

Chapter 1

Introduction

Charles Forceville and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi

All discourse is persuasive in the sense of aiming for some sort of cognitive, emotional or aesthetic effect, or all three together, in its envisaged audience. But purely verbal messages and texts in (mass) communication are nowadays often complemented, or even superseded, by information in other signifying systems. Printed material (advertisements, manuals, instruction books, maps, graphics, cartoons, etc.) usually combine, and establish interactions between, verbal and pictorial information, while most films and TV programs in addition draw on music and non-verbal sound. Internet sites combine text with pictures and sound, and pay attention to graphic lay-out. Spoken language is often accompanied by gestures, while modern product design involves not only what products *look* like, but also how they *sound* (e.g., cars' motors, their closing doors) or even *smell*.

Such developments reverberate in scholarly research. Classic language and literature faculties in the humanities are on the wane or get transformed and relabeled as media or cultural studies departments. Academic research in the humanities is beginning to shift from a focus on exclusively verbal text to discourses in which language is but one – albeit still highly important – communicative mode. This inescapable trend toward multimodality, whether applauded or bemoaned, clearly transpires from the rapidly growing number of papers, books, and conference panels with “multimodal” or one of its cognates in the title.

In the current volume this important development in humanities research is studied from the perspective of another, somewhat older paradigm shift: the claim that metaphor is not primarily a matter of language, but structures thought and action. This view was first systematically presented, at least in the English-speaking world, by two book-length studies: Andrew Ortony's (1979) edited volume *Metaphor and Thought*, which had its second life in a revised and expanded edition in 1993, and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's monograph *Metaphors We Live By* (1980; see also Lakoff and Johnson 2003).

We believe that the book you have in your hands is pertinent to scholars in both metaphorology and multimodality. Clearly, metaphorists considering themselves adherents of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) initiated by Lakoff and Johnson need to take seriously at least one crucial consequence of the tenet that “metaphor [is] not a figure of speech, but a mode of thought” (Lakoff 1993: 210): that metaphor can occur in other modes than language alone. Indeed they *must* do so, for if researching non-verbal and not-purely-verbal metaphor does not yield robust findings, this jeopardizes the Lakoff-and-Johnsonian presupposition that we think metaphorically. After all, in that case the supposedly metaphorical nature of human thinking would turn out to be a misconception: what has been presented as the CONCEPTUAL level of metaphor would then simply be verbal metaphor under a different name, disguised in SMALL CAPITALS. Mark Johnson appears to agree, arguing that lurking behind an exclusive focus on language is the prejudice that meaning is only to be found in words. He emphasizes that “the processes of embodied meaning in the arts are the very same ones that make linguistic meaning possible” (2007: 209). Of course work to correct the one-sided emphasis on verbal manifestations has already been done, notably on gesture and pictures, both by authors represented in this book and by others. What is new in this book is that it focuses not so much on non-verbal metaphor *per se*, but on multimodal metaphor, that is, on metaphors whose target and source are rendered exclusively or predominantly in two different modes/modalities (the terms “mode” and “modality” are currently both in use; it is unclear at present which one will catch on) – and in many cases the verbal is one of these. The definition of a mode is an extremely thorny one (for more discussion, see Forceville 2006/this volume). For present purposes, the modes to be taken into account are two or more of the following: (1) written language; (2) spoken language; (3) static and moving images; (4) music; (5) non-verbal sound; (6) gestures. Since what can be conveyed in terms of facts, emotions, and aesthetic pleasure differs from one mode to another, the choices for (one) particular mode(s) over (an)other(s) that the producer of a multimodal metaphor has to make is/are bound to affect its overall meaning. One mode’s potential to render “meaning” can never be completely “translated” into that of another mode – and sometimes translation is downright impossible. For this reason alone, a healthy theory of (cognitive) metaphor must systematically study non-verbal and multimodal metaphor. It may well be – indeed it is very probable – that the excessive emphasis on the verbal manifestations of metaphorical thought has blinded researchers to dimensions of the latter that quite simply cannot be cued by the verbal mode.

But researchers in the field of multimodal discourse can in their turn benefit from the work done by interdisciplinary-oriented (but often linguistically trained) metaphor scholars. It is true that “semiotics,” rooted in the structuralism of the 1960s and 1970s, deserves credit for being the first discipline to have conducted sustained research into non-verbal communication, at least if we discount art history, which has necessarily always had a more restricted focus. It is therefore also no coincidence that some of the contributors in this volume propose to marry insights from semiotics to those of cognitivist linguistics – and neither is the recent foundation of a journal called *Cognitive Semiotics*. However, multimodal discourse is a vast territory, comprising a multitude of material carriers (paper, celluloid, videotape, bits and bytes, stone, cloth ...), modes (written language, spoken language, visuals, sound, music, gesture, smell, touch), and genres (art, advertising, instruction manual; or at a more detailed level, say, “comedy,” “film noir,” “Western,” “science fiction”), many of these being further categorizable. It seems at this moment in time impossible, therefore, to provide anything approaching a holistic blueprint of multimodal discourse – although attempts have been made (Kress and Van Leeuwen 1996/2006, 2001; Baldry and Thibault 2006; O’Halloran 2004; but see Ventola et al. 2004 for more focused approaches). By contrast, systematically tracing the possible manifestations of a specific concept such as “metaphor” across various material carriers, modes, and genres, will signpost promising scholarly avenues, we trust, for how to analyze yet other aspects of multimodal discourse.

One way to date the conception of this book is to say that its seed was planted at “The pragmatics of multimodal representations” panel that we, the editors, organized at the 9th International Pragmatics Conference (Riva del Garda, Italy, 10–15 July 2005). In the call for papers we had emphasized we were particularly interested in multimodal metaphor, and in the end the majority of the submissions focused specifically on this topic. Along with these, other scholars we knew to have the expertise to bridge cognitive linguistics and the budding discipline of multimodal discourse were approached with the request to submit an abstract. They were given detailed guidelines about the book’s concept, and about how we envisaged each contribution fitting in. In order to ensure internal coherence, it was suggested that all prospective contributors take their cue for the definition of multimodal metaphor from the position paper by Forceville (2006/this volume) or else that they make clear why and how they deviated from it. Moreover, we requested that prospective contributors apply theoretical concepts systematically to one or more real-life case studies, the idea being that this procedure would fruitfully force them to face problems that mere introspective reasoning often circum-

vents (cf. Haser 2005: 50). In addition, each chapter is thereby expected to spawn ideas how the proposed procedure can be deployed to analyze *other* multimodal representations than those examined there. Contributors were also encouraged to present (some of) their conclusions in a form that allows for empirical testing. Most of those we approached responded positively, and of the latter, the majority of the delivered chapters displayed the quality we had in mind. Early drafts of the chapters were extensively commented upon both by the editors and by one other contributing author.

The guiding principle running through the chapters is a consideration of which modes play a role in the identification and interpretation of the metaphors studied. Almost invariably, this entails taking into account the genre to which the discourse featuring a multimodal metaphor belongs: advertisements, political cartoons, comics, animation, musical compositions, oral conversations and lectures, feature films. A third recurring dimension is the extent to which a metaphor is not only embodied but also governed by the cultural or professional community in which it functions. We will now briefly introduce each of the chapters in the book.

Chapter 2 is a slightly updated version of the position paper on pictorial and multimodal metaphor by Forceville (2006). This paper provides and discusses the definition of multimodal metaphor that contributors to the current volume were asked to use – or else explain why they opted for an alternative definition.

The first cluster of chapters pertains to multimodal metaphor in advertising. It makes sense to begin with this topic, since advertising has been the subject of a number of studies pertaining to pictorial metaphor – the variety of non-verbal metaphor that hitherto has attracted most scholarly attention. This is not surprising, for advertising constitutes a body of texts and practices that is persuasive *par excellence*. It allows bringing into play the modes of language, visuals, and sound/music. The first contribution in this cluster, “Brand images: Verbal and visual metaphor in corporate branding messages,” by Veronika Koller (chapter 3), charts how the logos, visuals, and layouts that are used to create companies’ corporate identities often require or invite the construal of metaphors. Tying in with the pervasive BRANDS ARE LIVING ORGANISMS metaphor, visual elements often subtly encourage the inference of positive corporate qualities that are not necessarily verbalized. Identifying the metaphorical mechanisms deployed to achieve this goal points the way to how the inevitably biased nature of companies’ self-portraits can be critically examined.

Chapter 4 is Rosario Caballero’s “Cutting across the senses: Imagery in winespeak and audiovisual promotion.” The chapter is part of an ongoing

research project which is partly based on an impressive corpus of 12,000 wine tasting notes in professional journals, and here takes into account Spanish and French wine advertisements as well. Clearly, since taste and smell – wines' most important characteristics – cannot be directly represented, their verbal and visual descriptions must rely on synaesthesia and metaphor. An important issue in the chapter is the difficulty of the “translation” of these hardly theorized modes of taste and smell into a shared “vocabulary” of pictures and words. Another pertinent issue is the role of the cultural background governing both the choice of source domain in purely verbal metaphors describing wines and the choice of visuals in the advertisements.

Eduardo Urios-Aparisi's “Interaction of multimodal metaphor and metonymy in TV commercials: Four case studies” (chapter 5) discusses instances of Spanish television commercials. He addresses how Forceville's (2006/*this volume*) multimodal metaphor interacts with metonymical mappings, and applies the taxonomy found in Ruiz de Mendoza and Díez Velasco (2002) to multimodal advertising texts, identifying their cognitive value and communicative strategies within this genre. He shows how metaphor and metonymy fulfil different cognitive and discursive roles, serving to identify the target of a metaphor, to limit the correspondences between the domains, or to expand and create new meanings.

In “Nonverbal and multimodal manifestations of metaphors and metonymies: A case study” (chapter 6), Ning Yu provides an in-depth analysis of a single educational message (a non-commercial commercial, if you like) broadcast on Chinese national TV in terms of two conceptual metaphors whose purely verbal varieties have often been discussed: LIFE IS A JOURNEY and LIFE IS A STAGE. He shows how aspects of these metaphors, which in some passages are “blended” (Fauconnier and Turner 1998, 2002), surface in various modes. In several scenes, moreover, other conceptual metaphors such as UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING and SUCCESSFUL IS UP are shown to play a role, as well as a range of metonymies. The analysis makes clear that whereas thanks to the visuals, the “embodied” aspects of the metaphors are presumably universally comprehensible, many details can only be fully appreciated by viewers aware of specific Chinese myths and beliefs (cf. Forceville et al. 2006).

The second cluster of chapters pertains to a different textual genre: political cartoons. While a crucial presupposition in advertising is that, one way or another, a positive claim is made about the product, service, or idea advertised, political cartoons, by contrast, are characterized by the convention that something critical or negative is conveyed about one or more persons, or a state of affairs, in the world. Chapter 7, “Visual metaphor versus verbal

metaphor: A unified account,” by Francisco Yus, mounts the argument that verbal and visual metaphors are rooted in the same cognitive mechanism. Drawing on Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) relevance theory and Fodor’s (1983) “modularity of mind” theory, he takes the CMT claim that textual surface manifestations of metaphors can be traced back to conceptual metaphors to imply that there is no substantial difference between how verbal, pictorial, and multimodal metaphors are processed. Analyzing a number of cartoons by the Spanish artist El Roto, Yus demonstrates that the interpretation of each creative metaphor, irrespective of the mode(s) in which it is presented, depends on the formation of *ad hoc* concepts and on “emergent properties” (Gineste et al. 2000; Fauconnier and Turner 2002).

Elizabeth El Refaie’s “Metaphor in political cartoons: Exploring audience responses” (chapter 8) further illuminates the reader about the cartoon genre by investigating two British specimens. As in Yu’s case study, the source-path-goal schema, with its LIFE IS A JOURNEY manifestation, is emphatically present. Since in both Yu’s educational commercial and El Refaie’s cartoons purposiveness as well as temporal development needs to be conveyed, this is hardly unexpected. After providing her own interpretation of the cartoons – which turns out to be consonant with their creators’ intentions – El Refaie reports part of a larger research project in which these two cartoons were presented to, mainly non-native, British youngsters. She finds that these adolescents are often seriously deluded about what is happening in the cartoons, with consequences for their interpretations that are as alarming as they are humorous.

Norman Teng’s “Image alignment in multimodal metaphor” (chapter 9) addresses the role of patterned visual entities in cartoons. One way of creating similarities between different visual elements is by presenting them as featuring the same orientation, color, size – or any other saliently shared aspect of design. Teng discusses how such alignments can play a role in multimodal metaphors. Examining six cartoons by Clay Bennett, he moreover suggests that “alignment” may be the preferred design choice to convey the abstract concept of similarity between two or more items. Teng’s chapter, finally, suggests avenues for research into other multimodal tropes besides metaphor.

Joost Schilperoord and Alfons Maes discuss a variety of Dutch cartoons in chapter 10, “Visual metaphoric conceptualization in editorial cartoons,” arguing that for an appropriate understanding of the metaphors in cartoons image schema-based reasoning needs to be complemented by taxonomic reasoning, since the latter “is often the crucial trigger in interpreting the critical stance expressed in editorial cartoons.” The authors thus focus not so

much on the pragmatic knowledge a viewer brings to a cartoon, but on the text-inherent information that guides metaphor interpretation, which they believe will permit the identification of textual genre-patterns. Examples of three subtypes of pictorial metaphor are examined in detail, and a number of source domains that appear to be particularly popular in cartoon metaphors are identified, such as “hospitals,” “marriage,” “funerals,” and “boxing.”

Based on work by Kövecses (1986, 2000) and Forceville (2005), the next two chapters examine how emotions, specifically the paradigm case of “anger,” are visualized in comics, and to what extent there is cultural variation in such renderings. This cluster shifts the focus from advertising and political cartoons to comics and animation, retains the cross-cultural dimension, and addresses the notion of structural (in contrast to creative) metaphors. In chapter 11, “Anger in Asterix: The metaphorical representation of anger in comics and animated films,” Bart Eerden compares Forceville’s findings not only to those surfacing from the analysis of another Asterix album, but also to the data elicited from two animation films based on Asterix albums. After all, since the medium is the message, it is likely that the visual signs communicating an emotion in animated film are not completely identical to those found in comics. Kazuko Shinohara and Yoshihiro Matsunaka pursue the investigations of the EMOTIONS ARE FORCES metaphor in chapter 12, “Pictorial metaphors of emotion in Japanese comics,” but they provide a novel perspective by analyzing Japanese manga rather than Western comics. As a consequence, they are able to shed light on which visual signs reflect presumably universal aspects of the metaphor, and which are manifestations of knowledge that is tied to a specific culture. Both chapters in this cluster strongly suggest that conceptual metaphors find expression in visual signs in ways that are not always translatable into language, and therefore may be “direct” manifestations of these conceptual metaphors, unmediated by language.

Spoken language and gestures are so closely interdependent that they really should be studied together (McNeill 1992, 2005; Cienki 1998). It is thus to be expected that multimodal metaphor frequently and naturally occurs in face-to-face communication. In the next cluster, two chapters discuss metaphors drawing on the gestural and spoken language modes. In chapter 13, “Words, gestures and beyond: Forms of multimodal metaphor in the use of spoken language,” Cornelia Müller and Alan Cienki distinguish between various types of monomodal and multimodal metaphor that are possible in spoken language accompanied by gestures, giving examples of each. In addition, they argue that intonation is an under-researched area of conceptual metaphor. Their work supports the central CMT idea that metaphor is a

conceptual phenomenon, but also demonstrates that specific modes each have their own affordances and limitations for conveying dimensions of such conceptual metaphors. Irene Mittelberg and Linda Waugh show in chapter 14, “Metonymy first, metaphor second: A cognitive-semiotic approach to multimodal figures of thought in co-speech gesture,” that gestures may manifest dimensions of conceptual metaphors that are not found in the co-occurring speech and that, moreover, in gesture awareness of metonymy should be considered as an indispensable stage in the process of accessing metaphor.

The chapters in the next cluster are specifically devoted to the musical and sonic contributions to multimodal metaphors. Lawrence Zbikowski discusses in “Music, language, and multimodal metaphor” (chapter 15) how significant aspects of conceptual metaphors in a number of classical and popular music fragments depend exclusively on the musical, as opposed to the verbal, mode. Zbikowski is careful to point out, however, that for these musical elements to be experienced as metaphorical, they need to be considered in conjunction with the theme of the piece. Moreover, not only mappings from language to music are possible, but also *vice versa*. Zbikowski concludes that to do full justice to the respective contributions of text and music to the various musical pieces scrutinized, in a number of cases a multimodal blending approach (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) provides a better model than a multimodal metaphor construal. In both, he maintains, music appears particularly suitable in supplying “sonic analogs” to dynamic processes. In chapter 16 in the cluster, “The role of non-verbal sound and music in multimodal metaphor,” Charles Forceville considers what sonic and musical sources contribute to the identification and interpretation of multimodal metaphors in two genres, commercials and fiction films. Whereas Zbikowski sometimes considers the combinations of text and music best theorizable in terms of blends, Forceville’s cases, drawing on visuals and music – often in conjunction with texts – appear all to impose a clear directionality for mappings from a source to a target, and hence can typically be considered multimodal metaphors. He ends the chapter with a series of preliminary claims, to be tested in further research in this field.

The chapters in the final cluster have been written by scholars with a cognitivist film theory rather than a cognitivist linguistics background. Mats Rohdin, in “Multimodal metaphor in classical film theory from the 1920s to the 1950s” (chapter 17), reminds us that reflection on non-verbal metaphor has a long tradition in film studies. He examines a series of classic texts that discuss cinematic metaphor, and considers to what extent the various approaches are consonant with the multimodal metaphor model adhered to in

this volume. Rohdin thus is the only contributor to present a diachronic perspective on the issue of multimodal metaphor. Moreover, he draws attention to the fact that cinematic metaphors may acquire extra meanings because through visual styling they can create intertextual references to other films and phenomena familiar from everyday life. Finally, Rohdin finds that, contrary to expectation, the silent cinema was particularly rich in multimodal metaphors of the verbo-pictorial variety, due to the creative use of intertitles. The final chapter, co-authored by Gunnar Eggertsson and Charles Forceville, is titled “Multimodal expressions of the HUMAN VICTIM IS ANIMAL metaphor in horror films” (chapter 18). Its key argument is that human victims in extreme horror films are typically abused as if they were animals. The findings shed light on metaphor theory, the genre of horror films, but they also encourage reflection on the issue of animal rights for, in the spirit of Kövecses (2005) we can adapt a famous dictum and say: “show me your metaphors and I will tell you who you are.”

The division in clusters and chapters chosen – loosely on the basis of genres and modes – could have been made in different ways, since many other thematic patterns can be detected across the chapters of the book. Without elaborate discussion, we will briefly list some of these patterns, presenting them as something with a status that hovers between hypothesis and research program. Some of the issues have been discussed in relation with verbal metaphors, but often their importance has been underestimated in that realm; others appear to reveal themselves precisely thanks to the multimodal nature of the metaphors that are the specific focus of attention here.

Many metaphors are mini-narratives. The paradigmatic NOUN A IS NOUN B formula disguises the dynamic nature of metaphor. Human beings move literally through space and figuratively through time, and it is within these parameters that they need to make sense of their lives. This sense-making happens through real or imagined metaphor *actions*; it would perhaps be better to conceive of metaphor as A-ING IS B-ING, since metaphor is always metaphor in action. The A IS B format – which maybe became popular also because CMT long discussed only decontextualized metaphors that already came in a ready-made verbal “A is B” form – is no more than a convenient short-hand for what Andreas Musolff calls a “metaphor scenario” (Musolff 2006). And of course we should not forget that Paul Ricoeur (1977) already strongly emphasized the discursive character of metaphor. Though not always explicitly, all chapters in the volume tie in with this notion of a scenario or a narrative.

Target and source in multimodal metaphor may both be concrete entities. Classic CMT has always stressed that human beings can only come to

grips (sic) with the abstract by metaphorically coupling it with the concrete – i.e., with that which is perceptible. But the chapters in this volume are reminders that only a target that is *concrete* is, for instance, *depictable*, which is important in advertising a product, satirizing a politician in a cartoon, or conveying information about a character in a film. The focus on verbal manifestations of conceptual metaphors, that is, has had as an unfortunate side effect that for instance the stylistic dimensions of metaphors and other tropes have been somewhat ignored by cognitivist scholars (but cf. Semino and Culpeper 2002). Many illuminating (aesthetic as well as persuasive) multimodal metaphors convey something about *this* specifically styled target in terms of *this* specifically styled source. Moreover, while the “embodied” nature of conceptual metaphors is one of the basic tenets of CMT, Caballero (this volume) correctly points out that the embodied domains of smell and taste *need* rather than *provide* metaphorical sources. The strong focus on a bottom-up approach (from attested “textual” manifestations to formulations of the conceptual metaphors which supposedly underlie them rather than the other way round) may also be the reason why in several of the chapters there is some interference of the terminology associated with Max Black’s (1979) interaction theory. Black – whose early contributions to cognitive theories of metaphor have insufficiently been acknowledged by most CMT theorists – anticipated that metaphor could be a matter of thought rather than language, but discussed specific, creative metaphors in terms of “features” that were projected or transferred from source to target. CMT favors referring to this process as the partial mapping of entities and knowledge structures from source to target, resulting in a (temporary) understanding of the target *in terms of* the source – but the occasional lapse into Black’s terminology is a healthy reminder that sometimes no more than a single aspect (“feature”) of the source is mapped.

It is impossible to study metaphor without addressing metonymy. Metonymy has over the past decade begun to receive sustained attention from cognitive linguists (Barcelona 2000; Dirven and Pörings 2002; Kristiansen et al. 2006). Clearly, each property or feature that is mapped from a source to a target must first have been metonymically related to that source. Of course, a metonym can be an *ad hoc* one, created by a particular context or shared by a specific community of users (cf. Yus, this volume). In addition, a metonym may have a strong emotional or evaluative relation to its source – and it may well be this latter that is the rationale for the metaphor in the first place. Secondly, a given phenomenon may double as the source domain in a metaphor and as metonymically related to the target. If this is the case, the consequence may be that a construal of the relation between two things as

metaphor is invited rather than forced; after all there may be a realistic, metonymic motivation for the source's presence on the grounds of expected contiguity in the domain of the target. The interaction between metaphor and metonymy is explicitly addressed in the chapters by Urios-Aparisi, Yu, and Mittelberg and Waugh.

Non-verbal and multimodal metaphors may make salient certain aspects of conceptual metaphors that are not, or not as clearly, expressible in their verbal manifestations. The role of for instance size and spatial dimensions in source domains (e.g., in POWERFUL IS BIG, HONEST IS STRAIGHT) is more noticeable in visual discourses than in verbal ones. Music, in turn, affords for example scalarity and loudness in ways that can be made productive in source-to-target mappings, and the same holds for a voice's timbre or an intonational pattern. Arm-and-hand gestures, both in face-to-face interaction and in the stylized varieties characterizing protagonists' behaviors in comics, manga, and animation are embodied actions whose metaphorical exploitation communicates perspectives and emotions not (readily) available in verbal metaphors. A consequence of this is that any "translation" of these non-verbal and multimodal metaphors into verbal ones – necessary for instance to enable scholarly discussion as in this book – inevitably is an approximation at best. Metaphor scholars should be acutely aware of this, and reflect on what the choice for one verbalization of a multimodal metaphor over another may entail. The verbal "short-hands" of multimodal metaphors suggest an explicitness and precision that may well be absent in their originally non-verbal or multimodal, forms. Aspects of this issue are addressed in the chapters by Eerden, Shinohara and Matsunaka, Yu, Yus, El Refaie, Mittelberg and Waugh, Müller and Cienki, Teng, Rohdin, Zbikowski, and Forceville.

Personification is a crucial variety of multimodal metaphor no less than of verbal metaphor. Living organisms and animals are attractive choices as source domains both for human target domains and for phenomena such as organizations and cars. This makes sense for a variety of reasons: as humans, we find fellow humans as well as animals provide rich opportunities for the mapping both of idiosyncratic features (snails are typically slow, peacocks proud and beautiful) and for what Black called "implicative complexes" (Black 1979) and Gentner and Loewenstein (2002) "aligned structures." To a considerable extent, the place of humans and animals in the medieval hierarchy of the Great Chain of Being (see Tillyard 1976 [1943], Lakoff and Turner 1989) is still pertinent today, but creatures' status can also be strongly influenced by cultural myths (think of the connotations of

the “dragon” in Western versus Chinese culture). Finally, it is attractive that people and animals *move*, which allows for numerous ways in which a metaphor producer can focus attention on mappable features – particularly in film. Chapters in which this issue of the animal realm, and of living organisms more generally, as source domain, receives attention are those by Koller, Caballero, Urios-Aparisi, Schilperoord and Maes, Forceville, Rohdin, and Eggertsson and Forceville.

Under what circumstances can or must a multimodal metaphor be construed? This is a difficult but crucial issue, particularly where a conceptual metaphor is assumed to be present. This can be rephrased as the following question: is the phenomenon under consideration necessarily to be interpreted as a metaphor, i.e., as one thing presented in terms of something that, given the context, belongs to a different category, or are other, non-metaphorical construals of their co-occurrence possible or even likely? This is a critical question for metaphor scholars. If the central tenet of CMT that in essence we *think metaphorically* is correct, metaphor scholars, working on verbal, non-verbal and multimodal specimens alike, should be able to demonstrate its truth, or at least probability, by showing that the phenomena under consideration can be best explained by postulating that human beings make sense of them by consciously or automatically construing metaphors. But even identifying *verbal* metaphors as such is no simple affair, although the Praggeljaz Group (2007) has started to develop a procedure for this. To make further progress on this issue it is necessary that alternative hypotheses are specified that might account for the phenomena under discussion (Gibbs and Perlman 2006: 217; for an alternative proposal see Haser 2005: 149 *et passim*), so that metaphorical and alternative explanations may be coolly juxtaposed and critically debated. This task, no easy matter to start with, is further complicated in the case of metaphors occurring in artistic discourses. Often, in such discourses, coupling two “things” metaphorically is not *necessary* to make the segment of discourse in which they occur meaningful, since alternative explanations for their co-occurrence are available. That is, a discourse producer may have reasons not to *emphasize* that a metaphor is to be construed. Evading censorship, avoiding litigation, or simply wanting to create a polyvalent discourse for aesthetic pleasure can motivate a maker not to produce a strongly signaled metaphor (cf. Forceville 1999: 191–96).

We are fully aware that many problems still have to be solved in the realm of multimodal metaphor, but we are confident that the present volume will give a substantial boost to its further theorization.

References

- Baldry, Anthony, and Paul J. Thibault
 2006 *Multimodal Transcription and Text Analysis: A Multimedia Toolkit and Coursebook*. London/Oakville: Equinox.
- Barcelona, Antonio (ed.)
 2000 *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Black, Max
 1979 More about metaphor. In *Metaphor and Thought*, Andrew Ortony (ed.), 19–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cienki, Alan
 1998 Metaphoric gestures and some of their relations to verbal metaphoric expressions. In *Discourse and Cognition: Bridging the Gap*, Jean-Pierre Koenig (ed.), 189–204. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Dirven, René, and Ralf Pörings (eds.)
 2002 *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner
 1998 Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science* 22: 133–187.
 2002 *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fodor, Jerry
 1983 *The Modularity of Mind*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Forceville, Charles
 1999 The metaphor COLIN IS A CHILD in Ian McEwan's, Harold Pinter's, and Paul Schrader's *The Comfort of Strangers*. *Metaphor and Symbol* 14: 179–98.
 2005 Visual representations of the Idealized Cognitive Model of anger in the Asterix album *La Zizanie*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 69–88.
 2006/this vol. Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven, and Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), 379–402. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Forceville, Charles, Ed Tan, and Paul Hekkert
 2006 The adaptive value of metaphors. In *Heuristiken der Literaturwissenschaft. Einladung zu disziplinexternen Perspektiven auf Literatur*, Uta Klein, Katja Mellmann, and Steffanie Metzger (eds.), 85–109. Paderborn: Mentis.

- Gentner, Dedre, and Jeffrey Loewenstein
 2002 Relational language and relational thought. In *Language, Literacy, and Cognitive Development*, Eric Amsel and James P. Byrnes (eds.), 87–120. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr., and Marcus Perlman
 2006 The contested impact of cognitive linguistics research on the psycholinguistics of metaphor understanding. In *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven, and Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), 211–228. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gineste, Marie-Dominique, Bipin Indurkha, and Véronique Scart
 2000 Emergence of features in metaphor comprehension. *Metaphor and Symbol* 15: 117–135.
- Haser, Verena
 2005 *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Experientialist Philosophy: Challenging Cognitive Semantics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kövecses, Zoltán
 1986 *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
 2000 *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 2005 *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen
 1996 *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. 2nd ed. Revised edition published in 2006. London/New York: Routledge.
 2001 *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Lakoff, George
 1993 The contemporary theory of metaphor. In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed. Andrew Ortony (ed.), 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson
 1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 2003 Afterword, 2003. In *Metaphors We Live By*, 243–276. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner
 1989 *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McNeill, David
 1992 *Hand and Mind: What Gestures Reveal about Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 2005 *Gesture and Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Musolff, Andreas
 2006 Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 21: 23–38.
- O'Halloran, Kay L. (ed.)
 2004 *Multimodal Discourse Analysis*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Ortony, Andrew (ed.)
 1979 *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 1993 *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pragglejaz Group
 2007 MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22: 1–39.
- Ricoeur, Paul
 1977 *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. Trans. by R. Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco José, and Olga Isabel Díez Velasco
 2002 Patterns of conceptual interaction. In *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, René Dirven and Ralph Pörings (eds.), 489–532. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Semino, Elena, and Jonathan Culpeper (eds.)
 2002 *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson
 1995 *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tillyard, E.M.W.
 1976 [1943] *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ventola, Eija, Cassily Charles, and Martin Kaltenbacher (eds.)
 2004 *Perspectives on Multimodality*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.