

## METAPHOR AS A DYNAMIC COMPLEX EMERGENCE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISCOURSE OF VIOLENCE VICTIMS

Ana Cristina Pelosi \*  
João Paulo Rodrigues de Lima \*\*  
Pedro Henrique de Sousa\*\*\*

### *Abstract*

Metaphor is here approached as a complex emergence which results from many internal and external factors such as those of a bio-psychological nature, among others. Based on an embodied view which assumes that cognition results from “structural couplings that bring forth a world” (VARELA; THOMPSON; ROSCH, 1993); it is assumed that socio-culturally shared beliefs, values and attitudes, individuals’ life history, their affective and psychological states, besides embodied factors interact dynamically to cause metaphor emergencies to occur. Such metaphors might incorporate verbal language, gestures, body language etc. Having this view of metaphor as a basis, data gathered from three focal groups composed by volunteer violence victims are analysed. Findings from participants’ talks about ways they cope with the threat posed by urban violence, point to the emergence of several systematic metaphors. VIOLENCE IN FOOTBALL IS A REPELLING FORCE and UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM are the two systematic metaphors analysed here.

Keywords: Cognition. Complex adaptive systems. Discourse. Metaphor. Urban violence.

## METAPHOR AS A DYNAMIC COMPLEX EMERGENCE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE DISCOURSE OF VIOLENCE VICTIMS

### *Resumen*

La metáfora se aborda aquí como una emergencia compleja que resulta de muchos factores internos y externos como los de carácter biopsicológico entre otros. Sobre la base de una visión encarnada que supone que la cognición resulta de “acoplamientos estructurales que dan lugar a un mundo” (VARELA; THOMPSON; ROSCH, 1993); se supone que las creencias, valores y actitudes compartidas socioculturalmente, la historia de la vida de las personas, sus estados afectivos y psicológicos, además de los factores encarnados interactúan dinámicamente para hacer que ocurran emergencias de metáforas. Tales metáforas podrían incorporar lenguaje verbal, gestos, lenguaje corporal, etc. Teniendo esta visión de la metáfora como base, se analizan los datos recopilados de tres grupos focales compuestos por voluntarios, víctimas de violencia. Los resultados de las conversaciones de los participantes sobre las formas en que afrontan la amenaza que representa la violencia urbana apuntan al surgimiento de varias metáforas sistemáticas. LA VIOLENCIA EN FOOTBALL ES UNA FUERZA DE REPELLING y ENTENDER DIFERENTES GRUPOS SOCIALES ES VERLOS son las dos metáforas sistemáticas analizadas aquí.

Palabras clave : Cognición. Sistemas adaptativos complejos. Discurso. Metáfora. Violencia urbana.

\* Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC).

\*\* Universidade Estadual do Ceará (UECE).

\*\*\* Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC).

## INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on metaphors present in the discourse of violence victims in urban areas of Brazil. Metaphor is here approached from a complex adaptive system perspective, and, therefore, it is understood as an emergence which springs from the interaction of ecological, historical, psychological, emotional and socio-culturally situated agents. Under this view metaphor rather than a mere mapping between conceptual domains is considered an ad hoc phenomenon which is unfinished and mutable, incorporating bio-psychological and cognitive aspects, such as socio-culturally shared beliefs, attitudes and values, among others.

Metaphors emergent in the discourse of violence victims will incorporate, among other things, the participants' feelings of the situations they have experienced, besides their beliefs and attitudes towards their assailants and the present state of affairs brought about by the generalized spread of violence in urban areas of Brazil. The analyses performed on participants' discourse try to probe into their feelings of security/insecurity as they express themselves informally and openly in three focal groups mediated by members of our research team.

The research is theoretically and methodologically grounded on a discursive-cognitive perspective based both on cognitive linguistics assumptions (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 1999; GIBBS, 2006) as well as on metaphor-led discourse analysis (CAMERON *ET AL.*, 2009; CAMERON; MASLEN, 2010). The analysis which is presented incorporates stretches of the discourse of 18 volunteers which participated in discussions about violence in urban areas of Fortaleza-Ceará-Brazil.

Before contextualizing the research and reporting on the methodological procedures for data<sup>1</sup> collection, analyses and results, metaphors' complex cognitive-discursive nature is discussed in the next two sections.

## METAPHOR AS A COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC, DISCURSIVE, AFFECTIVE AND SOCIO-CULTURAL EMERGENCE

From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, metaphors have traditionally been thought of as referring to linguistic expressions licensed by metaphorical mappings (i.e. metaphorical concepts) between domains of different natures – a source domain which is the basis for the formulation of the more abstract concept (the metaphorical concept), which is mapped in a target, more abstract domain. (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 1980).

Therefore, when we listen or use expressions such as *we are spinning our wheels*, or *our marriage is on the rocks*, we do so because in our culture, love is, among other things, conceptualized as a journey. The metaphor (or, the metaphoric concept) LOVE IS A JOURNEY would, thus, license such expressions. On the other hand, the JOURNEY concept would be grounded on a more basic level, one which involves the image movement schema of

<sup>1</sup> The data analysed in this paper are part of the data-base gathered by the implementation of the international research partnership project entitled *Living with uncertainty: Metaphor, empathy and the constant threat of urban violence in Brazil*, coordinated by the first author in partnership with Dr. Lynne Cameron of the Open University, England-UK.

TRAJECTORY (origin-trajectory-goal) (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 1999).

Although such a claim seems plausible, we believe, on the other hand, that such mappings are not rigid or pre-given, ready to be merely accessed in a kind of pre-linguistic formula that aggregates experiential cross-domain mappings. Thus, in line with Cameron (2007) and Cameron *et al.* (2009) it is here assumed that, although the individual's internalized bodily experiences can serve as cognitive reference points, capable of moulding his/her understanding and metaphoric production, metaphor is more than a mere linguistic instantiation of ready-made mappings. Metaphor is, above all, a dynamic process in constant change which emerges from both socio-culturally situated cognitive factors and linguistic factors which intermingle and complement each other.

Furthermore, the conceptual metaphor view seems to underestimate the creative power of languages, since the cross-domain mappings have already been fixed as a result of bodily experiences. If those mappings are prior to discourse interaction and are simply instantiated later during the discourse event, they would not allow new mapping directions to happen across domains and the same metaphors would emerge independently of the content of the discourse interaction, once the domains were put into use. However, that does not occur every time, in fact, some source domains may become target ones depending on the discourse flow or vice versa, which suggests mappings are not rigid and may be influenced by the linguistic interaction.

Thus, the conceptual metaphor theory fails to cover the dynamics of figurative thought and language towards creativity demanded by the discourse situation, and eventually, it does not comprehend the specificity of unconventional metaphors emerging out of the discourse flow.

Cameron (2007) asserts that an adequate understanding of metaphor needs to take its dialogical use into consideration. Metaphor is, according to this perspective, seen as a complex emergence, not as an instantiation of a fixed, pre-existing competence. In face-to-face interactions, the discourse flow occurs as a process which involves thinking-and-talking as a dynamic process which requires the inseparability between thought and language. Such a process requires the interpretation on the part of the participants of the discursive interaction, of the addressee's words and the necessary adjustments that such interpretation requires in order to adapt to intentions and emotions as these evolve in the flow of discourse. (CAMERON, 2003; LARSEN-FREEMAN; CAMERON, 2008). In such sense exchanges and negotiations, attitudes, beliefs and values, derived from socio-culturally situated cognitive factors, will influence people's use of figurative language to talk about a given topic. Under such circumstances, people will often resort to linguistic metaphors to express their ideas, they will use linguistic terms and expressions that function as metaphoric or metonymic vehicles. A linguistic metaphor is a term or an expression used with metaphoric value. The word (term or expression) congregates an incongruent sense in relation to its more basic or experiential sense. (CAMERON; MASLEN, 2010).

For example, in the data, we found that participants in talking about the limitations

that the high levels of urban violence impose on their lives, used expressions such as “curfew”, “imprisonment”, “close yourself”, “lock yourself up”, “deprive yourself”, “private arrest”. Such expressions function as metaphoric-vehicles (linguistic metaphors) that take part in the emergence of the systematic metaphor *FEAR AS A RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE IS A FORM OF IMPRISONMENT*.

The use of linguistic metaphors, which are shared and negotiated when participants interact, gives metaphor a cognitive-discursive status, one that is dynamic and complex and which contributes to the emergence of *ad hoc* systematic metaphors. In this regard, Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008) understand language in general and, more specifically, figurative language, as a complex system with emergencies which spring from a series of factors (or agents, according to complex systems theory). Such factors or agents are part of the discourse context and incorporate bio-psychological and cognitive aspects which come into play during the interaction, such as socio-culturally shared beliefs, values and attitudes, the life stories of participants in the discussion, their affective and embodied states, among other things. All these interact dynamically and give rise to multimodal metaphors which can be expressed both verbally and non-verbally (by gestures and body language, for example). Thus, language in general and figurative language in special, are thought of as something complex and in certain ways as an unfinished phenomenon which emerges from the interrelationship of these many agents.

Furthermore, under this perspective, discourse, itself, can be equally understood as dynamic, moulded by the constraints and perspectives which are available to the participants of the interaction. A subsystem nested into other systems – society, culture, history, the shared language of a given community. Discourse can, thus, be considered as something dynamic emerging out of many factors such as the ones mentioned in the previous paragraph. Language (figurative or otherwise) emergent in discourse results, results from interactions which take place in the core of any given society to the extent that various agents (embodied, psychological, emotional, cultural, etc.) interact in complex and dynamic ways. In a similar vein, Vereza (2007) points out that discourse is the inseparability of language use and cognition. Such an observation implicates that mental representations which guide discourse are embodied and socioculturally situated.

As already explained above, as a discourse emergence, metaphors can be more thoroughly explained as systematic,<sup>2</sup> since its constitution derives from factors which pertain to the discourse situation to the extent that participants share ideas and negotiate meanings during the interaction. Furthermore, systematic metaphors are considered as constituted from an integrated view which understands the discourse dynamics as taking place in a two-way mode, that is, from cognition to discourse as well as from discourse to cognition without precedence of one way over the other. Metaphor emergence, thus, results from both the individual's

<sup>2</sup> According to Cameron *et al.* (2009, p. 27), the systematic metaphor is “a dynamic collection of connected linguistic metaphors, a trajectory of one metaphor to the next along the dynamics of talk”. This way, systematic metaphors emerge from the discourse dynamics. They are not similar to conceptual metaphors, since they do not constitute mental mappings between conceptual domains. They are configured from the systematic use by the verbal interaction participants of connected linguistic metaphors and constitute a trajectory or guiding trace of the flow of talk.

accumulated knowledge - his/her embodied possibilities (*affordances*)<sup>3</sup> which makes makes reality knowledge possible by means of interactions with the environment, information from the historical and socio-cultural context to which the individuals belong as well as the constraints imposed by the discourse event<sup>4</sup> in which participants try in a talk-and-think dynamic process, to expose ideas and negotiate meanings. (CAMERON ET AL., 2009).

Metaphor can also be thought of as an emergence of a socio-cultural nature. An easily understood metaphor in a given society will not necessarily be relevant in another socio-cultural context. In a society which is deep into violence, such as the Brazilian society, violence can be described as “a cancer in the heart of society”, or as “a contagious disease”, whereas, in a society where violence is low, such expressions, probably, would not emerge in discourse.

## RESEARCH CONTEXT

This paper springs from an international project entitled *Living with uncertainty: metaphor and the dynamics of empathy in discourse* carried out in partnership with the Open University, Milton Keynes, UK, under the coordination of Dr. Lynne Cameron. Specifically, the paper reports on findings from research linked to the Brazilian project entitled *Metaphor, empathy and the constant threat of urban violence in Brazil* carried out under the coordination of this paper's first author.

The UK project focused on the effects that terrorist acts have in people's everyday lives, their feelings and emotions as well as their disposition (or lack of such) to show empathy in relation to their aggressors and on how such attitudes have emerged in their talk. The Brazilian project, on the other hand, tried to understand how people conceptualize violence prevalent in urban centres specifically, in Fortaleza-Ceará-Brazil, the place where the three focal groups, reported in this paper, were formed and informally discussed about the theme.

Some of the research questions were as follows: (1) How do people live with the risks imposed by the prevailing state of violence and what limitations do such risks impose on their routines? (2) How do participants of the focal groups construct the Other<sup>5</sup> in their discourses? (3) How do they use metaphor to relate to the Other? (4) How do they categorize the Other? (5) How do the media influence people's discourse about violence?

For space limitations we will specifically present some analyses and results pertaining to questions (1), (3) and (5). But, before this is done, the research method is explained below.

3 Affordances, translated here as possibilities, is a term which has its origin with Gibson's (1976) ecological psychology. According to this author, perception is understood as an emergence which springs from potential interactions between the organism and the world.

4 A discourse event is here understood as the time period in which participants actively interact in the discussion promoted about a given theme. For instance, in the present research there are three discourse events at hand: the occasions in which each of the three focal groups members got together to talk about violence practiced in urban areas of Fortaleza-Ceará-Brazil.

5 The Other in line with the theoretic and methodological backgrounds of the present research is understood as any person(s) the participant may have dealings with or relate to in any way. Such as people in general he/she might come across with, acquaintances, aggressor(s), authority(ies), government agent(s), official or private organizations, etc.

## PARTICIPANTS, DATA COLLECTION AND RESEARCH BACKGROUND

The data for analysis was collected from the discourse produced by members of three focal groups. Two groups were composed by twelve students (six in each group) with ages ranging from 16 to 43 years old from three high education institutions (two private institutions and a public one). The third group was composed by 6 football supporters with ages ranging from 20 to 40 who also took part as volunteers. Their level of schooling ranged from fundamental school to higher education. All of the participants in the three groups lived in Fortaleza-Ceará-Brazil and had been directly or indirectly victims of violence. The first two focal groups discussed informally about urban violence while the third group discussed about violence carried out in football stadiums and their adjacencies<sup>6</sup>. The groups were in each case moderated by a member of the research team whose role was to motivate the discussion interfering as little as possible with the groups' dynamics. Some of the questions posed by the moderators were: "When you hear the word violence, what is the first thing that comes to your mind?", "In your opinion, what have been the effects in your life, on people (or in society) by the threat posed by urban violence (or violence in football)?", "Do you think that this threat is, in any way, exaggerated or fantasized by the media, or the government?", "Do you think this situation affects some groups more than others? Or, does it affect everyone equally?" The questions were translated and adapted from a topic guide called PCTR (*Perception and Communication of Terrorist Risk*). The PCTR was elaborated by Dr. Lynne Cameron, as part of a research project funded by the *Economic and Social Research Council*, from 2005 to 2007. The project is part of a public call entitled New Security Challenges which had as its main goal to investigate how people perceive terrorist risk and the consequences for the communication of official risk situations. Since the topic in the UK research was terrorism, there was a need to translate and adapt the question guide to the research topic in Brazil.

The data was collected from the face-to-face interactions which took part in the focal groups' discussions for about 90 minutes in each case. The interactions were video recorded and fed into the Atlas.ti<sup>7</sup>.

## PROCEDURE

Data transcription, codification and analysis were done according to metaphor-led discourse analysis, a method for identification and analysis of systematic metaphors, proposed

<sup>6</sup> Although the specific themes under discussion were different, that is, urban violence in the case of FG1 and FG2 and violence in football stadiums in the case of FG3, they are treated as part of a macro-theme – violence practiced in urban areas of Brazil. For this reason, the data and the analyses are taken as interconnected and complementary.

<sup>7</sup> The Atlas.ti is a qualitative analysis software designed for data organization and codification. The software was used in order to search for discourse topics (DTs), metaphor vehicles (MetVs), and metonymies (Metons), and to facilitate their organization into families (or analysis categories). More information about the software can be found at [www.atlas.ti.com](http://www.atlas.ti.com).

by Cameron *et al.* (2009)<sup>8</sup>. The methodological steps followed for the organization of data in the Atlas.ti and the analyses of the discourse flow were as follows: (1) participants' utterances during the discussions were transcribed and broken into simplified intonation units (IUs), with endings and pauses. Micro-pauses were indicated with two dots (..), and those slightly longer with three dots (...). Pauses which were longer than one second were indicated with the approximate number of seconds in parenthesis. For example, the indication of (2.0) was used for a pause of approximately two seconds. A slightly falling intonation or level pitch at the end of an IU was indicated with a comma (,), dashes indicated an incomplete IU. A full stop at the end of an IU indicated a final closing intonation (CAMERON; MASLEN, 2010, p. 101); (2) each transcribed page of discourse was identified with information about the group involved (i.e. number of people present in the group, school or academic affiliation and date of the interaction)<sup>9</sup>; (3) instances of quasi-reported speech (i.e. another person's or organization's voice adopted by one of the discourse interaction participants) were transcribed in brackets (<Q...Q>). The symbol (X...X) was used to represent an impossible to decipher section of talk; (4) talk lines were numbered in order to facilitate the identification of important information; (5) the transcribed data from the groups were organized in three files. FG1 contained the data collected from the first focal group interaction. FG2 contained the data collected from the second focal group interaction, and FG3, the data collected from the third focal group; (6) methodical reading of the transcriptions and the identification of discursive topics (DTs) made the understanding of the discourse event possible (7) analyses of the type of language produced by the participants and the identification of metaphor vehicles (MetVs) and metonymies (Metons) made the identification of systematic metaphors (SysMets)<sup>10</sup> possible.

After the steps above were carried out, 10% of the transcriptions already preliminarily analyzed and coded by the use of Atlas.ti was double-checked by another researcher. Then, some relevant excerpts from the talk produced by the participants were analyzed.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As already mentioned, analyses and results here reported were guided by the following interconnected research questions: (1) How do people live with the risks imposed by the prevailing state of violence and what limitations do such risks impose on their routines?; (2) How do they use metaphor to relate to the Other?; (3) How do the media influence people's discourse about violence?

8 Cameron and colleagues use the term *Metaphor-led discourse analysis* to promote the idea that metaphor analysis has to be approached from a discourse perspective. Under their view discourse is understood as what happens when people engage in talk and dialogically make meaning emerge from such interactions. Metaphor is viewed as a dynamic multi-faceted phenomenon and is understood as *linguistic and cognitive processes, flows or movements* which are part of complex dynamic systems (LARSEN-FREEMAN; CAMERON, 2008; CAMERON *ET AL.*, 2009).

9 For a more detailed explanation of the method employed, see Cameron *et al.* (2009) and Cameron; Maslen (2010) included in the reference section.

10 The identification and labelling of this type of metaphors constitutes a methodological reflexive step on the part of the researcher. After the organization of recurrent and interconnected MetVs (metaphor vehicles or linguistic metaphors) within and across DTs into larger analysis categories of families, the researcher is able to identify and label a complex emergent metaphor in discourse (i.e. a systematic metaphor) which encompasses the participants' talks, participants' ideas, attitudes, beliefs, emotions, etc.

With the above questions in mind, metaphor-led discourse analysis of the focal group talks allowed, among others, for the emergence of two systematic metaphors: *VIOLENCE IN FOOTBALL IS A REPELLING FORCE* and *UNDERSTANDING OTHER SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM*.

Next, some excerpts that point to the presence of the first of the above metaphors in participants' talks are discussed. These are directly related to the first research question here addressed: How do people live with the risks imposed by the prevailing state of violence and what limitations do such risks impose on their routines?

### VIOLENCE IN FOOTBALL IS A REPELLING FORCE

The above metaphor emerges in the talks of four of six football supporters focal group participants (FG3), Carlos, Antonio, Marcos and Fabio<sup>11</sup>, more specifically in response to the moderator's questions: "When you hear the expression violence in football, what is the first thing that comes to your mind?", and "What have been the effects of the threat posed by violence in football in your life?"

Carlos answers the first question by saying on line 09, "*We think of violence in stadiums...*"<sup>12</sup>. (Figure 01, below). By his answer, it appears that the question posed by the moderator served as a trigger for the evocation of a "*violence at stadiums*" frame and the fear and insecurity that such a context brings about. The participant's thought is further elaborated by what he says next on lines 10, 11, "*we become rather reluctant*", "*we fear taking our children to [the stadium]*". By these observations Carlos indicates the he has the desire to be free to go to a football match at a stadium with his children but, at the same time, such an intention is blocked or impeded by his fear of the violence practiced at such events. He reinforces this point by saying: "*I myself want to take my boy to the stadium,*" "*But I can't because I am afraid,*" (ll. 16, 17). Violence practiced at football stadiums is a limiting factor which constrains people's intentions and brings fear.

FIGURE 01 – (FG3: lines 09 - 18) (Carlos)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	Word-by-word translation <sup>13</sup>	Colloquial translation
09.	Pensa em violência nos estádios, né?	Think in violence at the stadiums, not?	We think of violence at stadiums, don't we?
10.	..A gente fica até meio relutante,	..The people (we) stay a bit reluctant,	..We become rather reluctant,
11.	Tem até medo de levar nossos filhos pra,	Have even fear to take our children to,	We fear taking our children to,

11 Participants did not object to have their first names maintained.

12 For clarity purposes, the citations of participants' talks are in colloquial English.

13 This word-by-word translation preserves the structure of the Portuguese language. Thus, it may be ungrammatical from the point of view of the English language structure. Sometimes, when more clarity was required, it was adjusted, to some extent, to the English structure



12.	..A gente quer se divertir <i>um pouco</i> com eles, mas, não pode ir.	..The people (we) want to entertain themselves (ourselves) <i>a little</i> with them but not can go	..We want to have <i>a little</i> fun with them but we can't go
13.	..a gente não pode ir temendo a violência.	..the people not can go fearing the violence.	we can't go since we fear the violence.
14.	<i>Isso é a primeira coisa que vem na minha cabeça,</i>	<i>This is the first thing that comes in my mind</i>	<i>This is the first thing that comes in my mind</i>
15.	eu quero, por exemplo <X...X>	I want by example <X...X>	I want for example <X...X>
16.	Por mim, eu quero <i>levar meu menino pro estádio,</i>	By me, I want to <i>take</i> my boy to the stadium,	I myself, want to <i>take</i> my boy to the stadium,
17.	mas não posso porque <i>tenho medo,</i>	But not can because <i>have fear,</i>	But I can't because I am afraid,
18.	por <u>questão</u> disso.	by <u>question</u> of this.	On account of this situation.

This line of thought is pursued further along the discussion when Carlos brings into the interaction the discussion about which would be the most violent of the organized football leagues. (Figure 02, below). At this point, Antonio participates in the interaction by informing that his father, a local team supporter, has decided to stop going to football matches. (ll.134, 135). Using reported speech to reproduce his father's opinion as regards the limitations the prevailing state of violence imposes on his decision of not going to matches at stadiums, he says: <Q Boy, I prefer to go to a roosters' fight than to the stadium Q>. (Line 138). Contextualizing his father's words, Antonio says "*At least at roosters' fights there are no supporter's leagues, there are only bets*" (ll. 140, 141). Then, linking his words to the theme of the discussion – violence practiced in football stadiums – in connection with the reason his father now prefers going to roosters' fights, he continues "*.the only one who dies is one of the two roosters,*" "*And in the stadium, it is risky that we die,*" "*..the player dies,*" "*..the policeman dies,*" "*...everybody dies,*". (ll.142, 144-147).

FIGURE 02 – (FG3: lines 133 - 139) (Antonio)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	word-by-word translation <sup>14</sup>	colloquial translation
133.	<X...X> Qual a torcida mais violenta,	<X...X> What is the <i>supporters'</i> league most violent,	<X...X> What is the most violent <i>supporters'</i> league,
134.	Meu pai <i>torce</i> Ceará,	My father <i>supports</i> Ceará,	My father is a Ceará <i>supporter</i>
135.	meu pai <i>deixou</i> de ir,	My father <i>left</i> of go,	My father stopped going,

14 This word-by-word translation preserves the structure of the Portuguese language. Thus, it may be ungrammatical from the point of view of the English language structure. Sometimes, when more clarity was required, it was adjusted, to some extent, to the English structure.

136.	..mas, <i>acho</i> que ele não paga não,	..but, <i>find</i> that he not pays no,	..but, I think that he does not pay,
137.	.já é de idade.	.already is of age.	.he is already an elderly person.
138.	..ele <i>deixou</i> de ir pra estádio e ele disse:	..he <i>left</i> of go to stadium and he said:	..he stopped going to the stadium and he said:
139.	<Q Rapaz, prefiro ir pra uma briga de galo do que pro estádio Q>.	<Q Boy, I prefer to go to one fight of roosters than to the stadium Q>.	<Q Boy, I prefer to go to a roosters fight than to the stadium Q>.
140.	Pelo menos nas brigas de galo tem <i>torcida</i> não,	By less in the fights of rooters <i>have</i> not league of <i>supporters</i> ,	At least in roosters fights there are no <i>supporters'</i> leagues,
141.	é só aposta,	is only bet	there are only bets
142.	..só quem morre é um dos dois galos,	..only who dies is one of the two roosters,	..the only one who dies is one of the two rooters,
143.	.a gente só <i>faz</i> receber o dinheiro.	.the people [we] only <i>make</i> receive the money.	we only receive the money
144.	e no estádio é arriscado a gente morrer,	and in the stadium is risky the people (we) die,	And in the stadium, it is risky that we die,
145.	..morrer jogador,	..die player,	..the player dies,
146.	..morrer policial,	..die policeman,	..the policeman dies,
147.	...morrer <i>todo mundo</i> .	...die <i>all the world</i> (everybody)	...everybody dies.

Adding to the discursive dynamics as regards limitations imposed by violence on people's choices and freedom, Fabio says "*They are drawing people away from the stadium*" (Figure 03, below, line 231) and that, although, he wants to go, he is being driven away from the stadium "*I wanted to go*" (line 233), but, "if I go I **run** the risk of being beaten up" (line 238, 239). The metaphor vehicles "**draw away**" and "**push away**" point out the idea of a force repelling the football fans away from the event, limiting their choices and their movements. People's lives are restricted not only in their actual freedom of moving around freely, but, limitations imposed by violence practiced at stadiums and their adjacencies, interfere with their feeling of freedom to entertain themselves and enjoy life, as the exchange between Marcos and Alex indicates: "*Going to the stadium is a kind of leisure for you*", but, "*They are prohibiting everything because of the disturbances*" "*they prohibited people from drinking at the stadium*". (Figure 04, ll. 225, 226).

FIGURE 03 – (FG3: lines 231-238) (Fabio)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	word-by-word translation	colloquial translation
231.	Estão <i>afastando</i> as pessoas do estádio,	They are <i>drawing</i> the people <i>away</i> from the stadium	They are <i>drawing</i> people <i>away</i> from the stadium

232.	.tipo, agora <i>vai ter</i> a inauguração do Castelão,	.type, now <i>go to have</i> the inauguration of Castelão	.like now, Castelão is going to be inaugurated.
233.	..eu tava querendo ir	..I was wanting to go	I wanted to go
234.	.só que <i>vai ter</i> assim,	.only that <i>go to have</i> so,	.but, there is going to be
235.	.primeiro o jogo do Ceará,	.first the match of Ceará,	.first Ceará's match
236.	..logo depois, o do Fortaleza.	..soon after, the one of Fortaleza.	..and after, Fortaleza's match
237.	... <i>Acaba afastando</i> o torcedor por quê,	.. <i>Finish pushing</i> the supporter away because,	..The supporter ends up being drawn away because,
238.	..se eu vou?	.if I go?	.if I go?
239.	.vou <i>correr</i> o risco de apanhar,	.go <i>run</i> the risk of be beaten.	.I <i>run</i> the risk of being beaten up.

FIGURE 04 – (FG3: lines 224-229) (Marcos/Alex)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	word-by-word translation	colloquial translation
224.	É porque você <i>não tem</i> segurança.	Is because <i>not have</i> security	It is because you don't feel safe.
225.	..Você ir ao estádio que é uma coisa que é um <i>lazer</i> que você tem,	..You go to the stadium that is one thing that is <i>a leisure</i> that you have.	Going to the stadium <i>is a form of leisure</i> for you
226.	..estão proibindo tudo agora por causa da confusão,	..they are prohibiting all now by cause of the confusion,	they now prohibit everything because of the confusion
227.	...proibiram da pessoa beber no estádio	..they prohibit of the person drink in the stadium	..they prohibit the person from drinking at the stadium
228.	.não tem nada no estádio,	not have nothing in the stadium,	.there is nothing at the stadium,
229.	só água e refrigerante.	only water and soft drink.	only water and soft drinks

The violence practiced by members of organized football leagues at stadiums and adjacencies, and the dynamics established as regards the limitations imposed by violence on people's freedom of movement give rise to the metaphor discussed here. As highlighted by the participants' talks, people fear for their lives, for their children's lives and, in order to protect themselves, they give up on exercising their right to move freely and decide to avoid going to places considered dangerous, such as football stadiums, in the present case. Interestingly, in connection to the metaphor just discussed, a similar metaphor of constraint emerged in the talk of participants of FG1 and FG2, the focal groups who discussed about urban violence. In this regard responses to the limitations imposed by the fear brought about by violence were metaphorized as a form of imprisonment by the emergence of the metaphor *FEAR AS A RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE IS A FORM OF IMPRISONMENT*<sup>15</sup>. Participants of FG1 and

15 This metaphor is analyzed in the paper entitled "Urban violence in Brazil and the role of the media: communicative effects of systematic metaphors in discourse", in the journal *Metaphor and*

FG2 referred to changes and limitations brought to their lives by the prevailing state of urban violence with expressions such as “we have to *limit* our children’s lives”, “you deprive yourself of everything you could do”, and, “the majority of the society *lock* themselves up, [...] they *imprison* themselves”.

The second research question – How do people use metaphor to relate to the *Other* – will be discussed next in connection with the systematic metaphor..

### UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM

This metaphor is derived from the conceptual metaphor *UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING*. It also highlights an ideological aspect as regards the social structure. Participants of FG2 distance themselves from less privileged classes by clearly delimiting two groups “we” (*a gente*, in Portuguese) and “they” (*eles*). Such expressions have metaphorical value, functioning as vehicles, since they mean more than the mere address form and the subject pronoun. As used in the participants’ talks they establish a contextual contrast. (CAMERON; MASLEN, 2010). They are used to signal two distinct social groups. In order to understand the other group’s situation, one needs to be able to see the other group. Although the way empathy is present in the participants’ talks is not the main concern of this paper, it is worth to mention that systematic metaphors (SysMets) often point to this direction since these metaphors emerge from collaborative interactions as discourse participants communicate pertinent concepts and perceptions of the theme under discussion.

The metaphor *UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM* is present in the talk of three participants of FG2 Vania, Mateus and Elisa. The first move for the emergence of this metaphor is taken by Vania, when she contrasts their reality (i.e. of those of a higher social status) and the way they consider violence with the Other’s reality and the way these (i.e. poorer people) consider it. Trying to transport herself into poor people’s reality, the participant realizes that people might trivialize violence because, in a certain way, that situation is part of their lives. “*We say we don’t have a lot of information about violence*” (line 243), “*but if we go to the poorer neighbourhoods, where really there is misery, we see that it is not exactly like this*” (ll. 247-250). She rounds up her line of thought by saying “you end up **having a viewpoint** not only about violence but also of *the discrimination there is about them.*” (ll. 256, 257).

FIGURE 05 – (FG2: lines 258-279) (Vania)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	word-by-word translation	colloquial translation
243.	..A gente diz que não tem muita informação sobre a violência	..The people (we) say that not <i>have</i> much information about the violence	We say we don’t <i>have</i> a lot of information about violence
244.	sobre a mídia	about the media	about the media
245.	que ela <i>enche</i> demais	that it <i>fills</i> too much	that it is overpowering

*the social world*, 4:1 (2014), 27-47, published by John Benjamins.

246.	algo quando não há tanta necessidade,	something when not exist so much necessity	something that it's not really necessary
247.	mas se <i>a gente</i> for pros bairros mais pobres	but if <i>the people</i> (we) go to the neighbourhoods more poors	but if <i>we</i> go to the poorer neighbourhoods
248.	onde realmente	where really	where really
249.	.. há miséria	..there is misery	there is misery
250.	<i>a gente</i> vê que não é exatamente isso,	<i>the people</i> (we) <i>see</i> that not is exactly this,	<i>we see</i> that it is not exactly like this,
251.	<i>a gente</i> tá numa avenida Treze de Maio,	<i>the people</i> (we) are in an avenue Treze de Maio,	<i>the people</i> (we) are at Treze de Maio Avenue,
252.	Washington Soares,	Washington Soares,	Washington Soares,
253.	mas vai pro Tancredo	but go to Tancredo	but try going to Tancredo
254.	ou então p'rum Jardim União da vida,	or then to one Jardim União of life,	or to Jardim União or any place like that,
255.	conversa com <i>as pessoas</i> sobre aquele dia,	talk with <i>the people</i> about that day,	and talk to <i>the dwellers</i> about that day
256.	you <i>acaba tendo uma</i> <i>visão</i> não só de violência,	you <i>end having one vision</i> not only of violence	you end up <i>having a viewpoint</i> not only about violence
257.	mas também de discriminação com <i>eles</i> mesmos.	but also of discrimination with <i>themselves</i> .	but also of the discrimination there is about <i>them</i> ..
258.	.. e a televisão só faz mostrar isso	..and the television only <i>makes show</i> this	and television only exacerbates this fact
259.	e <i>eles</i> vêem aquilo,	and <i>they see</i> that,	and <i>they see</i> that,
260.	como <i>uma forma</i> de <i>eles</i> mesmos	like <i>one form</i> of <i>they</i>	as a <i>way</i> of <i>them</i>
261.	viverem a realidade <i>deles</i> .	live the reality of <i>them</i> .	living <i>their</i> reality.
262.	..não aquela coisa perfeita	..not that thing perfect	not that perfect thing
263.	que <i>a gente</i> vê nas novelas	that <i>the people</i> (we) see in the novels	that we see in soap operas
264.	que apesar de haver agressões	that although there are aggressions	although there are aggressions
265.	apesar de haver violência	although there is violence	although there is violence
266.	não é aquela coisa mais elitizada sabe,	is not that thing more classy, you know,	it is not that classy thing, you know,
267.	só pessoas ricas ou de classe <i>média alta</i> ,	only people rich or of <i>high</i> <i>medium</i> class,	only rich people or those of <i>high</i> <i>medium</i> class,

In the stretch of talk transcribed in Figure 05 (ll. 250-254) above, Vania appears to use what Cameron (2010) identifies as the landscape metaphor, by means of which the space that encompasses social relations appears to be conceptualized as divided into parts. She refers to herself and the other participants of the focal group as “*a gente*” (financially more favoured) as opposed to “*the people*”, “*they*”, the less favoured group she has in mind. She does so, by alluding to avenues such as Treze de Maio and Washington Soares, as opposed to Tancredo Neves and Jardim União, neighbourhoods in the city outskirts. While the mentioned avenues are considered high class areas in Fortaleza, Tancredo Neves and Jardim União are known as

drug trafficking and violent places.

According to Vania’s talk, the media distorts reality by broadcasting soap operas which portray a fictitious view of violence. Through the media, poor people (*they*) suffer discrimination, since the soap operas try to represent their reality, but with serious distortions. (ll. 258-263). When poor people are on the scene of real violence, as shown in some other programmes, and they seem to accept and trivialize the violence shown through the media, they are not really treating violence as common place, but only living their genuine reality, “*and they see that, as a way of living their reality*” (ll. 259-262). Vania, thus, shows an empathic attitude towards the poorer groups (*they*), and the need to see (or understand their true reality). She, however, establishes the distance between “*we*” and “*they*” by contrasting the groups’ different situations.

Using the same vehicles as Vania, “*a gente*” (we) and “*eles*” (they), Mateus elaborates on a slightly different view of the media. For him, all TV programmes, soaps or news programmes, indeed reflect the Other’s reality (Figure 06, below). According to him “*It’s like a kind of window through which they see*. (ll. 2767-2769), “*but in a certain way, they see in fact, what is happening*”, (ll. 2774-2777) and this is the reason why these programmes aggregate large audiences because, as implicit in his talk, they are more than us (*a gente*).

Elisa, another participant in the interaction, also tries to take the Other’s perspective (i.e. to see issues through the Other’s perspective) (Figure 06, below). She believes that different social groups may indeed perceive violence in different ways. “*I believe that a slum dweller will not have the same thought we do, they live in a different way, isn’t it?* (ll.2145-2147). And she adds “*Some might think that we deserve, for example, to be mugged,*” “[...] *We have so many things and they have so little,*” (ll. 2148-2151, 2153-2154).

FIGURE 06 – (FG2: lines 2141-2154) (Elisa)

	Original Brazilian Portuguese	word-by-word translation	colloquial translation
2141.	Eu acredito que <u>tenha</u>	I believe that <u>have</u>	I believe there are
2142.	..diferentes--	..different--	..different--
2143.	até justamente por uma <u>questão da realidade</u>	until justly for one <u>question of reality</u>	even just because of the reality
2144.	que a pessoa vive.	that the person live	the person lives
2145.	Acredito que um morador de favela	I believe that a dweller of slum	I believe that a slum dweller
2146.	não <u>tenha</u> o mesmo pensamento da gente,	not <u>have</u> the same thought of the people (us)	does not have the same thought we <u>have</u>
2147.	eles vivem de <u>forma</u> diferente, né?	they live of <u>form</u> different, isn’t it?	they live in a different <u>way</u> , don’t they?
2148.	Alguns devem pensar	Some may think	Some may think
2149.	que <u>a gente</u> mereça,	that <u>the people</u> (we) deserve,	that we deserve,

2150.	por exemplo,	for example,	for example,
2151.	ser assaltado,	be assaulted,	to be mugged,
2152.	sei lá, né?	I don't know, is not?	I don't know, isn't it?
2153.	... <u>A gente</u> tem tanta coisa	... <u>The people</u> (we) have so many things	... <u>We</u> have so many things
2154.	e <u>eles</u> têm tão pouco,	and <u>they</u> have so little,	and they have so little,

The systematic use of “a gente” (we) and “eles” (they), as well as other metaphoric and metonymic vehicles, which are underlined in Figures 05 and 06, establish a contrast between the two groups and their respective realities. At the same time, the interaction participants demonstrate through their discourse a disposition to see reality through the Other’s perspective allowing us to propose the emergence of the metaphor *UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM*.

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This paper presented analyses of two focal group participants’ discourse as they talked about urban violence in Fortaleza-Ceará-Brazil. The main concerns of the investigation were to understand better how direct and indirect victims conceptualize violence through the use of metaphor as they talk about feelings of (in)security brought about the high levels of violence prevalent in urban areas.

Metaphor was here approached from a complex system theory view in which rather than being thought of as a fixed mental mapping between cognitive domains, metaphor is considered a dynamic emergence which congregates socio-cultural, cognitive as well as discursive aspects which pertain to a particular discourse event. Metaphor is thus seen as an ad hoc phenomenon. One that incorporates bio-psychological and cognitive aspects, such as socio-culturally shared beliefs, attitudes and values, as well as discourse constraints and possibilities.

The emergence of discursive topics such as fear, death and insecurity which permeated the discourse flow both implicitly and explicitly and connected to metaphor vehicles (MetVs) present in the participants’ talk as well as in the qualitative analyses of the progression of metaphoric-vehicles emergent in participants’ talks according to Cameron *et al.*’s (2009) Metaphor-Led Discourse Analysis, made the identification of several systematic metaphors possible of which two metaphors were singled out to be discussed in the paper: (1) VIOLENCE IN FOOTBALL IS A REPELLING FORCE; (2) UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM. These were linked to two research questions chosen to be analysed in the paper: How do people live with the risks imposed by the prevailing state of violence and what limitations such risks impose on their routines? How do they use metaphor to relate to the Other?

Relative these questions, the analysis of participants’ discourse flow allowed for the formulation of the following conclusions: in connection to metaphor VIOLENCE IN

FOOTBALL IS A REPELLING FORCE, present in the FG3 talk, it is possible to say that violent actions practiced by members of organized football leagues at stadiums and adjacencies draw football supporters away from the stadiums as a repelling force and they also impose limitations on people's freedom of movement both on a concrete sense since they feel restricted as regards their right to come and go freely as well as psychologically due to constraints imposed on their choices and decisions. The second metaphor UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS IS SEEING THEM, part of the discourse flow of the FG2 participants, highlighted an empathic disposition on the part of some of FG2 participants to enter the poor world and try to see reality from their perspective. At the same time, the consistent use of "a gente" (we) and "eles" (they) clearly established a contrast between those who belong to the participants' world and reality and those who belong to a lower social class. Although not addressed here, but already discussed in other research papers, participants' discourses make evident that the exacerbated exposure to violence promoted in their everyday lives notably by the media is able to change people's values and influence their behaviour as regards the Other and the seriousness of the phenomenon.

Overall, it is possible to say that systematic metaphors are stabilizations in discourse complex system, which result from cognitive variables that join and interact with cultural and contextual variables, such as the discourse topic, for example which works as an attractor of cognitive agents and socio-cultural knowledge. In contrast with the conceptual metaphors (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 1999), these metaphors are not based on a bi-dimensional model (source and target domain), but on a soft-assembling model in which all of these variables interact to promote the negotiation of meanings. Thus, systematic metaphors do not tend to reach a universal range, neither do they pre-exist the discourse. They refer to the online thought linked to the conversational moment (the linguistic data and concepts which are being exchanged during the interaction), in other words, they are collaborative conceptual-discursive constructions which show how participants relate to each other and build relevant concepts in order to keep the complex discourse system flowing.



## REFERENCES

- CAMERON, L. **Metaphor in educational discourse**. London: Continuum, 2003. 294p.
- CAMERON, L. **Confrontation or complementarity: metaphor in language use and cognitive metaphor theory**. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, v.5, n. 1, p. 107-135, 2007.
- CAMERON, L. *et al.* **The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis**. *Metaphor and Symbol*, v.24, n. 2, p. 63-89, 2009.
- CAMERON, L.; MASLEN, R. **Metaphor analysis**. *Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities*. London: Equinox, 2010. 306 p.
- GIBBS, R. **Embodiment and cognitive science**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 337 p.
- LAKOFF, G.; JOHNSON, M. **Metaphors we live by**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 193 p.
- LAKOFF, G.; JOHNSON, M. **Philosophy in the flesh**. New York: Basic Books, 1999. 624 p.
- LARSEN-FREEMAN, D.; L. **Complex systems and applied linguistics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 287 p.
- VARELA, F.; THOMPSON, E.; ROSCH, E. **The embodied mind**. *Cognitive science and human experience*. The MIT press. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 1993. 308 p.
- VEREZA, S. **Metáfora e Argumentação: uma abordagem cognitivo-discursiva**. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso – LemD*, v. 7, n. 3, p. 487-506, set./dez. 2007