which means that affect triggers can be partly constrained and do not totally freely combine with emotion terms. This is a statement about typicality, rather than possibility: at least some emotion terms have a certain preference for occurring with specific sets of triggers (for example **pleased to**, **willing to**), which does not necessarily mean that they cannot occur with other triggers.

### 4.6 Summary

As I have shown in this chapter, each register has a certain number of patterns and usages that are particularly important (with some
functions occurring across certain sub-corpora). Let’s sum these up very briefly:

Conversation
- expressing authorial overt affect (often in the present tense): for example, I’m (not) surprised, x surprises me, I hate, I was a bit disappointed
- up-scaling affect (with very): for example, impressed, pleased
- expressing authorial/non-authorial past affect: for example, x was delighted, x was frightened

News
- first person affect (authorial affect that is quoted): for example, I hate, I admire, I was surprised
- third person affect (non-authorial affect, either in indirect speech or as description of news actor): for example, surprise the world/country/nation, he hates, x was delighted, x is anxious, x are frightened
- covert affect (N n pattern): for example, surprise attack, hate trap
- up-scaling affect (with so, very): for example, disappointed, impressed, pleased
- hedging, predicting, hypothesizing affect (colligation with modality): for example, I would (not) be surprised if, x will be disappointed, x would be willing to
- undirected overt affect (A n pattern): for example, delighted Andrew, an anxious day, an enthusiastic American superstar, an enthusiastic response

Fiction
- describing character emotion in narrative and dialogue (in past): for example, x was surprised, delighted, anxious, disappointed, frightened, impressed, pleased, willing
- expressor/action plus affect (prep N pattern): for example, giggled in surprise
- undirected overt affect (A n pattern): for example, anxious faces, willing young secretary

Academic discourse
- overt and covert authorial affect (with ‘plural’ emoter): for example, we should not be surprised, it might surprise us, x COME as no surprise
• hedging, predicting, hypothesizing affect (colligation with modality): for example, x will/may be disappointed, x must/will/would be pleased, x may/would be willing to

These functions are (among others) related to the expression of evaluation and emotional sharing in conversation, the creation of imagery and characterization in fiction, news values in news reportage, and the evaluation of research findings in academic discourse. More specific comments on the use of emotion terms within individual texts will be made in Chapter 6. However, as a basis of this analysis we need to modify the appraisal system slightly, which I will attempt to do in Chapter 5.

Notes

1. This analysis was done manually (but see Table A.17 in Appendix A 4.4 online for the results of an automatic collocation analysis) because this is more accurate (the manual analysis can identify differences between to as a preposition and to as infinitive marker as well as wrong POS tagging), and more comprehensive (it can consider semantic preference), and because I am interested more in the differences between corpora than in statistical significance as such. In the manual analysis of the 15 emotion terms, wrong POS classifications were as far as possible excluded from the analysis. Collocations and colligations were only noted if they occurred with a minimum frequency of three (two if the number of overall occurrences in the given sub-corpus was particularly small). Punctuation was excluded from the analysis of collocation, meaning also that collocations across punctuation (especially sentence punctuation rather than clause punctuation) were disregarded. All collocates were identified at L1 and R1 position; only for the analysis of some patterns could L2, L3 and R2 and R3 be considered. The basis of the analysis was the lemma rather than the word form (that is, I looked for collocates for surprise as a lemma rather than analyzing surprises, surprising, surprised, surprise individually). The maximum number of concordance lines analyzed was 250 – if an emotion term occurred more than 250 times in one of the corpora, 250 concordance lines were randomly selected.

2. The lexico-grammatical patterns of the emotion terms hate (N), admire (V), anxious (A), enthusiastic (A) and affection (N) in conversation will not be discussed in this chapter, because the occurrences are not frequent enough to allow conclusions as to representative tendencies.

3. Statements about things being a surprise (to or for someone) are also common, for example that's a surprise, was it a surprise to him?, it's gonna be a surprise. People also occasionally talk about someone getting a surprise. It follows that we find for as a common collocate at R1, realizing the implied emoter of the covert affect pattern (something is a surprise for someone), for example, it's gonna be a surprise for her.
4. Note that *admire* has two meanings, which both relate to emotion:

‘to respect sb for what they are or for what they have done’
‘to look at sth and think that it is attractive and/or impressive’

5. *Was surprised* frequently occurs in directed affect patterns, with the trigger realized by a prepositional phrase with *at* (2 occurrences) or *by* (2), a *to*-infinitive clause (2), a *that*-clause (2) or a *when*-clause (3). Three occurrences realize undirected affect, with the trigger to be retrieved from the context:

(i) Still, Bruno has charm and stage presence. I *was surprised*, although not as surprised as Mike Tyson when Frank got up and hit him back. (BRC, AAH 24)

(ii) C apps: 1st time The United Arab Emirates qualified against expectations; even their Brazilian coach, Mario Zagalo, *was surprised*. (BRC, A9H 179)

(iii) The cameraman who took the pictures at a French villa near St Tropez told the Mirror: ‘I definitely heard the child call out the word ‘Daddy’ to that bald man. You could quite clearly hear the noise from the pool at times. Eugenie uttered the word while she was playing with Bryan. ‘Of course I *was surprised*. I just wondered what the Queen would say, let alone the duchess’s husband.’ (BRC, CH6 8797–8800)

6. At L1 the most frequent collocate is *not*, negating the experienced surprise. Excluding *it is not surprising* but including *n’t* (rather than just *not*), the (quoted and not-quoted) occurrences are usually with people rather than metonymic emoters:

(iv) And that *didn’t surprise* Graham one bit as he bluntly admitted ... (BRC, CH3 3821)

(v) The reason for their non-availability *will not surprise* anyone who has dealings with an insurance company (BRC, A3J 211)

(vi) Diana’s gesture *did not surprise* her, merely bemused her. (BRC, CH1 9675)

(vii) ‘Although I have not seen the report, it *does not surprise* me that the Rover Group was sold for a song. (BRC, A7W 552)

(viii) ‘... It *would not surprise* us to see something like this over the next few months.” (BRC, A4F 524)

These do not relate to the news value of unexpectedness, but seem to be used either to evaluate things positively/negatively or describe people’s expectations.

7. In general, *anxious* can indicate either worry (that is, anxiety) or volition, with an R1 collocation with *to* indicating ‘volition’ (examples from OALD):

• He seemed anxious about the meeting (‘worry’)
• There were a few anxious moments in the baseball game. (‘worry’)
• He was anxious not to be misunderstood. (‘volition’)
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8. Surprise terms can actually be used as what SFL has called a grammatical metaphor of modality (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 613–17). Simplifying the matter greatly, this refers to mental clauses that realize (for example epistemic) modality. I believe that affective comments such as *I wouldn't be surprised* can similarly be regarded as relating to probability. Compare:

(ix) NINA [1352] I’ll bet they hear of these mini breaks through the wh I can’t remember
[...]
NINA [1354] her name.
[...]
CLARENCE [1359] I don’t know what her name is but ... I know the one you mean.
[1360] The travel agency girl?
NINA [1361] Mm.
CLARENCE [1362] Young woman, yeah.
NINA [1363] *I wouldn't be surprised.*
CLARENCE [1364] Probably.
(BRC, KBP)

Here, Nina’s utterance that she *wouldn’t be surprised* (if it turns out that they heard of the mini breaks through the travel agency girl) seems to be paraphrasable as ‘it is possible/likely that’, and functions like an epistemic modality marker. This also becomes apparent by Clarence’s answer, *probably*, similarly expressing epistemic modality, and mirroring Nina’s modal assessment.

9. Remember that *willing* has two meanings, which both relate to emotion:

(a) [not usually before noun] ‘willing (to do sth) not objecting to doing sth; having no reason for not doing sth’: They keep a list of people (who are) willing to work nights.

(b) [usually before noun] ‘ready or pleased to help and not needing to be persuaded; done or given in an enthusiastic way’: willing helpers/volunteers, willing support, She’s very willing.

(OALD)

A collocation at R1 with to indicates meaning (a).

10. With *hate* the pattern prep N also occurs: of is the most frequent L1 collocate of *hate*, occurring in the patterns full of hate, tide of hate, rictus of hate, that is, in overt (directed or undirected hate):

(x) And you sit there like a dog chained to a stake fixed in the past, mouthin’ your worn-out shibboleths, still full of hate for England and your Church, too arrogant to make your peace with God. (BRC, B1X 1376) [directed]

(xi) The evidence that it was an accident brought about by bullies was overwhelming, especially at a time when 9 out of 10 Britons were engulfed in a tide of hate for Hitler’s British Mosley stooges. (BRC, CHG 309) [directed]
(xii) Zulei hopped backwards, trying to regain her balance, her mouth a rictus of hate. (BRC, FP0 406) [undirected]

In many other cases, hate is used in a variety of patterns to realize undirected affect that is attributed to emoters or the relationship between them, for instance:

(xiii) A strange relationship, it was built on love and hate, uniquely tender on one side, and unspeakably cruel on the other. (BRC, FPK 922)

(xiv) The girls, looking one to the other, darting hate, hardly three foot tall, arose and walked down to the front of the class. (BRC, BNC 386)

(xv) She had begun to need her rage and her hate, even of late her fierce cruel fantasies. (BRC, APM 941)

(xvi) All the hate welled up inside him as he thought of Carrie and Mikey. (BRC, EF1 2234)

(xvii) Ellie saw the mockery in her father’s eyes, as she saw the hate. (BRC, EEW 1149)

(xviii) He was high on the flooding wave from the bursting dam of his dark nature, all the anxiety, guilt, hate and repressions sweeping out in a reckless torrent, no longer containable. (BRC, ADY 1202)

On the one hand, hate thus shows itself in emoters’ eyes; on the other hand, hate is construed as an uncontrollable force: hate welled up inside him, hate sweeping out in a reckless torrent. Other usages include the pattern: expressor with affect (for example his eyes blazing with hate), and more rarely, covert affect (N n pattern: hate mail, N: their common hate was Kenny) and unemoted affect (study of revenge, immortal hate). Adjectives preceding hate (often negative or referring to intensity) are common, too (absolute, common, dedicated, immortal, murdering, murderous, pure, similar, sudden, undiluted) as well as facial expressions (looking, darting, a look of, eyes, face(s), mouth, staring). Since the noun hate is too infrequent in the other corpora, no comparisons can be made.

11. The lexico-grammatical patterns of the emotion terms hate (V), hate (N), delighted and frightened in academic discourse will not be discussed in this chapter, because the occurrences are not frequent enough to allow conclusions regarding representative tendencies.

12. Considering R1 collocation, that and by are equally frequent as triggers (but to also occurs relatively frequently). Again, some refer to researchers’ (non) surprise at research results, but others realize non-authorial affect.

13. With respect to this comparison it must be pointed out that negation was not systematically considered; that is, triggers are listed whether or not the pattern is negated AT trigger or AT trigger. For example, triggers that are listed for impressed, include triggers that occur with not impressed.

14. It does seem as if impressed with might be associated more with people as triggers than impressed by. A search of the whole BNC of the exact phrases impressed with and impressed by (looking at 250 random hits), showed that impressed with occurs 40 times with people and impressed by only 21 times. (names, pronouns, and NPs like the young man but not the students’ enthusiasm
were counted, the latter referring to a quality associated with people rather than people themselves) *Impressed by* is also more frequent overall in the BNC than *impressed with* (757 vs. 383 occurrences).

15. This sub-categorization is subjective to a certain extent, and some of these groups can be seen as a subset of others (for example ‘admit, agree, accept’ and ‘pay’ as subsets of ‘give up’ or ‘admit, agree, accept’ as a subset of ‘linguistic’).
Mapping and Analyzing Affect

After looking at emotion terms and patterns in a large corpus (the BRC), the focus of Chapters 5 and 6 will be on a modification of appraisal theory and its application in a more detailed analysis of a much smaller corpus (a subset of the BRC). The following sections of Chapter 5 provide an overview of previous, related research, the data, and methodology, while Chapter 6 outlines the results of the analysis.

5.1 Appraisal research

There is a large amount of linguistic research on various aspects of the language of conversation, news reportage, fiction and academic discourse, but it is difficult to do justice to all. Instead, I shall comment mainly on appraisal analyses. Because of a somewhat critical attitude towards large-scale corpus analysis (Martin 2004b: 342), most appraisal studies analyze either individual texts or only small-scale corpora (White 1998, Coffin 2006), with many case studies (for example Humphrey 2006). As Kaltenbacher writes, ‘SFL is traditionally qualitative, looking at individual pieces of discourse of relatively small size’ (Kaltenbacher 2007: 90). In this respect, appraisal has been applied to the close analysis of many different kinds of text, such as a national inquiry report (Martin 2004a), a political speech, narrative, exposition, legal act (Martin 2002), stories, songs (Martin 2004c), an Act of parliament, a music review (Martin & Rose 2003), or a movie (Martin 1995, 2000a), to name but a few. Such analyses have emphasized the importance of references to affect in construing personae, negotiating sociality and solidarity (Martin 2004b) and aligning readers/hearers ‘into a community of shared value and belief’ (Martin & White 2005: 95).
Conversation

Although there is some non-SFL research on the use of references to mental (including affective) processes, and stance in conversation (for example Chafe 1982, Shimanoff 1985, Anderson & Leaper 1998, Precht 2000, 2003), there is hardly any research within appraisal on conversation. Exceptions are Eggins & Slade (1997), Martin (2000b), and Adendorff & de Klerk (2005, on Xhosa English), but their data are limited, and contain hardly any affect; further, the focus is on appraisal resources in general.

Rosenberg notes that in emotion research there is ‘too little exemplification of how actual conversations proceed’ (Rosenberg 1990: 170, similar observations are made by Fiehler 2002: 80), and Galasiński points out that there ‘are relatively few studies of discourse strategies employed by people accounting for, explaining, or simply telling stories about their emotions’ (Galasiński 2004: 2–3). Similarly, Anderson & Leaper mention that there has been little research examining speaker’s references to emotion in talk (Anderson & Leaper 1998: 419). Some (non-appraisal, non-SFL) analyses that do investigate emotion references focus on medical topics or types of discourse (for example Wowk 1989, Edwards 1999, contributions to Fussell 2002, Pittam & Gallois 2002) rather than ordinary conversation (on functions of emotion terms in German conversation, see Fiehler 1990:136).

News reportage

A general overview of linguistic research on news discourse is given in Bednarek (2006a); particularly relevant to the analysis of affect in news discourse are Ungerer (1997), and Edwards (1999).

Within appraisal theory, White (for example 1997, 1998, 2004c, 2006) analyzes a number of aspects of appraisal in news reportage, but does not focus in particular on affect. For instance, his research shows that interpersonal meanings occur in the headline/lead (which is often emotionally charged) and in following phases when ‘elements of the Headline/lead nucleus are appraised, typically by some expert external source, in terms of their significance, their emotional impact, or by reference to some system of value judgement’ (White 1997: 115). Bell (1991: 161–74) similarly analyzes textual structure, and notes that evaluation can be involved in the news story’s Commentary part, providing ‘the journalist’s or news actors’ observations on the action’ (Bell 1991: 170). See also Iedema et al. (1994) on the construal of objectivity and subjectivity in media texts, with a focus on judgement, and Körner &

**Fiction**

Though there is much stylistic research on point of view/focalization in literature (which includes affect as one of several resources), such as Simpson (1993), Toolan (2001), and Rimmon-Kenan (2002), appraisal analyses remain case studies. Thus, Martin & White (2005) provide an examination of extracts of Annie Proulx’s *Shipping News*, and Dorothy Sayers’s *Strong Poison*, and Macken-Horarik (2003a) focuses on one written narrative (Judith Stamper, *Click*). Rothery & Stenglin (2000) deal with interpretations of literary texts. On various aspects of emotion references in literature, outside appraisal theory, see van Meel (1994), Dijkstra *et al.* (1995), Watson (1999), and Oatley (1994, 2003).

**Academic discourse**

Outside SFL, there is a large body of research on evaluation (including affect) in written (and more rarely, spoken) academic language, such as Hyland (1999, 2000), Hunston (1994), Bondi & Mauranen (2003), Sandlund (2004) – an overview is given by Hood (2006: 37–8). Within appraisal theory, Coffin (2006; which was not available at the time of writing) provides a study of the language of the Australian secondary school history classroom, with an interest in the language of time, cause and evaluation, and Hood (2005, 2006) analyzes appraisal in research articles.

### 5.2 The corpus

The corpus that was used for the manual text analysis is a subset of the BRC, consisting of 85,121 words (based on a Microsoft Word count; includes the names of speakers in the conversation sub-corpus). In analogy to the ‘BNC baby’ (www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk), I shall refer to this as the ‘BRC baby.’ The BRC baby consists of about 20,000 words from each register:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>News reportage</th>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Academic discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,613</td>
<td>18,164</td>
<td>20,563</td>
<td>23,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the conversation sub-corpus two random samples of 2–3000 words were selected from each of the social categories AB, C1 and C2, and one sample of about 6000 words from DE, the samples consisting of a whole recorded conversation in each case (files KBC, KBD, KE4, KD0, KE2, KD8, KBP). The news reportage sub-corpus contains samples of about 3000 words from the (broadsheet) categories of social news, arts, sports, science, political news and commerce (from files AL5, AJG, A7S, A1N, A1M, A1G, A1E), and includes 30 news articles in total. For the fiction sub-corpus the first 2000 words or so were randomly sampled from ten files: AB9, AC2, BMW, C8T, CB5, CFY, FAJ, GOS, H9C and HR9 (these files are themselves samples from the beginning, middle or end of a novel). Finally, in the academic discourse sub-corpus we find two samples of about 2–3000 words each from files from the categories of natural science, politics/law/education, technical engineering, humanities and social science, and one sample of the same size from medicine (files A6 U, ACJ, ALP, AS6, EA7, EWW, FC1, FEF, FPG, HWV). More detailed information (including titles of books, type of sample, circulation size, level of difficulty, author gender, speaker age and occupation and so on) is listed in online Appendix A.1. Even though the sampling was relatively random, only those samples were chosen which contained the desired number of words (2–3000 words), which made up a relatively unified whole (for example a whole conversation), and which were also contained in the publicly available BNC baby corpus.

5.3 The analysis: theoretical and methodological considerations

In their recent book *The Language of Evaluation*, Martin and White note that the qualitative approach that they have taken up there should be complemented by ‘a quantitative approach, which would focus on fewer variables across a corpus of texts’ (Martin & White 2005: 260). This, they hope would ‘encourage a reconsideration of evaluative meaning’. They also note that ‘our maps of feeling (for affect, judgement and appreciation) have to be treated at this stage as hypotheses about the organisation of the relevant meanings – offered as a challenge to those concerned with developing appropriate reasoning’ (Martin & White 2005: 46). In the following sections I am taking up this challenge, and discuss some aspects of appraisal theory’s maps of feeling with respect to findings from corpus linguistics and cognitive linguistics/psychology.
The aim is to outline the mapping of affect that was applied in the textual analyses presented in Chapter 6.

5.3.1 Portraying vs. creating emotion

Let’s start with a discussion of the difference between what I shall call *portraying* and *creating* emotion. With respect to the analysis of affect in text and discourse, it is worthwhile to distinguish between two research questions:

- How can emoters’ emotions be portrayed (portraying emotion)?
- How do texts create an emotional response (in the reader) (creating emotion)?

The first question relates to how speakers or writers can portray their own (authorial affect) or others’ (non-authorial affect) emotions, with a focus on the different ways of doing so. The second question relates to the creation of an emotional response or atmosphere in the text or reader. This may be connected to the distinction that is made in SFL in the description of visual (but not verbal) interpersonal systems, between affect (character depiction: facial/bodily affect) and ambience (colour options, creating a certain atmosphere or mood, evoking an emotional response in viewers) (Martin, Painter & Unsworth 2006). I want to focus predominantly on the former here (portraying emotion); for research that deals with the latter (creating emotion) see Ungerer (1997), Macken-Horarik (2003a), Robinson (2005) or Humphrey (2006).

As noted in Section 1.4, one of the factors according to which affect is classified in appraisal theory (Martin & White 2005: 47) concerns whether feelings are realized as a surge of emotion involving para- or extralinguistic manifestation or whether they are more mentally experienced as an ongoing emotional state: behavioural surge (*the boy laughed, the captain wept*) vs. mental disposition (*the boy liked the present/felt happy, the captain disliked the present/felt sad*). In an earlier approach to affect, Martin and Rose (2003: 26–7) in fact mention three different ways of relating emotions: (1) writers can either use words that label emotions (*fear*), or (2) use words that denote ‘behaviour that also directly expresses emotion’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 26) (*shrieks*), or (3) describe ‘unusual behaviour which we read as an indirect sign of emotion’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 27) (*be very quiet*). With the last – what
Martin calls ‘behaviour which indexes emotion’ (Martin 2002: 203), the reader needs to invest some cognitive effort in retrieving the emotion:

... from this unusual behaviour we know something is wrong but we can’t be quite so sure about the exact emotion being expressed; we need to use a bit of psychology perhaps. Read in context, however, we do know what Helena’s on about, because these symptoms are surrounded by explicit references to emotions which tell us what the strange behaviour means. (Martin & Rose 2003: 27)

These different ways of portraying emotions can thus be placed on a cline of implicitness, as in Table 5.1. In this table, the broken line between behavioural terms and the description of unusual behaviour signals that the latter is ‘[r]elated to [the former], and sometimes hard to distinguish from it’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 27).

In order to elaborate on this three-fold distinction and to consider in more detail and more systematically how emotional responses can be portrayed linguistically, let’s briefly look to psychology. In Section 1.3 it was noted that emotions are often defined as involving:

- an eliciting condition/antecedent event
- a cognitive evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1 Cline of implicitness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describing emotions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of mental disposition terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of behavioural surge terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of description of unusual (physical) behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• a physiological response
• an action readiness/an action

In this sense, ‘emotions are complex physiological–affective–cognitive responses to the physical and sociocultural environment’ (Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 267). If we assume that non-psychologists’ folk knowledge of emotions also includes these aspects, that is, that people are at least dimly and sub-consciously aware of these factors (as proposed by Kövecses 2000: 130; for a discussion see Radden 1998: 289–92), their knowledge structures or schemas about particular emotions should include some knowledge about:

• the kind of cognitive evaluation associated with an emotion;
• prototypical and potential antecedent events (eliciting conditions) that cause a specific emotion;
• psycho-physiological expressions that are prototypically and potentially caused by a specific emotion;
• expressions of action readiness;
• prototypical and potential subsequent actions that are caused by a specific emotion.

People need and use this knowledge to understand/interpret their own and others’ emotions, to interact adequately with others, and to interpret the representation of emotional experience (for example in art).

Emotion terms can then be regarded as ‘a shorthand, an abbreviated way to refer to the various events and processes which comprise the phenomenon of emotion’ (Ekman 1997: 3). In cognitive linguistic terms, our folk model of emotion is structured in terms of schema knowledge – involving categories, interrelations, default assignments (prototypes), and expectations, and words can ‘trigger’ the ‘activation’ of such a schema (see Bednarek 2005a for an overview of relevant research). These assumptions are confirmed by a large body of research from cognitive linguistics as well as cognitive and cognitive-social psychology, and by other researchers on emotion (for example Shaver et al. 1987, Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989: 92–3, Russell 1991, White 1990, Gottman et al. 1996: 251, Kövecses 2000, Mees 2006: 7, Oatley et al. 2006: 184). For instance, it has been shown that speakers are aware of typical behaviour, situations and cognitive evaluations of the environment that are associated with emotions (Ortony et al. 1988: 3, Wowk 1989, Parkinson & Manstead 1993: 300). (Though it is in fact debatable if this knowledge corresponds to actual emotional experience in real life situations – Parkinson &
Manstead 1993: 
passim, Shaver et al. 1987: 1062.) Many words in English refer explicitly to parts of emotion schemas (antecedent event, evaluative process, physiological state, action, situational circumstances and so on; see Heelas 1986, Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989, Bellelli 1995, Fiehler 2002), triggering inferences about the emotional response involved. It seems as if, in English at least, the ways of referring to emoters’ emotions as set out in Table 5.2 (on page 150) seem possible.4

Whereas mental disposition terms can refer to the whole schema, other ways of portraying emotion make reference only to parts of the schema (part–whole relationship). As Kövecses notes, there are many linguistic expressions in English that describe physiological expressions of emotions, which can be considered as metonymies. This metonymic relation can be postulated as a general principle: THE PHYSIOLOGICAL AND EXPRESSIVE RESPONSES OF AN EMOTION STAND FOR THE EMOTION (Kövecses 2000: 134). We have seen examples of this in Section 4.3 and there is much research reporting on this (for example Enfield & Wierzbicka 2002). On the other hand, behaviour that has to do with emotions (for example hiding, banging things around, slamming doors, kicking things, hugging) – what are sometimes called action cues – has not received much attention in research on emotion (Planalp 1999: 47). These behaviours seem relatively important for emotion talk, however. Bamberg notes that ‘people, when asked to give emotion accounts (of how they or others once felt), construe elaborate circumstances around happenings and events, that is, seek refuge in the “world of actions” ’ (Bamberg 1997b: 25). Finally, causes of affect become apparent only through the context, and are extremely varied, as Planalp suggests for conversation:

It is especially difficult to determine the objects or causes of emotion or feelings in conversations because emotions can be about or caused by practically anything. In conversation, objects of emotion can be verbal (jokes or even the topic of conversation), nonverbal (gestures), people (your partner or yourself), thoughts (daydreams), or even emotions themselves (guilty about enjoying the ethnic joke or anger about your partner’s jealousy). They can be something as microscopic as a compliment, an insult, an interruption, or a touch or, alternatively, something as macroscopic as a stressful interview, an exciting argument, or a lifetime of frustrating interactions. (Planalp 1999: 17)

Generally speaking, causes are often unusual/exceptional events (Fiehler 1990: 233), for example threats of social rejection, loss (for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portraying emotions</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Examples (from Bamberg 1997b, Bednarek 2005b, Martin &amp; White 2005, TV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>referring to emoters’ emotions</td>
<td>the use of mental disposition terms</td>
<td>fear, sadness, love, hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fixed figurative expressions</td>
<td>My heart sank, He had a broken heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referring to emoters’ psycho-physiological expressions of emotion</td>
<td>the use of behavioural surge terms</td>
<td>tremble, cry, his voice broke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referring to emoters’ actions or behaviour (caused by emotion)</td>
<td>describing mental behaviour</td>
<td>more difficult to talk to, more tense, more withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>describing linguistic behaviour</td>
<td>rubbish, abuse, revile, caution, scold, castigate, compliment, complain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speech act terms</td>
<td>fuck, shit, what the hell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional talk devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chapter 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referring to causes of emotions</td>
<td>describing elicitors/antecedent events</td>
<td>my biggest sister got into a car accident so she died; I moved to Worcester and I couldn’t see my neighbors and their dogs; my Mommy hit me she hit me in the eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hypothetical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example of relationships), disapproval, insults, receiving esteem, love and so on (Planalp 1999: 18). Causes (or situations) are often part of comparisons, for instance: *He felt like a man who has just had a tooth drawn which has been hurting him a long time* (from Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*, quoted in Wierzbicka 1999: 12).

These different types of describing affect clearly interact in texts. As an example, let's look at an extract from the news reportage sub-corpus (see also Section 4.2). Literal and figural emotion terms are underlined, references to emoter's behaviour is in **bold face**, and references to causes of emotions are *in italics*:

(1) **THE HATE TRAP**
*Homes can’t be sold*
*Couples can’t split*
*Families live in hell*

THOUSANDS of couples who **hate** each other are trapped together in a living hell *because of the slump.*

The **tormented** partners *have had to put off their divorce actions as they can’t sell their homes.*

*Now they are stuck with each other*, locked in **violence** and **misery** with no end in sight, lawyers revealed yesterday.

**MEN** explode in frustration and **batter their wives**.
**WOMEN** strike back with anything that comes to hand – including **knives** and **rolling pins**.

**SOME** have **nervous breakdowns** and suffer stress and **high blood pressure**.

And **CHILDREN** are **damaged** by the constant **tensions**.

(BRC, CH2 9181–9192, from *The Daily Mirror*)

This extract illustrates well the prosodic nature of affect noted for example by Martin & Rose (2003) and Foley & Hood (2006), and that different types of affect ‘often work together’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 28) to create textual effects. This particular text starts with references to emotions and causes of emotions in the headlines and lead. It continues with this portrayal in its description of past events (*The tormented partners have had to put off their divorce actions as they can’t sell their homes*). As we move on to the present (*Now*) we encounter the first description of behaviour caused by emotion (alongside references to causes and emotions), which is then continued in the following three sentences, with the final sentences referring to consequences of emotions (if we interpret tensions
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as an emotion term). The patterning is as follows \( (E = \text{referring to emotions}, C = \text{referring to causes of emotions}, B = \text{referring to mental or other behaviour caused by emotions}) \):

\[
E \rightarrow C \rightarrow C \rightarrow E \rightarrow E \rightarrow C \rightarrow E \rightarrow C \rightarrow C \rightarrow B \rightarrow E \rightarrow E \rightarrow B \rightarrow B \rightarrow B \rightarrow B \rightarrow E
\]

Different ways of portraying emotions are thus interesting in terms of textual patterning and prosodic structures, and clearly deserve more attention.

However, in the analyses of Chapter 6 the focus was on mental disposition terms (emotion labels) only, disregarding other ways of portraying an emoter's emotion. Shimanoff (1985: 19) reports an inter-rater agreement of only 20 per cent for more indirect references to affect, whereas the inter-rater agreement for emotion labels is 75.8 per cent. The focus on labels thus means a more reliable and more valid analysis of affect, but the disadvantage is that this ‘may not get at the richness of the verbal expression of affect and emotion’ (Anderson & Leaper 1998: 439).

5.3.2 Analyzing emotion terms in discourse

Limiting our attention to emotion labels, the focus now shifts to their analysis. Any such analysis will be subjective to a certain extent on account of the fuzzy nature of emotion lexis (discussed below). However, the text/discourse analyst must take either/or decisions, putting certain emotion terms in certain categories, and deciding what to include and exclude from the analysis. To provide an antidote, this section documents some important methodological decisions. All such decisions were consistent across the data; each file was analyzed twice (with a sufficiently large time interval between the analyses), and checked for accuracy several times. In problematic cases, paraphrasing, translating, and two dictionaries (an English–German dictionary and the OALD) were used, with Martin & White (2005) also being consulted for help with the coding of emotion terms where applicable. On account of the small corpus size (see Section 5.2), the analyses are to be considered illustrative rather than representative.

The data were analyzed and coded with the help of Altova XMLSpy 2007, an XML editor software (www.altova.com). This software allows the user to tag data with a number of attributes, here linguistic variables such as affect trigger, emoter, negation and so on. Image 5.1 shows an example. The software also allows you to automatically transform the results of the analysis into a tabular form, which we will see later. Each
CHAPTER ONE

Tom O'Neill came through the revolving doors on a blast of icy air and stepped out on the other side into a blanket of almost oppressive warmth. Outside London might be shivering in the biting cold of a January morning, here in the foyer of the British and Cosmopolitan Insurance building centrally heated air oozed steadily from a series of concealed vents to waft summer warmth to every corner.

Tom unbuttoned his overcoat, fished in the pocket of the dark suit which he scathingly referred to as his ‘city uniform’ for his identity card and flashed it at the uniformed security man. He did not like wearing suits and he liked a collar and tie even less.

He was far more at home in jeans and a sweater or the favourite scuffed old flying jacket he had inherited from his father, who had been a Spitfire pilot in the war and who wore them whenever he could.

Occasionally his job as a private insurance investigator allowed him this privilege but there were occasions which called for him to dress more formally.

Visiting the Head Office of one of the companies that used his services in response to an urgent summons was one of them.

Without waiting for his nod and wave Tom strode past the security man to the block of six lifts beyond him.

One had just arrived at ground floor level, Tom followed two GU clerks into it and pressed the button for the fifteenth floor.

He felt rather than saw the two girls glance at him appraisingly but took no notice.

At just over an foot, with thick curling brown hair and eyes that owed their staring belligerence to his Irish ancestry, Tom was used to being the object of female appreciation whilst being slightly passed by.

He had never thought of the reflection which looked back at him each morning from the shaving mirror was particularly handsome.

His nose was too large and a little crooked since taking a devastating straight left in the boxing ring when he was fifteen years old, his chin too irregular.

But women certainly seemed to think it and that of course had its compensations.

Tom had not reached the ripe old age of twenty-eight without discovering quite a few of them.

The lift halted at the twelfth floor for the girls to get out, then whirred onwards to the fifteenth.

When the doors opened again Tom emerged into a corridor, thickly carpeted in gauze.

Like the twelfth floor, glimpsed through the left doors when the girls had got out, the walls were covered with a pale lemon wash, unlike the twelfth they were hung with pictures, not Old Masters but not Biot’s the chemists either — prints of hunting scenes and ships and a beautiful soft sunset over a bay that might have been St Ives — pictures deemed suitable for the Executive floor of a great international company.

Tom passed them by without a glance, heading for the door at the very end of the corridor.

He knocked briskly and without waiting for a bidding went in.

The secretary sat behind the desk in the outer office looked up accusingly, then her features softened and a faint pink flush coloured her cheeks.

‘Tom?’

‘Morning, Lucy.

I understand the Great White Chief wants to see me.’

Image 5.1 XML Spy Analysis
emotion term was coded on nine linguistic variables, but only five are relevant for the analyses in this book:

1. emoter
2. trigger
3. affect type
4. covert–overt affect
5. valence

While the analysis of emoter and trigger is relatively straightforward, some more detailed remarks are necessary for affect type, covert vs. overt affect, and valence.

5.3.2.1 Classification of affect

As mentioned in Section 1.4, in current appraisal theory affect is classified according to a number of factors (numbered by me for convenience):

- Factor 1: emotions are grouped into three major sets: in/security (the boy was anxious/confident) – dis/satisfaction (the boy was fed up/absorbed) – un/happiness (the boy was sad/happy).
- Factor 2: the feelings are culturally construed as positive or negative: positive affect (the boy was happy) vs. negative affect (the boy was sad).
- Factor 3: the feelings relate to future states (triggers) or existing ones: realis (the boy liked the present) vs. irrealis (the boy wanted the present). Irrealis affect is categorized as dis/inclination (fear/desire).
- Factor 4: the feelings are graded in terms of a cline of intensity: low (like) – median (love) – high (adore).
- Factor 5: the feelings are construed as directed at/ reacting to some external agency or as a general mood: reaction to other (the boy liked the teacher/the teacher pleased the boy) vs. undirected mood (the boy was happy).

(Martin & White 2005: 46–9).

While most of these factors are relatively self-explanatory, some more detailed comments on factors 1, 3 and 5 are necessary:

Un/happiness feelings are ‘concerned with “affairs of the heart” – sadness, hate, happiness and love’ (Martin & White 2005: 49), and can be sub-divided as indicating happiness or unhappiness. Such feelings can either be directed at a trigger or not (but compare the discussion of undirected affect in Chapter 3); see Table 5.3 (all examples in Tables 5.3–5.6 are from Martin & White 2005).
Table 5.3  Un/happiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unhappiness</th>
<th>happiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>misery ['in me']</td>
<td>antipathy ['directed feeling: 'at you']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down, sad, miserable</td>
<td>dislike, hate, abhor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheerful, buoyant, jubilant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be fond of, love, adore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4  In/security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>insecurity</th>
<th>security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disquiet</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneasy, anxious, freaked out</td>
<td>startled, jolted, staggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>together, confident, assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comfortable with, confident in/about, trusting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5  Dis/satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dissatisfaction</th>
<th>satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ennui</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat, stale, jaded</td>
<td>cross, bored with, angry, sick of, furious, fed up with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involved, absorbed, engrossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfied, impressed, pleased, charmed, chuffed, thrilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In/security feelings relate to ‘emotions concerned with ecosocial well-being – anxiety, fear, confidence and trust’ (Martin & White 2005: 49), with respect to our environment (including people), as visualized in Table 5.4.

Dis/satisfaction feelings, finally, involve ‘emotions concerned with telos (the pursuit of goals) – ennui, displeasure, curiosity, respect’ (Martin & White 2005: 49) (see Table 5.5). They have to do with:

achievement and frustration in relation to the activities in which we are engaged, including our roles as both participants and spectators. These oppositions take us to the borders of affect as it is popularly perceived, as reflected in Star Trek characters like Spock (a human/Vulcan hybrid who suppresses emotion) and Data (an android who feels none) – who occasionally express their fascination with things (Martin & White 2005: 50, original emphasis).

Additionally, let’s look at factor 3 more closely, namely the suggestion that feelings can concern future (irrealis) or existing states (realis). This involves either fear or desire as illustrated in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6 Dis/inclination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dis/inclination</th>
<th>inclination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wary, fearful, terrorized</td>
<td>miss, long for, yearn for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dis/inclination is not listed in the table as part of the classification of kinds of emotion (there are only three major groups of emotion listed: un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction) (Martin & White 2005: 49), but seems to be treated on its own terms. Presumably, this is because it differs from these three sets of emotion in terms of its irrealis trigger and its directedness (Martin & White 2005: 48). An opposition is set up between realis and irrealis (for example Martin & Rose 2003: 60–1), that looks as follows:

Affect

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{realis} &: \quad \text{un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction} \\
\text{irrealis} &: \quad \text{dis/inclination}
\end{align*}
\]

However, dis/inclination is also listed alongside un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction when talking about ‘kinds of unhappiness’ (Martin & White 2005: 51), and in example analyses desire is placed in the same column as cheer, misery, disquiet and so on (Martin & White
2005: 80–1), so that it seems reasonable to talk about dis/inclination as a fourth category or sub-type of affect.

As becomes apparent, all four categories of affect (un/happiness, dis/satisfaction, in/security, dis/inclination) involve both ‘positive’ (happiness, satisfaction, security, desire) and ‘negative’ (unhappiness, dissatisfaction, insecurity, fear) emotions (factor 2). In contrast, Galasiński argues that it is problematic to:

assign universal value to emotions and label them as positive or negative. Such an evaluation must be context-bound. I can imagine contexts (for example, those of abuse) in which the supposedly negative anger will be positive, as well as ones in which the supposedly positive love will, in fact, be negative (Galasiński 2004: 46).

However, the difference between positive and negative emotions is discerned by many researchers of emotion (cf. Jahr 2000: 7, Downes 2000: 104, Turner & Stets 2005), and examples such as that given by Galasiński can be disregarded in a more general framework: ‘We are not concerned here with the value that a particular psychological framework might place on one or another emotion (cf. “It’s probably productive that you’re feeling sad because it’s a sign that …”)’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 59). In this book (for example Chapter 2), I have repeatedly used this ‘positive–negative’ classification of emotion terms (which we might label *valence* as is frequently done in emotion research), while also noting that a number of emotion terms do not easily fit into this classification (consequently labelled ‘ambiguous/neutral’; see discussion below).

![Figure 5.1](image_url)

**Figure 5.1** Affect and evaluation

Finally, concerning factor 5 (directed vs. undirected affect), let us assume that this distinction is theoretically valid, even though it is questionable how many references to affect really are undirected (Section 3.3.3). With directed affect we can then distinguish at least two elements (Figure 5.1, above):

- the attribution of some emotion to an emoter through the usage of an overt or covert emotion term;
• the evaluation of some entity (the trigger) on the part of the emoter in terms of this emotion (by construing the emoter's reaction with respect to this entity).

Importantly, the emoter can either be the self (authorial directed affect) or the other (non-authorial directed affect) (Section 1.4). With authorial affect, the self attributes an emotion to him/herself, and simultaneously provides an evaluation of some trigger, whereas with non-authorial affect both an emotion and an evaluation of some trigger are attributed to an other (Figures 5.2 and 5.3).

**Figure 5.2** Authorial affect and evaluation

- **I [emoter]**
  - **admire** [emotion]
  - **linguists** [trigger]

  
  Attribution of emotion to emoter

  Evaluation of trigger

**Figure 5.3** Non-authorial affect and evaluation

- **He [emoter]**
  - **admires** [emotion]
  - **linguists** [trigger]

  
  Attribution of emotion

  Attribution of Evaluation

If we only consider the speaker of such utterances, the speaker of the utterance *I admire linguists* clearly expresses a positive evaluation of the trigger (*linguists*). This evaluative meaning depends on the cognitive evaluation associated with the relevant emotion schema (*admire*), and is therefore readily understood by hearers. People know that the emotion of ‘admiration’ involves a positive cognitive evaluation on the part of the emoter, and assume that this is implied when someone says *I admire linguists*.

On the other hand, the speaker of the utterance *He admires linguists* only attributes a positive evaluation of the trigger (*linguists*) to an emoter, but does not say whether s/he shares it. At the same time, non-authorial affect can imply a certain kind of evaluation on the part of the speaker. This may depend on the speaker’s attitude towards the trigger: if the speaker dislikes linguists, saying that *John admires linguists* may imply
negative evaluation of John, but if s/he likes linguists, the same utterance may imply positive evaluation of John. Furthermore, feeling rules (Section 1.3), which tell us whether emotions are appropriate or inappropriate (Fiehler 1990: 85) may influence the evaluative meaning of non-authorial affect. For example, a mother who hates her children implies negative evaluation of the mother since the utterance refers to a socially unacceptable emotion (see also discussions in Bedford 1956/57: 294, White 1998: 105, Bamberg 1997b, Planalp 1999: 170–9, White 2004c: 240, Bednarek 2006a: 54–6). In other words, the evaluative meaning of non-authorial affect can depend on the reader/hearer’s attitude towards the trigger or on social rules and expectations concerning emotional experience. These social expectations are extremely powerful. As the American writer Lionel Shriver, whom I have already quoted in Chapter 1, puts it:

[… we are all profoundly normative. We have explicit expectations of ourselves in specific situations – beyond expectations; they are requirements. Some of these are small: If we are given a surprise party, we will be delighted. Others are sizable: If a parent dies, we will be grief-stricken. But perhaps in tandem with these expectations is the private fear that we will fail convention in the crunch. That we will receive the fateful phone call and our mother is dead and we feel nothing. I wonder if this quiet, unutterable little fear is even keener than the fear of the bad news itself: that we will discover ourselves to be monstrous.

(Shriver 2006: 92)

The difference in the evaluative meaning of authorial and non-authorial affect can have results on linguistic construals of affect. Thus, Bamberg shows that there are differences in how emotions are referred to in first person accounts versus third person accounts of ‘anger’ in terms of agentivity, individualization, probability and intention, to shift blame and save face (Bamberg 1997b: 8–9). Precht’s large-scale corpus analyses suggest that there is ‘a slight tendency for an expression about one’s self to be more positive […], and comments about others not physically present to be negative’ (Precht 2000: 129). And Shaver et al. (1087: 1080–1) note differences in the construal of subjects’ self-reports of emotional experience and reports of typical emotional experience. Non-authorial affect is particularly important in conflict situations, prevention, and the regulation of disappointment (Fiehler 1990: 132, who calls this projektive Erlebensthematisierung – ‘a thematization of projected experience’). It may well be important for text analyses to be aware of these
distinctions. Occasionally, analysts might want to limit their analysis to authorial or non-authorial affect, respectively. In the analyses of Chapter 6 both are examined, since the focus of this book is on emotion talk as such. However, rather than using the current mapping of affect as just introduced, a modified version will be used which is outlined below.

5.3.2.2 Modification of affect types

While I do not want to attempt a completely new classification of emotion lexis, nor establish what Martin & White (2005: 51) call a semantic topology for this region of meaning, I want to suggest a modification of the present description of affect types, relating to the categories of in/security and dis/inclination.

**In/security.** If we consider un/happiness and dis/satisfaction, it becomes apparent that the positive sub-categories correspond exactly to, or ‘mirror’ the negative sub-categories (Table 5.7); but with in/security, this is much less the case (Table 5.8). This concerns in particular the opposition of trust and surprise. I therefore suggest setting up the system of in/security in analogy to the other systems, with the positive and negative categories ‘mirroring’ each other (Table 5.9).

### Table 5.7 Sub-categories of un/happiness and dis/satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>happiness</th>
<th>unhappiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cheer</td>
<td>misery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affection</td>
<td>antipathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.8 Sub-categories of in/security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>security</th>
<th>insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>confidence</td>
<td>disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.9 Modified in/security system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>security</th>
<th>insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>distrust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared to the old system, confidence becomes subsumed under the more general (technical) term of quiet, having to do with emotional calm, as it were, as realized for example by lexical items such as comforted, reassured, confident, solace. Trust is now opposed to its opposite emotional response, distrust, rather than surprise, which falls out of the system. In other words, the proposal is that in/security feelings relate to disquiet (for example uneasy, anxious, afraid, fear) or quiet (for example reassured, comforted, at ease, blithely) as well as distrust (for example reserve, emotional withdrawing, suspicious) or trust (for example confide, trust, believe in) but do not include surprise. In fact, I propose to set up surprise as a separate type of affect, and to treat it on its own terms, with affect at this stage relating to four sets of affect or four different affect types (Figure 5.4).

![Figure 5.4 Four sets of affect type](image_url)

Apart from this new classification resulting in a more ‘logical’ structural organization of the in/security sub-category, it is based on the belief that surprise is not culturally construed as negative – which would be the implication if surprise were included as the ‘negative’ part of in/security. The problematic status of surprise in terms of appraisal theory also becomes apparent in that it is excluded in earlier frameworks, for example Martin (1997: 22). It has also been noted by some researchers that emotion terms labelling the emotion of surprise (for example astonished, startled, surprised) seem to be relatively neutral rather than clearly positive or negative (for example Nöth 1992: 73, Robinson 2005: 64). Supporting evidence for this belief comes from corpus data, which will now be discussed in more detail.

Firstly, I have investigated what kinds of bodily symptoms and behaviour are associated with a number of emotion terms in the fiction sub-corpus of the BRC (because this is where such associations are most frequent; see Section 4.3). Instances that were counted as examples for such associations include (see Sections 3.3.2 and 4.3):

(2) gave a delighted laugh…(BRC, B1X 276)
(3) He smiled, pleased with…(BRC, GUG 341)
(4) a smile of affection (BRC, CEC 624)
(5) He shook his head, bitterly disappointed (BRC, GUG 1725)
(6) he rubbed his fingers through his hair and she could tell he was anxious (BRC, CKD 600)
(7) the whites [of her eyes] showing like a frightened horse (BRC, BMR 822)
(8) the dark eyes, smouldering with hate (BRC, CEC 2498)
(9) Cleo’s jaw dropped open in surprise (BRC, GW2 3033)
(10) he sat frozen in his seat by surprise (BRC, AB9 2196)

Appendix A 4.2 online lists the associated bodily behaviour in detail, but here is a summary of the most important tendencies:

- **Delighted** (A) is associated with kissing and hugging, squeals and whoops, and, most importantly, with laughter and smiles.
- **Pleased** (A) is associated predominantly with smiling and grinning.
- **Affection** (N): is associated with eye contact, smiles, kissing and hugging.
- **Disappointed** (A) is associated with biting one’s lips, sighing, shaking one’s head, and a ‘turning away’ movement (*turn away, jump to her feet, turn*) or a ‘downwards’ movement (*sink back, sat on*).
- **Anxious** (A) is associated with red-eyes, a white face, clenched hands, shivering and rubbing one’s fingers through one’s hair.
- **Frightened** (A) is associated with wide eyes, crying, shouts and screams, a pale face and several types of body movement: fleeing, freezing, and clinging/squeezing as well as a high pulse.
- **Hate** (V) is associated with dark, blazing or smouldering eyes, staring, and a twisted mouth and face.
- **Surprise** (N, V) and **surprised** (A) are associated with wide eyes, and staring and looking, blinking/flickering eyes, smiling and laughing, screams, shouts, grunts, squeaks and gasps, speechlessness, raised eyebrows, an open mouth, shaking one’s head, sudden body movements or freezing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared with ‘positive’ emotions</th>
<th>Shared with ‘negative’ emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>squeals → delight</td>
<td>screams, shouts → fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laughter, smiles → delight, pleasure, affection</td>
<td>wide eyes → fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freezing → fear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results show that in fiction the emotion of surprise is associated with characters’ behavioural surges that are also related to both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotions (Table 5.10). In other words, surprise is associated both with behaviour normally related to ‘negative’ emotions (wide eyes, screaming, shouting, freezing) and with behaviour normally related to ‘positive’ emotions (laughter, smiles, squeals).

Secondly, we can look at emotions that are conjoined with surprised (A), surprise (V), and surprise (N) with the help of the conjunction and, and compare this with emotions that are conjoined with other emotion terms. Tables A.18-A.20 in Appendix A 5.1 online show the findings for all emotion term occurrences, looking at the structures emotion term and as well as and emotion term. The function of such doublets is rhetorical – similar to ‘triplets such as appalled, perplexed and repulsed’ (Martin 2004b: 342), indicating intensification (graduation). They also allow us to construe events from different emotional perspectives (Bamberg 1997b: 11).

Summing up the results, there is a tendency for ‘positive’ emotion terms (delighted, enthusiastic, impressed, pleased, affection, admire) to be conjoined with other ‘positive’ emotion terms, for example relieved, pleased, encouraged, optimistic, grateful, kindness, love, trust. Vice versa, ‘negative’ emotion terms (anxious, disappointed, frightened, hate (N), hate (V)) are typically (but not exclusively) conjoined with ‘negative’ emotion terms such as tense, unhappy, fearful, miserable, frightened, ashamed, worried, cross, confused, despise, fear, anger.

Surprise, on the other hand is conjoined much more equally with both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ emotion terms (though ‘negative’ ones seem a bit more frequent), for example:

- relief and surprise
- embarrassment and surprise
- fear and surprise
- shock and surprise
- surprise and admiration
- surprise and pleasure
- surprise and delight
- pleased and surprised
- happy and surprised
- sad and surprised
- shocked and surprised
- touched and surprised
- surprised and interested
- surprised and relieved
surprised and flattered
surprised and irritated

This seems to support the assumption that surprise is not clearly construed culturally as a negative (or positive) emotion.

This is also borne out by some additional corpus findings. For instance, *to surprise* often co-occurs with expressions of volition (for example *hoping to*, *wanted to*, *urge to*, *it would be nice to*) in fiction, which clearly conceptualize this meaning of surprise as a positive emotion:

(11) I was hoping to surprise you – a sort of unexpected wedding present, but it was no good. (BRC, FPM 2334)
(12) “Well, I have three children of my own now and I thought it would be nice to surprise them with the sugar mice on the tree, and also the chocolate cat.” (BRC, AT7 409)

And as premodifying noun, *surprise* can occur with ‘negative’, *(surprise attack)* ‘neutral’ *(surprise move, surprise step, surprise decision)* and ‘positive’ *(surprise party, surprise gift)* lexis.8

This does not mean that surprise cannot be construed by a speaker/writer in a given context as a positive or negative emotion. For instance, we can use a lexical item such as *shock* which seems to inscribe (Martin & White 2005: 61) mostly negative (rather than neutral or positive) surprise:

**Inscribed construal:** *I was shocked* [negative surprise].

On the other hand, the positivity or negativity of an emotion such as surprise can be contextually implied with the help of other evaluations preceding or following the emotion term:

**Contextually implied construal:**

**Propective/cataphoric:**
What a lovely [positive appreciation] surprise [positive surprise]

**Retrospective/anaphoric:**
*I was surprised* [positive surprise] and delighted [happiness].

In the case of prospective construal, the positive appreciation (Section 1.4) conveyed via *lovely* turns the surprise cataphorically, as it were, into positive surprise. In the case of retrospective construal, the conjoined positive emotion term *delighted* anaphorically turns the surprise into
positive surprise. In other cases, however, the construal of the surprise may remain unclear, ambiguous or rather neutral.\(^9\)

Summing up the discussion so far, it appears that while a large number of emotions are culturally construed as positive or negative, some emotions (such as surprise) have a more ambiguous status (but may, though they need not, be construed in a given context as a positive or negative emotion). Other candidates for such an ambiguous status are desire or non-desire (see discussion below) – compare also Section 2.4 and Appendix A 2.4 online for further examples.\(^10\)

**Dis/inclination.** The second modification of appraisal theory’s affect types concerns dis/inclination which I include as indicating a certain kind of emotion in the same way as un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction. However, if we compare in/security and dis/inclination there seems to be some possibility for overlap between disinclination: fear and insecurity: disquiet, with both relating to emotions of anxiety or fear (Table 5.11). I thus propose to re-define dis/inclination as suggested in Table 5.12. Dis/inclination is here re-construed not in terms of a positive (desire) or negative (fear) emotion, but rather with respect to polarity, referring to desire (volition) and non-desire (non-volition).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inclination</th>
<th>disinclination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss, long for, yearn for</td>
<td>wary, fearful, terrorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td>insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solace, comfort</td>
<td>uneasy, anxious, freaked out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dis/inclination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss, long for, yearn for, want</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be emphasized that non-desire relates to lexicalized (for example *refuse*) and morphological (for example *disinclined*) negation.
only. This allows us to keep up the distinction that is made in appraisal theory between negative emotions and negated positive emotions:

We also find it useful to distinguish negative feelings from positive feelings that are grammatically negated, thus drawing a distinction between sad and not happy; by notating grammatical negation as ‘neg’, we can code not happy as ‘neg + happy’, opposed to sad as ‘−hap’. Morphological negation (eg unhappy, insecure) on the other hand is not arguable, since it is realised lexically …; so we will code it as negative rather than negated attitude (ie -hap for unhappy, neg + hap for not happy)

(Martin & White 2005: 73).

This permits us to code miss, willing as ‘inclination’, and not miss, not willing as ‘neg + inclination’, in contrast to refuse, which is coded as ‘disinclination’, and not refuse, which is coded as ‘neg + disinclination’. This does not mean, however, that inclination is considered positive and disinclination negative, since the organization of the relevant meanings is made in terms of polarity. This classification of dis/inclination in terms of polarity rather than positive/negative cultural construal takes into account the fact that neither desire nor non-desire seem to be unequivocally construed culturally as positive or negative. And the evaluation implied by desire and non-desire terms may also depend on the context: if I desire something that you do not think I deserve, or if I desire something that you think is bad (for example to steal, to lie, to cheat), your evaluation of me is presumably negative. But if I desire something that you think I deserve, or that you evaluate positively, your evaluation of me might be more positive. An example for negative desire is also represented by envy, a term for a specific type of desire which is culturally construed as negative.

The new set-up of dis/inclination avoids a double classification of emotion terms such as fear and anxiety, and takes into account the ambiguous status of desire in terms of cultural construal. It also takes into consideration the fact that irrealis cuts across all emotions, and can be realized differently, either grammatically (Martin & White 2005: 48) or lexically (desire, want, fear, afraid of); see Table 5.13. In other words, all emotions can relate to an irrealis trigger (for example I’d be happy if…) and dis/inclination is not the only type of affect that can be irrealis, though desire and fear terms usually lexicalize irrealis (desire, want, fear, afraid of). However, dis/inclination does seem different from the other types of affect in not allowing a realis trigger (Table 5.14).
We can set this up as an if-then relation (if dis/inclination then irrealis trigger), shown in Figure 5.5.

### Table 5.13  Affect types and irrealis trigger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trigger</th>
<th>surprise</th>
<th>dis/inclination</th>
<th>un/happiness</th>
<th>dis/satisfaction</th>
<th>in/security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td>I'd be pleasantly surprised if...</td>
<td>I don't want him to do this...</td>
<td>your parents would be delighted if...</td>
<td>I'd be furious if...</td>
<td>I fear that he might die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'd like to...</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'd hate it if...</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm afraid of her leaving me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trigger</th>
<th>surprise</th>
<th>dis/inclination</th>
<th>un/happiness</th>
<th>dis/satisfaction</th>
<th>in/security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>realis</td>
<td>I’m surprised that</td>
<td>I’m delighted to meet you...</td>
<td>I’m bored with this...</td>
<td>This frightens me. I’m scared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.14  Affect types and realis trigger

### Figure 5.5  Affect type and (ir)realis trigger

A fuzzy system of modified affect. To recapitulate, I propose that we classify emotion terms according to five rather than three categories, and re-construe the systems of in/security and dis/satisfaction accordingly (Figure 5.6). In this Figure the broken line signals that this system is set up as a fuzzy system, with no clear boundaries between the affect types, and possible blends (such as jealousy as disquiet (in/security) and affection (un/happiness). It is also assumed (in line with much psychological research into emotion terms, for example Shaver et al. 1987,
Russell 1991) that linguistic affect is organized as a prototype category, with core, better and worse members, and family resemblances (Wittgenstein) between the category members. Un/happiness is core – ‘probably the first to come to mind when we think about emotions’ (Martin & White 2005: 49) – whereas surprise and dis/inclination as well as parts of dis/satisfaction (see above) are non-core members. On the one hand, this reflects psychologists’ debates about whether both interest (dis/satisfaction category) and surprise are cognitive rather than emotional states (on interest, see Ekman 1999a: 8, Milton 2005: 33); on the other hand, I assume that interest terms (for example involved, absorbed, engrossed) as well as surprise terms are considered as marginal rather than prototypical examples of emotion terms by speakers. And dis/inclination arguably refers to volition rather than emotion (volition and emotion are often differentiated, for example by Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 208) and it has no realis trigger. Both surprise and dis/inclination are also culturally not construed as positive/negative. Dis/inclination has only two sub-types, and surprise has only one, because there is no corresponding lexicalized emotion of ‘no surprise’ (even though we
can refer to this with the help of negation). We can visualize this as Figure 5.7, which captures this fact better than a system network, showing that un/happiness includes the most ‘core’ emotions (followed by in/security) and that surprise, dis/inclination and dis/satisfaction include more ‘marginal emotions’. This new classification is not neatly organized, and incorporates fuzziness and gaps, but arguably this is offset by the fact that it allows us to classify instances of emotion terms more realistically. It de-prioritises elegance in order to account for authentic linguistic data – in line with many current models of language, including but not limited to SFL (Gonzálvez-García & Butler 2006). Summing up, Table 5.15 compares the old and new categorization of affect types in detail.

Table 5.15  Comparison of affect types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>un/happiness</strong></td>
<td><strong>un/happiness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappiness</td>
<td>unhappiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misery</td>
<td>misery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antipathy</td>
<td>antipathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheer</td>
<td>cheer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affection</td>
<td>affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in/security</strong></td>
<td><strong>in/security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecurity</td>
<td>insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disquiet</td>
<td>disquiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence</td>
<td>confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dis/satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>dis/satisfaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction</td>
<td>dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ennui</td>
<td>ennui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displeasure</td>
<td>displeasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td>interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dis/inclination</strong></td>
<td><strong>dis/inclination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disinclination</td>
<td>disinclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclination</td>
<td>inclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-desire</td>
<td>non-desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>surprise</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affect types and basic emotions. A brief note on the relation between this proposed re-classification of emotion terms, and suggestions to classify emotions: even though there is no reason to suspect that there is a one-to-one relation between a classification of emotion terms, and a classification of emotions (and neither should be used to classify the other), it might be interesting to take a look at the kinds of emotions that are mentioned in psychological research.

Some researchers in fact treat all emotions as basically the same, with differences only in intensity and pleasantness (Ekman 1999a: 1),
while others differentiate between a number of ‘basic’ (Ekman 1992) emotions. Generally speaking, there is no agreement in emotion research on how many emotions there are, how many are basic, how they are to be distinguished, or which causes and consequences they have (Jahr 2000: 24). But Ekman (1992: 170) points out that there is quite a lot of overlap concerning basic emotions (for a helpful overview see also Turner & Stets 2005: 13–15). And Jahr notes that most researchers seem to recognize fear, happiness, sadness, anger, disgust, and contempt with some also including interest, guilt and surprise (Jahr 2000: 23–4). For example, Johnson-Laird & Oatley (1989) mention happiness, sadness, anger, fear and disgust, and Ekman’s (1999a) list includes as possible basic emotions amusement, anger, contempt, contentment, disgust, embarrassment, excitement, fear, guilt, pride in achievement, relief, sadness, satisfaction, (sensory) pleasure, and shame. Adding interest, surprise, desire, love and sympathy which have also been listed by some researchers (for example Ekman 1992, Anderson & Leaper 1998: 426, Kövesces 2000: 4, Oatley et al. 2006: 93, Milton 2005: 33), the emotion terms referring to these emotional responses can certainly all be classified with the help of the modified affect framework, as visualized in Table 5.16. (In this table, bold face + underlining signals that these are recognized by all, bold face alone signals that these are recognized by many – according to Turner & Stets (2005: 13).

It is interesting that no basic emotion terms can be found in the security sub-category. Presumably, the emotional states that are referred to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>un/happiness</th>
<th>happiness</th>
<th>unhappiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>happiness, pride, contentment, relief (cheer)</td>
<td>sadness, guilt, shame (misery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>love, sympathy (affection)</td>
<td>contempt (antipathy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>embarrassment, fear (disquiet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interest, excitement (interest)</td>
<td>anger, disgust (displeasure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pleasure, satisfaction, amusement (pleasure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
<td>desire</td>
<td>non-desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with security terms (confident, together, assured, trusting, comfortable with) are not considered as emotions by psychologists – perhaps indicating another borderline area of affect. But it is promising that basic emotions can be found in each of the five types of affect suggested here: un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction, dis/inclination and surprise.

A brief summary. Before making some more detailed remarks on methodology, let me briefly summarize what I have said above: I have proposed a fuzzy system of affect, with five major sets of emotions, distinguished in their more ‘core’ or less ‘core’ membership: un/happiness, in/security, dis/satisfaction, dis/inclination and surprise. I have also suggested that emotions and terms referring to them can be classified as positive, negative or neutral (compare also Storm & Storm 1987: 810, Nöth 1992: 82, Schrauf & Sanchez 2004: 273), and that dis/inclination and surprise are not culturally construed as positive or negative. Further, I have also talked above about different ways of portraying emotion.

Let’s modify our definition of affect accordingly (in analogy to Martin & White 2005: 42). Affect is concerned with registering feelings: do we desire something or not, do we feel happy or sad, confident or anxious, interested or bored, surprised or unsurprised? These feelings are usually construed as positive (happy) or negative (sad) in Western culture. Some emotions, however, seem relatively ‘neutral’ in terms of this cultural evaluation, for instance surprise and desire. The portrayal of emotion (affect) can be more or less indirect: we can label emotions directly, refer to para-/extralinguistic symptoms of emotions, eliciting conditions, caused behaviour, and so on, because emotion terms evoke complex knowledge structures (schemas) that speakers associate with particular emotions.

Table 5.17 sums up the modifications of the affect system established so far. More research is needed on the relation between, and the interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valence</th>
<th>Description of emotional response</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Emotion type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>emoters’ emotions</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>in/security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emoters’ psycho-physiological expressions of emotion</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>emoters’ emotional language</td>
<td></td>
<td>un/happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emoters’ actions or behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>causes of emoters’ emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotion Talk Across Corpora

of, these factors. For instance, the question of whether the trigger is realis or irrealis is only relevant if a trigger is present in the first place, and dis/inclination is one type of emotion which allows only an irrealis trigger. There is, then, a definite interaction between affect type, direction and trigger, as shown in Figure 5.8. Figure 5.8 shows that dis/inclination needs a trigger (Martin & White 2005: 48), and that this trigger is always irrealis (I-T), and also describes the fact that realis/irrealis depends on the presence of a trigger.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 5.8 Interaction between affect type, direction and trigger

5.3.2.3 Analysis of affect types

The classificatory grid that was used to categorize affect types in the BRC baby (Chapter 6) is the modified system of five affect types that was just introduced. In order to simplify the analysis, no double codings (for emotion blends, see above, and Shaver et al. 1987: 1082) were undertaken; in each problematic case, one emotion only was given preference. Table 5.18 lists the relevant affect categories on the left, with their definitions (that is, typical emotions in a particular category), and the emotion terms analyzed as belonging to a certain affect category to the right. This is a complete list of all (covert and overt) emotion terms analyzed in the BRC baby.13
Table 5.18  Emotion terms analyzed in the BRC baby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Typical emotions</th>
<th>Emotion terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dis/inclination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>‘wishes, willingness, volition’</td>
<td>appetite for, aspire to, care to, coveted, deliberate, deliberately, desirable, the desire (to), desire (V), desired, desperate for, eager to, eagerly, enviable, envious, fancy, happy (for) to, hopeful, hopefully, hope that (V), the hope (that), jealousy, long to, had a mind to, miss, nostalgic, nostalgic affection, prefer (to), readily, seductive, felt tempted to, tempt, wanna/want, will/would (V), the will to do sh, willing to, willingly, wish (N), wish (V), would/’d like, ’d rather, yearning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-desire</td>
<td>‘reluctance, unwillingness, non-volition’</td>
<td>disinclined, involuntary, refuse to (not refuse an offer), refusal to, reluctant, reluctantly, reluctance to, unwilling to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in/security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: trust</td>
<td>‘trust in someone or in a future happening’</td>
<td>confident about, optimism that, optimistic, trusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecurity: distrust</td>
<td>‘distrust, reserve, suspicion’</td>
<td>doubtfully, emotional withdrawing, reserve, suspicious of, suspicion about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: quiet</td>
<td>‘assurance, confidence, ease, safety, relaxation’</td>
<td>assured, blithely, confident, confidence, comfortable with, comforting, the ease, at ease with, reassuring, reassurance, relax, feel safe, solace, unashamed, untroubled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Typical emotions</th>
<th>Emotion terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insecurity: disquiet</td>
<td>‘fear, worry, anxiety, puzzlement, confusion, embarrassment’</td>
<td>afraid of, agitation, alarm, anxiety, anxious, anxiously, concerned (that), concern (N), confusing, daunting, dauntingly, feels destabilised, disconcerting, distress, embarrass, fear (V), fear of/that, fretful, frighten (V), frightened, frightening, horror, intimidated by, intimidating, intimidation, overawed, puzzled, puzzling, perplexing, rattled, self-conscious, self-consciously, scared of, terrified, troubled by, unnerve, unsettled, upset, worried, worrying, worry about (V), worries about (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: interest</td>
<td>‘interest in, fascination with, excitement, entertainment’</td>
<td>arresting, went berserk, care about (V), carried away, curious, drawn to, engaging, entertaining, as entertainers, enthusiasm for, exhilarating, excited, excitedly, exciting, fanatical about, fascinated, fascination with, frenzy, interest (V), interested in, interesting, interestingly, interest (N), magnetised by, spellbound, stirring, thrilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction: ennu</td>
<td>‘boredom’</td>
<td>boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: pleasure</td>
<td>‘admiration, appeal, contentment, gratitude, being impressed, pleasure, pride’</td>
<td>admire, admirable, admiring, the appeal of, appealing, appreciate, appreciative, appreciation, content with, (feelings of) contentment, enjoy, entrance, gratitude, impressed, pleased, please, pleasing, proudly, proud, satisfaction, satisfying, satisfied with, thankful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>‘anger, frustration, dissatisfaction’</td>
<td>anger, anger (V), angry, annoyed at, bother (V), bothered, discontent, fed up with, frustration, furious, grudge against, impatience at, irate, irritated, irritably, maddeningly, mind (V), outrage, resignedly, spite (V), held on to his temper, unsatisfactory, vexing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3.3 Covert vs. overt affect

The distinction that was made in Section 3.3.4 between overt and covert affect was also applied to the manual text analysis. In addition to the patterns noted in Section 3.3.4 with count usages of certain emotion nouns (for example It BE a surprise/disappointment that, What a surprise/disappointment, the surprise/disappointment/appeal of), and certain emotion nouns used as pre-modifier (for example surprise decision, hate figure), further noun usages as well as certain adjectives and adverbs are included as covert affect, whenever they do not label an emoter's emotional response as such but rather refer to events, things, situations and so on that (have the power to) trigger an emotional response. This concerns the use of adjectives such as amazing, disappointing, adverbs such as amazingly, disappointingly (as stance adverbal/modal comment adjunct rather than circumstance adverbial/circumstance of quality), and nouns such as appeal, concern, disappointment, frenzy in certain patterns (the frenzy of, be of concern and so on). Thus:

covest affect: It was amazing; happily, he missed; he was a disappointment

overt affect: I was amazed; he smiled happily; to our great
disappointment...

Table 5.19 lists emotion terms that were coded as covert affect.

Table 5.19  Analysis of covert affect in the BRC baby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded as</th>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘covert affect’</td>
<td>admirable, amazing, anxious (moments), appealing, arresting, boring, comforting, confusing, coveted, daunting, depressing, desirable, disappointing, disconcerting, engaging, entertaining, enviable, exhilarating, exciting, fretful, frightening, happy (living spaces/days), haunting, interesting, intimidating, jovial (retort), loving (family support), moving, painful, perplexing, pleasing, puzzling, reassuring, (a) respectful (distance), sad (events/day), satisfying, seductive, shocking, sick-making, stirring, surprising, thrilling, unashamed, unsatisfactory, vexing, worrying</td>
<td>amazingly, dauntingly, disappointingly, happily, hopefully, interestingly, maddeningly, pitifully, sadly, surprisingly</td>
<td>the appeal of, X’s concern was/is, be of concern, (a big) disappointment, the sense of ease conveyed by, as entertainers, my greatest fear, the frenzy of, her horror is, his love’s, the shock of, a surprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.20  Analysis of valence in the BRC baby

| 'negative'                        | alarm, agitation, agony, anguish, anger/angry, annoyed, anxiety/anxious/ly, boring, bother/bothered, can’t bear/stand, concern/concerned, confusing, dauntingly/daunting, dejection, depressing/depressed, destabilised, disappointing/disappointed/disappointment, discontent, disconcerting, disdain, dislike, distress, embarrass, envious, fed up, fretful, frightening/frighten/frightened/fear/afraid, frustration, furious, gone off, grief, grudge, hate, horror/horrified, impatience, intimidation/intimidating/intimidated, irate, irritably, irritated, jealousy, loathe, let down, maddeningly, malaise, melancholy/melancholic, miserable, miss, outrage, painful, perplexing, rattled, regret/regretful, resent, sadly/sad, scared, scornful/scorn, self-conscious/ly, shock/shocked, shocking, sick-making, sorrow, spite, sullen, suspicion/suspicious, temper, terrified, terrorise, tormented, troubled, unhappy, unsatisfactory, unsettled, unnerve, upset, vexing, worked up, worry/worrying, wretched |
| 'positive'                        | appealing/appeal, appreciative/appreciate/appreciation, affection, admirable/admiring/admire, amused, assured/reassuring/reassurance, blithely, brightening, cheered/cheerfulness/cheery/cheerfully, cherish, comfortable/comforting, confidence/confident, content/contentment, coveted, desirable, devotion, ease, enjoy, engaging, entertaining/entertainers, enthusiasm, entrancing, enviable, exciting, exhilarating, fond of, glad, gratitude, happy/happily, hopefully/hope, impressed, be into, jovial, keen on (so), like, love/loving/beloved/much-loved, merry, optimism/optimistic, pity, pleased/please/pleasing, proud/ly, relax, respectful, reverently, feel safe, satisfaction/satisfying/satisfied, solace, soulfully, taken with, thankful, trust, untroubled, warmth/warmly |
| 'neutral/ambiguous'               | ‘desire’: desire, involuntary, deliberate/ly, yearning, want, fancy, happy to, seductive, wishes, aspire, wish, willing, will, unwilling, desired, eagerly, readily, keen, refused/refusal, to, reluctant/reluctance, disinclined, appetite for, would like, long, care for/about/to, desperate (to/for), prefer to, had a mind to, disinclined, tempted, I’d rather |
|                                  | ‘interest’: interest in/interest/interesting, fascinated/fascination with, magnetised by, fanatical about, (being) drawn to, carried away by, excited/ly, arresting, stirring, thrilling, frenzy, curious |
|                                  | ‘surprise’: surprising, surprised/surprise, astonishment, amazing/amazingly, spellbound, astounded, start, staggered |
|                                  | Other: pitifully, overawe, haunting, unashamed, doubtfully, resignedly, sorry, berserk, weakness for, puzzled/puzzling, nostalgic, reserve, emotional withdrawing, moving, mind |
5.3.4 Valence

Valence concerns the coding of emotion terms as positive, negative or neutral/ambiguous, as discussed in Section 5.3.2.1 above. For the text analysis, a general classification scheme was adopted which regards most emotion terms relating to ‘interest’, ‘surprise’ and ‘desire’ as neutral/ambiguous. Exceptions are for example *hope* (coded as positive) and *shock* (coded as negative). Where the valence was neither clear nor strong, a coding of the emotion term as neutral/ambiguous was also preferred. Again, though there may be some debate about the coding of individual emotion terms, the analysis was consistent and is outlined in Table 5.20 (on p. 177) to ensure transparency (compare also Appendix A 2.4 online).

While this chapter was mainly concerned with outlining the theoretical and methodological background to the text analysis, Chapter 6 will report the results of analyzing affect according to these and other factors.

Notes

1. See for example, Ortony *et al.* (1988), Robinson (2005: 8–27). Confusingly for linguists perhaps, this process is called *appraisal* (for example Ellsworth & Scherer 2003). The hypothesis is that ‘for events to prompt emotions, they must be evaluated, or appraised, in relation to the individual’s goals’ (Oatley *et al.* 2006: 167). This can be an unconscious or potentially conscious process (primary vs. secondary appraisal) (Oatley *et al.* 2006: 167). As the authors put it, ‘[i]f we know what appraisals (or evaluations) are made we can predict the emotion; if we know what the emotion is we can infer the appraisals’ (Oatley *et al.* 2006: 21).

2. Action readiness items are, for example, ‘I wanted to oppose, to assault, hurt, or insult’ (for antagonism), ‘I felt inhibited, paralyzed, or frozen’ (for inhibition), ‘I wanted to do something, but I did not know what’ (for helplessness) (Oatley *et al.* 2006: 132; more examples in Fridja *et al.* 1995: 129). In the following, I will include these as actions without differentiating between action readiness and actions.

3. Schema theory suggests that our knowledge of the world is organized in terms of mental knowledge structures which capture the typical features of the world (for an overview see Bednarek 2005a). They are part of our semantic memory, and usually shared by members of the same linguistic community (they are more or less conventionalized but can vary cross-culturally or among sub-cultures) and can refer to both more or less factual knowledge (spiders usually have eight legs), and to scientifically wrong folk beliefs (spiders are insects). Concerning the structure of schemas, they are often assumed to consist of categories and the specific interrelations (for example X has a Y, X is on Y, X is a part of Y) existing between them, the categories providing default assignments (by supplying prototypes) and associated expectations (Ungerer & Schmid 1996: 212–13). In Kövecses’s terms,
‘[f]olk understandings can be thought of as knowledge structures in our conceptual system’ (Kövecses 2000: 114). This knowledge is presumably based on our experience of actual emotional responses (for example increased body heat when angry), and observing them in others, as well as exposure to discourse on emotions and other socialization mechanisms. That is, I want to follow Kövecses’s suggestion that emotion schemas are both motivated by human physiology and produced by the socio-cultural environment (Kövecses 2000: 14). Folk knowledge also has to do with feeling rules (Section 1.3). Related to this, emotional intelligence involves knowledge of more than emotion schemas, and has been used to refer to differences in:

communicative skills ..., including discerning others’ emotions, realizing that expressions and experience do not necessarily match, knowing the cultural rules for displaying emotion, using the emotional vocabulary, feeling empathy, recognizing that your own expressions affect others, and using all of these skills in relationships with others.

(Planalp 1999: 70)

4. To this we might perhaps need to add ways that show ‘the way the world appears to a person in that emotional state’ (Robinson 2005: 275, italics in original).

5. With respect to a proposed cline of implicitness or indirectness, we can say that this depends on how strongly an action, behaviour and so on is associated with an emotion, and how prototypical it is for an emotion. The stronger the association, and the more prototypical the action, behaviour and so on, the less inferencing is perhaps involved. For instance, if a strong causal relation exists, inferences are more easily drawn (O’Halloran 2003: 141) so that ‘various aspects of a scenario [schema] may be differentially accessible at various points in processing’ (O’Halloran 2003: 188, citing Sanford & Garrod 1994: 704).

6. The remaining four variables are hypotheticality, negation, part of speech, and speech act – a complete guide to the analysis with respect to all nine variables is provided in Appendix A 6.2 online.

7. I am neither a semanticist nor a lexicographer by training, but presumably, the analysis of such a semantic field should involve thorough corpus-based lexicographic, semantic and discourse analytic studies of these terms, perhaps complemented by a native speaker survey. Since more than 1000 emotion terms can be identified, this is well beyond the scope of this book (for an attempt of a taxonomy of emotion vocabulary based on elicited data, see Storm & Storm 1987). Nevertheless, I agree with Martin & White that ‘there is a need to develop social semiotic principles for classifying lexis’ (Martin & White 2005: 58). There are of course existing alternatives to Martin & White’s classification of emotion terms, for example the classification of emotion and related terms adopted by the Encarta Thesaurus (see Section 1.6.3) or Wierzbicka (1999: 49). In terms of folk classifications, Ortony et al. report that people asked to sort emotion terms into categories use love, joy, surprise, anger, sadness, and fear at the basic level (Oatley et al. 2006: 182) and Fillenbaum and Rapoport (1971: 100–24) are interested in subjects’ similarity ratings of emotion terms. Mees (2006), looking at
German emotion terms, classifies them as denoting *ereignisfundierte Emotionen* (‘event-based’), *Attributions-Emotionen* (‘attribution-based’), *Beziehungs-Emotionen* (‘relationship-based’), and *Verbindungs-Emotionen* (‘connection-based’). Johnson-Laird & Oatley (1989: 96), on the basis of a specific theory of emotion, classify emotion terms as denoting generic emotions (*feelings*), basic emotions (*happiness*), emotional relations (*love*), caused emotions (*gladness*), causatives (*reassure*), emotional goals (*desire*) and complex emotions (*embarrassment*). Ortony *et al.* (1987) also offer a taxonomy of 500 emotion terms. However, these are psychologists’ classifications which are mostly intuition-based and do not use corpus or discourse data. As pointed out earlier, I also believe that we need to draw a clear dividing line between classifying *emotions* and classifying *emotion terms*. Different kinds of emotions have been defined as event-triggered (interest, excitement, surprise, fear), state-triggered (happiness, distress) or action-triggered (pride, shame, guilt) (Izard 1977, in Daneš 2004; compare also Fiehler 1990: 47). Similarly, Ortony *et al.* (1988: 14) differentiate between Event-based emotions (related to goals), Attribution emotions (related to agents and standards of behaviour), and Attraction emotions (related to attitudes). Emotions can also be distinguished with reference to goal achievement (Ekman 1999a: 2). Such classifications are problematic for linguistic purposes since expressions such as *I am angry* can be used for describing emotions about actions, situations or persons (Daneš 2004: 28 and Chapter 4 above). Compare also the overviews given in Jahr (2000: 23), Daneš (2004: 30–1), and Turner & Stets (2005: 289) on descriptions of different types of emotions.

8. The assumption that surprise is not construed as a negative emotion is also confirmed by the classification of experimental subjects of surprise terms as positive rather than negative (Wallace & Carson 1973: 16), as well as by semantic change (*amazing* meaning ‘very surprising, especially in a way that makes you feel pleasure or admiration’, OALD, emphasis mine). Note also that there are both lexical items that conflate unexpectedness and positive evaluation (*miraculous*) and items that conflate unexpectedness and negative evaluation (*alarming*) (Lemke 1998).

9. This is perhaps the case because the mental state of surprise has a problematic status in emotion research (Ungerer 1997: 326, Robinson 2005: 64). For example, Daneš (2004: 27) lists surprise as a neutral emotion, Johnson-Laird & Oakley (1989: 102) classify it as a reaction rather than a distinct emotion, and others include it only as emotion if it involves an evaluative specification (Jahr 2000: 26). Ekman suggests that surprise might be ‘perceived differently than other emotions’ (Ekman 1992: 176). While most emotion theorists seem to include surprise (Ortony *et al.* 1988: 32), this depends on the particular theory of emotion involved. For example, Ortony *et al.* (1988) claim that emotion is only related to positive–negative appraisal, and therefore excludes neutral surprise (since this is related only to an appraisal of unexpectedness). Reasons for including surprise as an emotion in psychological research are that, like other emotions (see below):

• it is based on a cognitive evaluation of the environment;
• it has associated typical actions/behaviour;
• it has an associated physiological response;
it has an associated facial expression (for an illustration of this see http://www.woodstock.edu/myers6e/content/psychsim/, last accessed 12 October 2006).

For appraisal theory, whether or not psychologists consider surprise as an emotion is only one of the considerations to be taken into account, another might be whether speakers consider surprise terms as being emotion terms or not. In experiments where subjects had to free-list emotion terms, surprise terms were in fact not core members of the emotion category (Shaver et al. 1987), but arguably still members. If we assume that the field of emotion terms has no clear boundaries, and that emotion terms ‘designate fuzzy sets’ (Shaver et al. 1987: 1063), feelings involving surprise, like dis/satisfaction (see above), are on the borders of ‘true’ affect but can still be included in the affect system.

10. Let me make a more general point: it seems necessary to make a distinction between positivity/negativity in terms of cultural construal vs. positivity/negativity in terms of the evaluation that can be implied by using an emotion term. For instance, I may use an expression denoting surprise to evaluate someone negatively or positively (Bednarek 2006b), but this does not necessarily mean that the surprise felt by the emoter is construed as positive or negative. Furthermore, there is no automatic correlation between positive emotions and positive evaluation: to refer to an emoter’s positive emotional reaction (for example delight) to a trigger that is evaluated negatively by the writer/speaker may result in a negative evaluation of the emoter, rather than a positive one (Bednarek 2006a: 210). This might constitute a problem for computational linguistics when a seed list is used with emotion terms that are tagged as ‘positive’ or ‘negative’, in order to analyze automatically the type of evaluation in texts (for computational linguistic approaches to appraisal see Taboada & Grieve 2004, Whitelaw et al. 2005, Bloom et al. 2007).

11. There are at least three different ways in which the term basic is used in emotion research (Ekman 1992: 170, Kövecses 2000: 3). Different criteria for basic emotions are given by Johnson-Laird & Oatley (1989), Ekman (1992: 175–89), and Jahr (2000: 24), and include the presence of distinctive universal signals (for example, facial expression), the existence of the given emotion in other primates, a quick onset of the emotion and a brief duration (Ekman 1992, 1999a). For some researchers a basic emotion is not a distinct emotional state but rather ‘an emotion family [which] can be considered to constitute a theme and variations’ (Ekman 1999a: 8). Similarly, Johnson-Laird & Oatley point out that ‘[a]round each mode [happiness, sadness, anger, fear, disgust], there may cluster a family of related emotional experiences’ (Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989: 85).

12. It is of course problematic that emotion research uses English words to classify emotional states (compare Wierzbicka 1992a, b, 1998, 1999). Wierzbicka instead proposes to use a language made up of universal semantic primitives for their description. As Athanasiadou & Tabakowska explain: ‘If there are some innate and universal cognitive scenarios which play a special role in human lives all over the world, such scenarios would have to be identified via such lexical universals, and not via culture-specific words such as sadness or anger’ (Athanasiadou & Tabakowska 1998b: xiv). Wierzbicka (1999:
Chapter 2) gives an analysis of about fifty emotion concepts in English and their underlying cognitive scenarios in terms of semantic primitives (but not based on large-scale corpus linguistics).

13. Word combinations such as *nostalgic affection*, *preferential love*, *compassionate love* were coded as one emotion (nostalgia, love) rather than two.

14. In contrast to Martin (2000a: 153) I classify *enjoy* as satisfaction: pleasure rather than happiness: affection, since enjoying something means that something gives you pleasure, and seems to be goal-related (which is what dis/satisfaction is about, see Martin & White 2005: 49). Vice versa, I classify *respect* as happiness: affection rather than dis/satisfaction (Martin & White 2005: 49), since it seems to me not related to the pursuit of goals but rather to affection/liking. It must be noted that there is some overlap between dis/satisfaction and un/happiness.

15. I coded *I’m/I am sorry* only as unhappiness: misery; the general, conventionalized use of *sorry* was excluded from affect, since its emotional meaning is bleached.

16. These are classified by appraisal theory as appreciation: reaction rather than affect (White 2001: 3, White 2002: 16, Martin & White 2005: 57–8), but, as I have argued elsewhere (Bednarek forthcoming 2008), they constitute a ‘bridge’ between appreciation/judgement and affect, and imply emotional responses, which is why they were included as covert affect.
6
Enacting Affect: Pragmatic Analysis

As proposed, the large-scale studies of Chapters 2 to 4 are complemented by a brief foray into the pragmatics of emotion talk in the BRC baby using a modified version of appraisal theory and the methodology described in Chapter 5 (also in Appendix A 6.2 online). The 85,000 words of the BRC baby were manually analyzed for all listed variables, but because of space constraints only extracts are included in this chapter. Such a small-scale analysis allows us to make safer guesses about the pragmatics of emotion talk in the four registers than are possible using large-scale analysis, but is less representative. (The small-scale analyses are necessary because it takes time to analyze texts manually according to the methodology outlined in Chapter 5.) No detailed, ‘truly’ qualitative analyses of each of the roughly 60 texts in the BRC baby were undertaken, which would take into account textual development, or logogenesis (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 43) and social context, though an extended extract from fiction will be commented upon. This is because there are already many such qualitative analyses using the appraisal framework (see Section 5.1 for references). The aim of this chapter is thus to open up research by pointing to future fields of study, showing opportunities for new research projects, and laying out a ‘road-map’ for further research into affect. More specifically, this chapter discusses the notions of affective key and stance before outlining some typical functions of emotion terms.

6.1 Affective key and stance

Much research has shown that affect clusters or patterns in text. This has been discussed as ‘prosody’ in appraisal theory (Macken-Horarik 2003b, Martin & White 2005: 19–23; on ‘emotive prosody’ from a non-SFL
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perspective, see Bublitz 2002, 2003), and is explained as ‘the spread, sprawl, smear or diffusion of interpersonal meanings that accumulate, reinforce, or resonate with each other to construct an evaluative “key” over an extended segment of text’ (Hood 2006: 38). Evaluative keys concern the co-occurrence of evaluative options (Martin & White 2005: 164): ‘patterns in the use of evaluative resources within texts by which certain types of evaluation and stance are favoured or foregrounded while others occur infrequently, only in restricted settings, or not at all.’ (Martin & White 2005: 161). Evaluative key is defined in terms of patterns for all systems of appraisal (attitude, engagement and graduation), but since the focus of this book is on emotion talk, I make use of the notion of the more narrow concept of affective key instead. This is described in terms of the co-occurrence of particular configurations of affect.

Whereas ‘key’ refers to patterns across texts, ‘stance’ refers to evaluative patterns ‘within a given “key” associated with particular rhetorical objectives and the construction of authorial personae’ (Martin & White 2005: 164). (This notion of stance is not to be confused with the definition of ‘stance’ adopted by Biber and his colleagues, where it is more or less equivalent to appraisal: see Section 1.5.) I shall broaden the notion of stance to describe the construction of personae in texts in general – whether these personae are authorial or not. Again, the focus is on affect. That is, I define affective stance as the co-selection or patterning of affect types in stretches of text related to the construal of certain authorial and non-authorial personae with respect to emotional experience.

In the following sections, I shall comment on affective key and stance in the four registers, based on analyses of the BRC baby. While the discussion of conversation focuses on affective key and that of fiction focuses on affective stance, comments on both key and stance shall be made with respect to news reportage and academic discourse.

Conversation. Affective keys in conversation seem to depend on the conversational topic, and be task-related. Only one conversation in my data (KE2) exhibits a clear affective key, containing exclusively desire and affection terms, ostensibly associated with a shopping trip. As Table 6.1 shows, it is predominantly the speaker and the listener (I, you) who are the emoters. We can see here a co-occurrence of the affect types desire and affection – an affective key that we might perhaps label ‘consumer voice’ (‘I like’ → ‘I want’; ‘I don’t like’ → ‘I don’t want’). Within the consumer voice, the text alternates between a desire and an affection stance. None of the other conversations represent clear examples of additional
Table 6.1  Affect in KE2 (BRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoter</th>
<th>Emotion term</th>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>wanted</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>some pot some [flowers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>them [flowers] now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>wanted</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>them [flowers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>it [the weather]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>that [the weather]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>me to show you what they look like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my wife</td>
<td>tempted</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>context: flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>wants</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>your advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>a better white bigger than that one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>liked</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>the look of [the one]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>it in the red one and not the silver one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>that [flower]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[does] he</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>want to</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>change another note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>like</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>it in there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>taken with</td>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>that big card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>whatever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

affective keys, as Figure 6.1 (available in colour in Appendix A 6.3 online) shows.

According to Figure 6.1 (on page 186), perhaps KE4 is most similar to KE2 in terms of affect sub-types; however, it also has occurrences of antipathy and pleasure, and there are differences regarding emoters. The occurrence of affection and desire across all corpora also reflects the findings in 2.2.1 above, that the verbs want and like are uncharacteristically frequent in conversation. An important question to be tackled in future research, then, is whether the notion of affective key has validity in conversation, and if so, which other affective or evaluative keys might exist in different genres of conversation (a possible candidate is a negative judgement key in gossip; compare Eggins & Slade 1997: 273–311).

Fiction. Affective keys in fiction can perhaps be associated with the types of focalization identified by Rimmon-Kenan, who differentiates between objective (uninvolved) vs. subjective (involved) emotive point of view (Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 82). Differences in emotive point of view, she says, also have to do with whether character emotions have
to be inferred from behaviour or whether the emotions are explicitly revealed by interior monologue or the narrator (compare the distinctions made in 5.3.1). However, ‘[t]he whole gamut of stylistic possibilities [of indicating focalization] has not yet been established’ (Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 85). In SFL, it has been suggested that evaluation is crucial in the establishment of narrative voice (Martin & White 2005: 72, Macken-Horarik 2003a) but, to my knowledge, affective or evaluative key has not yet been systematically related to focalization. This matter is, however, a very complex one (for overviews of focalization see Simpson 1993, Toolan 2001), and a burning issue is to investigate how different systems of appraisal and modality (epistemic/modalization or deontic/modulation) construe a focalizer’s point of view. For instance, Simpson (1993) makes a useful distinction between four facets of speaker attitude: deontic (obligation, duty, commitment, related to modulation and engagement), boulomaic (desire: related to attitude), epistemic (knowledge, belief and cognition, related to affect [quiet, trust], engagement and modalization), and perception (related to attitude and engagement).

On account of this complexity, the analysis below focuses on affective stance rather than key; that is, it is concerned with how characters are construed as personae, rather than narrative voice (compare also
the *emotional response inventory* established in Appendix A 6.4 online). Here is an extended extract from one of the analyzed samples:


After chatting to Davidson for a few minutes longer, he went back to his office, looking for his secretary, a plumpish, infinitely competent, middle-aged mother of three. She was on the phone and he stood silently, filling the doorway, raising an eyebrow at her. She motioned him to stay.

‘It’s Francesca, John.’

‘Thanks, Jenny.

I’ll take it back there,’ he said, *brightening*, and she watched, with a little *jealousy*, as he hurried back to his desk.

‘Darling.

I’ve got a horrendous problem.

Can you possibly duck out and have coffee in the caff in ten minutes?’

The voice at the other end was slightly husky but very clear.

‘It’s Tristram.

He’s been arrested in New York.

Better not talk on the phone, had we?’

‘Oh, Christ.

No.

I’ll meet you.’

He put down the phone, *rattled*. With his *much-loved* Francesca came her four younger brothers for whom, as the eldest child of a widow, she had always considered herself responsible. All four were talented musicians and difficult people, in varying degrees; Tristram, one of the twenty-four-year-old twins, had proved the most difficult, perhaps because he was not the most talented. McLeish gritted his teeth, and, trying not to consider the implications of what he had been told made one quick phone call, then took the lift down and walked across the road from New Scotland Yard to the little café which was, as usual, full of workmen engaged in rebuilding the offices in the area. Stopping to buy a paper, he caught sight of Francesca through the window, perched on one of the bar stools, totally unconscious of the table full of men next to her all eyeing her long legs. He stood and watched her, putting off the moment when, as he half knew, he would be asked to acquiesce in some lunatic
scheme for pulling Tristram out of trouble, and saw her for a moment from a position of detachment: a tall young woman looking younger than her twenty-nine years. dark [sic], with a long straight nose and arched eyebrows. She was looking particularly uncompromising today, tired and pale, her dark, short hair spiking up at the back. She had been crying, McLeish observed **resignedly**, as he pushed through the door.

‘All right, tell me,’ he said, as he sat down heavily beside her, and got a careful, measuring, sidelong look.

‘I have to go to New York in a hurry and bail Tristram out. He was arrested last night, with one of the backing group and three of the band. They’re all in the nick, charged with possession. Cocaine, as I understand it.’

‘Jesus.’

‘I know, I know, just when he was beginning to be a success like Perry. It simply went to his head – you know what he was like when he left.’

‘Thought he could walk on water,’ McLeish said, in **irritated** memory.

‘Frannie, why do you have to go? He has a manager and a studio, doesn’t he? What can you do that they can’t?’

She sighed so heavily that her whole ribcage moved.

‘I am to some extent on home ground there,’ she said, **reluctantly** and not looking at him.

‘Mike – Michael O’Brien – will help, but I need to be on the spot.’ McLeish **held on to his temper**, reminding himself that he was very tired. Francesca’s much publicized affair with Senator Michael O’Brien was the reason that she had been sent home rather early from a tour of duty in the Embassy in Washington, over a year previously, just before he had met her in London. As one of Francesca’s DTI colleagues had maliciously observed, it had been felt that fraternization with the American colleagues could be carried too far. Francesca herself had characteristically taken the line that the Foreign Office ought to have been **glad** that someone on the staff was that closely involved with the American political Establishment.

‘What are you going to do with O’Brien?’
‘Well, I’m hardly going to get back into bed with him after more than a whole year.
There’ll certainly be another incumbent by now.
But he is the senior Senator, we were close when I was in Washington, and whichever way you slice it he won’t want my brother being buggered or beaten up in a New York jail.’
Her classically good diction always became even clearer under stress, so that this statement emerged with the slightly metallic clarity of a dubbed film, and the clientèle of the small café was obviously appreciating every moment. McLeish decided that since she was unaware of her audience it did not become him to be selfconscious, and asked what she expected even a Senator to achieve in these circumstances?
‘Oh, darling.
The American legal system is so odd that I’ve been told I could get Tristram deported in my custody.
It’s a disaster, of course it’s a disaster, he’ll be banned from the US for ever presumably; but at least he won’t be being interfered with in some unspeakable foreign nick.’
‘I thought he was off drugs?’
‘Well we all hoped, didn’t we?
But evidently he isn’t, and I must get him back.’
McLeish found himself on the verge of suggesting that a thoroughly unpleasant time in a New York jail might succeed in curing Tristram where all other methods, including exhortation, loving family support and a spell in a comfortable private hospital in Devon, had failed. He looked at his love’s shuttered, miserable face and realized he would get nowhere along those lines.
‘Why can’t your Mum or one of the boys go?’
‘Mum is in bed with bronchitis, as you would know if you had managed to get out of that place since last Friday.’
Francesca, a true eldest child, knew how to score her points.
‘Charlie’s baby is due tomorrow, Perry is in Japan on tour, just like all the papers say.
Jeremy is coming with me but he is too young to do this alone, and in any case I’m the only one who can deploy O’Brien.’
‘How is the DTI receiving all this?
You’ve got four rescue cases.’
Francesca sighed.
'They are as fed up with me as you are, but they won’t stop me taking leave.'
She stopped sharply, and blushed scarlet.
‘Wait a minute.’
John McLeish felt his blood-pressure going up.
‘What about skiing, if you’re using leave?’
She looked at him, wretchedly.
‘I have to go.
I really expect to get back in three or four days and I will try and hang on to the holiday.
I know we need it, it seems ages since we went to bed.’
McLeish scowled round the fascinated audience, returning the customers to their egg and chips.
‘Anyway, it’s been you who have been too busy for months.’
McLeish was too honest not to acknowledge the point.
‘The more important, then, for us to have a holiday together.’
‘I know.
Darling, I am sorry, I really expect to be back inside the week, and I wouldn’t go if anyone else could.
I am trying – I mean I know I let the boys lean too much.’
He looked at her, defeated, and she saw that she had carried the point, but at a heavy cost.
‘Do you still love me?’ she asked anxiously.
‘Not at the moment.’
An indrawn breath from the spectators unsettled both of them for a moment.
Francesca nearly laughed, but McLeish’s expression sobered her.
‘Let’s get out of here.’
She slid obediently off the bar stool, bidding a civil good-morning to the café owner who looked, McLeish observed, as if he would willingly have swept her into his plump Italian embrace, and they walked together to the gates of New Scotland Yard.
‘I’ll ring you when I get to New York.’
She looked, worried, at his profile.
‘You’re furious with me.
I’m sorry.
I love you.’
‘I don’t think we can go on like this.’
McLeish surprised himself as well as her.
‘John.’
It was an appeal and he was not proof against it. He bent and kissed her.

‘I am furious, and I want you back quickly. But good luck with it — ring me if you need help.’

The look she flicked him reminded him that this was one area where she would not appeal for his help; she had been more than careful to protect him from any involvement with a drug-taking brother. It was one of her many advantages that as a professional civil servant herself she understood the constraints of his career. She turned to go, head down. McLeish saw that she was crying again, but decided coldly there was nothing he was going to do and trudged wearily back to the lift, the morning’s cheerfulness totally evaporated.

(BRC, AB 9 26–139)

### Table 6.2 Affect types of characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Emotion terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: cheer</td>
<td>brightening, cheerfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>much-loved, love, love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>rattled, self-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>resignedly, irritated, held on to his temper, fed up with, furious, furious, want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Francesca</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclination: non-desire</td>
<td>reluctantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: misery</td>
<td>miserable, wretchedly, sorry, sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>anxiously, worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disregarding the audience at the café, whose affective stance is one of satisfaction: pleasure (appreciating) and satisfaction: interest (fascinated), and other minor characters (O’Brien, the café owner, McLeish’s secretary and so on), Table 6.2 shows which affect types are associated with McLeish and Francesca in this sample. McLeish has mostly emotions of cheer (later negated), affection (towards Francesca), and satisfaction: displeasure, whereas Francesca has mostly emotions of misery and disquiet. There might perhaps be a reason for arguing that Francesca’s emotions (anxiety, worry) are more ‘female’ than McLeish’s emotions (anger), though it is worth pointing out that McLeish also has a considerable amount of affection and some disquiet. However, the references to McLeish’s love (affection) for Francesca occur only in descriptive passages rather than character dialogue, with one passivized reference and one of...
covert rather than overt affect:

- With his much-loved Francesca came her four younger brothers for whom, as the eldest child of a widow, she had always considered herself responsible.
- He looked at his love’s [covert affect] shuttered, miserable face and realized he would get nowhere along those lines.

One reference to McLeish’s love does occur in character dialogue, but Francesca is the speaker, and the existence of the emotion is actually questioned by her, conforming to a wide-spread stereotype about female insecurity and behaviour:

- ‘Do you still love me?’ she asked anxiously.

In fact, it is interesting to look more closely at the dialogue between McLeish and Francesca and their use of emotion terms there.

Francesca:

- ‘Well we all hoped, didn’t we?’
- ‘They are as fed up with me as you are, but they won’t stop me taking leave.’
- ‘I know. Darling, I am sorry, I really expect to be back inside the week, and I wouldn’t go if anyone else could.
- ‘Do you still love me?’
- ‘You’re furious with me.’
- ‘I’m sorry.
- I love you.’

McLeish

- ‘Not at the moment.’ [ellipted: I don’t love you at the moment]
- ‘I am furious, and I want you back quickly.

There are clearly more emotion terms in Francesca’s contribution to the dialogue, namely authorial misery and affection, and non-authorial affection and displeasure with McLeish as emoter. In contrast, McLeish’s dialogue has only one ellipted reference to negated affection, one to displeasure and one to desire – all authorial statements, with no questions to Francesca about her emotions (construing him as more confident than her).
Summing up, a number of factors contribute to the relatively stereotypical construal of the characters in this extract:

- the attribution of ‘male’ emotions to McLeish and ‘female’ emotions to Francesca
- Francesca’s questioning of McLeish’s love and her overt statement of her own affection (I love you)
- the use of more emotion terms by Francesca than by McLeish in character dialogue.

It can of course be argued that this construal does not so much reflect male–female differences and a stereotypical construal of gender, but that it in fact relates to the social action at hand. In fact, Francesca is the one jeopardizing the relationship, and therefore has to make up for it, which puts her in a perhaps only temporary position of lesser power or confidence. Politeness strategies and relationship management rules then constrain her affective behaviour. Thus, one could even argue that Francesca’s behaviour is stereotypically ‘masculine’ or ‘male’ (cancelling their holiday, taking care of things without help). In fact, at least some of Francesca’s usage of emotion terms is the result of her trying to negotiate the relationship, with the problem being in a way ‘her fault’: her misery and disquiet are the result of McLeish’s displeasure at her decision. However, she arguably uses stereotypically ‘female’ strategies to do so (saying how sorry she is, that she loves him), and if we look at other aspects of the text such as descriptions of non-verbal behaviour (for example Francesca being perched on one of the bar stools, sighing, blushing scarlet, crying; McLeish gritting his teeth, scowling), and the characteristics of their language (for example Francesca using ‘female’ terms such as darling, horrendous, caff and tags (had we); McLeish preferring the more ‘male’ swear words Christ, Jesus and Frannie rather than darling/sweetheart) a gender-related construal of affective stereotypes does strongly suggest itself. We can also look at behavioural surge expressions and agency, such as He bent and kissed her (rather than she kissed him), which reflects a general tendency in the culture for men to be represented as kissing women rather than the other way round (Hunston 2006). For a comparison with present research on affect and gender refer to Besnier (1990), Lutz (1990), Gallois (1994: 306–7), Anderson & Leaper (1998), Planalp (1999: 36), Goldshmidt & Weller (2000), Galasiński (2004), Oatley et al. (2006: 246–8).
Table 6.3  Affect sub-types in news reportage categories in the BRC baby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect sub-type</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social¹</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclination: non-desire</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: pleasure</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: ennui</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: quiet</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: trust</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security: distrust</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: affection</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: antipathy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: cheer</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness: misery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See Note 1 to the chapter.

News reportage. Affective key in news reportage can be investigated with regard to at least four aspects of affect: (1) sub-types of affect, (2) covert vs. overt affect, (3) authorial vs. non-authorial affect, (4) mediated vs. unmediated affect (having to do with different types of reporting affect, discussed below).

Starting with (1), Table 6.3 lists affect sub-types and their frequency in the six BRC categories of news reportage. What Table 6.3 shows is that inclination: desire, security: disquiet and happiness: misery occur across all categories, and are frequent overall, with some variation between the categories where disquiet and misery are concerned. It is not surprising that two of these three categories are negative, as I have shown elsewhere (Bednarek 2006a: 179) that negative emotions clearly outweigh positive emotions in news stories – this is related to the news value of negativity. Fowler notes that references to terms that denote negative emotions such as fear and confusion can create stridency and contribute to ‘hysterical discourse’ (Fowler 1991: 164) in the press. Satisfaction: interest and satisfaction: pleasure are also relatively frequent overall, but occur only in four/five of the six categories,
Table 6.4  Affect types of 50 most frequent emotion terms in the BRC news reportage sub-corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Emotion terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disquiet</td>
<td>worried, horror, worry, concerned, anxious, worry, fear, embarrassment, concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>keen, desperate, willing, care, desire, hope, prepared, ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>pleasure, pleased, proud, delighted, admire, delight, enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displeasure</td>
<td>hate, anger, fury, furious, angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misery</td>
<td>disappointed, sad, unhappy, disappointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>shock, surprised, shocked, surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affection</td>
<td>love, sympathy, love, respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td>enthusiasm, excitement, passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheer</td>
<td>joy, happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antipathy</td>
<td>tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>feeling, expectation, bitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respectively, and there is a considerable amount of variation between the categories. The importance of desire, disquiet and pleasure (and to a certain extent that of misery) for news reportage is in fact confirmed by a classification of the 50 most frequent emotion terms in the 2.6 million BRC news reportage sub-corpus – as summarized in Table 6.4. Beyond this, it is difficult to make generalizations because of the small size of the BRC baby, though there is perhaps a particular preference in Sports and Arts reporting for satisfaction: interest, and in Sports reporting for satisfaction: pleasure as well as in Commerce reporting for security: disquiet (however, these tendencies may just be present in my data).

Turning now the spotlight on authorial/non-authorial, overt/covert and mediated/unmediated affect, definitions for the first two pairs of concepts have already been given in Chapter 5. The difference between mediated and unmediated affect goes back to a comment by Martin and White (2005: 177), where mediated affect relates to emotion terms in reported speech and thought, and unmediated affect directly asserts a non-authorial emoter’s emotion. Consequently, both direct and indirect speech are included as mediated affect. I also code cases of reported affect as mediated where speakers report on someone else’s emotion (for example ‘Goldsmith decided that if you wanted to be a capitalist the UK and France were not the places to be’). Examples for
unmediated and mediated covert and overt non-authorial affect from my data are:

**Non-authorial affect**

**Covert**

unmediated: *I remember once seeing a small girl remove a tin of soup from halfway down a display stack in a supermarket. The predictable, and very satisfying, result attracted the attention of a nearby assistant . . .* (A1M 62–63)

mediated: *Calcavecchia said, yawning in mid-sentence. . . . ‘It seems that every time I come back from a big disappointment I win’* (A1N 112–115)

**Overt**

unmediated: *Once people overcome their fears about computers . . .* (A1M 54)

mediated: *‘I really enjoyed it’, Calcavecchia said* (A1N 112)

*Mr Rich said many dentists were concerned that . . .* (ALS 11)

*Hard, they say, to be too overawed by a character like Cage . . .* (A7S 11)

Table 6.5 shows the distribution of these different aspects of affect in the news data from the BRC baby.

Two provisory sets of texts emerge from this comparison: in the first set, most texts exhibit a preference for either unmediated or mediated non-authorial overt affect, mostly preferring unmediated affect over mediated affect. If authorial affect occurs (which it does only rarely), it is covert. Most texts in Commerce, Report, Science, and Social reporting fall into this group. The second set – Sports and Arts reporting – is characterized by the presence of authorial affect, though it also has a lot of non-authorial mediated and unmediated overt affect. Sports has only covert authorial affect, whereas Arts includes both covert and overt authorial affect (though the latter is generalized: *you have to hope, making one long to*). In terms of affective key, the first set probably falls into Martin & White’s (2005: 178) *reporter voice* (− authorial affect + observed/non-authorial affect), and the second set is perhaps more akin to their *commentator voice* (+ authorial affect + observed/non-authorial affect), although I have not looked at judgement/appreciation patterns that
Table 6.5  Affect and mediation in the BRC baby news reportage sub-corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorial affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)^4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-authorial affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmediated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediated</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmediated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^4 See Note 4 to the chapter.


Finally, let's look very briefly at affective stance to consider the construal of news actors' personae in news texts. News actors can use affective patterns to construe themselves as particular personae in their statements to reporters (and hope that this construal is taken up), as in this example:

(2) She [Health Secretary Virginia Bottomley] recalled a promise made by Mr Major when he became Prime Minister: that he would work for a nation at ease with itself. 'I want to see a health service at ease with itself — optimistic and confident about its essential work. (BRC, Al5 25–26)

Here co-selections of desire (want) and security (at ease, optimistic, confident) position the speaker as someone whose goal is the well-being of the health service, appealing to a common human desire for security. It is an example of a non-human emoter (the NHS) being construed as a conscious being capable of experiencing emotion (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 202–3) – compare also the discussion of emoters in 3.3.2 above.

Another example, from Social reporting, is:

(3) One [woman in the study] insisted on cleanliness but didn’t care about tidiness, while her husband didn’t care about cleanliness but
was fanatical about tidiness. Sabine begins the day by making her husband look at a pile of dirty washing by the bed. Anne-Sophie, on the other hand, lives a life wracked by doubt because she can never decide whether a garment is dirty or not. Each time she tries to judge she suffers ‘a feeling of agitation and indeed anguish’. Her chief horror is to have clothes lying around that are neither one thing nor the other. She inspects the scene, she smells the garment. Eventually she puts it away, deciding not to wash it because she hates ironing. But the malaise persists and all day she feels ‘destabilised’. [···] Leon and Madelaine, meanwhile, have chairs on either side of their bed on which to put their respective clothes. They pile up. Madelaine refuses to put Leon’s away. This bothers him deep down. He believes it is her job. Out loud, he complains about the pile on her chair. She resents this. (BRC, AL5 89–113)

In the extract, the affective stance of the first couple (woman and husband) is construed in terms of satisfaction: interest (didn’t care about, didn’t care about, fanatical about – insist on implies desire). (This shows how emotion terms can be used to construe people’s values rather than momentary emotional states – see also fiction below. As has been noted, ‘some emotional words are systematically ambiguous because they can be used to refer either to an immediate subjective feeling or to a general predisposition.’ (Johnson-Laird & Oatley 1989: 90; similarly Ortony et al. 1987: 350, Edwards 1999: 282). For example, an emoter can be described as a generally angry person (disposition) or as being angry at a particular thing at a particular time (momentary). In contrast, Anne-Sophie’s affective stance is predominantly one of disquiet (agitation, destabilised) and misery (anguish, horror, malaise). In the description of the third couple, a causal chain is presented where Madelaine’s non-desire causes Leon displeasure (shown externally by complains about), which in turn causes Madelaine’s antipathy – an example of a vicious circle that cannot easily be broken. In order to break it, the participants ‘have to step outside the circle’ (Watzlawick et al. 1967: 96).

As a final example, consider:

(4) The government in Addis Ababa will [here interpreted as desire] say nothing about the situation, and the war is not reported by the state-run media. However, recent visitors to Dese describe the areas as chaotic, with whole units leaderless and unwilling to fight.
[...] The Russians have said they believe in a negotiated settlement to the civil war, but they are continuing to supply arms to President Mengistu, apparently to allow him to negotiate from a position of strength. A large consignment of weapons was unloaded from a Soviet ship at Assab on 21 September. Weapons will not, however, save President Mengistu if no one is willing to use them. (BRC, A1G 11–18)

Here, the affective stance is one of non-desire: non-desire on the part of the government to comment, and non-desire on the part of the war parties to fight/use weapons. Thus both personae (government and war parties) are similarly construed in terms of affect, though the functions of the references to affect differ: both The government in Addis Ababa will say nothing about the situation, and the war is not reported by the state-run media comment on the media’s accessed voices (cf. Bednarek 2006a: 92, 177) as well as evaluate the government in power, whereas the other references seem to be used to describe and predict behaviour. From a critical linguistic position, it might perhaps be possible to argue that such and similar construals can contribute to Western perceptions about Africa, if they accumulate over time and occur in connection with judgements such as chaotic, whole units leaderless.

Academic discourse. Five different affective keys can be identified for academic discourse from an analysis of (non-) authorial affect in my data.

Descriptor: no affect or rare non-authorial affect (EWW, FPG)
Illustrator: no or extremely rare authorial affect; low probability of non-authorial affect (FC1, ACJ)
Arguer: no authorial affect; median probability of non-authorial affect (ALP)
Observer: low probability of authorial (overt or covert) affect; highest probability of non-authorial affect (A6U, AS6, EA7)
Mentor: highest probability of authorial (covert) affect; median probability of non-authorial affect (FEF)

This can be visualized with respect to authorial vs. non-authorial affect as in Figure 6.2.
The following texts exemplify these five groupings.

(5) **Descriptor**

If a matrix $A$ has $m$ rows and $n$ columns, i.e. it is of order $(m \times n)$, its typical element lies at the intersection of the $i$th row and $j$th column. If we form the matrix by writing columns for rows in order, the new matrix, of order $(n \times m)$ is called the transpose of $A$ and is denoted by $A^T$. For example, $A^T$. The process is clearly one of reflection in the diagonal containing the terms, which is described as the principal diagonal. (BRC, EWW 84–90)

(6) **Illustrator**

In In re A Debtor (No. 1 of 1987) the Court of Appeal refused to follow that approach and held that a statutory demand, which on the face of it contained a number of puzzling and perplexing statements, was nonetheless valid because the debtor knew precisely what he owed and there was no injustice in holding that his failure to pay the debt gave rise to a presumption that he was unable to pay. (BRC, FC1 63)

(7) **Arguer**

In the sections to follow the stark question is therefore put ‘Is the Probation Service in the business of inflicting pain?’ and the answer which unfolds may be summarized ‘No, because it neither aspires nor wishes to!’ […]

In 1985 the management of Somerset Probation Service was faced with the fact that nearly one in three of the offenders supervised in their area were either known to be or suspected of misusing alcohol
(Singer, 1985). Aware of practitioners’ frustration in not being able to work effectively with these problematic clients, Probation management, in partnership with the voluntary sector, determined to develop an Alcohol Education Course (AEC). (BRC, ALP 32–45)

(8) Observer
The recourse to books, documents, or sources, underscores a perception which is somehow already in the air. The effort to recapture art’s ‘history’ is always entangled with the desire to remake its identity and meaning as part of contemporary struggles. This article comes out of the familiar experience of being drawn to a particular image, or set of images, without at first knowing why, and the attempt to account for this feeling. Looking intermittently at the so-called colonial art of Latin America in churches, museums, private collections and books, I became magnetised by the figures of angels. (BRC, A6U 7–10)

(9) Mentor
In order to have a unified view of the subject we have started with Maxwell’s equations. It means a new approach but not a radical departure. The subject is still the same. You will be able to see that the laws you love and cherish (Coulomb’s, Biot-Savart’s, Snell’s, etc.) all follow from our eqns (1.1)–(1.7). The order of discussion will follow the traditional one: electrostatics first, followed by steady currents, then we shall move on to slowly varying phenomena, and reach finally the most interesting part, fast-varying phenomena, exhibiting the full beauty of Maxwell’s wonderful equations. (BRC, FEF 47–51)

In the descriptor voice (one text aimed at undergraduate students of engineering and one from a text on the design of computer data files), descriptions abound, both of the contents of the book (Chapter 8 deals with ...) and of the subject-matter (matrices, computer files). No references to affect are present in the extract from engineering; the voice is very non-affective. In the text on computer files, the rare non-authorial affect references are used only to explain the concept of a directly organized file and to introduce a problem and show why these files are necessary:

(10) It is possible to process the records in a directly organized file either directly, using the keys in any desired order, or serially,
taking the records in the order they are stored and ignoring their keys. . . .

A bank cannot predict which of its customers wish to withdraw or deposit money on any given day; a travel firm cannot control which of its package tours will be booked at a particular time. Customers arrive as a result of their own decisions, and not in an order dictated by the travel agent or bank. As these transactions are not predictable they present a processing problem. (BRC, FPG 6–12)

In the illustrator voice (texts from The Weekly Law Reports, Principles of Criminal Law) there is some non-authorial affect (but also rare authorial affect, one instance each), which is used to illustrate the case at hand. This becomes apparent in example (6) above, which reports on a Court of Appeal decision as well as in the following extract:

(11) A fairly typical set of facts is provided by Nedrick (1986), where D had a grudge against a woman and had threatened to ‘burn her out’. One night he went to her house, poured paraffin through the letter-box and on to the front door, and set it alight. One of the woman’s children died in the ensuing fire. When asked why he did it, D replied: ‘Just to wake her up and frighten her.’ A defence of this kind, a claim that the purpose was only to frighten and not to cause harm, requires the full definition to be put to the jury. The question is: granted that D’s purpose was to frighten, did he nonetheless realize that it was practically certain that his act would cause death or grievous bodily harm to someone? The jury should answer this by drawing inferences from the evidence in the case and from the surrounding circumstances. (BRC, ACJ 89–95)

Here, we have a clustering of in/security: disquiet terms simply because a case is reported which deals with the question of purpose/intent. This points to the fact that many emotion terms in criminal discourse may derive simply from describing the motives and emotions of people that have committed crimes – since this is of some relevance in criminal law.

In the arguer voice, there is no authorial affect, but a slightly higher probability of non-authorial affect than in the illustrator voice. In the
given text, from the *British Journal of Social Work*, the references to overt non-authorial affect are mostly part of cause–effect relations or arguments:

(12) In the sections to follow the stark question is therefore put ‘Is the Probation Service in the business of inflicting pain?’ and the answer which unfolds may be summarized ‘No, because it neither *aspire* nor *wish* to!’ (ALP 32) → explaining answer...

THE PROJECT: MORE DEMANDING THAN PUNISHMENT

Government *concern* about the problem of drink-related offending is as old as the Probation Service. (ALP 33–34) → arguing for relevance of problem...

In 1985 the management of Somerset Probation Service was faced with the fact that nearly one in three of the offenders supervised in their area were either known to be or suspected of misusing alcohol (Singer, 1985). Aware of practitioners’ *frustration* in not being able to work effectively with these problematic clients, Probation management, in partnership with the voluntary sector, determined to develop an Alcohol Education Course (AEC). (ALP 44–45) → reasoning and relevance

In the *observer voice* (texts from *Oxford Art Journal, Tackling the Inner Cities, France in the Making*) humans and their emotions are the concerns of the research itself, resulting in a fairly high proportion of non-authorial affect to describe the research topic. For example, the first text deals with ‘the familiar experience of being drawn to a particular image, or set of images, without at first knowing why, and the attempt to account for this feeling.’ The second text deals with urban poverty and its effect on social life (mainly in terms of negative feelings of in/security, discussed below). And the third text is about aristocratic life from 98 to 1108. Disregarding intra-textuality, sentences containing emotion terms in this text are:

(13) The famous letter from the archbishop of Rheims to Baldwin V of Flanders, praising him for his activities in draining and ditching the coastal areas (presumably after the Dunkirk inundation of 1014–42 had at last subsided) is explicit evidence of an *interest* in agricultural expansion. (EA7 11)
Deliberate assistance to economic growth went hand in hand with administrative reform aimed at channelling its profits firmly into princely treasuries. (EA7 24)

Ademar of Chabannes told of the murder of the duke of Aquitaine’s prévôt at St Jean d’Angély in 1026, and the destruction of his house by the angry inhabitants of the town. (EA7 34)

At this point, one of Garsinde’s noble followers, unwilling to accept the verdict, arose and demanded that the decision be made not by arbitration but by battle. In the tumult which ensued, the terrified monks made their escape, only to find their way blocked by the same young lord with fifty knights, who threatened them with death. (EA7 57–58)

At this juncture, St Foy sent a storm, the aggressive aristocrat was struck by lightning, his terrified armed men ran away, and when the news of divine intervention reached her, the Lady Garsinde abandoned her case. (EA7 59)

But out of pity for Bouchard’s poverty, Geoffrey prevailed on the abbot to allow him possession of the mill for the rest of his life. (EA7 65)

So, though Geoffrey expressed his anger after the knight Walter had killed one of his kinsmen, he accepted two mills from him as the price of his peace. (EA7 68)

This may have been the simple truth; it may, alternatively, have been an instance of the use of delay by an intelligent but reluctant pleader. (EA7 77)

Since the text deals with the ruling class in early medieval society, it involves statements about potential emotions both of the nobles/aristocrats as well as their subjects (armed men, monks, inhabitants and so on). These are important in explaining aspects of social life, providing illustrations of the writer’s statements on wealth and justice, and explanations for the behaviour of people in these times. Hence, in the observer voice, the references to affect relate predominantly to observations on the subject matter at hand.

Finally, the mentor voice has the highest probability of authorial (covert) affect, and a median probability of non-authorial affect. This text (from Lectures on Electromagnetic Theory) is in fact very different from all the other texts in terms of its overall style. Compare:

(14) As far as the interrelationship of electromagnetic quantities is concerned Maxwell knew as much as we do today. He did not
actually suggest communication between continents with the aid of geostationary satellites, but if he was taken now to a satellite ground-station he would not be numbed with astonishment. If we would give him half an hour to get over the shock of his resurrection he would quietly sit down with a piece of paper (the back of a bigger envelope, I suppose) and would work out the relevant design formulae.

[...] I could go on for a long time in praise of Maxwell. Unfortunately we have little time for digressions however entertaining they might be.

[...] The rest of the course will be concerned with the various solutions of eqns (1.1)–(1.7). Isn’t this boring for an engineer? Shouldn’t this be done by mathematicians or by computer programmers?

Not for the time being.

[...] In order to have a unified view of the subject we have started with Maxwell’s equations. It means a new approach but not a radical departure. The subject is still the same. You will be able to see that the laws you love and cherish (Coulomb’s, Biot-Savart’s, Snell’s, etc.) all follow from our eqns (1.1)–(1.7). The order of discussion will follow the traditional one: electrostatics first, followed by steady currents, then we shall move on to slowly varying phenomena, and reach finally the most interesting part, fast-varying phenomena, exhibiting the full beauty of Maxwell’s wonderful equations.

[...] The choice of [formula] in the form of eqn (2.5) immediately ensures that eqn (2.1) is satisfied: [formula], so we have less to worry about.

[...] Interestingly, the electric field does not depend on the actual positions of the charges. (BRC, FEF 11–99)

In this text, there are many first and second person pronouns (I, we, our, you) and question–answer sequences (underlined), which make the text very interactive. Apart from the emotion terms relating to Maxwell, which are used to illustrate a point, the other emotion terms are crucial in construing the writer–reader relationship, referring either to the writer...
(for example interestingly), the reader (for example boring for an engineer) or both at the same time (we have less to worry about). Presumably, the peculiar style of this text results from the transformation of what was originally spoken academic discourse into written academic discourse. I call this the mentor voice, because the writer seems to construe himself very much as a guide, or mentor into the subject matter, someone who is willing to share his ample experience with the students, and who construes himself very much as part of a bigger research community to which the students (will) belong.

In terms of the data analyzed here, five (or potentially six\(^5\)) affective keys have suggested themselves. However, affective keys are only reliably identifiable by looking at a relatively large number of texts (Martin & White 2005: 163), and can depend on the subject matter, discipline, and on the type and genre of academic discourse. Clearly, more research into different types of academic discourse, with the help of a bigger corpus, is necessary (a) to confirm and refine the identified affective keys, and (b) to add further affective keys.

To finish, a brief glance at affective stance in academic discourse. As in the other registers, we can find clusters of affect types in different stretches of text that construct a certain stance. Because of space constraints, I can only give one example here – text AS6, which concerns urban poverty, and its effect on society. This is conceptualized in terms of mainly negative emotions, and there is a preponderance of negative security: disquiet terms relating to poverty and attendant consequences. For example:

(15) The biggest single difficulty in drawing attention to urban poverty is that it is not new, but simply – in some of its most worrying manifestations – getting worse. Like the poor themselves, the inner city has long been with us. Ever since the Industrial Revolution created a mass urban society, the conditions of the poorest city dwellers have given rise to anxiety among the better off. (BRC, AS6 5–7)

The feelings in this file are also mostly general, relating to the public or society as such. Table 6.6 gives a summary of emoters, affect types and triggers. In this example the construal of personae in terms of affective stance (here mostly the population, society or a general emoter), in fact functions rhetorically to construct urban poverty in terms of its effect on people. The emphasis is not so much on the emoters, but rather on the
Table 6.6  Affect types in AS6 (BRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoter</th>
<th>Emotion term</th>
<th>Affect type</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>author (+ general)</td>
<td>worrying</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>poverty (in some of its manifestations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the better off</td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>the conditions of the poorest city dwellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>outrage</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>The inner city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td>impatience</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>at the slackening pace of social reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td>optimism</td>
<td>security: trust</td>
<td>that little more than economic growth, fuelled by technological change, was needed to remove the main causes of urban deprivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the poor in London, Bristol, Birmingham, Liverpool</td>
<td>frustration</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>plight of the inner cities, collapse of manufacturing industry, outlook for unskilled looked bleak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the residents of the poorest areas</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>of attack on themselves or their property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>frightening</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>an underclass (football hooligans, muggers, inner city rioters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>alarm</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>The spiral in drug abuse and trafficking, with direct consequences for the AIDS epidemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td>fears</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>that this particularly dangerous substance [crack] might become widespread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>anxiety</td>
<td>security: disquiet</td>
<td>about urban squalor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political will</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td></td>
<td>to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general (people who live there)</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>happiness: cheer</td>
<td>living-spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
<td>discontent</td>
<td>satisfaction: displeasure</td>
<td>none [mood]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government approach</td>
<td>hopefully</td>
<td>inclination: desire</td>
<td>reducing the potential for conflict among the urban poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trigger in terms of its emotional impact – displeasure and, predominantly, disquiet. At the same time as characterizing the research object, it also underlines the importance of the problem.

6.2 Investigating and problematizing affective key

Instantiation and individuation. One possible research project into affective key would be to investigate how far the keys that were identified here on the basis of a small corpus are relevant across a larger group of texts, addressing the question of how we can generalize from instances to keys. In terms of SFL theory, this problem can be discussed with respect to the cline of instantiation (see Martin & White 2005: 23–5). Ultimately, future research will show whether the identified keys will stand the test of time, and the extent to which these affective co-selections recur across texts.

Another research project could address the relation between signatures and keys. Signatures concern ‘syndromes of evaluation which characterise an individual’ (Martin & White 2005: 203) rather than groups of texts written by different individuals. In SFL, this involves the cline of individuation (see Martin in press). Examining only affective patterns that are present in one text, it is difficult to say whether they constitute signatures or keys. Researchers investigating instantiation and individuation would therefore need to look at a corpus of similar texts by different authors, and a corpus of different texts by the same author to explore how a particular text is alike or unlike other texts of the same register, and how it is alike or unlike other texts by the same author.6

Key, patterns, and frequency. Another controversial issue is the narrow definition of key adopted here. Martin & White (2005) speak of evaluative keys in terms of all systems of appraisal (attitude, engagement, graduation), meaning that the concept relates to patterning across the taxonomy of appraisal. Affective key, on the other hand, relates only to one of the sub-systems of attitude (affect), meaning that the concept relates to patterning within a taxonomy. Thus, incorporating configurations of patterns outside affect might suggest different sets of keys. This issue relates to how we know which aspects of appraisal establish key. For instance, when we consider purely frequency of emotion terms in news reporting we find that Sports and Arts have more emotion terms per 1000 words than the texts in the other affective key set (with the exception of Social reporting): see Table 6.7. This distribution is partly confirmed when we look at 15 frequent emotion terms in the six categories of reporting in the 2.6 million word BRC news reportage corpus (anxious,
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Table 6.7 Number of emotion terms in news reportage categories of the BRC baby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of emotion terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

surprised, delighted, grateful, embarrassed, anxiety, optimism, humiliation, happiness, regret (N), admire, anger (V), surprise (V), baffle, frighten), which is as follows:

Social (573.9 ppm) > Sports (339.2 ppm) > Arts (338.2 ppm) > Report (257.8 ppm) > Science (229.7 ppm) > Commerce (181.2 ppm).

That is, in terms of frequency different sets of texts suggest themselves: Social – Sports/Arts – Report/Science – Commerce.

Comparing this with the establishment of keys in journalistic discourse, Martin & White (2005: 176–7) note that their reporter voice has rates of authorial appreciation of between 0.9 and 6.3 per 500 words, and their writer voice has rates of between 1.6 and 11.3 per 500 words. But if some reporter voice texts have a rate as high as 6.3 and some writer voice texts have a rate as low as 1.6, this means that some reporter voice texts may contain more appreciation than writer voice texts. In other words, if frequency of appreciation were taken as the distinguishing criterion, different evaluative keys would be identified, as the texts would fall into different sets.

The same is true to some extent for academic discourse. Looking at the distribution of 15 frequent emotion terms (willing, anxious, worried, surprised, disappointed, enthusiasm, reluctance, willingness, optimism, temptation, worry (V), anger (V), dislike (V), admire, resent) in the different disciplines represented in the larger BRC academic discourse sub-corpus, emotion terms are distributed as follows:

Humanities (327.3 ppm) > Politics/law/education (277.9 ppm) > Social and behavioural sciences (240 ppm) > Medicine (99 ppm) > Technology/computing/engineering (58.3 ppm) > Natural sciences (31 ppm).
These findings can be compared to Hyland’s (1999) study which showed that attitude markers vary in frequency according to subject. They were found to be least frequent in biology and physics, followed by electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, and most frequent in sociology, philosophy, marketing and applied linguistics. Hyland concludes that ‘the distribution of stance [overall] shows a clear correlation with the traditional distinction between hard and soft disciplines’ (Hyland 1999: 109). Hyland (2004) also finds that the soft sciences express ‘far more explicitly personal stance’ (Hyland 2004: 18) compared to the hard sciences. Even though Hyland’s attitude markers include more than emotion terms, and the analysis of emotion terms includes more than just the expression of (authorial) stance (cf. Section 1.5), meaning that the results are not directly comparable, the similarities are quite striking. The frequency distribution of emotion terms, like the distribution of attitude markers, seems to correlate with the distinction between hard and soft sciences, being most frequent in the humanities and least frequent in the natural sciences.

In terms of frequency, then, six affective keys suggest themselves (corresponding to different disciplines), which only partly overlap with the affective keys suggested above: see Table 6.8. Thus, the observer voice contains both texts from the social sciences and the humanities, rather than being associated with one discipline only. This is not surprising since both have a common interest in social life, and its products, and analyses of art will make reference to aspects of social life, as will historical analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Illustrator</th>
<th>Argumentor</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EWW, FPG: technology/politics/law/education</td>
<td>FC1, ACJ: social sciences</td>
<td>ALP: technology/politics/law/education</td>
<td>A6U, A56, EA7: social sciences, humanities</td>
<td>FEF: natural sciences</td>
<td>HWV: medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings for frequency of affect in journalistic and academic discourse throw up a question that future research will need to address: should patterning or frequency of appraisal be taken as a basis for establishing key? A related question is how we know just which aspects of appraisal actually establish key. Perhaps we need more sophisticated techniques for more precise measurements, such as the factor analysis applied by Biber and his colleagues (Section 1.5). It is also necessary to
find out about the minimum corpus size needed to reliably identify keys – the BRC baby is certainly too small, but are the corpora used by Martin & White (2005) and Coffin (2006) big enough? In other words, corpus-based research could tackle these issues by compiling representative corpora, analyzing the data according to all aspects of appraisal that could be potentially relevant and using multivariate statistical techniques to determine relevant configurations of appraisal. Precht (2000) does research in conversation along these lines using the stance paradigm.

6.3 Functions of emotion terms

In this section I look more closely at the pragmatic functions of emotion talk in the four registers of the BRC baby. This is not intended to be exhaustive of possibilities in the four registers. All that is intended is an illustration of some typical functions of emotion terms as evidenced in the BRC baby.

Conversation. As is well-known, casual conversation can involve moments of story-telling which are generically structured as narrative (Eggins 2004: 74). In the context of story-telling, emotion terms are employed by narrators to describe the emotive reaction of characters (including the speaker) in a narrative or by hearers to provide an evaluative comment on it:

(16) [Narrative about a near-collision with a car]
AUDREY [288] A woman said, my God! [289] And it [the car] came through on red Gordon! [290] You know where the er, the er MacDonalds is on the corner?
GORDON [291] Yeah.
AUDREY [292] There! [293] I was crossing there. [294] ... I couldn’t believe it.[295] Everybody sort of, you know, they were, they were just absolutely staggered! [296] It frightened me to death! (BRC, KBC)

(17) [Narrative about evacuees]
GORDON [141] And then she was going out making money on munitions.
AUDREY [142] Yes.
GORDON [143] So there’s a big income coming and no kids to feed.
GORDON [146] And then of course, this was all blown when ... th the raids stopped for a quite a long time, all these bloody kids came back!

AUDREY [147] Yes.

GORDON [148] And they **didn't** really **want** them back at that time.

AUDREY [149] Oh I know. [150] I know

GORDON [151] They were quite happy where they were you see.

AUDREY [152] Mm. [153] ... Yeah, it's **amazing** really.

(BRC, KBC)

These two functions have attracted the attention of many linguists in the past: the classical reference is Labov (1972) on evaluation in narrative – Cortazzi & Jin (2000: 108) give an overview of the application of his model in linguistics, and Bamberg (1997c) includes many relevant contributions. Emotion terms belong to the evaluative resources that story tellers use to show the point of a story (Labov 1972: 366) or that story recipients employ to 'show appreciation of story content or narrative performance' (Cortazzi & Jin 2000: 110). Even though evaluation is concentrated in one section, it pervades the whole narrative in 'waves of evaluation' (Labov 1972: 369). Similarly, Bamberg (1991, 1997a) discusses how references to emotion connect and frame narrative episodes, providing a certain perspective on the narrated events. The structuring function of emotion terms has also been noted by Precht, who emphasizes that 'the evaluation seems to be made just as often by the listener as by the story teller' (Precht 2003: 248). On evaluation and narrative/textual structure compare also Fiehler (1990: 231), Martin & Plum (1997), Martin (2001: 316, 2004a, 2004c), Macken-Horarik (2003a), Reilly & Seibert (2003: 548), Galasiński (2004: 71), and Hunston & Thompson (2000: 11, citing Sinclair 1987).

When conversation is more fluid, when 'more open-ended structures ... take over as the talk develops dynamically, with no clear end point to be achieved, and few discrete steps or stage boundaries along the way' (Eggins 2004: 75), emotion terms can provide evaluations of triggers that are offered in order to keep the conversation going (evaluations other than affect are underlined in the example):

(18) ALAN [1916] Have you ever tried octopus?
NONE [1917] Erm ... no.
BARRY [1918] Er ... no I haven’t.
NONE  [1919] No.
BARRY  [1920] I mean, squid I've eaten a lot of.
ALAN   [1921] Bit like that innit?
        [1922] Squid.
BARRY  [1923] Yeah.
ALAN   [1924] I've had octopus soup.
        [1925] That was quite ... well ... a weird taste.
BARRY  [1926] I like shark.
        [1927] Have you eaten shark?
ALAN   [1928] No.
BARRY  [1929] Oh I like shark, it’s really nice cos it ... it’s really meaty, I mean, it’s like eating meat (BRC, KBD)

This text shifts from Alan’s and Barry’s talk about and evaluation of octopus and squid to Barry’s evaluation of shark, with both affective and other evaluations ‘propelling’ the conversation (compare Martin 2000b: 31–4). The conversation continues with further talk about shark, a fish shop, fish markets, cooking, octopus and related matters for another 128 utterances, with speakers offering various experiences and evaluations. This demonstrates that, as Martin has put it, ‘appraisal telos ... anticipates expansion, with respect to the attitudes available for negotiation (as speakers align and individuate by way of negotiating solidarity relations’ (Martin 2000b: 38). It is not just authorial affect, but also non-authorial affect that propels conversation, for instance questions about evaluations by the listener or a third party (such as why does sea fishing interest you?). Additionally, to enquire about someone’s emotions/evaluations naturally means taking an active interest in that person, and can be regarded as a positive politeness strategy. On the other hand, in example (18), the inquiry is used to monitor the child’s progress at school, and is employed very differently – showing the importance of social power, rank and status with respect to emotion talk (see Poynton 1985: 78, Abu-Lughod & Lutz 1990: 14, Irvine 1990: 128, Gallois 1994, Planalp 1999: 147, Precht 2003: 241):

(19) VALERIE   [438] Did you get it [homework] all right?
              [439] Was she pleased with you today? (BRC, KE4)

Some non-authorial affect is used jokingly or for teasing, contributing to bonding. Note the laughter in the examples below:

(20) MARTINE  [7251] The Tottenham game was really good wasn’t it?
NONE 2 [7252] You let them down
MERIELLE [7253] Yeah
NONE 2 [7254] you, you were meant to come on and score
two goals and
MERIELLE [7255] Yeah
MARTINE [7256] You got the score
MARTINE [laugh] (BRC, KD8)

(21) MARTINE [7397] Oh you don’t want to have a Robin Hood
do you?
MIKE [7398] just shave that bit there and
MARTINE [7399] no, oh no,
MARTINE [7400] no, please don’t
MIKE [7401] Or just shave me tache off
MARTINE [7402] Oh
MIKE [laugh]
MARTINE [7403] I hate beards like that, I dislike that
MIKE [7404] No not to a point
MARTINE [7405] I know, but sort of none there and just all
sort of down there, like sort of Brian
MARTINE [7406] That’s no good
MIKE [7407] sticking out of his head
MARTINE [7408] [laugh] . . . oh . . . (BRC, KD8)

Other interpersonal resources such as mood (negation) and apprecia-
tion/judgement clearly contribute to the teasing at play here. Research
into appraisal and humour is still in its infancy, but see Eggins &
Slade (1997) for exploratory research, and Knight (2007) for an ongoing
research project into appraisal, humour and bonding.

On a more local level emotion terms are used in association with
cause–effect relations, often providing explanations for behaviour or
justifications of decisions (on the importance of causal explanation for
comprehension see O’Halloran 2003: 208–11):

(22) GORDON [67] She said we always sleep together
AUDREY [laugh]
GORDON [68] sister and me.
AUDREY [69] Yeah.
GORDON [70] She said, **why do you do that?** [71] Says, well . . . if I wake up in the night and my sister's not there I'll think someone's taken her or she's run away, **I'll be frightened.** [72] And the same applies the other way so we always stick together. (BRC, KBC)

Investigating just what kind of causal connections are made with emotion terms is an interesting and fruitful area of research (see Bednarek forthcoming). Such references show exactly what kind of behaviour can be justified by making reference to emotional experience, and also reflect the kind of folk construal of emotional behaviour that was referred to in terms of emotion schema in Chapter 5 (with respect to causal antecedents). The importance for affect in cause–effect relations also confirms findings by Painter regarding mother–child talk that ‘apparently impersonal areas such as causal relations and generalizations arise initially from the impetus to share “attitude”’ (Painter 2003: 183, italics in original) as well as findings by Edwards (1999) on emotion discourse and rational accountability in relationship counselling sessions. It also supports the claims made by the philosopher Errol Bedford in the 1950s that emotion terms can be used to explain and justify behaviour or actions (Bedford 1956/57: 303).

**News reportage.** I have already discussed the functions of emotion terms in news reportage to some extent elsewhere, and shall not comment on them in detail here. In Bednarek (2006a: 156–60, 170–8) I looked at the discourse functions of lexical items referring to news actors’ emotion and volition in British news stories, examining what is essentially non-authorial affect in the appraisal framework (though appraisal theory was not applied). Generally speaking, such references can be used to evaluate, to emotionalize, and to dramatize. The main functions identified for references to EMOTION and VOLITION in Bednarek (2006a) were:

- evaluating the content of attributed propositions as positive/negative
- evoking the reader's emotion (see also Ungerer 1997)
- evoking the reader's interest, appealing to their emotional voyeurism (for example in headlines and other prominent positions)
- shifting blame (with VOLITION)
- triggering positive/negative evaluation
- enhancing news value (in particular negativity, colour, unexpectedness and facticity)
In terms of authorial affect, White notes that

**AFFECT** strongly foregrounds authorial inter-subjectivity when it is the author's own emotional responses which are being presented. For authors to describe their own anger, fear, sadness, boredom etc is clearly to inject their own subjectivity into the text. (White 1998: 272)

Authorial affect, when it occurs in the news data, seems mostly to express a personalized opinion on the part of the news writer, hence introducing an unwanted subjectivity in a purportedly objective type of discourse. This explains why such references are rare in news discourse in general (Martin & White 2005: 177) – in particular, overt rather than covert authorial affect, as shown above (Table 6.5).

**Fiction.** As suggested in Section 4.3, emotion terms in fiction provide characterizations, create imagery, cause empathy, and establish point of view. The construal of characters can lead us to like or dislike them, empathize with them or not, identify with them or not. This has been commented on in terms of reader involvement, engagement and affinity (Watson 1999), identification, empathy (Dijkstra et al. 1994: 142, Macken-Horarik 2003a: 286), and the author's 'play of sympathy and antipathy' (Martin & White (2005: 73).9

Books of fiction can be considered as ‘macro-genres’ (Martin & Rose 2003: 209) that comprise different types of genres. One possibility for linguistic analysis is hence to investigate the function of emotion terms with respect to logogenesis in the generic structure. However, space does not allow such an analysis here. The perspective that is adopted in this section is therefore local rather than global, considering the immediate functions of emotion terms in text passages without taking into account the larger co-text of the chapter or book.

Firstly, emotion terms in dialogue and in descriptive passages can construe the emotional relationship between characters:

(23) ‘I’ve **missed** you so much, this time,’ she told him breathlessly.  
‘Can’t think why.  
Really forgotten what you look like.  
Let’s have a look at you.  
Hum, not bad, considering your age and everything I suppose….’  
‘It s great to be home, darling.  
I’ve **missed** you too,’ he whispered in her ear.  
‘Don’t know why I feel this way.  
Must be Spring!’ (BRC, AC2 35-43)
As readers, we are invited to incorporate this affective relationship into our ongoing mental construction of the narrative, and to ‘care’ about the characters – whether through positive or negative emotions.

Emotion terms can also provide readers with a character’s affective perspective on an entity or a proposition. This affective perspective may either be long-term (shading into judgement as a construal of an emoter’s character values) or momentary (compare news reportage above):

(24) Mark always experienced the same feelings of contentment when entering the home straight. Today he felt particularly pleased to be back. (BRC, AC2 21–22)

How such construals of temporary or long-term affective states create emotional responses such as empathy or identification or evaluative reactions in readers may depend on the personality of the reader, but is also associated with cultural norms. For instance, it would be hard for any reader to adopt a positive perspective on O’Reilly in the following example:

(25) O’Reilly was impossible to please and suspicious of everybody and everything. He trusted nobody, not even fellow Catholics on the Board. (BRC, AC2 85–86)

Depending on affective key (see Section 6.1 above), emotion terms can also be part of descriptions, with an emphasis on the emotional impact of the described entity on a given character or in general, and also creating a certain atmosphere or ambience:

(26) And now, for the first time, he thought that he could smell the North Sea, that potent but half-illusory tang evoking nostalgic memories of childhood holidays, of solitary adolescent walks as he struggled with his first poems, of his aunt’s tall figure at his side, binoculars round her neck, striding towards the haunts of her beloved birds. And here, barring the road, was the familiar old farm gate still in place. Its continued presence always surprised him since it served no purpose that he could see except symbolically to cut off the headland and to give travellers pause to consider whether they really wanted to continue. (BRC, C8T 4–6)

This can also occur in descriptions of characters. For instance, in the following passage, a female character is described through the eyes of
a male character (the focalizer; compare the underlined verbs that refer to cognition and perception), providing an evaluation of that character and contributing to imagery, giving the reader a mental picture from the focalizer's point of view:

(26) It was a distinguished face with the deep-set, widely spaced eyes beneath straight brows, a well-shaped, rather secretive mouth and strong greying hair swept upwards and curled into a chignon. In her publicity photographs she could, he recalled, look beautiful in a somewhat intimidating, intellectual and very English mould. But seen face to face, even in the informality of her own house, the absence of a spark of sexuality and, he sensed, a deep-seated reserve, made her seem less feminine and more formidable than he had expected, and she held herself stiffly as if repelling invaders of her personal space. The handshake with which she had greeted him had been cool and firm and her brief smile was surprisingly attractive. He knew that he was oversensitive to the timbre of the human voice and hers, although not jarring or unpleasant, sounded a little forced as if she were deliberately speaking at an unnatural pitch. (BRC, C8T 34–38)

Describing the inner life of characters, then, helps to engage us emotionally, to make us care. Where this is not the case, a character can remain ‘a shadowy figure’ or ‘less than fully human’ (Robinson 2005: 217). Descriptions of characters’ emotions have moral connotations of virtue and vice (van Meel 1994: 162), and conceptualize characters as particular types of persons (Dijkstra et al. 1994: 142).

**Academic discourse.** I am only going to list some important functions of emotion terms in academic discourse together with an illustrative example, since they have already been commented on above in the analysis of affective key:

- Providing explanations: *It is possible to process the records in a directly organized file either directly, using the keys in any desired order;*
- Introducing a problem: *A bank cannot predict which of its customers wish to withdraw or deposit money on any given day . . . As these transactions are not predictable they present a processing problem;*
- Illustrating a point/argument: *A fairly typical set of facts is provided by Nedrick (1986), where D had a grudge against a woman;*
• Offering reasoning (cause-effect relations): Aware of practitioners’ frustration in not being able to work effectively with these problematic clients, Probation management [...] determined to develop an Alcohol Education Course;

• Observing aspects of human life: This article comes out of the familiar experience of being drawn to a particular image, or set of images, without at first knowing why;

• Construing the writer/reader relationship and writer/reader personae: Isn’t this boring for an engineer? Shouldn’t this be done by mathematicians or by computer programmers? Not for the time being;

• Construing an argument: In the sections to follow the stark question is therefore put ‘Is the Probation Service in the business of inflicting pain?’ and the answer which unfolds maybe summarized ‘No, because it neither aspires nor wishes to!’;

• Construing a research topic, often in terms of its importance/relevance: For this reason, the variable and often unsatisfactory seroconversion rates in developing countries after routine administration of OPV are of concern.

It is not affect alone that is associated with these functions; for instance, question–answer sequences are just one of a number of linguistic features that interact with affect to produce these effects. Since much research into evaluation in English for Academic Purposes exists (compare Section 5.1), no more will be said about this here. There is no doubt, however, that research into affect needs to take into account different genres and registers (Swales 2004, Biber 2006) of academic discourse.

6.4 A road-map for research on affect

The proposed road-map for research on affect mentioned at the beginning of this chapter aims at a three-pronged analysis for each genre, text type or register, such that the study of, say, affect in news reviews would involve a large-scale quantitative corpus analysis, a small-scale corpus analysis, and a qualitative analysis of one or a few texts, with each analysis having certain foci, advantages and disadvantages. Compare Table 6.9. This extends previous studies in linguistics that involve both corpus and discourse analysis, for instance corpus-based discourse analyses or Matthiessen’s ‘two-pronged approach’ (Matthiessen 2006: 110).
It is evident that the focus of this book has been predominantly on large- and small-scale corpus analysis rather than qualitative analysis, and that only certain aspects of affect could be investigated. Summing up, we need bigger corpora to investigate affect in different genres, text types, and registers (also taking into account intra-register/intra-genre/intra-text type variation), to explore instantiation and individuation (keys vs. signatures), and to examine the polyfunctionality and ‘flexibility’ (Edwards 1999: 281) of emotion talk. We also need studies that involve more variables of affect (and other appraisal sub-systems) and examine the co-selection and patterning of these variables, as well as qualitative studies that take into account logogenesis and social context. The studies reported on in this chapter are therefore intended to serve as a stepping stone to future research which elaborates on, confirms or contradicts these findings.

6.5 Envoi

Chapter 6 has taken a brief foray into the study of the pragmatics of emotion terms, outlining projects and challenges for future research. At a more general level, and echoing what Martin & White (2005: 260) note for the study of evaluation, research into affect needs to find the right balance between corpus-linguistic (quantitative) and discourse analytical (qualitative) research, as well as research that is situated somewhere in-between (such as small-scale corpus analysis). Another challenge is the combination of both social and cognitive approaches to the language of emotion, as we need to reach beyond the limits of any single analytical perspective. If emotion is at the same time rooted in biology (in the mind) as well as socio-culturally construed, we arguably need to look for an approach that can bring out both – providing a kaleidoscopic
lens which fractures perception, and simultaneously shows us different aspects of emotion talk.

This book is intended to make a contribution to the combination of corpus and discourse-analytic as well as functional and cognitive research. As such, the analyses might be useful for:

- the application of appraisal theory;
- the modelling of probabilistic register variation;
- lexicography and language teaching;
- natural language processing (automated register recognition, parsing of affect).

The analyses have also offered ways of seeing what we get up to when we use emotion terms in language, whether in conversation, news reportage, fiction or academic discourse. From this examination, it does not seem to be strictly true that ‘how we talk about emotion ... is a question analogous to how we talk about nature, about the body, about teaching’ (Weigand 2004b: 11). Rather, emotion talk tells us much more about human interaction, about power relations, about social and cultural norms – about human life as such.

Notes

1. In order not to skew the analysis in Table 6.3 one article was excluded from Social reporting for these frequency calculations, as it reports French emotions/attitudes towards clothes/laundry, and therefore has as many as 26 emotion terms (more than all the other articles in this category combined). Nevertheless, I have analyzed this article, and comment on it below.
2. I make no distinction within authorial affect between mediated/unmediated affect because news writers rarely quote themselves. This may be different in other text types, for example academic discourse.
3. The small girl in the first sentence seems to be the emoter here with the writer adopting her perspective; hence this is classified as covert unmediated affect.
4. In Table 6.5, the terms in brackets occur in one text only, A1G. A1G clearly differs from all other texts in the Report category in including both covert and overt authorial affect (as well as first person references to the writer) – it is perhaps misclassified. The text, given below in example (i) deals with the Siberian crane, and concludes with a clear evaluation on the part of the writer, making it more of a commentator voice text (affect in bold; other evaluations underlined):
   (i) Given the awesome sum of human misery in this part of the world, I suppose I shouldn’t get too worked up about the fate of a flock of birds — particularly as the much larger eastern race of the Siberian crane, which migrates from north-eastern Yakutia to the lower reaches of the
Yangtse river in China, is apparently surviving well. But if the snow-wreaths of the Ob river don’t reach Bharatpur this year, I shall feel inescapably sad. (A1G 128–129)

5. One of the files, HWV, does not easily fit in any of the keys (though it is somewhat similar to the descriptor voice in its predominant absence of affect). It contains only two instances of covert authorial affect, but no non-authorial affect, and constitutes perhaps an affective key in itself. In this key, authorial covert affect is used only in the discussion section, here outlining the significance of the problem:

(ii) ... For this reason, the variable and often unsatisfactory seroconversion rates in developing countries after routine administration of OPV are of concern, especially in tropical areas where wild poliovirus infection remains endemic. (HWV 82)

As Hood points out, negative emotions can be used to construe research topics as problematic, and worthy of research (Hood 2006: 41).

6. There is not yet much research in SFL on instantiation and individuation (Martin in press), and the relation between these clines cannot be discussed here. Generally speaking, ‘instantiation interprets the relation of system to instance’ (Martin in press) whereas ‘[i]ndividuation interprets the relation of system to individual’ (Martin in press). Watson (1999) has shown that there may be variation in affect even between novels by the same author.

7. This is not to imply that the mentor voice is the only voice present in the natural sciences; rather, it is the voice that is adopted in the random sample from natural sciences investigated here. I suspect that most natural sciences texts in fact make use of the descriptor voice, and that the mentor voice has more to do with lecturing than written academic discourse.

8. Additionally, emotion terms relating to dis/inclination – what has been described as boulomaic modality (for example Simpson 1993) – are frequently associated in conversation with making plans and offers (see also Precht 2003: 250). Desire terms are clearly important with reference to goals, which are vital for the regulation of human life and well-being, as social cognitive psychologists have shown (Pishwa 2005). Desire terms are also often used to express offers (Do you want some help with it; KD0), orders (plus you want the archiving doing, the A three drawer doing [= reported order]; KD8), and demands (Have you got two tens you want to change for a twenty Paul?; KD0). In many such examples want is simply used as part of a conversational formula. Compare Werth (1998) and Precht (2000: 137, 139) on emotion terms and conventionalized formulae (examples are I'm afraid, I'm sorry, to my regret, and so on). (In SFL terms, some of them can be described as interpersonal grammatical metaphor; see Martin 2000b.) Terms of volition can also be used to evaluate a trigger (clausally realized in the following example) positively or negatively on the part of the emoter:

(iii) DAVID [472] Don’t want to go.
    VALERIE [473] Well you’ll have to get ready for going. (KE4)
    → ‘I go’ = bad
This is because saying that you desire an event to happen implies that, from your perspective, it is good if this event actually happens, and vice versa. Desire terms can also provide more indirect evaluations of entities in terms of the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of the emoter's goals (Bednarek forthcoming).

9. Emotion terms are also associated with suspense (cf. Dijkstra et al. 1994: 142) and provide clues to the reader (in crime fiction). Emotion terms that are part of dialogue in fiction arguably mimic conversation and have similar functions, which I will not discuss here again. It would be interesting, however, to compare fictive dialogue in detail with real-life conversation.

10. Compare also Martin & White (2005: 89). Emotion terms can also construe emotional relationship of characters towards animals, as in file AC2.

11. These applications are discussed more extensively in Appendix A 6.4 online.
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