

MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN PRINT BEER ADS

ISABEL NEGRO ALOUSQUE

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

inegro@ccee.ucm.es

M.^a ENRIQUETA CORTÉS DE LOS RÍOS

Universidad de Almería

mecortes@ual.es

101

Abstract

The aim of this study is to shed some light on the way meaning is constructed in print beer ads. The present paper lies within the scope of the research into the instantiation of metaphor, metonymy and image schemas in advertising. It analyses the role of these conceptual mechanisms from a contrastive perspective on the basis of an on-line corpus of English and French print beer ads. The theoretical underpinnings of this paper are based on the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez 2011, among others) on the one hand, and the studies on multimodal metaphor (Forceville 1996, 2009, 2012, 2016; Forceville and Urios-Aparisi 2009) on the other, which have revealed that meaning is created through modes of communication other than verbal ones. The paper shows the role of monomodal and multimodal metaphor and metonymy as persuasive devices in advertising and the image-schematic basis of many metaphors and metonymies.

Keywords: metaphor, metonymy, image schema, advertising, persuasion.

Resumen

El objetivo de este estudio es arrojar luz sobre la forma en que se construye el significado en anuncios de cerveza impresos. El presente artículo se centra en la

metonimia, la metáfora y la creación de esquemas de imagen en publicidad. Analiza el papel de estos mecanismos conceptuales desde una perspectiva contrastiva basándose en un corpus en línea de anuncios impresos de cerveza en inglés y francés. Los fundamentos teóricos de este artículo se asientan en la Teoría Cognitiva de la Metáfora (Lakoff y Johnson 1980; Ruiz de Mendoza y Pérez 2011, entre otros), por una parte, y en los estudios sobre la metáfora multimodal (Forceville 1996, 2009, 2012, 2016; Forceville y Urios-Aparisi 2009), por otra, que han revelado que el significado se crea a través de modos de comunicación distintos a los verbales. El artículo muestra el papel de la metáfora y metonimia monomodal y multimodal como mecanismos persuasivos en publicidad y la imagen esquemática de muchas metáforas y metonimias.

Palabras clave: metáfora, metonimia, esquema de imagen, publicidad, persuasión.

1 Introduction

102

Metaphor, metonymy and image schemas are conceptual devices that allow for the interpretation of verbal and non-verbal messages. These devices play a crucial role in the interpretation and understanding of advertisements; hence, advertisers use these mechanisms to attract and persuade the consumer to buy a specific product.

The theoretical underpinnings of this paper are based on the Cognitive Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez 2011, among others) on the one hand, and the studies on multimodal metaphor (e.g. Forceville 2009, 2016; Forceville and Urios-Aparisi 2009) on the other, which have revealed that meaning is created through modes of communication other than verbal ones. The present research lies within the scope of the research into the instantiation of metaphor, metonymy and image schemas in advertising (Forceville 1996, 2008, 2012; Caballero 2009; Velasco 2009; Negro 2015a, 2016). It analyses the role of these conceptual mechanisms from a contrastive perspective on the basis of a corpus of French and English on-line beer ads. The purpose of our investigation is twofold: (1) to show the role of verbal and visual metaphors and metonymies in the creation of a particular conceptualization about the specific attributes and benefits of beer in English and French ads; and (2) to show the contribution of image schemas as devices that carry a positive evaluation of the product being advertised.

The layout of the paper is as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the theoretical background of this study. Section 3 deals with the corpus and the methodology employed. Section 4 presents the sample analysis. Section 5 examines

the theoretical implications of the corpus analysis. Section 6 draws some conclusions.

2. Theoretical background

In the cognitive view, metaphor, metonymy and image schemas occupy a central role in our conceptual structure. They are conceived as primarily cognitive devices structuring human thought and action.

2.1. Metaphor and metonymy

Within the Cognitive Metaphor Theory (e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999; Lakoff 1987, 2006; Kövecses 2002; Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez 2011, among others), metaphor involves understanding an abstract domain of experience (target) in terms of a concrete domain (source). While a metaphor is a mapping (i.e. a set of correspondences) between two different conceptual domains, a metonymy is a domain-internal conceptual mapping. Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal (2002: 58) suggest two types of metonymy based on the domain-internal nature of metonymic mappings:

- a) Source-in-target metonymies are those in which the source domain is a subdomain of the target domain like SIGN FOR STATE (e.g. ‘to raise one’s eyebrows’). They involve domain expansion.
- b) Target-in-source metonymies are those in which the target is a subdomain of the source, for example the metonymies based on Kövecses and Radden’s part-for-part relationship and those based on other frames like the product and the location frames (1998), e.g. *The flute* (i.e. the person playing the flute) *isn’t coming today*. They involve domain reduction and the consequent highlighting of part of a domain.

Metaphor and metonymy often interplay (Ruiz de Mendoza and Díez 2003). In metaphor-metonymy interaction metonymy is subsidiary to metaphor (Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal 2002). This assumption results from the nature of the two mappings. While a metaphor involves two conceptual domains, a metonymy involves just one. Therefore, the two domains of a metaphor cannot operate within the single domain of a metonymy.

Metaphors and metonymies do not only manifest themselves in language, but also occur non-verbally and multi-modally. Multimodal metaphors and metonymies are those whose target and source are rendered in two different modes. Advertising is a type of multimodal discourse, where overall meaning is construed through four modes: written language, spoken language, visuals, and

sound. In this regard, our analysis shows how image and text interact in the creation of meaning.

2.2. Image schemas

The notion of image schema was jointly introduced by Lakoff (1987) and Johnson (1987) and further developed by other authors such as Evans and Green (2006). Briefly, an image schema is a basic conceptual pattern that organizes our experiences. A close look at the literature yields the following basic properties of image schemas (Lakoff 1987: 267-269; Hampe 2005: 1-2; Evans and Green 2006: 179-189):

- They are preconceptual, i.e. non-linguistic.
- They are generic.
- They are embodied, i.e. they are based on sensory-perceptual experience.
- They are multimodal, i.e. they encompass all types of sensory experience.
- They are structured. Although image schemas constitute *gestalts*, i.e. structured wholes, they consist of a number of structural elements and a basic logic that can be expressed propositionally. Thus, the structural elements of the PATH schema (Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987, 1989) are a starting point, an end point, and a direction. If you want to move from a source to a goal (the destination) along a path, you must pass through each intermediate point on the path (Lakoff 1989) and any obstacle may prevent you from reaching your goal.
- They are meaningful because they arise from experience.
- They are recurrent in our physical experience.
- They are common to all human beings.
- They can undergo transformations, e.g. count nouns can be transformed into mass nouns, and vice versa.
- They can occur in clusters.

A range of image schemas taxonomies have been proposed by cognitive semanticists (e.g. Lakoff and Turner 1989). We adopt Evans and Green's list of image schemas (2006: 190) for the purposes of our study. Evans and Green group image schemas according to the nature of the experiential grounding:

- (a) space: up-down, front-back, left-right, near-far, centre-periphery, path, straight-curved, scale.
- (b) containment: in-out, full-empty.
- (c) multiplicity: part-whole, count-mass.
- (d) balance: axis balance, point balance equilibrium.

- (e) force: compulsion, blockage, counterforce, diversion, enablement, attraction, resistance.
- (f) cycle.
- (g) attribute: heavy-light, dark-bright, big-small, warm-cold, strong-weak.

As Gibbs and Colston (2006: 260) remark, image schemas “are a crucial, undervalued dimension of meaning”. Cognitive literature has revealed that image schemas provide the basis for a large number of metaphoric and metonymic mappings (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999; Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989) and underlie metaphor-metonymy interaction (Díez 2001). In addition, they play a role in the metaphorical representation of emotions (Peña 1999) and the conceptualization of music (Saslaw 1996). In much the same way, many metaphors and metonymies used in specialized discourse are based on image schemas as shown in economics (Alejo 2010), advertising (Cortés 2001, 2010; Velasco and Cortés 2009; Negro 2013a) and political cartooning (Negro 2013b).

2.3. Metaphor and culture

The issue of cross-cultural variation in metaphor has raised great interest. Metaphorical concepts and expressions reveal differences across cultures and languages. In line with this, the present paper gives evidence of the way metaphorical images reflect culture in different nations. Some attention has been paid to the interaction between culture and metaphor within the cognitive linguistics framework (Boers 2003; Kövecses 2005, among others). Lakoff and Turner (1989: 66) argue that knowledge about source domains is not merely a question of embodiment, but also of cultural connotations and correspondences. In their view, cultural models underlie a great number of metaphors. From a multimodal perspective, Forceville (2009) claims that the study of multimodal metaphor manifestations may contribute to the understanding of culturally embedded knowledge and beliefs.

Boers (2003) distinguishes three ways in which metaphor use can vary across languages. The first type of variation refers to different degrees of productivity or conventionality of the same source-target mapping. The second type consists in differences in the value-judgments associated with either the source domain, the target domain or the appropriateness of the metaphor; for example, describing the government as a machine can evoke associations of efficiency and smooth running in one culture and associations of impersonality and inhumanity in another. Such differences are rooted in culture. The third type of metaphor variation concerns differences in the degree of pervasiveness of metaphor as such: a language may show more or less preference for the use of metaphor as compared to other figures

of speech. Of these three types, the first type of variation is the most obvious and common in metaphor. Kövecses (2005) provides abundant linguistic data from typologically different languages, showing that variations in the use of metaphors occur not only cross-linguistically, but also within the same culture. Some cross-cultural analysis has been carried out on advertising discourse (e.g. Lantolf and Bobrova 2012).¹

2.4. Metaphor, metonymy and image schemas in advertising

Metaphor and metonymy have two essential roles in advertising:

- a) Cognitive role. Metaphor and metonymy are employed to describe the product or service advertised by means of a number of features associated with it, such as its price, origin, size, shape, colour, use, effect or the target audience (Velasco and Fuertes 2004: 866).
- b) Pragmatic role. Metaphor and metonymy contribute to the communicative function of advertising. The primary intention behind advertising is to make people buy. In this context, metaphor and metonymy play a persuasive role, which is closely related to the rhetoric of advertising. Metaphor and metonymy work as advertising strategies (e.g. Ungerer 2000; Velasco and Fuertes 2004; Ma 2008; Negro 2013a, 2015b). It is convenient to mention that the communicative impact of metaphor is influenced by its conventional or innovative nature. New metaphors taken from our corpus such as BEER IS A SHIP, BEER IS A SINGER and BEER IS A FLOWER (cf. below) have a stronger communicative effect than conventional ones.

The role played by image schemas in advertising is related to their axiological value. As Krzeszowski (1993) postulates, the axiological parameter POSITIVE-NEGATIVE lends special dynamism to the use of preconceived schemas in metaphorisation. The second element of an image schema sometimes carries a positive evaluation which reinforces the positive qualities of the product advertised, thus working as a persuasive tool to attract consumers (Cortés 2010).

3. Corpus and methodology

To illustrate and contrast the use of metaphor, metonymy and image schemas in English and French advertising we compiled two on-line corpora of English and French beer advertisements. Our choice is justified on the following grounds:

- 1) On-line adverts are particularly good examples of interaction between the modes of language and visuals inasmuch as the text and the image are dependent upon each other to convey the message (Negro 2013a).

2) On-line adverts provide a complete image and a text in a limited space span.

Each corpus consisted of 100 ads² from the following beer brands:

- (a) English beer ads: Guinness, London Pride, Mackeson, The Beer Daily, Murphy's, Boddingtons, Caledonia Best and Carling.
- (b) French beer ads: 1664, Lorraine, Kronenbourg, Hoegaarden, Cardinal, Grimbergen, Pelforth, Licorne, Champigneulle, Fischer, Kanterbräu and La Dodo lé.

We selected those ads that displayed cognitive content in their image and/or verbal element. The English corpus contains a higher proportion of metaphors and metonymies than the French corpus (78 vs 64 instances). In order to analyze the beer ads selected, we followed a cognitive and multimodal approach. We identified the metaphors and metonymies and determined whether they are monomodal (verbal or pictorial) or multimodal (verbo-pictorial, pictorio-verbal) (Forceville 1996, 2009, 2012, 2016). We also explored the image schemas that motivate a number of metaphors and metonymies. We adopted Evans and Green's list of image schemas (2006) for the purposes of our study.

Finally yet importantly, our analysis reveals the pragmatic value of metaphor and metonymy, which is linked to the promotion of beer, and the way image schemas contribute to the persuasive potential of metaphor and metonymy by conveying an evaluative meaning.

107

4. Corpus analysis

The corpus provides a metaphorical representation of both beer and beer consumption.

The bulk of beer metaphors are based on the Great Chain of Being proposed by Lakoff and Turner (1989). This is a cultural model that defines the attributes and properties of natural beings. In this model, natural beings are arranged in the following hierarchy: God, humans, animals, plants and complex and natural objects.

In other ads metaphor views beer drinking as a source of pleasure and of loyalty to a particular beer brand as a commitment like marriage.

Images of a particular beer served on glasses or shown by means of beer bottles are frequently used. In some ads we can see a half-full beer glass. This detail is meaningful since it profiles the foam as a beer ingredient (cereal).

Only in three instances does metonymy occur alone. In the ad for Hoegaarden, a pile of broken glass cues the metonymy INSTRUMENT FOR ACTION (the glass for the action of seeing), which highlights beer density. The clincher reads: *Rien à faire*,

cette bière est trouble. Image-text interaction yields the correct interpretation of the ad. In fact, the metonymy is activated by one of the meanings of *trouble*, ‘blurred’. The other meaning, ‘cloudy’, refers to the most relevant feature of this beer brand.

In the ads for the 1664 beer (see figure 1) the beer taste is cued by the source-in-target metonymy TASTE OF BEER FOR BEER, which is verbally encoded: *Le goût à la française* ‘taste in the French way’. Beer is considered an element of cultural identity through association with the country. This association is made explicit by the presence of French cultural symbols such as the Eiffel Tower in Paris.



108

Figure 1. Ad for the 1664 brand

The metonymy BEER INGREDIENT FOR BEER highlights the aroma of the beer, as illustrated by the Kronembourg ads, where the image features wheat (*blé, grain*), a beer ingredient, standing for the beer. The metonymy is also verbally cued: *Gardez votre blé au frais* ‘Keep your wheat in a fresh place’, *Pas de doute, on a un grain* ‘No doubt we have a grain’. In both ads the metonymy is generated through the activation of the literal sense of the idiom in the clincher rather than the idiomatic meaning (*garder son blé* ‘save your money’, *avoir un grain* ‘have a screw loose’). Table 1 displays the metaphors reflected in our corpus.

Meaning Construction in Print Beer Ads

General metaphor	Specific metaphor	Instance
BEER IS A LIVING BEING	BEER IS A WOMAN	Guinness Mackeson Champigneulles
	BEER IS A QUEEN BEER IS A SINGER	Lorraine Kronenbourg
	BEER FOAM IS THE TONGUE	La Dodo lé
	BEER IS AN ANIMAL	Licorne Murphy's
	BEER IS A PLANT BEER IS A FLOWER	Pelforth Guinness
BEER IS A NATURAL OBJECT	BEER IS GOLD BEER IS A LANDSCAPE ELEMENT BEER ORIGIN IS A BEER INGREDIENT	Kanterbräu Fischer London Pride
BEER IS A COMPLEX OBJECT	BEER IS CHINA	Fischer
	BEER IS BUTTER BEER IS FACE / SUN CREAM BEER IS WHIPPED CREAM	Boddingtons
	BEER IS AN ICECREAM	La Dodo lé
	BEER IS FUEL	Murphy's
	BEER IS THE SHOVEL OF A CRICKET	Guinness
	A BEER GLASS IS A PILE OF MOBILE PHONES	Guinness
IMPORTANCE IS SIZE	BEER IS A SHIP	Murphy's
	A BEER GLASS IS A CHINESE LANTERN	Boddingtons
BEER IS A NATURAL PHENOMENON	BEER IS A TIDAL WAVE/A WATERFALL BEER IS A HEAVY STORM	Guinness
	DRINKING BEER IS GETTING MARRIED	Guinness

Table 1. Metaphors in English and French beer ads

As advanced above, the majority of beer metaphors encoded in the ads are based on the Great Chain of Being proposed by Lakoff and Turner (1989). The metaphors belonging to the highest level in the Great Chain of Being hierarchy, i.e. those subsumed under the general metaphor BEER IS A LIVING BEING —BEER IS A PERSON, BEER IS AN ANIMAL and BEER IS A FLOWER— emphasize crucial aspects of brand positioning such as defining product features, creating the consumer's need for that particular brand or enhancing the brand reputation, while the metaphors falling within the lower levels of the hierarchy focus on more specific aspects such as the product characteristics and benefits. Thus the metaphorical description of the Guinness beer as “tall, dark and handsome” enhances the beer features, whereas the

metaphors depicting beer as a woman are meant to make the product desirable by employing sexual appeals. In this sense, metaphorical gender metaphors (Velasco 2009) give rise to a sexist interpretation since women are presented as desirable objects. This is best illustrated in the ads for the Mackeson beer, which feature a sexy woman. In the ad shown in figure 2 the identification of beer with a woman (A WOMAN'S LEGS ARE A BOTTLE OPENER) relies on a further source-in-target metonymy (INSTRUMENT FOR OBJECT), the bottle opener standing for the beer. The metonymic basis of the BEER IS A WOMAN metaphor is also reflected in another ad for the Guinness beer, where the woman is represented through her back. The upper part of the back is in white, thus working as a metaphorical configuration of the foam of the Guinness beer, one of its most highly valued features, whereas the lower part of the back appears in black, the colour of the Guinness brand. The anthropomorphic metaphor is based on the space schema (front-back).

110



Figure 2. Ad for the Mackeson brand

In contrast, in the French subcorpus the metaphorical representation of beer in terms of a woman is based on a perceptual feature, colour. Beer is regarded as a blonde, as illustrated by ads for lager brands like Fischer: *La plus belle des blondes ne s'appelle pas Claudia, mais Fischer*. The ad creates a connection between the beer and the fashion model Claudia Schiffer, whose surname resembles the brand name.

We encountered variants of the personification of beer in the French corpus that enhance the brand reputation. The Kronenbourg beer is metaphorically understood as a renowned singer who is on tour across the whole France, as the text hints: *Actuellement en tournée* ('on tour') *dans toute la France*. The second variant of the personifying metaphor is the metaphor BEER IS A QUEEN underlying an ad for the Lorraine beer. The metaphor is verbally rendered by the text *La reine* ('queen') *de Martinique* and visually cued by the image of a glass of beer with foam shaped as a crown. The metaphor is based on a source-in-target metonymy (SIGN FOR STATUS), the crown standing for the queen.

In a few English ads the anthropomorphic metaphor enhances the beer brand origin as a sign of its high quality, as exemplified in the ads for the London Pride beer (figure 3), in which the verbal element (*Made of more / Made of London*) activates the metonymies LONDON FOR UNIQUE BREWING STYLE and LONDON FOR UNIQUE INGREDIENTS. Here, London stands for a supposedly unique or highly characteristic way of brewing beer in London that can be identified through its ingredients, so in tasting the beer one can identify its unique origin.



Figure 3. Ad for the London Pride brand

Similarly, the metaphorical representation of the Boddingtons beer as a Chinese lantern that metonymically stands for the Chinese district in Manchester, as the text *Part of Manchester* suggests, highlights the beer origin as a positive attribute in a BEER ORIGIN FOR HIGH QUALITY metonymy.

Animal metaphors foreground beer features or the beer origin. The metaphorical configuration of the Licorne beer as an untamable (*indomptable*) unicorn (figure 4), which is triggered by the brand name, profiles the beer character,³ and the FORCE-ATTRACTION schema underlying the metaphor reinforces this characteristic.



Figure 4. Ad for the Licorne brand

In some ads for the Murphy's brand, beer is featured as a dragon standing for Ireland. Metaphor thus serves to present the beer brand as a symbol of national identity. The underlying metonymy BEER ORIGIN FOR HIGH QUALITY further enhances the beer features.

The view of beer as a cultural icon is also conveyed through the source domain of plants. The Guinness beer is sometimes portrayed as the corolla of a shamrock. The visual metaphor is based on two metonymies: PART FOR WHOLE (the corolla for the flower) and SYMBOL FOR COUNTRY (the shamrock standing for Ireland). Again the beer origin metonymically represents its high quality.

The flower metaphor may be used to enhance the floral taste of beer, as illustrated by some Pelforth ads. The glass of beer is viewed as a flower and the beer foam is equated with the liquid nectar sucked by a butterfly. The TASTE OF BEER FOR BEER metonymy is verbally expressed by the sentence *Et le palais renaît* 'And the palate revives'.

A set of ads equate beer with a natural or complex object. These metaphors enhance beer features or benefits. The Kanterbräu ad (figure 5) highlights the

COLOUR of the beer by depicting it as gold: *Que l'or coule à flots* 'Gold streams down'. The BEER IS CHINA metaphor profiled in another ad for the Fischer brand enhances its high quality. The image of a beer bottle between a knife and a fork combines with the text to instantiate the metaphor: *En Alsace, quand on sort l'argenterie, on sort aussi la porcelaine* 'In Alsace, when you put the silver crockery on the table, you also put china'.



Figure 5. Ad for the Kanterbräu brand

Other metaphors highlight the creaminess of a particular beer. These metaphors use source objects such as butter, face cream, suncream or whipped cream. For example, the metaphorical reading of the Boddingtons beer as whipped cream is triggered by both the image and the text: the image depicts a whip twisted around a glass of beer, the beer being described as *the cream of Manchester*.

In other ads metaphor enhances the freshness of beer by depicting a beer glass (metonymically representing the beer) as an icecream. In the ad for La Dodo lé brand the metaphor is intended to stimulate beer drinking on the hot island of

La Martinique. The same ad highlights the taste of the beer through the metaphor BEER FOAM IS THE TONGUE, which relies upon the metonymy SENSE FOR ORGAN, the tongue standing for taste.

The strong taste of the beer is also enhanced through its metaphorical configuration as a natural phenomenon such as a tidal wave or a waterfall. The Guinness beer is sometimes depicted as a heavy storm, strength being translated into “greatness”, as the text reads in one of its adverts: *Greatness in every drop.*

In other ads the beer is associated with a French region or island. For instance, the link of the Fischer beer to Alsace is created through the metaphor BEER IS A LANDSCAPE ELEMENT, which is cued by both the image of a Fischer bottle in the fog and the text (*Photo d'un paysage typiquement Alsacien par un temps de brume* ‘Photo of a typically Alsatian landscape in foggy weather’).

A further group of metaphors highlight the benefits of beer. For example, the metaphor BEER IS FUEL cued in a Murphy’s ad where the beer bottle is depicted as a pump suggests that beer provides energy to consumers in just the same way as fuel provides energy to engines. The energy that beer brings is also conveyed through the configuration of beer as the shovel of a cricket in a Guinness ad, a cultural metaphor that invokes the UP and FORCE schemas, both being positively valued. This is reinforced by the text: *The power to lift us all.*

114

Beer also has emotional benefits. Thus the conceptualization of beer as a ship cued in a Murphy’s ad suggests that beer drinking makes our daily life more comfortable. The use of a big ship on a billboard evokes the help of American soldiers to British ones to win World War II. This cues the interpretation that Murphy’s beer is an external help to survive in “our daily war”. The communicative impact of the metaphorical image is reinforced by two image schemas, namely FORCE and ATTRIBUTE (BIG). In addition, the BIG schema is called up by the primary metaphor IMPORTANCE IS SIZE (Grady 1999). Curiously, FORCE correlates with BIG. The metaphor confirms the role of shipping as a prototypical source domain in many metaphors, which is in consonance with the importance of seafare in British history.

A set of metaphors in English ads convey the idea of beer consumption as a special occasion or a source of pleasure, as illustrated by a Guinness ad where a beer glass (metonymically standing for the beer) is depicted as a pile of mobile phones. This visual metaphor suggests that beer drinking time is to be enjoyed in group without being disturbed. The metaphor interacts with the PILE schema and it is based on the INSTRUMENT FOR ACTION metonymy.

Some metaphorical images highlight brand loyalty by featuring it as a commitment. For example, another Guinness ad creates a visual and verbal analogy between

drinking Guinness beer and getting married. The view of a pile of beer glasses filled with Guinness as the layers of a wedding cake is backed up by the clincher: *Making a commitment*. The metaphor relies on the PILE schema and a part-whole metonymy, as cutting the cake represents the act of getting married.

5. Data discussion

It is clear that the target domain imposes constraints on source selection. The choice of source objects is constrained by branding strategy. Advertisers use the anthropomorphic metaphor to develop the ‘commoditization process’ (Borchers 2005: 27), in which a commodity is understood in terms of a person, adding value to the product by transferring to it human features and behavioural actions. Therefore, by presenting a product as a person, advertisers incite consumers to buy it.

Highlighting special features of a particular beer brand such as softness or creaminess increases brand positioning. This explains why advertisers resort to source objects that prototypically have those features, i.e. butter and cream, and map them onto the beer brand. In addition to that, establishing the brand reputation through metaphors that equate beer with an outstanding figure (a queen, a celebrity), a valuable object (gold, china) or a cultural symbol (a ship, the shovel of a cricket, a dragon/shamrock) can help promote the brand.

Monomodal visual metaphors show these source objects in the centre of the image, while the brand name appears on the bottom right corner, so that establishing the relationship between the source object and the beer brand is quite straightforward.

The high quality of a beer may be determined by its origin, which explains the metaphors BEER IS A LANDSCAPE ELEMENT and BEER ORIGIN IS A BEER INGREDIENT.

In the remaining of the corpus meaning inferences are produced through multimodal metaphor. The text either triggers or supports the metaphorical interpretation of the image. In the ad for the Kronenbourg beer, the image does not convey metaphorical meaning by itself; it is the text that profiles a metaphor (BEER IS A PERSON). In other ads (e.g. Lorraine, Kanterbräu, Boddingtons, Fischer, La Dodo lé) the text simply acts as a linguistic support of a visual metaphor.

The analysis also gives evidence of the metaphor-metonymy interplay. First, metonymy highlights the beer ingredients, a beer feature (e.g. taste, quality) or its origin. Then the element metonymically highlighted activates a metaphor. In the ad for the Murphy’s brand, the metaphorical representation of the beer as a shamrock rests upon the metonymic view of Ireland as a shamrock, suggesting that both the shamrock and the Murphy’s brand are symbols of Ireland.

Occasionally metonymy operates within a metaphorical scenario. Thus the ad for Guinness shown in figure X activates a MARRIAGE scenario. The image of a couple cutting the wedding cake reflects a PART-WHOLE metonymy subsumed within the metaphor DRINKING GUINNESS IS GETTING MARRIED, which is cued by the layers of the cake, equated with beer glasses. This metaphor-metonymy interaction is illustrated in table 2:

Metaphor BEER GLASSES ARE LAYERS OF A WEDDING CAKE	
Source domain	Target domain
Getting married	Beer drinking
METONYMY : PART OF AN EVENT FOR THE WHOLE EVENT	

Table 2. Metaphor-metonymy interaction

As regards image schemas, they are productive in the creation of metaphoric or metonymic mappings in both languages. The most recurrent ones are the SPACE schema (up-down, front-back), the ATTRIBUTE schema (big-small), the FORCE schema and the PILE schema. It is worth noting that specific beer features are enhanced by means of particular image schemas in both subcorpora. Thus density is highlighted through the PILE schema, while the beer origin is shown through the FORCE-ATTRACTION schema. The beer benefits are highlighted through the SPACE (up-down) and ATTRIBUTE (big-small) schemas in English and French. Additionally, the PILE and FORCE schemas are used to enhance the benefits of beer in the English ads.

In both subcorpora metaphor, metonymy and image schemas add value to the beer being advertised and contribute to beer promotion by (1) enhancing product features (colour, density, creaminess, freshness, origin) and benefits (source of energy and pleasure); or (2) highlighting elements that determine the beer brand's position in the market, such as brand reputation and brand loyalty.

6. Conclusion

The present paper has attempted to show the role of cognitive devices in advertising through a contrastive analysis of a sample of English and French beer ads. Advertisers exploit metaphor, metonymy and image schemas in the verbal and/or visual mode to create powerful messages and call customers' attention. The relevance of these cognitive mechanisms lies in (1) their contribution to the correct interpretation of the visual and verbal components of ads; and (2) their broadly rhetorical function, being decisive in generating persuasion. Our corpus analysis

reveals that metaphor and metonymy contribute to the primary goal of advertising by promoting beer in different ways: (i) by emphasizing specific beer features that make it unique; (ii) by evoking the beneficial effects of beer drinking; and (iii) by regarding beer as a cultural symbol that provides identity. The image schemas SPACE, FORCE, PILE and ATTRIBUTE underlying many metaphors and metonymies contribute to beer promotion by conveying a positive evaluation of the product.

The scope of the paper being limited, further research should be carried out on a wider corpus to provide further evidence for the findings.

Notes

¹ These authors examine multimodal conceptual metaphors in American and Ukrainian television beer commercials.

² The sources of the adverts are the beer brand websites. We only show those adverts that we were granted permission to publish.

³ Colour, flavour, mouthfeel, alcohol content and bitterness are the main parameters of beer character (Oliver 2011).

117

Works Cited

ALEJO, Rafael. 2010. "Where does the money go? An analysis of the container metaphor in economics: The market and the economy." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (4): 1137-1150.

BOERS, Frank. 2003. "Applied linguistics perspectives on cross-cultural variation in conceptual metaphor." *Metaphor and Symbol* 18 (4): 231-238.

BORCHERS, Timothy A. 2005. *Persuasion in the Media Age*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CABALLERO, Rosario. 2009. "Cutting across the senses: Imagery in winespeak and audiovisual promotion." In Forceville, Charles and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (eds.): 73-94.

CORTÉS DE LOS RÍOS, M. Enriqueta. 2001. *Nuevas perspectivas lingüísticas en la publicidad impresa anglosajona*. Almería: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Almería.

CORTÉS DE LOS RÍOS, M. Enriqueta. 2010. "Cognitive devices to communicate the economic crisis: An analysis through covers in *The Economist*." *Ibérica* 20: 81-106.

DIEZ VELASCO, Olga I. 2001. "Metaphor, metonymy and image schemas: An analysis of conceptual interaction patterns." *Journal of English Studies* 3: 47-63.

EVANS, Vyvyan and Melanie GREEN. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- FORCEVILLE, Charles. 1996. *Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- FORCEVILLE, Charles. 2008. "Metaphors in pictures and multimodal representations." In Gibbs, Raymond W. (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 462-482.
- FORCEVILLE, Charles. 2009. "Nonverbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: agendas for research." In Forceville, Charles and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (eds.): 19-42
- FORCEVILLE, Charles. 2012. "Creativity in pictorial and multimodal advertising metaphors." In Jones, Rodney H. (ed.) *Discourse and creativity*. Harlow Person: Longman: 113-132.
- FORCEVILLE, Charles. 2016. "Pictorial and multimodal metaphor." In Klug, Nina-Maria and Hartmut Stöckl (eds.) *Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext [The Language in Multimodal Contexts Handbook]*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 241-260.
- FORCEVILLE, Charles and Eduardo URIOS-APARISI. (eds.) 2009. *Multimodal Metaphor - Applications of Cognitive Linguistics*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GEERAERTS, Dirk. (ed.) 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- GIBBS, Raymond and Herbert COLSTON. 2006. "The Cognitive Psychological Reality of Image Schemas and their Transformations." In Geeraerts, Dirk (ed.): 239-268.
- GRADY, Joseph. 1999. "A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: correlation vs. resemblance." In Steen, Gerard and Raymond Gibbs (eds.) *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 79-100.
- HAMPE, Beate. (ed.) 2005. *From Perception to Meaning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JOHNSON, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- KÖVECSES, Zoltán and Günter RADDEN. 1998. "Metonymy: developing a cognitive linguistic view." *Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (1): 37-77.
- KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford U.P.
- KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- KRZESZOWSKI, Tomasz P. 1993. "The axiological parameter in preconceptual image schemata." In Geiger, Richard A. and Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (eds.) *Conceptualizations and Mental Processing in Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 307-330.
- LAKOFF, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, George. 1989. "Philosophical speculation and cognitive science." *Philosophical Psychology* 2 (1): 55-76.
- LAKOFF, George. 2006. "The contemporary theory of metaphor." In Geeraerts, Dirk (ed.): 186-238.
- LAKOFF, George and Mark JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, George and Mark JOHNSON. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- LAKOFF, George and Mark TURNER. 1989. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LANTOLF, James P. and Larysa BOBROVA. 2012. "Happiness is drinking beer: a cross-cultural analysis of multimodal metaphors in American and Ukrainian commercials." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 22 (1): 42-66.
- MA, Lin. 2008. "Pictorial metaphor in advertising and consumer interpretation of its cultural meaning." *China Media Research* 4 (3): 9-17.
- NEGRO, Isabel. 2013a. "Verbo-pictorial metaphor in French advertising." *Journal of French Language Studies* 24 (2): 155-180.
- NEGRO, Isabel. 2013b. "Visual metaphor and metonymy in French political cartoons." *RES-LA* 26: 365-384.
- NEGRO, ISABEL. 2015a. "CORRUPTION IS DIRT: Metaphors for political corruption in the

Meaning Construction in Print Beer Ads

- Spanish press". *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 92 (3): 213-238.
- NEGRO, Isabel. 2015b. "Visual wine metaphor and metonymy in ads." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 173: 125-131.
- NEGRO, Isabel. 2016. "The human being as the target of crisis metaphors in English, Spanish and French." *Metaphor and the Social World* 6 (2): 177-204.
- OLIVER, Garrett. (ed.) 2011. *The Oxford Companion to Beer*. Oxford: Oxford U.P.
- PEÑA, Sandra. 1999. "Subsidiarity relationships between image-schemas: An approach to the FORCE schema." *Journal of English Studies* 1: 187-207.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA, Francisco J. and José L. OTAL. 2002. *Metonymy, Grammar and Communication*. Granada: Comares.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA, Francisco J. and Lorena PÉREZ HERNÁNDEZ. 2011. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: Myths, Developments and Challenges." *Metaphor and Symbol* 26 (3):161-185.
- RUIZ DE MENDOZA, Francisco J. and Olga I. DIEZ VELASCO. 2003. "High-level metonymy and linguistic structure." In Inchaurrealde, Carlos and Celia Florén (eds.) *Interaction and Cognition in Linguistics*. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang: 189-210.
- SASLAW, Janna. 1996. "Forces, containers, and paths: The role of body-derived image schemas in the conceptualization of music." *Journal of Music Theory* 40 (2): 217-243.
- UNGERER, Friedrich. 2000. "Muted metaphors and the activation of metonymies in advertising." In Barcelona, Antonio (ed.) *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 321-340.
- VELASCO SACRISTÁN, María S. 2009. "Overtneess-covertneess in advertising gender metaphors." *Journal of English Studies* 7: 111-148.
- VELASCO SACRISTÁN, María S. and M. Enriqueta CORTÉS DE LOS RÍOS. 2009. "Persuasive nature of image schematic devices in advertising: their use for introducing sexism." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 22: 239-270.
- VELASCO SACRISTÁN, María S. and Pedro A. FUERTES OLIVERA. 2004. "Metáfora y LSP: valor cognitivo de la metáfora en el discurso publicitario de *British Cosmopolitan*." In Sanz, Inmaculada and Ángel M. Felices (eds.) *Las nuevas tendencias de las lenguas de especialidad en un contexto internacional y multicultural*. Granada: Universidad de Granada: 863-878.