

Multimodal metaphors and their use in advertising and political cartoons – a research overview

Sabine Heinemann, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz

(sabine.heinemann@uni-graz.at)

Abstract

This article provides a research overview of multimodal metaphors, with particular emphasis on their use in political cartoons and advertisements; the integration of both the linguistic and pictorial levels (verbo-pictorial metaphors) is widespread. After a brief outline of conceptual metaphor and its extension through blending theory, the phenomena of visual metaphor will be discussed before addressing the problem area of multimodal metaphor. In this context, the continuum-based definition proves to be useful. Furthermore, selected works from the two central fields of application in focus here, namely multimodal metaphors in political cartoons and in advertising, are discussed by way of example.

Der vorliegende Beitrag bietet einen Forschungsüberblick zu multimodalen Metaphern unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Verwendung in politischen Cartoons und Werbeanzeigen/-plakaten; die Einbindung gerade der sprachlichen und der bildlichen Ebene ist weit verbreitet. Nach einem kurzen Abriss zur konzeptuellen Metapher sowie ihrer Erweiterung durch die *blending*-Theorie wird zunächst der Phänomenbereich der Bildmetapher diskutiert, bevor der Problembereich der multimodalen Metapher behandelt wird; dabei erweist sich die Definition unter Rückgriff auf ein Kontinuum als sinnvoll. Im Weiteren werden ausgewählte Arbeiten aus den beiden hier im Fokus stehenden, zentralen Anwendungsfeldern, nämlich zu multimodalen Metaphern in politischen Cartoons und in der Werbung, exemplarisch diskutiert.

1. Introduction

In recent years, and against the background of the relevance of metaphors in everyday language, there has been a growing interest in creative metaphors within specific multimodal types of discourse. This interest is rooted in cognitive metaphor theory (Lakoff/Johnson 1980) and is driven by a variety of reasons, such as capturing attention in advertising. Unlike other approaches, studies in the context of cognitive metaphor theory (CMT) link the concept of mode closely to sensory perception, although a 1:1 relationship is not possible here, as not only images, but also writing or gestures are perceived visually (Forceville 2021: 678–679). The multimodal discourses that have dominated cognitive-semantic studies to date concern those which show a combination of pictorial elements and written language or spoken language and accompanying gestures. When considering verbo-pictorial metaphors, particular attention is

paid to advertising and political cartoons, while at the same time interdependencies between metaphors and metonymies are examined, especially for adverts. The studies on pictorial metaphor, as presented by Forceville (*passim*) in particular, are also essential here.

This article provides a research overview of the specifics of multimodal, verbo-pictorial metaphor. After a brief introduction to metaphor within the context of CMT, its connection to the concept of frame and the utilisation of blending theory, which are ultimately also fundamental for multimodal metaphors, the studies concerning the application area of the political cartoon are presented first, highlighting essential results for discussion. Subsequently, the article explores the field of advertising as a further application domain.

Specific features of the studies, such as the interdependence of metaphor and metonymy, particularly emphasised in advertising communication, are considered in the analysis. Finally, on the basis of previous studies, the idea of a continuum is raised that allows the metaphors in question to be localised between the poles of mono- and multimodality, depending on the interdependence of visual representation and verbal elements.

2. Cognitive metaphor theory and blending theory

Referring to Lakoff/Johnson (1980: 5), it immediately becomes clear that metaphors, although primarily examined with regard to their linguistic realisation thus far, are by no means confined to language; as per their definition, they are “primarily a matter of thought and action and only derivatively a matter of language”, i.e., a predominantly conceptual phenomenon. Linguistic, figurative, and other forms are therefore only reflexes of the underlying conceptual representations (cf. also Stöckl 2004: 202).¹ Consequently, the realm of possible metaphors extends to pictorial expressions, as examined by Forceville in particular, and also to multimodal metaphors (Forceville 2008a: 462, 2006: 379; El Refaie 2003: 76). In the case of the latter, several modes are integrated, each of which controls the viewer’s attention differently (Forceville

¹ Nevertheless, the findings on the existence of conceptual metaphors depend almost exclusively on the patterns recognisable in verbal metaphors (Forceville 2006: 381).

Peng (2011: 617–618) refers to a similar analysis for linguistic modality despite deviating decoding of image information (cf. also Joue et al. 2020 on the cognitive processing of multimodal metaphors in general).

2008: 469; Pérez-Sobrino 2017: 56; Stöckl 2016). Forceville (2009: 22) defines a mode as “a sign system interpretable because of a specific perception process”; i.e., the authors take a broad orientation towards sensory perception (cf. Forceville 2006);² the consideration of a limited number of modes, defined as “one meaning-generating aspect that always needs to be complemented by others” (Forceville 2021: 679), facilitates a clearer distinction between multimodality and monomodality.

Metaphors can be understood independently of the respective mode as mental similitude-based projection processes (mappings) between independent concepts, in the context of which aspects of the source concept are transferred to the target concept.³ A distinction can be made between primary and complex metaphors (cf. Lakoff/Johnson 1980; Grady 1997). Primary metaphors are unconscious and anchored in physical experiences, such as *EVENTS ARE MOTIONS*, *PROGRESS IS MOTION FORWARD*, *PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS*, *DIFFICULTIES ARE OBSTACLES*, etc. These can be built upon by complex metaphorical mappings which show a systematic coupling of source and target domains (e.g., *THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS*); however, frequently, only some aspects are transferred.⁴ In addition to the interplay of primary metaphors, cultural

² Bateman/Wildfeuer/Hiippala (2017: 19) refer to the fact that “modes may cross-cut sensory distinctions rather freely”. Bezemer/Kress (2008: 171) define modes as “socially and culturally shaped resource[s] for making meaning” (cf. Porto/Romano 2019: 325; Bateman 2016: 39). Jewitt/Bezemer/O’Halloran (2016: 15) describe modes as “a set of resources, shaped over time by socially and culturally organised communities, for making meaning”, which take on certain roles assigned to them by social actors; a first approximation is possible, for example, via the medial realisation (cf. also Stöckl 2019: 46–47, who speaks of medial variants and mode families against this background). Fundamental to multimodality is “the textual combination of different modes and their integration in terms of structure, discourse semantics, and rhetorical function within contexts of social (inter-)action” (Stöckl 2019: 50). Since the focus here is on multimodality in the sense of the combination of linguistic (written) and visual elements and these serve as central concepts in the context of multimodality, a detailed discussion of the concepts of mode and multimodality will be omitted here. For an overview regarding multimodality (which shows the merging of semiotic and cognitive(istic) insights), please refer to Kress/Van Leeuwen (2001); Stöckl (2019); Bateman/Wildfeuer/Hiippala (2017); Wildfeuer et al. (2019); Klug/Stöckl (2016).

³ There is a large number of fixed, conventionalised metaphorical mappings in languages (Lakoff 2008: 23).

⁴ Herrero Ruiz (2006: 171) further differentiates between one-correspondence metaphors (*PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS*) vs. many-correspondence metaphors (*LOVE IS A JOURNEY*), to which further metaphors can be subordinated (cf. lovers as travellers, common goals as destinations, etc.).

beliefs and assumptions must also be taken into account here, so that complex metaphors are definitely specific to the cultural area (Yu 2009: 121). It is striking that the basic level category in particular has a high cognitive salience due to its (culturally determined) high salience and is therefore used metaphorically more frequently (Ziem 2008b: 404; Zinken/Hellsten/Nerlich 2008: 373–375).⁵ Metaphors are realised through language, images, music, and gestures, but also by using a combination of different modes (Spieß 2016: 76–81).⁶ In principle, metaphors can be accessed via frame analyses; i.e., via relevant properties, actions, objects and facts (cf. Spieß 2017: 104–105; Fraas 2013: 262–268). Frames can be defined as experience-based knowledge structures in human long-term memory with a prototypical information hierarchy. Frames therefore enable the description of comprehension-relevant background knowledge for metaphors (cf. “metaphorical framing effect”, Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021: 10; for the concept of frame cf. Ziem 2008a: 93–108, 2012: 71–74; Minsky 1975; Fillmore 1985). From a semiotic perspective, despite the linguistic level dominating Fillmore’s approach to text comprehension, there is no doubt that pictorial elements also evoke frames; the constitution of knowledge takes place via different stimuli; i.e., just as multimodally as the communication itself (cf. also Busse 2012; Meier 2010). At the same time, this means that the potential of frames in the case of multi-modal sign complexes is no less than for linguistic signs (Ziem 2012: 85; cf. also Pérez-Sobrino 2017: 39).⁷ Since concepts as units of meaning become associated with other concepts depending on context

⁵ Cf. more generally on the different types of metaphor Lakoff/Johnson (1980); Kövecses (2005: 3–5); Harder (2010: 36–37); Musolff (2004: 9–10); Ziem (2008b: 369). Despite more recent neurolinguistic findings, the statements by Lakoff/Johnson (1980) are still largely valid (cf. Lakoff 2008: 24–25).

Grady (1997) differentiates primary metaphors into correlation-based and embodied metaphors (e.g., MORE IS UP), which show a sensorimotor anchoring of the source domain (vs. target domain), and resemblance metaphors, which are based on a perceptual similarity; primary metaphors can be combined (e.g., THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS (ORGANISATION IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE, PERSISTING IS REMAINING ERECT); cf. Ortiz 2011: 1569; Pérez-Hernández 2019: 532–533).

⁶ Forceville (2006: 486) points out that “non-verbal metaphors often have targets and/or sources that are cued in more than one mode simultaneously”.

⁷ Fillmore’s concept of *frame* is closely related to Langacker’s concept of *domain* (Croft/Cruse 2004: 15, 24–26; for differences cf. Harder 2010: 25–27). Basic domains are to be understood as conceptual units at a superordinate level and are linked to a direct physical experience. These include SPACE, MATERIAL, TIME, FORCE as well as sensory and physical perceptions (COLOUR, LOUDNESS, HUNGER, PAIN).

(Croft/Cruse 2004: 8), the use of a metaphorically used word also evokes the corresponding frame with all associated concepts. This process not only causes an interweaving of source and target domains, but also allows the understanding of unconventional and creative metaphors, such as those that occur in the context of advertising (cf. Spieß/Köpcke 2015: 9–10; Spieß 2017: 97–98; Croft/Cruse 2004: 203–210).

The blending theory (according to Fauconnier/Turner 1998; Fauconnier 2001; Turner 2008) is an extension of the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff/Johnson 1980), which only integrates a source and a target domain.⁸ This then refers to the formation of new components of meaning on the basis of encyclopaedic knowledge. The fundamental differences between conceptual metaphor theory and blending theory can be summarised with Grady/Oakley/Soulson (1999: 101) as follows:

CMT posits relationships between pairs of mental representations, while blending theory (BT) allows for more than two; CMT has defined metaphor as a strictly directional phenomenon, while BT has not; and, whereas CMT analyses are typically concerned with entrenched conceptual relationships (and the ways in which they may be elaborated), BT research often focuses on novel conceptualizations which may be short-lived.⁹

Essential to the blending theory is the assumption of two input spaces: a generic space in which the components common to both input spaces appear, and a blended space, which shows the contextually conditioned, often only short-lived, new conceptualisation: “[m]ental spaces are built up, interconnected, and blended in working memory by activating structures available from long-term memory” (Fauconnier 2001: 2497; cf. similarly Fauconnier/Turner 1998: 136). The mental spaces are structured by frames and can be equated with them in many ways. The mental spaces created through conceptual blending (blended

⁸ As mentioned above, conceptual metaphor theory is characterised by unidirectional mappings, by the differentiation between metaphor and metonymy, by limited inferential activity and its context dependency, and finally by the principle of invariance, according to which the structure of the image schema of the source domain is used for the target domain (Pérez Sobrino 2017: 47–53). Image schemas are abstract representations of recurring dynamic, pre-linguistic patterns of sensorimotor interactions; they can be understood as conceptualisations of specific, internalised (embodied) experiences that can be implemented across modes (Velasco Sacristán/Cortés de los Ríos 2009: 241–243; Górska 2019: 280; Croft/Cruse 2004: 44).

⁹ Cf. also Croft/Cruse (2004: 203–210); Yu (2009: 122).

space) include information that is relevant for comprehension, which can, however, also remain relevant beyond the specific context (Ziem 2012: 76-77 limits this to information that is relevant for actual comprehension; cf. Kutz et al. 2015).¹⁰ Blending theory does not explain the genesis of new properties, but rather describes *post-hoc* which information from the blended space belongs to the input spaces and which meaning components are new (Pérez-Sobrinó 2017: 46–47). The interplay of verbal and pictorial metaphors, for example, can now lead to multimodal metaphors, which Forceville (2009: 24) defines as “[...] metaphors whose target and source are each represented exclusively or predominantly in different modes”.¹¹ Depending on the medium, there are differences in the similarity between target and source compared to purely verbal metaphors; however, the only partial representation of source and target in the different modes also appears to be significant (Negro Alousque 2014: 63–67; El Refaie 2009: 181). In the context of multimodal metaphor, therefore, more than one mode contributes to the creation of aspects of meaning, each of which is partially dependent on the characteristics of the modes (cf. Forceville 1996; Forceville 2008a: 469; Hidalgo Downing/Martínez/Kraljevic-Mujic 2016: 139–144). The linguistic level is often integrated into multimodal metaphors (medially conveyed orally or in writing); images (both static and dynamic) are also quite common. In printed material (e.g., adverts, cartoons, maps, graphics, etc.) there is often an interplay between verbal and pictorial information. As a consequence, metaphorical uses are not uncommon in this context either. In principle, however, music, sounds, gestures, smell, taste, and haptics can of course also be relevant as modes in the context of multimodal metaphors alongside visual, written and spoken signs (Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009a: 4–5; Forceville 2016b: 244; Forceville 2006: 381–383). Non-linguistic elements

¹⁰ Fauconnier/Turner (2002: 40) combine their four-space model with a network model. In principle, four types can be differentiated based on the relationship between the input spaces and the resulting blended space (simplex network, single-scope network, double-scope network, mirror network). In addition, different optimality principles apply (cf. Turner 2008; Joy/Scherry/Deschenes 2009: 4; Pérez Sobrinó 2017: 41–42).

In the case of metonymy, the matches between the two components involved are coincidental and not relevant to the message, so there is no blending (Croft/Cruse 2004: 216). The use of metonymies, however, causes a change in salience (Hidalgo Downing/Kraljevic Mujic 2011: 156–157).

¹¹ Multimodal metaphors contrast with monomodal metaphors, in which the source and target domains are represented in one mode; in the case of image metaphors, these are often concrete (Johnson 2010: 2848).

can make some aspects of conceptual metaphors appear salient that cannot be represented linguistically or not so clearly, for example, the size of objects or their spatial dimension (POWERFUL IS BIG, Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009a: 13). Salient elements also generally help with interpretation (Forceville 2008: 470); in the case of pictorial elements, salience can be realised via the composition of the image (foreground vs. background) (Forceville 1999: 166; Schilperoord/Maes/Ferdinandussen 2009).

3. Pictorial metaphors

Since access to multimodal metaphors was, in part, facilitated via (monomodal) pictorial metaphors, these will be briefly examined first. This is especially relevant as the characteristics of visual realisation are also important for multimodal metaphors. Against this background, Stöckl's work (2004), which is primarily dedicated to image semiotics and semantics (i.e., analysing visual communication), seems interesting.¹² In addition to the denotative content, design is also important for the connotative meaning (e.g., motif staging, lighting, camera angles, image composition). It should also be noted that image content is not typically perceived in isolation, but rather captured in a frame-related manner (Meier 2010: 379–382). In principle, images are more ambiguous than language, which is why they are usually disambiguated by linguistic context (Stöckl 2004: 95).

The most recent image theories focus on the nature of visual representations and thus on cognitive schemata (frames), connectionist networks or mental models that serve as internal cognitive grids based on the confrontation with the world. Stöckl (2004: 73–77, 206f.; 214) emphasises that cognitive-semantic

¹² The author also refers here to the “picture grammar” according to Kress/van Leeuwen (2001, 2006) with the attempt to transfer a functional grammar of language, whereby the authors' concept of the picture appears to be theoretically weakly founded and detached from the use of language (Stöckl 2004: 13–15, 68–72). According to the authors, three levels can be distinguished: an ideational (representational, visual representation of facts), an interpersonal (interactional, creative elements) and a textual (compositional, principles of image composition). Three cognitive operations are essential for visual communication, namely object recognition, scene recognition and attention switching (Stöckl 2004: 21; cf. also Pérez Sobrino 2017: 20–21). The coherence and cohesion of linguistic and visual elements is also interesting here.

theories can also be understood as image theories, since they are primarily based on sensorimotor experiences (cf. also McQuarrie/Mick 1999).

Eikhenbaum (1927) and Aldrich (1968) provide an early approach to pictorial metaphor, although a more in-depth examination of the problem did not take place until the 1990s; Forceville (1996 and *passim*) in particular has advanced research in this area. While some authors (e.g., Eikhenbaum 1927; Kennedy 1982) regard pictorial metaphors as translations of verbal metaphors, others assume that metaphors are pre-linguistic, i.e., in the sense of Lakoff/Johnson's (1980) notion of cognitively reconnection, thus their immediate pictorial realisation is legitimated (Carroll 1994).¹³ Pictorial metaphors show a striking structural similarity to verbal metaphors, but they differ from them in that a reversal of source and target often seems to be possible (Carroll 1994: 190; cf. also Forceville 2006: 384).¹⁴ In the case of pictorial metaphors, the elements for mapping must be perceptually recognisable and correspondingly visually salient (Carroll 1994: 208). Forceville therefore scrutinises which are the

¹³ Only Forceville seems to make direct and explicit reference to cognitive metaphor theory in his studies (Johnson 2010: 2848; Ortiz 2011: 1568).

One example outside of advertising is comics, which show realistic and non-realistic signs to depict emotions that are not necessarily derived from linguistic metaphors. Kennedy terms these *pictorial runes* (non-realistic pictorial metaphors), which are often used to represent abstract concepts that are difficult to translate 'literally' (e.g., spirals around the head for dizziness, smoke above the head for anger; Teng 2009: 245–246). In contrast, indexical signs are realistic (although exaggerated, e.g., open mouth, half-closed eyes, red face).

Concerning the use of humorous metaphors in the context of internet memes, which involve analogy (with regard to the domains involved in the mapping) on the one hand and incongruity (with regard to the pragmatic manipulation of the metaphor) on the other, cf. the studies by Piata (2016) and Scott (2021).

Metaphors and metonymies can also be found in gestures, whereby in gestures that accompany speech, the source and target domains typically appear in both modes. A metaphorical meaning can be inherent in gestures without necessarily corresponding to a metaphor on the linguistic level. Since many gestures are often used unconsciously and spontaneously, they cannot be compared with elaborate, intentionally chosen metaphorical expressions, for example in cartoons or adverts (e.g., Müller/Cienki 2009: 306-307, 322; Mittelberg/Waugh 2009: 330–336, 348; Cienki 2010: 204).

¹⁴ This raises the question of whether understanding a non-verbal or multimodal metaphor means that the recipient mentally translates the metaphor into language (cf. Forceville 2009: 31).

Context, as well as experiential and world knowledge, prove to be extremely important for capturing the (intended) meaning of pictorial and multimodal metaphors (cf. the assumptions of frame theory; cf. Negro Alousque 2014: 66).

respective elements of the pictorial metaphor (target, source) and which characteristics are transferred (cf. the relevance principle of Sperber/Wilson 1995).¹⁵

Visual correlation metaphors are particularly relevant in the case of image-based advertising. With pictorial metaphors in adverts, the advertised product – which can be identified by the brand name and logo – often acts as the target domain¹⁶ by being depicted within a visual context in such a way that the object is presented as something other than it actually is. For example, Forceville (2016b: 245–246, 2008a: 467, 2009: 28, 2006: 388) cites the metaphors DESIGNER BAG IS SCULPTURE (a designer bag is presented on a pedestal similar to an art object) and BEER IS WINE (storage of beer similar to wine in a separate cellar, which is intended to address the quality of the beer). The underlying metaphor therefore corresponds to the type OBJECT A IS OBJECT B in each case.¹⁷ Forceville's basic definition envisages a "replacement of an expected visual element by an unexpected one". It is precisely the deviation from conventional (context) usage, recognisable via the metaphors, that increases the attractiveness of an advertisement (Forceville 1996: 69). By placing an object in a certain context that is unusual for it, one can evoke associations with a typical or conventional context for that object (Forceville 2009: 31, 2006: 391; Yus 2009: 148).¹⁸ For the interpretation of the metaphor, it is therefore important to recognise the respective deviations from the user's expectations which can also serve as a

¹⁵ In their study on the depiction of the right-wing extremist Geert Wilders in political cartoons, Forceville/van de Laar (2019) look in particular at the question of which source domains are used and whether there are deviating mappings for the case of the source domains that are also used for the depiction of Rutte (Prime Minister at the time of the study).

¹⁶ It would be interesting to see which metaphorical source domains are mainly used to advertise products and whether these source domains are implemented verbally or figuratively (Forceville 2008a: 467). The extent to which the structure of the source domains (and correspondingly the salience of potentially transferable elements) is culturally influenced should also be examined (Forceville 2009: 28–29).

¹⁷ This metaphor is often found in pictorial or multimodal metaphors, although cognitive metaphor theory does not provide any further details on this (cf. Forceville 2006: 388); knowledge of the source domain does not always seem to refer back to embodiment, rather cultural connotations that are metonymically linked to the source domain are probably important (cf. also Lakoff/Turner 1989: 66).

¹⁸ If, on the other hand, two objects are implemented via different modes, identification is achieved by a salient, simultaneous representation of source and target (Forceville 2006: 391 refers to this as *cueing*).

stimulus for different possible interpretations (Forceville 2016b: 255, 1996: 66, on salient clues 2008a: 470).¹⁹

El Refaie (2003: 80) indicates that existing or conventionalised connections are required in order to be able to speak of a pictorial metaphor. The advertisements analysed by Forceville show that new metaphors are also possible, even if they are highly context dependent. The relationship between elements representing the source and target domains is clearly essential here. Pictorial metaphors are also possible in the absence of pictorial fusion in a spatially bound object (fusion); in most cases, the source or target domain is not explicitly shown (El Refaie 2003: 79 with reference to Carroll 1994; El Refaie 2009: 177–178); in many cases, however, there are linguistic elements that are essential for the interpretation.

With regard to the nature of visual metaphors according to the domains visually captured, Forceville (e.g., 2008b: 182–195, 2016b: 247) differentiates the following types in the context of static adverts and posters: a) hybrid metaphor: source and target domains overlap in such a way that the result is a non-real representation; e.g., the planet Earth, whose upper hemisphere is a burning candle; b) contextual metaphor: The target domain of the metaphor is placed in a visual context that evokes the source domain in the viewer, even if this is not depicted (e.g., via the metaphor BEER IS WINE); c) visual similarity: Both the source and target domains are depicted, the similarity relation is created via the visual resemblance in one or more features of the images (cf. colour, size, etc.)²⁰; d) integrated metaphor: Here, the target domain is represented by a posture or position, as in Forceville's advert for a Senseo coffee machine which resembles

¹⁹ The cultural context is important for the interpretation of images, not only with regard to the historical legibility and the necessary knowledge of the viewer, but also with regard to the gestures, attitudes, colours etc. common in the speaker community (cf. also frames; Forceville 1996: 74–81, with reference to Barthes 1964). Contextual elements of any kind have an anchoring function; the first contextual level is the immediate physical environment (e.g., a bus stop, a wall in the case of advertising posters).

²⁰ Cf. here, for example, the advertisement of a health service analysed by Ortiz (2011: 1578) and Schilperoord/Maes/Ferdinandusse (2009: 156) with the image of revolver cartridges placed in a row, in which a cigarette is also inserted, with the addition "Smoking kills" (cognitive dissonance).

a butler leaning forward.²¹ In the case of the Air France example discussed in more detail in Forceville (an Air France ticket is folded like a deckchair), there is of course also a metonymic relationship between the airline and something foldable, such as the flight ticket in this case. Although equally important for political cartoons and advertising, the relationship between metonymy and metaphor is primarily discussed in studies on advertising (cf. chapter 3.2).

With regard to the related elements, it is striking that “people prefer metaphors with the target and source moderately distant from each other and metaphors with sources from referentially concrete domains” (van Mulken/van Hooft/Nederstigt 2014: 336).²²

4. Multimodal metaphors

Due to the abundance of studies, we will focus on advertisements and political cartoons, as they often show a strong interweaving of pictorial and linguistic information: “Unsurprisingly, cartoons (like advertisements [...] often draw on metaphors, since metaphors are highly efficient means to quickly present a specific perspective, and the emotions, valuations, and attitudes inhering in that perspective, on a given topic [...]” (Forceville/van de Laar 2019: 295). The significance of the text-image relationship is essential, especially for non-conventionalised metaphors,²³ as the linguistic elements are often used to interpret the pictorially realised metaphor (e.g., via the verbalisation of the target domain or an explicit reference to it). A political cartoon by Giannelli

²¹ Van Mulken/le Pair/Forceville (2010: 3419–3420) and van Mulken/van Hooft/Nederstigt (2014: 334–335), based on Forceville’s classification, distinguish only the first three types, which span a continuum due to the varying degrees of integration of the source domain.

The differentiation by Phillips/McQuarrie (2004) in the context of visual semiotics explicitly refers to the components’ complexity (structure, pictorial layout, to a certain extent graspable as a ‘grammar’ of visual representation) and pictorial expression; however, the types can be assigned to those of Forceville (with a different designation: juxtaposition, fusion, replacement).

²² Obviously, more complex and cognitively demanding adverts are preferred by the viewer over less elaborate ones (van Mulken/van Hooft/Nederstigt 2014: 340; van Mulken/le Pair/Forceville 2010: 3418–3421).

²³ Metaphorical creativity should be considered both with regard to the novelty or underlying mappings and their originality as well as with regard to the salience of individual features (cf. Lakoff/Turner 1989: 89–96; El Refaie 2015: 16; cf. the detailed studies in Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021).

(*Corriere della sera*) may serve as an example here: The cartoon from December 2020 refers to the decision about the Recovery Fund, which was favourable for Italy. It depicts a table with a *panettone* on a plate and a knife lying next to it. The mat under the plate is labelled *Recovery Fund*. The room in which the table with the *panettone* stands is empty, but people are pushing through a wide doorway, all of them politicians, who are being held back by the then Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte and Roberto Gualtieri, then Minister of Finance (Silvio Berlusconi is trying to get into the room on all fours); above the doorway there is a banner with the words *Buone fette*. Without the (few) linguistic elements, it would be questionable whether the interpretation of the metaphor RECOVERY FUND IS PANETTONE would be secure. *Buone fette* is also linguistically important, as it refers to the metaphorical use of *una buona fetta di torta* 'large piece, large portion' and makes the connection to the Italian Christmas cake *panettone* (and also via the phonetically similar *buone feste*, of course, which also establishes the reference to Christmas). The image of the *panettone* and the recovery fund lettering enable a contextual interpretation of the conventionalised metaphorical meaning for *fetta* (cf. Heinemann 2022: 87–89).²⁴ Similarly, the advertisement for an Opel vehicle analysed by Ziem shows the interpretation of the image of the Opel in the sense of the metaphor OPEL IS A VERY GOOD PUPIL, which is only made possible by the linguistic addition of *Klassenerster*. The interplay between linguistic and pictorial information is even closer here; in both cases the interpretation is more or less guaranteed by the linguistic information. Against this background, the boundary between monomodal and multimodal metaphors can be located on a continuum and accordingly characterised as fluid (inter-individual differences must also be taken into account here). This can also be seen – albeit not as clearly, and combined with a tendency towards a strict separation of source and target domains according to modes – in Forceville's definition (2009: 24), according to

²⁴ The interpretation of a metaphor (such as a metonymy) is determined on the one hand by the context in which it is embedded, and on the other hand by the recipient's familiarity with a topic – in the advertising context with the brand – as well as encyclopaedic and experiential knowledge, which causes intersubjective deviating interpretations (Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021: 77–79). For detailed studies, it is therefore not only useful to involve other speakers, but also to carry out a systematic analysis, ideally on the basis of criteria for identifying metaphors, as they are actually defined by various authors (here we refer, for example, to the work of the Pragglejaz group (e.g., 2007) or the further remarks on multimodal metaphors in political cartoons and advertisements).

which multimodal metaphors can be summarised as “metaphors whose target and source are rendered in two different modes/modalities [...] and in many cases the verbal is one of these”. In her definition (“mapping, or blending, of domains from different modes”), Koller (2009: 46) also seems to make a mode-dependent differentiation according to source and target domain (which ultimately also makes it possible to differentiate between monomodal and multimodal metaphors; cf. Forceville 2009: 21–23). At the same time, the author mentions blending, which indicates that in the interplay of verbal and pictorial (or other) components (at least in these contexts), new meanings are generated more frequently.²⁵

4.1 Political cartoons

Generally speaking, cartoons portray an aspect of social, cultural or political life; they show a simplification of reality by resorting (humorously) to stereotypes. The essential element here is an implicit, sometimes extremely critical commentary with reference to the frame provided by the linguistic and situational context, which primarily consists of emphasising negative or shameful facts (McMahon 2018: 103–104; Schilperoord/Maes 2009: 215–216; El Refaie 2009: 175–176, 2003: 88; Morris 1993: 196, 202–203; Forceville 2008a: 476).²⁶ Furthermore, advertising is also related to cultural areas (cf. Hofstede/Hofstede 2005) and some visual or multimodal metaphors may be more difficult to access for people who do not belong to the cultural area in question due to their allusions to history, literature and music.²⁷ In the case of political cartoons, however, there is often the additional factor of their strong daily political relevance and the need to analyse them in a socio-political context (McMahon

²⁵ Whether components of meaning provoked by blending become permanent depends on the discourse structure.

²⁶ In contrast, in the advertising context, the focus is on presenting the advertised product as positively as possible.

²⁷ In their analysis of political cartoons, Kennedy/Green/Vervaeke (1993: 251) point to the relevance of cultural knowledge in cases where public figures are depicted as wolves or similar. The pictorial representation allows the characteristics of a general class to be pointed out (here via attributes such as fangs, claws; cf. also Popa 2015; on prototype-based classification as in *Lawyers are the sharks of business* cf. Schilperoord/Maes/Ferdinandusse 2009: 228). Intertextual references can also be identified here, for example via fairy tales about the use of clichéd ideas (cf. also McMahon 2018: 104–105).

2018: 105; cf. also El Refaie 2003: 75, 78).²⁸ Irrespective of these aspects relevant to society as a whole, it is important for the interpretation and possible inter-individual differences that the viewer draws on encyclopaedic knowledge and knowledge stored in long-term memory as well as personal experiences and attitudes on the one hand; on the other hand, ideas that have been evoked by communicative interaction immediately before viewing a cartoon also have an influence on the individual interpretation (cf. El Refaie 2009: 182; 2003: 75–78, 85, 91).

For metaphors such as those used in political cartoons (cf. El Refaie 2003: 75), the concept metaphors which are generally encountered in political discourse are decisive. For example, the *WAY* metaphor is often used to express political goals, decision-making processes, etc. via the basic concept of a body moving spatially (Spieß 2017: 106–111). Also typical are the *NATURAL FORCE* metaphor (for negatively assessed developments, destruction, chaos etc.), further metaphors such as *DISEASE* (*CRISIS AS DISEASE*, *STATE AS PATIENT*, consider the broader connection to the *ORGANISM* metaphor in this context as well), *BUILDING* (with the subordinate concept *STATICS*, which refers to security) or generally *CONSTRUCTION* (to represent processes). The *INDUSTRY/COMMERCE* metaphor, which refers to economic aspects, is also widespread, as is the *WAR* metaphor (conflicts).²⁹

In many cases, the use of metaphors can be assigned to specific communicative goals, with the persuasive function taking centre stage in a newspaper or political context. In addition, the cognitive structuring of knowledge and the condensation of arguments play a significant role in evoking different

²⁸ What is also important here, however, is the variation in metaphor related to cultural space that must also be taken into account in other contexts (cf. also Johnson 2010: 2849). Differences in metaphorical conceptualisation are likely to be based on different framing (cf. Kövecses 2005: 13, 253).

²⁹ In principle, conventionalised metaphors are also those that are used more frequently, which is why a continuum between innovation and conventionality can be established on the basis of the criterion of usage (Spieß 2016: 89; Heyvaert et al. 2019). In many cases, the most frequently used metaphors that are integrated into the general vocabulary are not (or no longer) perceived as such by the average speaker. In political cartoons, however, the concepts invoked via the literal meaning of the metaphors (often phraseologisms) are often realised pictorially. In the advertising context, creative visual renderings can be used in these cases, such as with the metaphor *A CAR IS A HORSE*, which invokes a wide range of desirable attributes (e.g., power, speed) and sometimes evokes more symbolic values (elegance, freedom, wildness) (Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021: 39).

judgments (cf. Spieß/Köpcke 2015: 5–8; Spieß 2017: 100–102; Valdivia 2019: 286–288; cf. also the various contributions in Carver/Pikalo 2008). *Highlighting* is one of the characteristic features with regard to the message of cartoons or advertisements; not only do the visual realisations reinforce the linguistic statement (as long as they do not take its place), in many cases individual aspects are emphasised – components of a socio-political situation that are not depicted or disadvantageous characteristics of a product (see greenwashing) are simultaneously pushed into the background (*hiding*). Non-conventionalised metaphors allow a perspective on a deviating source domain. The salience of the different contextually possible source domains must also be taken into account here (Heyvaert et al. 2019: 2–6; Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021: 7).

In parallel to the pictorial elements,³⁰ cartoons often also contain linguistic elements, as mentioned and central to this presentation, either in the form of a title, a statement assigned to a person by a speech bubble, as in a comic, or by inscriptions on objects. In principle, the linguistic elements can have different functions – on the one hand, they can be an ‘aid’ to interpretation for visually implemented metaphors; on the other hand, they may also restrict interpretation possibilities, as in the case of complex metaphors where the precise source or purpose of these can be recognised via the linguistic elements. Against this background, more importance is presumably attached to the linguistic statement than to the pictorial elements, even though the latter initially receive more attention (Koller 2009: 47; El Refaie 2003: 83–87; cf. Kress/Van Leeuwen 2006 on “narrative” images). At the same time, the combination of pictorial and linguistic elements in cartoons serves to build a

³⁰ The differentiations mentioned in the course of metaphorical imagery can of course also be used for the pictorial elements in political cartoons. In addition to the categorisation by Schilperoord/Maes/Ferdinandusse (2009: 220–221, 228) based on Forceville (1996), Phillips/McQuarrie (2004) and Teng/Sun (2002) of *juxtaposition*, *fusion* and *replacement*, a first differentiation of representations in cartoons in general, including metonymy, can already be found in Gombrich (1978). In the case of *condensation*, a complex phenomenon is reduced to an image that represents the essence (stereotypically), while individual events are reduced to the common core (McMahon 2018: 103; Morris 1993: 200–201). In *combination*, elements of the different domains are superimposed, which also incorporates metaphors. Finally, in *domestication*, for example, unfamiliar people or abstract ideas are conceptualised as familiar people (Morris 1993: 201). At the same time, this entails the risk of trivialising the uniqueness of certain events and downplaying alternative perspectives (cf. the concept of *carnivalisation* in Morris 1993: 202).

bridge between fact and fiction (El Refaie 2009: 174; Negro Alousque 2014: 66). The double coding, involving both verbal and pictorial coding, is not redundant. It does not present the same metaphor twice monomodally, but rather a connection between the information presented in the different modes is necessary for the correct interpretation (cf. Pollaroli/Rocci 2015: 7–9). A special feature of the metaphors appearing in political cartoons appears to be the predominance of the type OBJECT A IS OBJECT B; metaphors relating to orientation are also frequent (*orientational metaphors*; e.g., HIGH STATUS IS UP/LOW STATUS IS DOWN, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP/BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL IS DOWN; Forceville 2009: 28; El Refaie 2009: 176, 179). The chronology of events or actions is less easy to translate graphically than spatial relationships; abstract concepts such as the EU or Italy can also be ‘translated’ into concrete concepts and thus visualised (often metonymically, e.g., European flag, geographical map, prime minister; El Refaie 2003: 85; Negro Alousque 2014: 67, 72; Bounegru/Forceville 2011: 220).³¹ In principle, a localisation on a continuum between the prototypical referent of the image and the referent intended by the cartoonist seems useful for the interpretation of the pictorial components (Yus 2009: 148).³² Overall, it can be said that the concrete meaning ultimately depends on the interaction of the evoked frames and the information presented in the individual modes (Forceville 2019: 369).³³

³¹ While abstract concepts can be verbalised, their pictorial implementation is severely limited, which is why they are often conveyed through metaphors (El Refaie 2003: 91). As with the pure pictorial metaphor, the arrangement of the visual elements in cartoons in terms of size, orientation, distance, etc. is important, as the cartoon analysed by Teng (2009: 197–198) on the metaphor (AMERICAN) NEWS IS HORROR NOVEL clearly shows – on the bookshelf realised graphically, there are books with horror stories, including a newspaper (titled *News*), which is used to bring about the mapping.

³² In this context, Bounegru/Forceville (2011: 213) refer to the assumption that the cartoonist selects a relevant component of meaning with regard to the interpretation of the metaphor.

It is also possible to differentiate between visual elements according to their use – Birdsell/Groarke (2007) distinguish between a) *visual flags* (attention-getting), b) *visual demonstrations* (illustration of the message/statement), c) *visual metaphors* (realisation of the claim), d) visual symbols (e.g., cross for Christianity), e) *visual archetypes* (characterized as popular, e.g., long nose of Pinocchio, ultimately also metaphorical; cf. Pollaroli/Rocci 2015: 13–14).

³³ Bounegru/Forceville (2011: 224) additionally point out that the interaction of multimodal metaphors with other metaphors/tropes or colour, layout etc. of the cartoon must also be examined with regard to the generation of rhetorical effects (cf. also Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford 2021: 53–56, 126–127, 143). For advertisements, Pérez Sobrino/

According to Muelas-Gil (2021: 62), metaphors that emphasise certain characteristics and views while simultaneously devaluing other aspects prove to be particularly efficient. However, the author points out the danger of conventionalisation when depicting the relationship between two nations or conflict parties – for example, when portraying Catalonia as a rebellious, naïve or disappointed child in relation to Spain (as a target domain, primarily implemented pictorially), there is a danger that the reader will always experience Catalonia as oppressed and thus helpless. In other words, recourse to the same conceptual metaphors can have effects that go beyond the individual cartoon (Muelas-Gil 2021: 74).³⁴

The study by Tsakōna (2009) on humour in political cartoons is also interesting; in two thirds of the 561 Greek political cartoons examined, humour is caused by the interaction of linguistic and visual elements (Tsakōna 2009: 1172–1177). Of course, not all cartoons are metaphorical, but pictorial metaphors often occur in hyperdetermined humour. The combination of linguistic and visual elements and their appearance in a specific context breaks up the expectations of the respective frames, which also generates a humorous effect (Tsakōna 2009: 1180). Piata (2016: 40) points out that in the case of humorous metaphors, “it has been suggested that the humorous effect arises from only partially resolving the metaphorical mapping”.

A relevant example study demonstrating the use of linguistic metaphor on a visual level (transmodality³⁵) is that of Porto/Romano (2019) concerning the tidal metaphor in the context of Spanish protest rallies. Since 2011, the metaphor A MASS OF PEOPLE IS A TIDE has been anchored with a view to the social movement *las mareas*, which repeatedly shows new, creative mappings and at

Littlemore/Ford (2021: 15) emphasise the intensifying effect of hyperbole for the metaphorical statement.

³⁴ In the case of conventionalised, largely context-independent metaphors (cf., for example, the image of a light bulb on the head of an individual), El Refaie (2015: 20–21) speaks of an “inactive metaphorical representation”.

³⁵ Cf. also Forceville (2019: 371) on transmodality with reference to the study by Porto/Romano (2019): “Not only can a given metaphor develop *within* a medium, for instance in language; it is moreover bound to transform and adapt itself to some extent when it migrates to another medium with its own affordances and constraints, such as visuals, visuals-plus-written texts, or music.”

Murphy (2012) notes that transmodality focuses on the emergence of semiotic chains. New modes can extend, reduce or even contradict the original meaning.

the same time refers to the integration of the metaphor into the socio-historical context of Spain (cf. STATE EDUCATION SUPPORTERS ARE A GREEN TIDE³⁶). What is also striking here is their characterisation of multimodal metaphors (“in which target and source are presented in at least two different modes, to the extent that it becomes unidentifiable if one of them is deleted”), which differs from Forceville’s much-cited definition. They also note that “in a multimodal metaphor, all the modes have to be present simultaneously, and the final emergent meaning of the metaphor goes far beyond the mere sum of its parts” (Porto/Romano 2019: 323; similarly, Schilperoord/Maes 2009: 234).³⁷

Linguistic and pictorial elements or metaphors can therefore also appear in parallel in cartoons without necessarily resulting in multimodal metaphors in Forceville’s sense, i.e., showing an exclusive or dominant realisation of the target and source domains via different modes. With regard to Forceville’s definition, however, it is interesting to note that depending on the mode (e.g., in the case of pictorial metaphors), the similarity between the source and target domains is often given via other components compared to purely verbal metaphors. This certainly raises the question of the required extent of overlap (cf. Forceville “predominantly”) for the different modes in the case of multimodal metaphors. An at least partial representation of the source and target domain in the different modes seems to be fundamental in many cartoons (Negro Alousque 2014: 63–67; El Refaie 2009: 181). El Refaie (2009) also notes that there are often linguistic elements that complement the pictorially realised metaphor but contain essential information that helps the viewer to determine the source and target concepts of a complex metaphor. Accordingly, she points to the necessity of extending the concept of multimodal metaphors to cases “where target and source are *partially* represented in different modes” (2009: 181); her definition is thus less restrictive than Forceville’s.

However, it should also be questioned how the continuum implied by this for the concept of multimodal metaphor is organised. In fact, many of the

³⁶ Based on the recontextualisation of this metaphor, an adaptation is made for further groupings, whereby a colour is chosen in each case on the basis of a metonymy, e.g., *marea blanca* for hospital staff (cf. white coat).

³⁷ The authors also state that, according to Kress (2005), the salience of the units and their relationship to each other are important for the pictorial level due to the simultaneity of the elements; this in turn results in closer relationships between images than between linguistic elements and domains (Porto/Romano 2019: 340–342).

contributions in the volume edited by Forceville and Urios-Aparisi (2009b) show that there is often a parallel in the representation of the same metaphor in different modes. Finally, Forceville (2006: 384) also points to the necessity of extending the definition in order to include all instances of metaphors in which the source and target domains are represented exclusively, predominantly or only partially in different modes (cf. El Refaie 2009: 191). Reference can be made here to the previously discussed example RECOVERY FUND IS PANETTONE, where it is extremely questionable whether the correct interpretation would be guaranteed without the few linguistic elements. In addition, the fact that the verbal and pictorial realisation of a metaphor is often not congruent is seen by some authors as a partial loss of meaning. Nevertheless, the parallel use of different modes also offers the possibility of a modifying, more nuanced, comprehensive grasp of a metaphor (with simultaneous redundancy in the case of major overlaps). Lakoff/Turner (1989: 89–96) refer here to the incommensurability of semiotic modes, which allows genuinely new meanings to be generated by combining several modes (cf. also Forceville 2019: 369). Language is probably better suited to the representation of actions, causal relations, etc., while the spatial organisation of images tends to express the relationship of elements to one another or visual similarities (cf. El Refaie 2015: 18–21). In cartoons, the source domain is often implemented visually, which breaks up the conventionality of the metaphor recognisable on a linguistic level, i.e., the linguistic polysemy of literal and metaphorical meaning is exploited for the interplay of linguistic and pictorial representation.

The occurrence of several metaphors is also possible, although these do not necessarily have to invoke the same frame; Schilperoord/Maes (2009: 223–227) show that in most of the cartoons they analysed, two metaphors occur together, each referring to a specific frame. Against this background, the authors propose an analysis comprising the following steps: 1) defining the conceptual content by paraphrasing the metaphor(s) and determining the target and source domains; 2) determining the realisation of the domains; 3) analysing the argumentative structure, objective reconstruction of the expressed perspective (cf. also Peng 2011: 617–618; Bounegru/Forceville 2011: 213).

4.2 Multimodal metaphors in advertisements and billboards

In advertising, the product being advertised (identifiable by the brand name and logo) is often presented as the target domain of a pictorial metaphor (cf. Urios-Aparisi 2009: 97).³⁸ In the less common scenario in which competing products are addressed as the target domain, negative characteristics of the source domain are transferred (Forceville 2008b: 180). Similar to political cartoons based on metaphor, a humorous or at least perceptually striking text-image relationship is essential for advertisements and billboards.

In the advertising context, multimodal metaphors serve to emphasise product qualities as well as the positive evaluation of the world depicted in the advertisement (and correspondingly a negative evaluation if the advertised product is not used; Hidalgo Downing/Martínez/Kraljevic-Mujic 2016: 156).

In contrast to political cartoons, the various studies on multimodal metaphor in this context can be differentiated according to their specific focus – there are studies that emphasise conceptual blending with recourse to the frames evoked by language and image, i.e., which focus on the (non-permanent) constitution of meaning in advertisements and posters. In other analyses, possible analytical steps are developed. Finally, categorisations are discussed that also include the metonymies that are often present in the advertisements parallel to the actual metaphor. As seen, frames can be evoked by linguistic signs,³⁹ as well as other signs such as images. This is particularly interesting with regard to advertising and the resulting interaction of modes, which is fundamental to multimodal metaphors (cf. Forceville 2016a, 2016b; Phillips/McQuarrie 2004; van Mulken/le Pair/Forceville 2010; Pérez Sobrino 2017). For metaphors or metonymies, the blending theory can be utilised for the relationship between

³⁸ Following Forceville (2008a: 467), it would be interesting to analyse the source domains that are used metaphorically in brand communication (linguistically and visually).

Unlike political cartoons, which are often presented in black and white and characterised by a lack of non-essential detail, advertisements are much more elaborate in their visual design. In addition to the selection and arrangement of the elements, the colour design is also essential, influencing the evocation of frames and underpinning the central advertising message. At the same time, the specific advert is supported by the brand frame established for well-known brands. In the case of political cartoons, reference can be made to frames built up through the behaviour of prominent politicians and their portrayal in media coverage or cartoons.

³⁹ In the case of polysemous or (quasi-)homonymous lexemes (see also the use in word games here), several frames can be evoked in parallel.

linguistic and figurative elements, as the studies by Joy/Scherry/Deschenes (2009) or Ziem (2012) show. Ziem (2012) analyses various advertisements in which conventionalised knowledge is evoked to a certain extent within the language community via linguistic components. In interaction with the pictorial elements, different frames are shown (cf. the advert of an Opel model as first in class, the frames *AUTOMOBILE* and *SCHOOL*), via which strongly context-dependent meanings are generated in the blended space, which can experience a differentiation of the meaning conditioned by the overlapping of the input spaces via an elaboration.⁴⁰ The advert in question is an ideal example of multimodal metaphors in Forceville's sense; the depicted product is the target domain, the source domain is indicated linguistically. The study by Joy/Scherry/Deschenes (2009) is similar to Ziem (2012) and also Pollaroli/Rocci (2015), with the authors also focusing on the processes associated with blending and the constitution of meaning (Joy/Scherry/Deschenes 2009: 43–48). They explicitly point out that, as with frames, the process of conceptual blending is not limited to language, but that visual representations also evoke blends.⁴¹ Mazzali-Lurati/Pollaroli (2016) also refer to blending theory; they assume that the recognition of mappings and the resulting abstract cognitive structure is communicatively fundamental (Mazzali-Lurati/Pollaroli 2016: 217–221). For the examples discussed (Erdal shoe polish, use of a high-gloss shoe as a rear-view mirror (car), depiction of a Nike shoe as a jumping mat), the analysis is based on the six patterns formulated by Goldenberg/Mazursky/Solomon (1999): pictorial analogy, extreme situation, consequence, competition, interactivity, and change of dimension. Pictorial analogy is dominant in advertising, and the adaptation of cultural symbols to the intended advertising message is also relevant in this context. The authors also shed light on the interpretation of individual characteristics that determine the mapping. In the case of the Erdal advert, for example, the elongated shape of the mirror (target domain) would be transmitted, the possibility of adjustment, the functionality for safe driving would thus be given; at the same time, the material of the shoe (shiny leather)

⁴⁰ The two input spaces are given by the frame relating to the lexical meaning as well as the frame evoked by the depicted product (Ziem 2012: 76–77).

⁴¹ Interestingly, the use of multimodality in advertising communication, used to achieve special effects such as humour, emotionalisation, etc., can lead to the development of new aspects of meaning (in the blend) with regard to the brand-specific advertising message. However, it often shows a coherent use of only one or a small number of complementary frames (Heinemann, in publication).

would be projected, but other properties of the shoe would not be used. Such constellations point to the advantage of blending theory, which considers such phenomena in the context of blended space (Mazzali-Lurati/Pollaroli 2016: 225–227).

The study by Caballero (2009) on wine advertising is particularly interesting because of the representation of smell and flavour using linguistic and visual elements. The verbalisation takes place via metonymies (*ripe flavours*), comparisons (*it smells like a barnyard*) or synaesthetic metaphors (*it smells crisp*). The multimodal metaphors that occur show language and culture-specific differences, e.g., with regard to the choice of source domain (Caballero 2009: 74–77; cf. Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009a: 7–12). The most frequently used metaphors are WINE IS A LIVING ORGANISM, WINE IS A TEXTILE (e.g., *cloak, glove, frock, mantle*, French colour as *robe*) or WINE IS A THREE-DIMENSIONAL ARTIFACT.

For the dominant ORGANISM metaphor, mainly physical characteristics (*body, brown, flabby, slim, thin, masculine, feminine*) or character traits (*aggressive, honest, expressive*) are transferred. The FAMILY metaphor is also addressed, for example in an advert that also figuratively depicts a Rioja wine as “the last generation” like a newborn baby (wrapped in cloth and placed in a basket; Caballero 2009: 83–86), similarly for a French wine “Nous vous dévoilons notre dernier nez” (see Homophonie *né* vs. *nez* [ne]), whereby the figurative implementation works with the BIRTH metaphor.

Urios-Aparisi (2009) sheds light on the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in car adverts. The intertwining of these two cognitive association principles results, to a certain extent, from the aforementioned utilisation of the frames evoked by central elements of advertising, since metonymies can be located within the same domain. Yu (2011) analyses the different mechanisms for advertising the Olympic Games in Beijing using the Beijing Opera as a source domain (linguistic, visual, acoustic; TV commercial). The analysed commercial contains a central metaphor, which is, in turn, fed by components from lower levels (Yu 2011: 615–617; cf. also Hidalgo Downing/Martínez/Kraljevic-Mujic 2016: 156 on *extended metaphors*).

In her study, Martín de la Rosa (2009) emphasises the reference to a “literal primary subject” and a “figurative secondary subject” in Forceville’s sense (1996: 5). The focus here is clearly on the visual metaphor of an Audi advert, for example, even though the source domain is (also) made linguistically explicit

via branding elements such as the depiction of the company logo. Otherwise, the reference made on a visual level would result in a generalisation (AN AUTOMOBILE ENGINE IS AN ORCHESTRA; cf. also Martín de la Rosa 2009: 173).⁴² Finally, following Forceville's assumption, the author points out that the less a pictorial metaphor depends on the linguistic component, the stronger it is. In principle, the figurative context as the foundational context for the viewer, along with the possible linguistic elements that are relevant for the acquisition of meaning such as the anchorage, as well as the (culturally bound) world knowledge of the relevant target group, which provides many of the mappings, must be taken into account (Bounegrou/Forceville 2011: 221; Martín de la Rosa 2009: 177–178).

Although addressed in many studies, the metonymic relations that (can) occur in connection with multimodal metaphors in advertisements are occasionally relegated to the background in the analysis, as the focus is on the specifics of the metaphor. Consequently, works that shed light on the relationship between metaphors and metonymies in advertising are also interesting.⁴³

Urios-Aparisi (2009: 97–98) notes that with regard to the interaction of metaphor and metonymy, a continuum between literal and metaphorical meaning can be identified, whereby the source domain can be made explicit, but does not have to be. In principle, two basic metonymies can be distinguished, namely *totum pro parte* (target-in-source; *she is taking the pill* → contraception) and *pars pro toto* (source-in-target; *all hands on deck* → sailors), whereby interactions between these two types are also possible (*Wall Street is in panic*, cf. place for institution, institution for persons; cf. also Ruiz de

⁴² Martín de la Rosa (2009) uses the metaphor DRIVING THE AUDI S3 IS LISTENING TO MUSIC, whereby the engine noise is probably in the foreground and, metonymically derived from this, driving an Audi could be compared to listening to (melodious, classical) music.

⁴³ It is interesting to note here that, according to Pérez Sobrino/Littlemore/Ford (2021: 19, 22), metonymies rarely appear on their own, but much more frequently in combination with metaphors in advertising. A combination of metaphor and metonymy is also particularly evident in so-called 'shockvertising', which contradicts the viewer's expectations and thus attracts attention.

Mendoza/Otal Campo 2002; Negro Alousque 2014: 62–63). The metonymies are accompanied by a domain reduction or expansion.⁴⁴

A systematic presentation of the types of conceptual interaction can be found, for example, in Kashanizadeh/Forceville (2020: 80–81), who take up Ruiz de Mendoza's (2000)⁴⁵ proposal to differentiate four interactional patterns, which largely correspond to those in Urios-Aparisi (2009: 1) metonymic expansion of a metaphorical source (cf. bear with trimmed fur on its head for a barber shop), 2) metonymic expansion of a metaphorical target (depiction of the Renault logo as armour, reference to safety, the logo stands for the vehicle), 3) metonymic reduction of a metaphorical source (imprint in the form of a candy wrapper on an advertised cake to indicate the intense taste of chocolate); 4) metonymic reduction of a metaphorical target (mobile phone with banderole like banknotes, advertising for bank app). The authors supplement the classification with the type 5) metonymic expansion of a metaphorical source and a metaphorical target, which also appears in Pérez Sobrino (2017) (advertising for the café in the van Gogh Museum in Amsterdam via the image of a cup with a broken handle; the ear called up via the handle refers to van Gogh or the museum dedicated to him, the cup with the broken handle refers to the café in the van Gogh Museum; the advert for Zoo Artis uses the image of an orangutan with the words *Mona Lisa* underneath; *Mona Lisa* refers to the Louvre, orangutan to the zoo).

Using the example of an advert for 7UP, Pérez Sobrino (2013) shows the use of a multimodal metaphor (PRODUCT X IS FRUIT) and a metonymy chain (GREEN FOR NATURE FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY), which at the same time highlights the widespread greenwashing in advertising.⁴⁶ Pérez Sobrino (2013: 9) suggests

⁴⁴ Pérez Sobrino (2016: 64) points out that metonymic reduction processes are primarily used in advertising when the matrix domain is too complex or elaborate to be processed in line with the advertising message.

⁴⁵ Elsewhere, Ruiz de Mendoza (2007) lists four patterns of metonymic interaction, cf. 1) double domain expansion, 2) double domain reduction, 3) domain expansion and domain reduction, 4) domain reduction and domain expansion.

Cf. also Pérez Hernández (2011: 372–373) on supplementary content-related cognitive and formal operations (e.g., comparison, correlation, strengthening etc.), which can be used to enrich the meaning of the target domain.

⁴⁶ The intention to convey a positive image of the product serves as the background for the greenwashing that can be observed here (cf. on the corresponding aspects implemented in the advert Pérez Sobrino 2013: 2).

the following analytical steps: 1) what are the two elements included in the metaphor? 2) which represents the source domain and which the target domain? 3) which characteristics are transferred? The advert shows a can of soft drink hanging from a branch instead of a lemon (next to it are lemons and leaves, the background is green).

As in this particular case, the source domain is often expressed implicitly, while the target domain (namely the product) is expressed explicitly (cf. metaphor 7UP CAN IS A LEMON). With regard to the conceptualisation of the can as a lemon, Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (2011: 108) argues that conceptual integration through enrichment is necessary (achieved here through the visual environment). The accompanying text also controls the interpretation via different metonymies, among other things (Pérez Sobrino 2013: 11–12). In Pérez Sobrino (2016: 64), the author discusses different types of interdependence between metaphor and metonymy;⁴⁷ her classification goes beyond that of Kashanizadeh/Forceville (2020: 80–81) and the primary interest in multimodal metaphors discussed in this article: a) parallel metonymic expansion in both metaphorical domains; b) parallel metonymic reduction in both metaphorical domains; c) metaphonymic scenario; d) multiple-source-in-target metaphonymy. In addition, it is possible to make a distinction between single-source metaphoric amalgams (integration of one metaphor into another) and double-source metaphoric amalgams (transfer of two different source domains to the same target domain). In the case of metaphoric chains, there is a combination of metaphors in which the target domain of the first metaphor forms the source domain of the next (Pérez Sobrino 2016: 65–73). The different types reflect the *figurative-literal continuum* described by the author (based on that described by Dirven 2002), which shows metonymy and the metaphoric chain as extremes (metonymy, multiple source-in-target metonymy, metonymic chain, metaphor, metaphonymy, metaphoric amalgam, metaphoric chain).

The case discussed earlier in Pérez Sobrino (2013) can therefore be summarised as multimodal metaphonymy (metaphor, metonymic chain in one of the domains involved). According to the author (2016: 78-79), metaphonymy is most common in advertising, followed by metonymic chain; metonymy and metaphor are similarly common. In 64% of the 210 advertisements she analysed,

⁴⁷ It is not always possible to make a clear differentiation between the processes or, alternatively, statements can be interpreted both metaphorically and metonymically.

the source domain is exclusively depicted visually, 27% use visual and linguistic elements, and 7% use only the linguistic level; in contrast, the target domain is implemented visually in 39%, in 35% of cases hybrid (linguistic and visual), and in approximately 50% of the advertisements, the advertised product is only addressed linguistically.⁴⁸ According to the author, the combination of visual and linguistic elements proves to be the most effective, as images are remembered for longer and linguistic elements control the interpretation of the advertising message.

5. Concluding remarks

The analysis of the various studies on multimodal metaphors in general and in political cartoons such as adverts shows that, on the one hand, the assumption of a continuum appears to make sense for the definition of multimodal metaphors. Even Forceville's basic definition, according to which the source and target domains should be implemented exclusively or at least primarily via one modality, is relatively restrictive, but it opens up the possibility that elements of a metaphor may appear doubled in the pictorial and linguistic realisation. A parallel of verbal and pictorial metaphor could thus be understood as a pole of the continuum (in a sense as a parallel of the same metaphor implemented monomodally in each case).⁴⁹ The opposite pole is the 'classic' case of the multimodal metaphor,⁵⁰ which sees the source domain implemented linguistically and the target domain pictorially (or vice versa). The use of a continuum seems justified not least by the fact that different aspects of meaning are (or can be) invoked via the translation into the individual modes, so the figurative and linguistic translation do not show a 1:1 correspondence (cf. in particular Hidalgo Downing/Martínez/Kraljevic-Mujic 2016: 139–144). The coding is therefore not redundant; in many cases, the elements appearing in the other mode contain essential information that allows a (correct, intended)

⁴⁸ This is particularly striking in view of the assumption that the advertised product, as seen, is usually the target domain (and depicted).

⁴⁹ In monomodal metaphors, the source and the target are each represented in one mode, although here, too, meaning-constituting elements implemented via the other mode must be taken into account.

⁵⁰ Cf. also Forceville (2006: 486) on the diverse interrelationships between source and target domains.

interpretation of the complex metaphor.⁵¹ Porto/Romano (2019: 323) define multimodal metaphors accordingly with a view to capturing the meaning, which would be impaired if the linguistic or figurative element were to be deleted. A partial representation of the source and target domain in both modalities seems to be especially common in political cartoons. Forceville (2006: 384) himself also sees the need for a broadening of the definition with regard to cases in which the source and target domains are partially implemented in different modalities (cf. also El Refaie 2009: 181).

In addition to the problem of defining multimodal metaphors, the studies on metaphor in the context of advertising language also show the inclusion of metonymy and the interweaving of metaphor and metonymy. Although this shifts the focus, it would still be interesting to examine whether and to what extent the types formulated in the context of different attempts at classification are equally applicable to political cartoons and what effects are achieved with each individual type.⁵² There is no doubt that the rarely explicit referral to frames as a reference value is helpful for the study of multimodal metaphors, especially since they prove to be independent of modality.

6. Bibliography

- Abdel-Raheem, Ahmed (2019): *Pictorial framing in moral politics: A corpus-based experimental study*, London: Routledge.
- Aldrich, Virgil (1968): "Visual metaphor", in: *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 2 (1), 73–86.
- Barthes, Roland (1964): "Rhétorique de l'image", in: *Communications* 4, 40–51.
- Bateman, John A. (2016): "Methodological and Theoretical Issues for the Empirical Investigation of Multimodality", in: Klug, Nina-Maria/Stöckl, Hartmut (eds.): *Sprache im multimodalen Kontext*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 36–74.
- Bateman, John/Wildfeuer, Janina/Hiippala, Tuomo (2017): *Multimodality: Foundations, research and analysis – A problem-oriented introduction*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

⁵¹ In this context, the aforementioned transmodality should also be interesting, from which new multimodal metaphors may emerge.

⁵² Lin/Chiang (2015: 259) also emphasise the intertwining of metaphor and metonymy in political cartoons.

- Bezemer, Jeff/Kress, Gunther (2008): "Writing in Multimodal Texts: A Social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning", in: *Written Communication* 25 (2), 166–195.
- Birdsell, David S./Groarke, Leo (2007): "Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument", in: *Argumentation and Advocacy* 43, 103–113.
- Bobrova, Larysa (2015): "A procedure for identifying potential multimodal metaphors in TV commercials", in: *Multimodal Communication* 4 (2), 113–131.
- Bonhomme, Marc/Lugrin, Gilles (2008): "Interprétation et effets des figures visuelles dans la communication publicitaire: le cas de la métonymie et de la métaphore", in: *Studies in communication sciences* 8 (1), 237–258.
- Bounegru, Liliana/Forceville, Charles (2011): "Metaphors in editorial cartoons representing the global financial crisis", in: *Visual Communication* 10, 209–229.
- Busse, Dietrich (2012): *Frame-Semantik. Ein Kompendium*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Caballero, Rosario (2009): "Cutting across the senses: Imagery in winespeak and audiovisual promotion", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 73–94.
- Carroll, Noël (1994): "Visual metaphor", in: Hintikka, Jaakko (ed.): *Aspects of Metaphor*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 189–218.
- Carver, Terrell/Pikalo, Jernej (eds.) (2008): *Political Language and Metaphor. Interpreting and changing the world*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2004): *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Basingstroke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cienki, Alan (2010): "Multimodal metaphor analysis", in: Cameron, Lynne/Masle, Robert (eds.): *Metaphor Analysis: Research Practice in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*, London: Equinox, 195–214.
- Croft, William/Cruse, D. Alan (2004): *Cognitive linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dirven, René (2002): "Metonymy and Metaphor: Different Mental Strategies of Conceptualisation", in: Dirven, René/Pörings, Ralf (eds.): *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 75–111.
- Domínguez, Martí (2015): "The metaphorical species: Evolution, adaptation and speciation of metaphors", in: *Discourse Studies* 17, 4, 433–448.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris (1927): "Problems of cine-stylistics", in: Taylor, Richard (ed.): *The Poetics of Cinema*, Oxford: RPT Pub, 5–31.

- El Refaie, Elisabeth (2003): "Understanding visual metaphor: the example of newspaper cartoons", in: *Visual Communication* 2 (1), 75–95.
- El Refaie, Elisabeth (2009): "Metaphor in political cartoons: Exploring audience responses", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 173–196.
- El Refaie, Elisabeth (2015): "Cross-modal resonances in creative multimodal metaphors: breaking out of conceptual prisons", in: Pinar Sanz, Maria Jesús (ed.): *Multimodality and Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 13–26.
- Fauconnier, Gilles (2001): "Conceptual blending", in: Wright, James D. (ed.): *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2495–2498.
- Fauconnier, Gilles/Turner, Mark (1998): "Conceptual Integration Networks", in: *Cognitive Science* 22 (2), 133–187.
- Fauconnier, Gilles/Turner, Mark (2002): *The way we think*, New York: Basic Books.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1985): "Frames and the semantics of understanding", in: *Quaderni di Semantica* 6 (2), 222–254.
- Forceville, Charles (1996): *Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising*, London: Routledge.
- Forceville, Charles (1999): "Educating the eye? Kress and Van Leeuwen's *Reading Images: The Reading of Visual Design* (1996)", in: *Language and Literature* 8 (2), 163–178.
- Forceville, Charles (2002): "The identification of target and source in pictorial metaphors", in: *Journal of pragmatics* 34 (1), 1–14.
- Forceville, Charles (2006): "Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: agendas for research", in: Kristiansen, Gitte et al. (eds.): *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 379–402.
- Forceville, Charles (2008a): "Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations", in: Gibbs, Raymond (ed.): *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 462–482.
- Forceville, Charles (2008b): "Pictorial and multimodal metaphor in commercials", in: McQuarrie, Edward F./Phillips, Barbara J. (eds.): *Go Figure! New Directions in Advertising Rhetoric*, Armonk NY: ME Sharpe, 178–204.

- Forceville, Charles (2009): "Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 19–42.
- Forceville, Charles (2016a): "Mixing in pictorial and multimodal metaphors?", in: Gibbs, Raymond (ed.): *Mixing Metaphor*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 223–239.
- Forceville, Charles (2016b): "Pictorial and multimodal metaphor", in: Klug, Nina-Maria/Stöckl, Hartmut (eds.): *Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 241–260.
- Forceville, Charles (2019): "Developments in multimodal metaphor studies: A response to Górska, Coëgnarts, Porto & Romano, and Muelas-Gil", in: Navarro i Ferrando, Ignasi (ed.): *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 367–378.
- Forceville, Charles (2021): "Multimodality", in: Wen, Xu/Taylor, John R. (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, London: Routledge, 676–687.
- Forceville, Charles/Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (2009a): "Introduction", in: Forceville, Charles/Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 3–17.
- Forceville, Charles/Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.) (2009b): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Forceville, Charles/van de Laar, Nataša (2019): "Metaphors portraying right-wing politician Geert Wilders in Dutch political cartoons", in: Hidalgo-Tenorio, Encarnacion/Benitez-Castro, Miguel-Angel/De Cesare, Francesca (eds.): *Populist discourse: Critical approaches to contemporary politics*, London: Routledge, 202–307.
- Fraas, Claudia (2013): "Frames – ein qualitativer Zugang zur Analyse von Sinnstrukturen in der Online-Kommunikation", in: Frank-Job, Barbara/Mehler, Alexander/Sutter, Tilman (eds.): *Die Dynamik sozialer und sprachlicher Netzwerke. Konzepte, Methoden und empirische Untersuchungen an Beispielen des WWW*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 259–283.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. (ed.) (2016): *Mixing metaphor*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gibbs, Raymond W./Matlock, Teenie (2008): "Metaphor, Imagination, and Simulation: Psycholinguistic Evidence", in: Gibbs Jr., Raymond W. (ed.): *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 161–176.

- Goldenberg, Jacob/Mazursky, David/Solomon, Sorin (1999): "The fundamental templates of quality ads", in: *Marketing Science* 18 (3), 333–351.
- Gombrich, Ernst H. (1978): "The cartoonist's armoury", in: Gombrich (1978): *Meditations on a hobby horse and other essays on the theory of art*, New York: Phaedon, 127–142.
- Górska, Elżbieta (2019): "Spatialization of abstract concepts in cartoons: a case study of verbo-pictorial image-schematic metaphors", in: Navarro i Ferrando, Ignasi (ed.): *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter/Walter de Gruyter, 279–294.
- Grady, Joseph E. (1997): *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*, Berkeley [PhD thesis University of California].
- Grady, Joseph E./Oakley, Todd/Soulson, Seana (1999): "Blending and metaphor", in: Gibbs, Raymond W./Steen, Gerard J. (eds.): *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics: Selected papers from the 5th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Amsterdam, 1997*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 101–124.
- Harder, Peter (2010): *Meaning in Mind and Society. A Functional Contribution to the Social Turn in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Heinemann, Sabine (2022): "The conceptualisation of EUROPE in the Italian press since the early 20th century", in: Heinemann, Sabine/Helfrich, Uta/Visser, Judith (eds.): *On the discursive deconstruction and reconstruction of Europe*, Berlin/Heidelberg: Metzler, 47–70.
- Heinemann, Sabine (in publication): "Frames in der Markenkommunikation", in: L. Gautier, Laurent/Varga, Simon (eds.): *Frames und Fachwissen*, Berlin/Boston [Ms. 2020].
- Herrero Ruiz, Javier (2006): "The Role of Metaphor, Metonymy and Conceptual Blending in Understanding Advertisements: The Case of Drug-Prevention Ads", in: *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 19, 169–190.
- Heyvaert, Pauline et al. (2019): "Metaphors in political communication. A case study of the use of deliberate metaphors in non-institutional political interviews", in: *Journal of Language and Politics* 18, 1–25.
- Hidalgo Downing, Laura/Kraljevic Mujic, Blanca (2011): "Multimodal metonymy and metaphor as complex discourse resources for creativity in ICT advertising discourse", in: *Review of cognitive linguistics* 9 (1), 153–178.

- Hidalgo-Downing, Laura/Martínez, María-Ángeles/Kraljevic-Mujic, Blanca (2016): "Multimodal metaphor, narrativity and creativity in TV cosmetics ads", in: Romano, Manuela/Porto, M. Dolores (eds.): *Exploring Discourse Strategies in Social and Cognitive Interaction*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 137–158.
- Hofstede, Geert/Hofstede, Gert Jan (2005): *Lokales Denken, globales Handeln. Interkulturelle Zusammenarbeit und globales Management*, München: dtv.
- Jewitt, Carey (ed.) (2014): *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*, London: Routledge.
- Jewitt, Carey/Bezemer, Jeff/O' Halloran, Kay (2016): *Introducing multimodality*, London: Routledge.
- Johnson, Mark (2010): "Rez. Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009", in: *Journal of pragmatics* 42 (10), 2848–2850.
- Joue, Gina et al. (2020): "Metaphor Processing is Supramodal Semantic Processing: The Role of the Bilateral Lateral Temporal Regions in Multimodal Communication", in: *Brain and Language* 205, Article 104772.
- Joy, Annamma/Scherry, John F./Deschenes, Jonathan (2009): "Conceptual blending in advertising", *Journal of Business Research* 62, 39–49.
- Kashanizadeh, Zahra/Forceville, Charles (2020): "Visual and multimodal interaction of metaphor and metonymy: a study of Iranian and Dutch print advertisements", in: *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 7 (1), 78–110.
- Kennedy, John M. (1982): "Metaphor in pictures", in: *Perception* 11, 589–605.
- Kennedy, John M./Green, Christopher D./Vervaeke, John (1993): "Metaphoric thought and devices in pictures", in: *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8, 243–255.
- Klug, Nina-Maria/Stöckl, Hartmut (eds.) (2016): *Sprache im multimodalen Kontext*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Koller, Veronika (2009): "Brand images: Multimodal metaphor in corporate branding messages", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 45–71.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2005): *Metaphor in culture. Universality and variation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, Gunther (2005): "Gains and losses: New forms of texts, knowledge, and learning", in: *Computers and Composition* 22, 5–22.
- Kress, Gunther (2009): "What Is a Mode?", in: Jewitt, Carey (ed.): *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, London: Routledge, 54–67.

- Kress, Gunther/Bezemer, Jeff (2016): *Multimodality, Learning, and Communication: A Social Semiotic Frame*, London: Routledge.
- Kress, Gunther/Van Leeuwen, Theo (2001): *Multimodal discourse*, London: Arnold.
- Kress, Gunther/Van Leeuwen, Theo (2006): *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*, London: Routledge.
- Kutz, Oliver et al. (2015): "E pluribus unum: Formalisation, Use-Cases, and Computational Support for Conceptual Blending", in: Besold, Tarek R./Schorlemmer, Marco/Smaill, Alan (eds.): *Computational Creativity Research: Towards Creative Machines*, Paris: Atlantis Press, 167–196.
- Lakoff, George (2008): "The Neural Theory of Metaphor", in: Gibbs, Raymond W. (ed.): *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 17–38.
- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George/Turner, Mark (1989): *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lin, Tiffany Y.Y./Chiang, Wen-yu (2015): "Multimodal fusion in analyzing political cartoons: Debates on U.S. beef imports into Taiwan", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 30, 137–161.
- Martín de la Rosa, María Victoria (2009): "The role of pictorial metaphor in magazine advertising", in: *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses* 22, 167–180.
- Mazzali-Lurati, Sabrina/Pollaroli, Chiara (2016): "Blending metaphors and arguments in advertising", in: Gola, Elisabetta/Ervass, Francesca (eds.): *Metaphor and Communication*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 217–234.
- McMahon, Rachel (2018): "Debating nationhood through images: the visual language of French political cartoons", in: *NPPSH Reflections* 2, 103–116.
- McQuarrie, Edward F./Mick, David G. (1999): "Visual Rhetoric in Advertising Text-Interpretative, Experimental and Reader-Response Analyses", in: *Journal of Consumer Research* 26, 37–54.
- Meier, Stefan (2010): "Bild und Frame – Eine diskursanalytische Perspektive auf visuelle Kommunikation und deren methodische Operationalisierung", in: Duszak, Anna/House, Juliane/Kumiega, Lukasz (eds.): *Globalization, Discourse, Media: In a Critical Perspective/Globalisierung, Diskurse, Medien: eine kritische Perspektive*, Warschau: Warschauer Universitätsverlag, 371–392.

- Minsky, Marvin (1975): "A Framework for Representing Knowledge", in: Winston, Patrick H. (ed.): *The Psychology of Computer Vision*, New York: McGraw/Hill, 211–278.
- Mittelberg, Irene/Waugh, Linda R. (2009): "Metonymy first, metaphor second: A cognitive semiotic approach to multimodal figures of thought in co-speech gesture", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 329–356.
- Morris, Ray (1993): "Visual Rhetoric in Political Cartoons: A Structuralist Approach", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 8 (3), 195–210.
- Muelas-Gil, María (2021): "National vs. international cartoons depicting Catalonia's independence process in the press: a critical multimodal metaphor approach", in: Crespo-Fernández, Eliecer/Musolff, Andreas (eds.): *Discourse Studies in Public Communication*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59–81.
- Müller, Cornelia/Cienki, Alan (2009): "Words, gestures, and beyond: Forms of multimodal metaphor in the use of spoken language", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 297–328.
- Murphy, Keith M. (2012): "Transmodality and temporality in design interactions", in: *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (14), 1966–1981.
- Musolff, Andreas (2004): *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Negro Alousque, Isabel (2014): "Pictorial and verbo-pictorial metaphor in Spanish political cartooning", in: *Circulo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 57, 59–84.
- Ortiz, Maria J. (2011): "Primary metaphors and monomodal visual metaphors", in: *Journal of pragmatics* 43 (6), 1568–1580.
- Peng, Mignwei (2011): "Rez. Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009", in: *Intercultural pragmatics* 8 (4), 614–622.
- Pérez Sobrino, Paula (2013): "Metaphor use in advertising: analysis of the interaction between multimodal metaphor and metonymy in a *greenwashing* advertisement", in: Gola, Elisabetta/Ervás, Francesca (eds.): *Metaphor in Focus: Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor Use*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 67–82.
- Pérez Sobrino, Paula (2016): "Multimodal and Metonymy in Advertising: A Corpus-Based Account", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 31 (2), 73–90.
- Pérez Sobrino, Paula (2017): *Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy in Advertising*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Pérez Sobrino, Paula/Littlemore, Jeannette/Ford, Samantha (2021): *Unpacking creativity. The Power of Figurative Communication in Advertising*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez-Hernández, Lorena (2011): "Cognitive Tools for Successful Branding", in: *Applied Linguistics* 32 (4), 369–388.
- Pérez-Hernández, Lorena (2019): "XL burgers, shiny pizzas and ascending drinks: Primary metaphors and conceptual interaction in fast food printed advertising", in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 30 (3), 531–570.
- Phillips, Barbara J./McQuarrie, Edward F. (2004): "Beyond visual metaphor: a new typology of visual rhetoric in advertising", in: *Marketing Theory* 4 (1–2), 113–136.
- Piata, Anna (2016): "When metaphor becomes a joke: Metaphor journeys from political ads to internet memes", in: *Journal of Pragmatics* 106, 39–56.
- Pollaroli, Chiara/Rocci, Andrea (2015): "The argumentative relevance of pictorial and multimodal metaphor in advertising", in: *Journal of Argumentation in Context* 4 (2), 158–199.
- Popa, Diana E. (2015): "Multimodal metaphors in political entertainment", in: Pinar Sanz, María Jesús (ed.): *Multimodality and Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 79–95.
- Porto, M. Dolores/Romano, Manuela (2019): "Transmodality in metaphors: TIDES in Spanish social protest movements", in: Navarro i Ferrando, Ignasi (ed.): *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 321–345.
- Pragglejaz Group (2007): "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1), 1–39.
- Radden, Günter (2000): "How metonymic are metaphors?", in: Barcelona, Antonio (ed.): *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads. A cognitive perspective*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 93–108.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J. (2011): "Metonymy and cognitive operations", in: Benczes, Réka/Barcelona, Antonio/Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J. (eds.): *What is Metonymy? An Attempt at Building a Consensus View of the Delimitation of the Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 103–124.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco (2000): "The role of mappings and domains in understanding metonymy", in: Barcelona, Antonio (ed.): *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 109–132.

- Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco (2007): "High-level cognitive models: in search of a unified framework for inferential and grammatical behaviour", in: Kosecki, Krzysztof (ed.): *Perspectives on metonymy*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 11–30.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco J./Otal Campo, José Luis (2002): *Metonymy, Grammar, and Communication*, Granada: Comares.
- Schilperoord, Joost/Maes, Alfons/Ferninandusse, Heleen (2009): "Perceptual and Conceptual Visual Rhetoric: The Case of Symmetric Object Alignment", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 24 (3), 155–173.
- Schilperoord, Joost/Maes, Alfons (2009): "Visual metaphoric conceptualization in editorial cartoons", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 213–240.
- Scott, Kate (2021): "Memes as multimodal metaphors: a relevance theory analysis", in: *Pragmatics and Cognition* 28 (2), 277–298.
- Sperber, Dan/Wilson, Deirdre (1995): *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Spieß, Constanze (2016): "Metapher als multimodales kognitives Funktionsprinzip", in: Klug, Nina-Maria/Stöckl, Hartmut (eds.): *Sprache im multimodalen Kontext*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 75–98.
- Spieß, Constanze (2017): "Metaphern", in: Roth, Kersten Sven/Wengeler, Martin/Ziem, Alexander (eds.): *Handbuch Sprache in Politik und Gesellschaft*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 94–115.
- Spieß, Constanze/Köpcke, Klaus-Michael (2015): "Metonymie und Metapher – Theoretische, methodische und empirische Zugänge. Eine Einführung in den Sammelband", in: Spieß, Constanze/Köpcke, Klaus-Michael (eds.): *Metapher und Metonymie. Theoretische, methodische und empirische Zugänge*, München et al.: De Gruyter, 1–21.
- Stöckl, Hartmut (2004): *Die Sprache im Bild, das Bild in der Sprache: zur Verknüpfung von Sprache und Bild im massenmedialen Text. Konzepte, Theorien, Analysemethoden*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Stöckl, Hartmut (2016): "Multimodalität – Semiotische und textlinguistische Grundlagen", in: Klug, Nina-Maria/Stöckl, Hartmut (eds.): *Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 3–35.
- Stöckl, Hartmut (2019): "Linguistic multimodality – multimodal linguistics: A state-of-the-art sketch", in: Wildfeuer, Janina et al. (eds.): *Multimodality: Disciplinary thoughts and the challenge of diversity*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 41–68.

- Teng, Norman Y. (2009): "Image alignment in multimodal metaphor", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 197–211.
- Teng, Norman Y./Sun, Sewen (2002): "Grouping, simile, and oxymoron in pictures: A design-based cognitive approach", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 17, 295–316.
- Tsakōna, Billy (2009): "Language and image interaction in cartoons: towards a multimodal theory of humour", in: *Journal of pragmatics* 41 (6), 1171–1188.
- Tseronis, Assimakis/Forceville, Charles (eds.) (2017): *Multimodal Argumentation and Rhetoric in Media Genres*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Turner, Mark (2008): "Frame Blending", in: Rossini Favretti, Rema (ed.): *Frames, Corpora, and Knowledge Representation*, Bologna: Bononia University Press, 13–32.
- Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (2009): "Interaction of multimodal metaphor and metonymy in TV commercials: Four case studies", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 95–117.
- Valdivia, Pablo (2019): "Narrating crises and populism in Southern Europe: Regimes of metaphor", in: *Journal of European Studies* 49 (3–4), 282–301.
- van Mulken, Margot/le Pair, Robert Gerard/Forceville, Charles (2010): "The impact of perceived complexity, deviation and comprehension on the appreciation of visual metaphor in advertising across three European countries", in: *Journal of pragmatics* 42 (12), 3418–3430.
- van Mulken, Margot/van Hooft, Andreu/Nederstigt, Ulrike (2014): "Finding the Tipping Point: Visual Metaphor and Conceptual Complexity in Advertising", in: *Journal of Advertising* 43 (4), 333–343.
- Velasco Sacristán, María Sol/Cortés de los Rios, María Enriqueta (2009): "Persuasive Nature of Image Schematic Devices in Advertising: Their Use for Introducing Sexisms", in: *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 22, 239–270.
- Virag, Agnes (2020): "Multimodal conceptual patterns of Hungary in political cartoons", in: *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 7 (1), 222–252.
- Wildfeuer, Janina/Bateman, John A./Hiippala, Tuomo (2020): *Multimodalität: Grundlagen, Forschung und Analyse – Eine problemorientierte Einführung*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Yu, Ning (2009): "Nonverbal and multimodal manifestations of metaphors and metonymies: A case study", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 119–143.

- Yu, Ning (2011): "Beijing Olympics and Beijing opera: a multimodal metaphor in a CCTV Olympics commercial", in: *Cognitive linguistics* 22 (3), 595–628.
- Yus, Francisco (2009): "Visual metaphor vs verbal metaphor: A unified account", in: Forceville, Charles J./Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (eds.): *Multimodal Metaphor*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 147–172.
- Ziem, Alexander (2008a): "Frame-Semantik und Diskursanalyse – Skizze einer kognitionswissenschaftlich inspirierten Methode zur Analyse gesellschaftlichen Wissens", in: Warnke, Ingo H./Spitzmüller, Jürgen (eds.): *Methoden der Diskurslinguistik. Sprachwissenschaftliche Zugänge zur transtextuellen Ebene*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 89–116.
- Ziem, Alexander (2008b): *Frames und sprachliches Wissen. Kognitive Aspekte der semantischen Kompetenz*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Ziem, Alexander (2012): "Werbekommunikation semantisch", in: Janich, Nina (ed.): *Handbuch Werbekommunikation: sprachwissenschaftliche und interdisziplinäre Zugänge*, Tübingen: Francke, 65–87.
- Zinken, Jörg/Hellsten, Ina/Nerlich, Brigitte (2008): "Discourse metaphors", in: Frank, Roslyn M. et al. (eds.): *Body, Language and Mind*, vol. 2: *Sociocultural Situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 363–385.