



Maíra **Avelar**, mairavelar[at]gmail.com  
Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia, Brazil

## **The emergence of multimodal metaphors in the political-religious discourse: a comparative analysis**

In this paper, we aim to analyze the emergence of multimodal metaphors in legislative sessions from the Brazilian House of Representatives, performed by the so-called “Deputy Pastors” that belong to the Evangelical Bench, taking into consideration three variables: verbal, prosodic – that belongs to the auditory modality –, and gestural – that belongs to the visual modality. We intend to analyze the conceptual metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) that gradually emerge in the deputy’s discourses. We assume the hypothesis that the more entrenched in our conceptual system the metaphoric expression is, the more difficult it is to recognize it as metaphoric. On the other hand, the less entrenched in our conceptual system the metaphoric expression is, the easier it is to recognize it as a metaphoric expression. To demonstrate the emergence of the metaphors in the three modalities mentioned above, as well as the relation among them, we have selected 3-minute scenes from two plenary sessions, belonging to two different deputies, broadcasted and made available by TV Câmara, the Brazilian House of Representatives TV channel. In order to perform our analyses, we chose our Multimodal Semiotic Blending model (Avelar in press), an adaptation of the Cognitive Semiotics Model proposed by Brandt (2004) that establishes architecture of spaces projected by the subjects in their interactions, which makes the cognitive processing of blends possible. We intend to perform a comparative analysis of the emergence of multimodal metaphors in the discourse of the two chosen plenary sessions, specifically observing the multimodal metaphoricity in speech and gesture compounds (Müller & Cienki, 2009), the emergence of prosody as a body-based feature (Auchlin 2013), and the pragmatic use of gesture families (Kendon 2004). Partial results confirmed our initial hypotheses that the more conventionalized the metaphors are, the more difficult it is to recognize the metaphoric nature of the expressions. On the other hand, the less conventional the metaphors are, the easier it is to recognize the metaphoric nature of the expressions, and, consequently, more gestural and prosodic resources are used for driving the attention of the listener to what is being said or iconically depicted by the gestures. After performing all the analyses, we intend to demonstrate how the verbal, prosodic and gestural features can interact in order to generate multimodal metaphors that can be more or less conventionalized, depending on the contextual environment of their emergence.

### **References**

- Auchlin, A. (2013) “Prosodic Iconicity and Experiential Blending”. In : S. Hancil (Ed.) *Prosody and Iconicity*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Avelar, M (in press) “The emergence of multimodal metaphors in Brazilian political-electoral debates: a comparative analysis of the 2010 and 2014 second-round presidential debates In: Zlatev, J, Konderak, P & Sonesson, G (Eds). *Establishing Cognitive Semiotics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Brandt, P. (2004) *Spaces, Domains, and Meaning: Essays in Cognitive Semiotics*. Brussels: Peter Lang.
- Grady, J., T. Oakley & S. Coulson (1999) “Blending and Metaphor”. In: *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*, G. Steen & R. Gibbs (eds.). Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999.
- Hougaard, A. (2008) “Compression in interaction”. In: T. Oakley & A. Hougaard (eds.) *Metaphor in Discourse and Interaction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kendon, A. (2004) *Gesture: visible action as utterance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Müller, C. & A. Cienki (2009) "Words, gestures, and beyond: Forms of multimodal metaphor in the use of spoken language". In, C. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (eds.). *Multimodal Metaphors*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 297-328.