UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

[Review of: E. El Refaie (2019) Visual Metaphor and Embodiment in Graphic Illness Narratives]

Forceville, C.

DOI

[10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.007)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Submitted manuscript

Published in

Journal of Pragmatics

License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Forceville, C. (2020). [Review of: E. El Refaie (2019) Visual Metaphor and Embodiment in Graphic Illness Narratives]. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 155, 352-354.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.007>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

Journal of Pragmatics

Book review of: Visual Metaphor and Embodiment in Graphic Illness Narratives

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Article Type:	Book review
Keywords:	graphic novel; conceptual metaphor theory; visual metaphor; depression; cancer
Corresponding Author:	Charles Forceville Universiteit van Amsterdam Amsterdam, Netherlands
First Author:	Charles Forceville
Order of Authors:	Charles Forceville
Abstract:	This is a book review.
Opposed Reviewers:	

From: Charles Forceville

To: Journal of Pragmatics

Re: Book review of El Refaie (2019)

Date: 14 September 2019

Dear editor,

Please find enclosed my review of El Refaie (2019). This book review has been read and approved by Siobhan Chapman, *Journal of Pragmatics'* book review editor.

Yours sincerely,

Charles Forceville

Visual Metaphor and Embodiment in Graphic Illness Narratives

Elisabeth El Refaie, Oxford University Press, New York, 2019

Review by Charles Forceville for *Journal of Pragmatics*

(read & approved by Siobhan Chapman)

14 September 2019

Charles Forceville
University of Amsterdam
Dept. of Media Studies
Turfdraagsterpad 9
1012 XT Amsterdam
The Netherlands
c.j.forceville@uva.nl

Visual Metaphor and Embodiment in Graphic Illness Narratives

Elisabeth El Refaie, Oxford University Press, New York, 2019, 232 pp (including 36 figures in b/w, index). ISBN 9780190678173 (cloth)/9780190678197(E-book), £47.99.

Charles Forceville, University of Amsterdam

Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) launched Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), often called *embodied* because it claims that human beings systematically conceptualize abstract, complex things (the "target domains") in terms of concrete domains (the "source domains") – concreteness consisting in sensory perception and bodily locomotion. The book catapulted metaphor studies into the heart of cognitive science. Since then several developments have strengthened CMT: One, the increasing awareness that bodily, potentially universal, dimensions are always complemented by (sub)cultural ones (e.g., Yu, 1998; Kövecses, 2005; Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2013). Two, the exploration of non-verbal manifestations of metaphors – whether in visuals, music, sound, gestures, or in multimodal combinations of these – which in turn made clear that the affordances and constraints of metaphors may differ between genres and media (Forceville and Urios-Aparisi, 2009). Three, the awareness that the conventional A IS B formula runs the risk of downplaying metaphor's inherently dynamic character. Metaphors can develop and change in the course of a discourse (e.g., Cameron et al., 2009; Müller and Kappelhoff, 2018). Related to this is the insight that analyzing metaphorical

meanings requires paying attention to the specific contexts in which they occur (e.g., Kövecses, 2015). Four, marrying CMT and Critical Discourse Analysis/CDA (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2004; Musolff, 2016; Abdel-Raheem, 2019), thereby demonstrating how systematic analysis of metaphors in a discourse sheds light on ideological issues or socio-cultural problems.

El Refaie's monograph contributes insights to all these developments. In this review I will first focus on her case study chapters and then examine in some detail the novel perspectives on CMT she presents.

El Refaie's corpus consists of 35 graphic novels (say, "serious comics") pertaining to various, mostly physical, illnesses – but even when they are primarily mental afflictions, they do affect bodily functioning, and in turn disturb sufferers' sense of identity. Unlike in the default CMT examples, in these illness narratives the body is not the "normal" healthy body that imposes structure on complex target domains, but constitutes itself the problematic target domain that is in need of insight-generating metaphorical source domains. Moreover, the author points out, "normalcy" is to some extent subject to values and norms that differ from one (sub)community to another, while the experience of one's body is not stable or unalterable – temporary illnesses and ageing processes affect every person's bodily experiences.

A recurring pattern El Refaie observes in the ten graphic narratives about cancer in her corpus is that they all thematize the "troubling and paradoxical relationship between human vision and knowledge/understanding" (p. 119), an issue she claims

has not been discussed in studies of verbal cancer narratives. Moreover, this view
problematizes the supposedly universal UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING metaphor
(Sweetser, 1990). Cancer results in few bodily symptoms that are outwardly visible,
while its visualizations in the form of X-rays are baffling to all but medical experts.
Consequently, the author argues, SEEING often functions as metaphorical *target*
domain in cancer narratives, resulting in a metaphor that could be labeled SEEING IS
(NOT) KNOWING/UNDERSTANDING/BELIEVING (p. 122).

The eight autobiographical graphic novels dealing (partly) with depression all
reveal a problematic relation with time, disrupting the conventional CMT TIME IS
SPACE metaphor in which the present is here, the past is behind is, and the future is
in front of us (e.g., Johnson, 1987): “The subjective perception that everything has
lost significance may [...] lead to an erosion of the boundaries between the past,
present, and future” (p. 161). The result is a form of temporal and spatial
containment that leads El Refaie to propose considering the experience of
depression as “a form of entrapment in spacetime” (p. 180). The familiar DEPRESSION
IS DESCENT, DEPRESSION IS DARKNESS (e.g., Forceville and Paling, 2018),
DEPRESSION IS A BURDEN, and DEPRESSION IS FRAGMENTATION often converge in the
graphic novels’ color patterns and lay-out.

Several important insights arise from the case study chapters. First, CMT
scholars are reminded of McLuhan’s wisdom that the medium is the message:
graphic narratives enable metaphors that are not (so readily) expressible in verbal
discourses, for instance because of the medium’s ability to *transform* things and

1 bodies (see also Forceville 2006: 381). Second, the choice of source domain in a
2
3 metaphor matters. With reference to Sontag (1978), El Refaie observes about the
4
5 ubiquitous CANCER IS AN ENEMY metaphor: “For people who are suffering from an
6
7 incurable form of cancer, or who no longer have any effective treatment options
8
9 available to them, having their illness experience framed in terms of victories and
10
11 defeats is likely to be deeply demoralizing” (p. 130). She shows that graphic novel
12
13 artists come up with very different source domains for cancer, for instance A
14
15 PARASITE or A JELLYFISH. El Refaie even cites empirical research (Keefer et al.,
16
17 2014) suggesting that patients’ acceptance or rejection of certain therapies or
18
19 medication is influenced by the degree to which medical experts adopt the same
20
21 metaphors as their patients.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 El Refaie’s systematic applications of a theory (here: CMT) to a new medium
31
32 (graphic novels) and genre (illness narratives) lead to insights that may require
33
34 adaptations in that theory. Thus, she maintains that while Forceville’s (1996) model
35
36 of pictorial metaphor can account for some occurrences of visual metaphor in her
37
38 corpus, it cannot do justice to others, proposing two additional types of visual
39
40 metaphor. For one, since visual lay-out may contribute to metaphorical construal,
41
42 she introduces “spatial metaphors”. This is an insightful idea – also because it links
43
44 up with Lakoff and Johnson’s “orientational” metaphors (1980: Chapter 4). A second
45
46 new subtype El Refaie offers for consideration is “stylistic metaphor,” pertaining to
47
48 metaphorical construal on the basis of an artist’s choices in terms of, for instance,
49
50 elements’ colors, forms, sizes, and lay-out. I agree that stylistic idiosyncrasies
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 sometimes trigger metaphor construal. After all, *any* similarity between two things
2
3 that are either textually present or contextually made salient can be a reason for a
4
5 reader-viewer to construe a metaphor – something El Refaie also points out (p. 14). I
6
7
8 look forward to further fleshing-out of the new concept of “stylistic metaphor”.
9

10
11 A proposal I have serious difficulty with, by contrast, is El Refaie’s radical idea
12
13 that in graphic novels metaphorical mappings may run from target to source no less
14
15 than from source to target, making the metaphors “bidirectional” or “reversible”. The
16
17 irreversibility of target and source in a given context is a fundamental tenet both in
18
19 verbal manifestations of metaphor (Black, 1979; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) and in
20
21 visual and multimodal expressions (Forceville, 2002), and rejecting it would
22
23 constitute abandoning what has hitherto been considered one of the defining criteria
24
25 of metaphoricity. It is clear where El Refaie’s suggestion comes from. The author has
26
27 convincingly shown that in graphic illness narratives “embodiment” is problematic, so
28
29 that vision and embodiment become themselves target domains that are in need of
30
31 clarifying metaphorical source domains. Accepting this does not, however, in my
32
33 view amount to agreeing that target and source are in the examples analyzed
34
35 *reversed*. Surely Lakoff and Johnson’s MIND AS BODY metaphor (1999: 248) has not
36
37 changed, in El Refaie’s examples, to BODY AS MIND.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 In order to retain “metaphor” as a useful analytical tool, its applicability certainly
51
52 requires adaptations *vis-à-vis* non-verbal and multimodal media such as graphic
53
54 novels, but there is a limit to how far “metaphor” can be stretched without
55
56 deteriorating into an umbrella term covering all sorts of “hybrids” that are, in one way
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 or another, figurative (see also Forceville, 2018). I agree with Black (1979) that
2
3 metaphor is one trope among others. We simply need richer theorizations of many of
4
5 those other tropes. As for their visual and multimodal varieties, this work has already
6
7 begun for visual puns, metonymy, hyperbole, antithesis, and allegory, which
8
9 moreover can often be combined (for discussion and references, see Forceville,
10
11 2019). Moreover, not all non-literal meaning can be captured in existing tropes. In
12
13 cases where El Refaie suggests bidirectional mappings to do justice to complex
14
15 meaning, my proposal would instead be to adopt a blending theory model (e.g.,
16
17 Fauconnier and Turner, 2002), in which two domains (*input spaces*) “democratically”
18
19 contribute meaning to a *blended space*, on the assumption that all metaphors are
20
21 blends, but that there also many other, non-metaphorical types of blends.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In short, El Refaie definitely fulfils her claim that she “presents the first
32
33 comprehensive account of metaphor in graphic illness narratives” (p. 186), and
34
35 excellently demonstrates the medium’s specific affordances to create metaphorical
36
37 meaning. Her book thereby is first of all a substantial contribution to comics/graphic
38
39 novel scholarship. In the second place, it helps understand how graphic illness
40
41 narratives can provide insight and consolation to those who suffer from these
42
43 illnesses and to their friends and family. Moreover, her analyses can aid doctors’ and
44
45 therapists’ understanding how they should communicate with patients – if only by
46
47 letting patients choose their own metaphorical source domains so as to avoid
48
49 unwanted mappings in source domains favored by others. Thirdly, this monograph
50
51 proposes refinements and adaptations in CMT, varying between being insightful,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 promising, and problematic. My estimate is that El Refaie's book will resonate in all
2
3 three fields.
4
5
6
7

8 References 9

10
11
12
13
14 Abdel-Raheem, Ahmed. 2019. Pictorial Framing in Moral Politics: A Corpus-Based
15
16 Experimental Study. London, Routledge.
17

18
19 Black, Max. 1979. More about metaphor. In: Ortony, A. (Ed.), Metaphor and
20
21 Thought. Cambridge MA, Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-43.
22
23

24
25 Cameron, Lynne, Maslen, Robert, Todd, Zazie, Maule, John, Stratton, Peter,
26
27 Stanley, Neil. 2009. The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and
28
29 metaphor-led discourse analysis. Metaphor and Symbol 24, 63-89.
30
31

32
33 Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2004. Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis.
34
35 Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.
36
37

38
39 Fauconnier, Gilles, Turner, Mark. 2002. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending
40
41 and the Mind's Hidden Complexities. New York, Basic Books.
42
43

44 Forceville, Charles. 1996. Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising. London, Routledge.
45
46

47 Forceville, Charles. 2002. The identification of target and source in pictorial
48
49 metaphors. Journal of Pragmatics 34, 1-14.
50
51

52 Forceville, Charles. 2006. Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist
53
54 framework: Agendas for research. In: Kristiansen, G., Achard, M., Dirven, R.,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. (Eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications*
2
3 *and Future Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 379-402.
4

5 Forceville, Charles. 2018. Multimodality, film, and cinematic metaphor: an evaluation
6
7 of Müller and Kappelhoff (2018). *Punctum: International Journal of Semiotics*
8
9 4(2), 90-108.
10

11 Forceville, Charles. 2019. Developments in multimodal metaphor studies: A
12
13 response to Górska, Coëgnarts, Porto & Romano, and Muelas-Gil. In: Navarro i
14
15 Ferrando, I. (Ed.), *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse*.
16
17 Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 367-378.
18
19

20 Forceville, Charles, Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo (Eds.). 2009. *Multimodal Metaphor*.
21
22 Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
23
24

25 Forceville, Charles, Paling, Sissy. 2018. The metaphorical representation of
26
27 DEPRESSION in short, wordless animation films. *Journal of Visual Communication*
28
29 (ahead of print via open access,
30
31 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1470357218797994>).
32
33

34 Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide. 2013. The relationship between conceptual metaphor
35
36 and culture. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 10(2), 315-339.
37
38

39 Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning,*
40
41 *Imagination and Reason*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
42
43

44 Keefer, Lucas A., Landau, Mark J., Sullivan, Daniel, Rothschild, Zachary K. 2014.
45
46 Embodied metaphor and abstract problem solving: Testing a metaphoric fit
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 hypothesis in the health domain. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 55
2
3 (November), 12-20.
4

5 Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation. Cambridge,
6
7 Cambridge University Press.
8
9

10 Kövecses, Zoltán. 2015. Where Metaphors Come From: Reconsidering Context in
11
12 Metaphor. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
13
14

15 Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark. 1980. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, University of
16
17 Chicago Press.
18
19

20 Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark. 1999. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind
21
22 and its Challenge to Western Thought. New York, Basic Books.
23
24

25 Müller, Cornelia, Kappelhoff, Hermann. 2018. Cinematic Metaphor: Experience –
26
27 Affectivity – Temporality. Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.
28
29

30 Musolff, Andreas. 2016. Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios.
31
32 London, Bloomsbury.
33
34

35 Sontag, Susan. 1978. Illness as Metaphor. New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
36
37

38 Sweetser, Eve E. 1990. From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural
39
40 Aspects of Semantic Structure. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
41
42

43 Yu, Ning. 1998. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: A Perspective from
44
45 Chinese. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65