Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Journal of Pragmatics 122 (2017) 65–76

journal of PRAGMATICS

www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma

Metaphor and metonymy in advertising: Building viewpoint in multimodal multi-space blends

Eve Sweetser

University of California, Berkeley, Department of Linguistics, Berkeley, CA 94720-2650, USA

Available online 2 November 2017

Abstract

Video advertisements often involve metonymy and metaphor as major aspects of their structure. A complex multimodal ad's meaning, however, lies not just in individual metaphoric mappings or metonymic structures, but in the interrelationship between multiple mappings and mental spaces – that is, in the mental space network built up by the ad. Skilled creators of ads, in some respects like skilled poets, involve their audiences by prompting active network construction from implicitly as well as explicitly evoked inputs. Since input frames typically involve viewpoint, their viewpoint structures also participate in the broader network's structure – sometimes in important though inexplicit ways.

Keywords: Implicit versus explicit evocation; Multimodal advertising; Multi-space blends; Network of mental spaces; Superbowl ads; Viewpoint

1. Introduction

This paper uses multimodal advertising data to address a somewhat neglected question: exactly *how* do multimodal communicators build metaphoric mappings? When I see a video sequence, accompanied by words (voice-over, print, character speech), how does that entice me into a particular metaphoric structuring of the content? And more specifically, what kinds of configurations are built? I shall thus be examining multimodal mental-space Blends in video ads. My primary claim is that in building up the complex meaning of an effective video ad, we need to go beyond classic metaphoric mappings between a Source and Target, and examine the ways in which the advertiser builds up a complex *network* of meaning relationships between multiple frames or spaces.

Recent decades of research on metaphor and metonymy have clearly shown that these phenomena are pervasive in human cognition – and are thus pervasive in human communication, language, and nonlinguistic or multimodal artifacts such as art and film. Cognitive linguistic analysis treats metaphor as a mental space *mapping* between spaces populated by two distinct *frames*. LOVE IS A JOURNEY, then, is first of all a mapping between a Target and a Source, e.g. a Relationship frame and a Shared Journey frame (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999). The development of the relationship maps onto the course of the journey. Therefore Source-frame (Shared Journey) linguistic expressions can be used to refer to aspects of the Target domain of Relationship, as in *We've come a* ***long way*** or *This relationship is a* ***dead end***. This unidirectionality is a defining characteristic of metaphor: I can't use love relationship vocabulary in the same way to refer to aspects of physical travel. Further, current cognitive work on metaphor sees these mappings as building up *blended spaces*, in Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) sense: that is, we don't just link up Love with a Journey cognitively, we build up

E-mail address: sweetser@berkeley.edu.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.012
0378-2166/

a blend, a new conceptual structure of Love understood as a Shared Journey – a conceptual structure different from our independent understandings of Love and Journeys. As we shall discuss below, this particular kind of two-frame metaphoric blend is the simplest case of a model which allows multiple-space networks of relationships.

Forceville (e.g., 1996, 2009, 2016) has been a major proponent of using such metaphoric mapping models for the analysis of multimodal advertising data, like the ads focused on in this paper. Such two-frame mappings are one subset of mental space Blending, as described by Fauconnier and Turner: it is assumed that out of the metaphoric mapping between (for example) Love and Journeys, a new blended space emerges, which is our comprehension of Love in terms of Journeys – this is distinct from our separate understandings of the frames of Love and Journeys. But we shall here argue that many multimodal ads in fact require a more complex *multi*-frame analysis – hence (as argued below) a larger mental space *network* of mappings.

As Dancygier and Sweetser (2014) have argued further, blending involves and shapes viewpoint. In metaphor, the Target and Source spaces themselves have *viewpoint structure* – e.g., it's entirely reasonable to find a Dead End a negatively evaluated frame, assuming that a Traveler's viewpoint (rather than a resident's) is taken, and from the Traveler's viewpoint a Dead End is an obstruction to their intentions. (From a local inhabitant's viewpoint, a dead end street may in fact be a positive phenomenon: low traffic, less noise – but that viewpoint on the Dead End frame is not what is mapped onto the Relationship.) Metaphoric blends inherit such viewpoints: a love affair judged useless to a participant's life goals (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) may be negatively evaluated as a Dead End. Such extremely clear and conventional mappings shape everyday language and cognition: no English speaker lacks an understanding of a Love Relationship as a Shared Journey, or has trouble identifying the mappings. In complex literary data, or (as we shall discuss) advertising data, it can be significantly less simple and obvious to identify metaphoric structures analytically, partly because there may be multiple metaphors interacting in a single complex video or text passage. But viewpointed structures are part of the construction of the complex space network.

I shall be examining such data, looking at the varying means by which such mappings (and resultant viewpoints) are built up in such contexts, and how we can analytically identify them. *How* does the speaker or writer or film-maker guide the audience into particular metaphoric mental space structures – and what difference does it make what means are chosen? Sweetser and Sullivan (2012) have argued that very different effects are produced in poetry, by poets who choose to more or less explicitly evoke both Source and Target frames, and state mappings – as opposed to ones who more implicitly set up metaphors, perhaps by mentioning only the Source domain (Frost's famous 'The road not taken' never explicitly mentions life-choices as opposed to path choices). But in multimodal material, there are many possible routes to ''mention,'' more or less explicit. Identifying an unmentioned domain as Source or Target frame is clearly a different job than identifying the metaphoric structure of *this relationship is a dead end* (which mentions both Source and Target and states a mapping overtly). How do advertisers exploit the difference between implicit and explicit, to draw their viewers into the mappings they intend? And how does viewpoint, in both Source and Target frames, result from such mappings: what is the difference between explicitly built viewpoint and implicitly built viewpoint, for example?

Print and video advertising are saliently multimodal phenomena: printed language and images, or audio and visual streams, come together to influence the viewer. There are social reasons to study it; we are flooded with these influences daily, and commercial advertising at least is clearly intended to profit the advertiser, not the consumer. But further, advertising is of special interest to analysts of multimodal communication. Precisely because of its financial value, it is frequently devised by able, experienced and highly paid creative teams who exploit the relevant modalities very fully. So the most successful advertising pushes the limits on the amount of meaning to be squeezed into a limited space of paper, or a brief span of television or on-line advertising time. These craftsmen know how to build blends, and to draw viewers into the desired viewpoint.

Not all ads involve metaphor to any major extent, of course. Consider washing-machine ads where the primary character is an attractive woman, obviously prosperous from the looks of her clothing and her well-furnished house, who takes good care of her family – these frames (Wealth, Beauty, Home-maker) may help make viewers want to be *like* her, take part in her category, even by choosing her brand of washing machine. The ''My Tide'' sequence of Tide ads (aimed at broadening the detergent's appeal) featured characters including a handsome young dad folding a little girl's fresh-washed pink ruffled dress; by inference, using this detergent might include the user too in the frame-based category of Cool Young Dad. These ads involve characters serving as exemplars of larger categories: The Housewife, The Nurturing Dad. Such ads are therefore primarily drawing on categorial and frame metonymy, rather than metaphor. Such non-metaphoric ads will not be the primary topic of this paper, although I will address the issue of metonymy as a strong contributor to metaphoric ads as well.

In ads where metaphor is a central component, there seem to be quite a range of possible combinations of Target and Source frames to evoke relevant metaphoric mappings. With visual metaphors, often there is full visual depiction of both a Target and a Source: e.g. a famous Prius ad showing the shape of a Prius hybrid car superimposed on a green leaf shape (I will return to the Prius ad in Section 6). But a very common formula appears to be *more* explicit expression of the Target frame in language/text, and focus on the Source domain in the visual material. And this, again, is complicated by the fact

that there are frequently multiple source domains in an ad – in such cases, unlike the Prius/leaf visual mapping, we need a complex network of mental spaces, which may be expressed in varying degrees in different modalities.

For example, in the ''Depression Hurts'' ad series, a 2012 Cymbalta (antidepressant) TV ad seems to communicate the Target frame (depression) with full explicitness only in the voice-over, which reminds the audience that *depression hurts*. The video track opens with rather dark indoor scenes, showing someone sitting alone, not answering a phone; someone forcing a smile and having difficulty keeping up a conversation; a woman sitting in the dark rubbing her own joints as if in response to physical aches. All of this could metonymically evoke the frame of depression: people suffering from depression may experience physical problems, may not want to leave their apartment, and may get socially isolated. But literally, the ad depicts dark indoor settings, lack of good social contact, and physical discomfort. (Since Cymbalta is also advertised for treatment of arthritis pain, the pain sequence can only be interpreted as specifically depression-related by reference to the specific context of this ad.) The second half of the ad switches to much better-lit and more colorful (mostly outdoor) scenes showing the same people playing with dogs (in sunshine), answering the phone, gardening, and chatting happily with friends – presumably now helped by Cymbalta, though we don't see them taking it. So although these people don't seem to be depressed, it's only in the context of the ad that we guess their cheerfulness to be due to drug treatment. There are a range of adult participants depicted (the drug is not approved for children) – but in a category-metonymy characteristic of advertising at large, the ad begins and ends with depictions of white women, the top target consumer audience for antidepressants.[1]

It has been remarked (e.g. Forceville, 1996, 2009, 2016) that voiceover and on-screen print are commonly more likely to carry Target-frame information in multimodal ads. But interestingly, in the Cymbalta ads, only *one* of the multiple source domains (and perhaps the least visually prominent one) is mentioned in the voiceover *depression hurts* – the source frame of Physical Pain, triggering the metaphor that PSYCHOLOGICAL SUFFERING IS PHYSICAL PAIN. More dominant in the visual track are darkness (SADNESS IS DARKNESS) and indoor isolation (PSYCHOLOGICAL DISABILITY AND SOCIAL ISOLATION ARE PHYSICAL CONFINEMENT). And yet these metaphors are clearly present. The take-home message from the visual track is that curing the symptoms of depression is ''bringing the patient out of the dark room into the sunshine'' where happy social contact also happens (picnics, playing with dogs). The voice-over nowhere states that specific people (the ones shown are presumably actors, not patients) are cured by Cymbalta: it just says Cymbalta can cure the ''hurt'' of depression. On-screen written messages (presumably legally required) remind viewers that they will need medical advice before taking such a medication, and that Cymbalta is only recommended for adults, and that it can have negative side effects. The metaphors thus are not solely located either in text or in image, but emerge from the interaction of text and image, with Source images dominating the visual track, while the text track partially expresses explicit Target structures, and one Source structure (Pain) to build up the necessary (highly conventional) metaphoric meanings. Crucially, one cannot analyze the ad in terms of just one of these metaphors: it is the combined multi-space blend, wherein Depression is *simultaneously* Darkness, Confinement and Pain, which makes the ad message so forceful.

Another – and very controversial – case of putting most of the message into the visuals is Sharron Angle's 2010 ad sequence for her campaign against Harry Reid for a Nevada U.S. Senate seat. The voice-over and on-screen print state that Harry Reid has been advocating all kinds of government-funded services for illegal immigrants, which encourage them to enter the U.S. illegally. The video shows primarily Hispanic males, walking through tunnels and gaps in broken walls, dressed in gang-suggestive clothing, and carrying weapons. The very obvious metaphor, immediately agreed on by all the students in my first advertising-language class: A NATION IS A HOME, UNDOCUMENTED HISPANIC IMMIGRANTS ENTERING OUR NATION ARE CRIMINALS BREAKING INTO OUR HOME. Racist category metonymy is pervasive in the text of the ad: it says illegal immigrants are using our tax money to live here, and joining gangs and raising crime. It mentions Arizona's legal enforcement system, which Harry Reid opposes – this certainly cues the frame of Hispanic immigrants, rather than general immigrants, for knowledgeable Nevada listeners. Harry Reid is metonymically linked to a negative immigration situation in both text and visuals – his photo appears alongside the images, and is needed to link the metaphoric space network to a Senate Voting space where Harry Reid (and his viewpoint on immigration) is presumably to blame for the immigration of criminals. But the rather powerful home-invasion metaphor is only accessible via rather partial visual depiction of the Source domain – and it goes beyond the language to a much stronger and more emotional claim about illegal immigration.

As suggested above, a major question is *how* these ads prompt metaphoric mappings in viewers. And we don't get a sufficient answer to this question just by noting the forms (or modes) of expression of Source and Target frames: how are they effective, in the observed distribution pattern? And what about different patterns of distribution? Given that the language of the Angle ad never mentioned home-breaking at all, and even the images did not show clear residential houses, how did an entire undergraduate class unerringly choose that as the metaphor involved? In what follows,

[1] cf. https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/astounding-increase-in-antidepressant-use-by-americans-201110203624, or http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/11/16/women-and-prescription-drug-use_n_1098023.html.

I discuss a type of commercial which complicates some of these emerging questions, and also adds to the understanding of the emergence of viewpointed multiple-space blends, in these contexts of partially-explicit contributions to metaphoric structure.

2. Mechanisms of multiple metaphoric blending: the balance between explicit and implicit

The analysis in this paper is based in the frameworks of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (cf. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, 1999), which treats metaphors as mappings between Source and Target frames, and on the subsequent analysis of such metaphoric mappings as *single-scope blends*. This process of using cross-frame mappings to build a newly meaningful metaphoric Blended Space (cf. Fauconnier and Turner, 2002) is detailed in Dancygier and Sweetser (2014), which also lays out an understanding of metonymy and especially its relation to metaphor. In particular, in mapping frames onto frames (e.g. Nation onto Home), sub-pieces of frames (e.g. Walls, for a Home) may metonymically evoke the whole larger frame, which is then available for mapping onto another frame via metaphor. This is all part of building a metaphoric Blended Space, in Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) terms: a new understanding of Target in terms of Source. New inferences arise from blending the two frames: in the Source frame (House), the house's walls protect the residents from outside harm, and breaking them puts residents at risk from criminals; in the Target frame of Nation, we now understand that restrictions on immigration protect citizens from danger and crime. But more specifically, *how* does the metaphoric blend get built and what role does it play in a larger mental space network? And in particular, how does it get built in multimodal media?

Forceville (e.g. 1996, 2009, 2016) has long argued that multimodal advertising needs to be analyzed using the tools of cognitive science and metaphor theory, and in particular has also argued for the added importance of metonymy in such a task. He has also laid out ways in which physical force structures are crucial to metaphor in both advertising and cartoons. I follow him here in considering video advertising as not only bimodal (language and image) but truly multimodal (sequences of images, spoken words of characters, voiceover, print, soundtrack and more), and crucially involving metonymy as well. Forceville has also (e.g. 2009) criticized Conceptual Metaphor Theory, and blending theory, as focusing too much specifically on language alone, and as insufficiently attentive to creativity. However, if a theory extends successfully to a new range of data, it is not a criticism of the theory itself to say that it hasn't been applied widely enough. And Forceville's work is not alone in attesting to such a success: the field of gesture studies has proposed a well-established and productive research direction of examining metaphoric gesture accompanying speech (Cienki and Müller, 2008; Mittelberg, 2008; Müller, 2008; Müller et al., 2013, among many others), using the mechanisms of Blending Theory.[2] However, none of this work has focused primarily on the more complicated *networks* of mental space meaning in which the metaphoric mappings emerge – and without which, I would argue, the individual metaphoric mappings involved in these multimodal blends would be far less meaningful.

There is also an extensive literature on rhetoric and persuasion in advertising and on actual viewer reactions to advertising (e.g. van Mulken et al., 2010; McQuarrie and Mick, 1996, 1998, 2003, 2009). This paper has different goals. It is an analysis of content in terms of a particular multimodal blending theory, and attempts to show *how* the advertiser might produce particular effects of viewpoint and blending – which then (as other scholarship might test) could make an ad more or less appealing or convincing to a viewer.

Particularly since advertising is often done by highly skilled and creative professionals, it may be helpful to compare multimodal metaphoric blends of this kind with high-level linguistic poetic blends, which Sweetser and Sullivan (2012) have argued can be built via quite different mechanisms. In particular, poets sometimes don't even have to bring up both domains to get readers to build a metaphoric blend. Readers of Robert Frost's 'The road not taken' have for decades understood his last lines ('I took the one less traveled by/and that has made all the difference') as not referring literally to choice of physical paths, but metaphorically to life-choices – because they had LIFE IS A JOURNEY in their core ''pre-fab'' metaphor repertory. (Since Frost does not literally mention Life Choices, another reading is technically possible; but as Sweetser and Sullivan note, ironically, only Frost himself has noticeably argued for it as an active option.) Or, alternatively, poets can creatively leave interpretation ''open'' by only partially specifying the target domain. For example, Emily Dickinson's 'Over the fence' shows a small girl longing for strawberries but restricted from climbing over the fence to eat them. As Sweetser and Sullivan point out, part of the power of the poem is that we may read it to be about the restricted lives of 19th-century women – and we are left wondering whether the strawberries are metaphorically representing sexuality, authorship, life-satisfaction in general, or any number of other possible elements in the target Women's Life frame. As in some of the ads I have examined above, conventional metaphors (SEX IS FORBIDDEN FRUIT, HAPPINESS IS SWEETNESS, CAREER SUCCESS IS CLIMBING) can contribute to these readings. But any of these readings is deniable – or

[2] Other very recent developments in this area include the EMMA database (Exploring Multimodal Metaphor (and Metonymy) in Advertising; https://multimodalmetaphor.com/), and Pérez Sobrino (2017).

arguable. And unlike Frost, the impact of Dickinson's poem is largely due not to the choice of one mapping, but rather to the shared viewpoint involved in these multiple input spaces. The strawberries and the fence thus become metaphoric *simultaneously* for all the frustrated desires of a 19th-century girl, and all the social forces which are frustrating those desires.

Poetry may not be unique in such uses of partially explicit expressions and open meaning possibilities, creating multiple interactions between meaning spaces. Advertisers who evoke potential source and target frames certainly do not have to lay out the mappings between them to prompt construction of a metaphoric blend. Often parallel inferential structures guide the blending process; mental space blends (Fauconnier and Turner, 2002) depend on shared or parallel inferences which can be identified in the Generic Space. For example, Cymbalta ad viewers know that physical pain is bad, and medical science should be trying to alleviate it, often using medications. Alongside this inference, we also know that depression involves psychological suffering, which is also bad, and which medical science should also be trying to alleviate. American ad viewers already have multiple highly conventional metaphoric blends at their disposal, such as, in this case. SADNESS IS DARKNESS and PSYCHOLOGICAL SUFFERING IS PHYSICAL PAIN. So the mappings are pre-guided – as, therefore, are some inferences. Psychological distress might be treated with counseling, while physical pain would be treated with, e.g. aspirin. But the Cymbalta ad opens up the inference that, since physical pain is treated with medications, and metaphorically PSYCHOLOGICAL SUFFERING IS PHYSICAL PAIN, it may make sense to treat psychological suffering with medications as well. But the psychological suffering in question is also Darkness and Confinement; even if the characters in the ad don't seem to be in severe physical pain, it's much more fun to be outside in sunshine with your dog than stuck inside in the dark, so imagine how much worse it is to be in physical pain while confined in the dark. This larger network of spaces increases the urgency of alleviating the patient's discomfort, while leaving the inference in place (from the PSYCHOLOGICAL SUFFERING IS PHYSICAL PAIN mapping) that a medication could solve the problem.

Thus, skilled advertisers, like good poets, can depend on pre-existing blend structures to build their intended blends. In the case of the Sharron Angle campaign ad, the makers of the ad could (perhaps unfairly) depend on background rhetoric which Angle would not have wanted to quote directly. It had/has been a pervasive theme in the conservative American media that illegal immigrants are dangerous criminals, *bad hombres* in the words of Donald Trump (despite the fact that crime rates in the U.S. are lower in immigrant communities). And the metaphors that A NATION IS A HOME and A NATION IS A FAMILY are deeply rooted in many Euro-American cultures, and many others world-wide as well. Once these conventional mappings are done, inferences readily arise for viewers: do you want criminals in your home?

To this we may add that metonymy is necessarily rampant in advertising, as in other areas of communication, since no frame is ever fully represented. In general only sub-parts of the relevant frame are presented to ad viewers, such as walls for the House/Home frame in the Angle ad. We thus get progressions, where some sub-part of a visual frame evokes the entire frame, and the frame in turn evokes possible conventional metaphors, and the various linguistic tracks in the ad help us to pin down which metaphors. What is crucial in the process of a metaphoric ad's effect on the viewer is not simply the mapping between Source and Target – it is the progression of enrichment of meanings, prompting the emerging blend.

3. How does a car get multiply mapped to a farmer (and a football player): the Dodge Ram Superbowl ''farmer'' ad

The ads I have examined so far can be considered relatively standard examples of the genre, though the Angle ad is an unusually ferocious political ad, and we have to keep in mind that medical drug advertisements are a special sub-genre with some of its own character. In what follows, I will discuss an ad which belongs to a highly distinctive specific genre: a Superbowl ad. The Ram ad allows us to examine the further complexities of metaphoric blends, and the interplay of viewpoints evoked. Further, this data offers a particularly cogent case for an analysis in terms of metaphor as blending, not solely in terms of metaphoric mappings between exactly two domains.

Advertising time during the Superbowl of American football is a financial and creative pinnacle of American television advertising. It is among the most expensive television time that advertisers can buy, and it commands a huge audience whose demographics are thoroughly studied by the advertising world and accessible to advertisers. The results are also artistically unusual: unlike advertising during regular television programming, but perhaps more like advertising during World Cup games or the Olympics, the content of Superbowl ads frequently refers to aspects of the Superbowl or football culture, and at least poses as narrative entertainment. For example, instead of talking about the car's durability, energy efficiency or other qualities, a Volkswagen ad during a Winter Olympics skating competition showed a New Beetle ''skating'' on one wheel, and ''bowing'' at the end of the routine as roses are thrown on the ice; the vehicle is simply shown as a ''winner'' in the metaphoric terms of Olympic competition. Often the product itself will only be seen in passing in the ad, or only in a logo at the end. Advertisers compete to involve game viewers in interesting and fun video experiences; and some of these ads become famous in themselves.

Not all Superbowl ads are metaphoric, but because of the genre constraints just mentioned, metaphoric Superbowl ads often provide minimal explicit mention of the major Target frame – the product itself. In one famous World Cup ad for Nike,

the Brazilian national soccer team plays soccer through an airport (e.g. kicking the ball through the luggage-scanner), with no verbal mention of Nike: viewers see their Nike t-shirts and a Nike logo at the end (the players' shoes are also Nike, though not seen close enough for most viewers to notice that). The visual track, rather atypically of ads in general, is basically showing more of what the surrounding program is showing – soccer, played with magical mastery. This kind of relative backgrounding of the product (Target) frame is characteristic of the genre (a broader genre including Superbowl, World Cup, and Olympics ads), and is now expected by viewers of this genre.

However, here as in other genres of advertising, metonymy as well as conventional metaphor is pervasively deployed in building the successful blends in these high-level ads, and allowing them to ''refer'' to the product. A classic (in some circles, famous) example is the 2013 Dodge Ram Superbowl ad, which claims to be a tribute to the American Farmer. Before we do the metaphoric analysis, let me say that the category-metonymic appeal involved here is a rather strange one. Advertising is often thought of as appealing to the identity of the viewer – and of course numerically most Americans, and even most American football fans, are not farmers. And American agriculture is increasingly centralized into large ''agribusiness'' commercial entities which are not family owned but have the financial advantages of volume and market share; they are able to sell to, and bargain with, large chains of supermarkets or fast-food vendors who want giant quantities of processed cheese, or identical-quality apples or carrots. However, the idea of the agricultural ''Heartland'' and its traditional values contributes significantly to many Americans' idea of their country's identity. Even if you are an urban American, you may have some nostalgia for the imagined simplicity, independence, and work ethic of Family Farmers – who (ignoring fast food production) after all produce food, which is essential to life, not a luxury product. The appeal is perhaps even stronger for blue-collar Americans – who make up a very significant contingent of the football audience, as well as of the Dodge Ram truck's target buying group. Thus, the ad's reference to, and praise of, American farmers, can make a category-metonymic identity appeal to Superbowl viewers. These farmers are seen as prototypical Americans.

It must be clearly stated here that for American viewers, this ad is not humorous – though descriptions of it clearly are hilarious to some European readers (and conference audience members). American viewers, depending on their viewpoint, find the ad either genuinely sweet (certainly its fame on YouTube is due to real fans), or disgustingly, hypocritically sweet. If it they could construe its intention as humorous, the disgust reaction would certainly be less strong.

The voice track of this ad is excerpted from a 1978 speech by radio broadcaster Paul Harvey, to a convention of the Future Farmers of America, a farming-community youth group. The speech is entirely about farmers, and the text of the ad never mentions Dodge trucks. (Dodge donated $100,000 to FFA for each million views of the ad on YouTube, in return for the use of the text.) The original speech mixed comedic elements with the more dramatic ones. E.g. *I need somebody with arms strong enough to wrestle a calf and yet gentle enough to deliver his own grandchild; somebody to call hogs, tame cantankerous machinery, come home hungry, have to await lunch until his wife's done feeding visiting ladies, then tell the ladies to be sure and come back real soon, and mean it*. The scene of the farmer trying (and managing) to be polite to the ''visiting ladies'' despite how hungry he is, is intended to be both sympathetic and funny: it's pretty minor ''heroism'' to stifle your hunger pangs (the farmer is not starving to death, he had a good breakfast we assume) for the sake of politeness. The Dodge Ram ad omits those references, and does not include any such humorous edge. It is simultaneously an overt saccharine paean to the imagined prototype of an American Farmer, and a metaphoric paean to the Dodge Ram truck.

In what follows, a transcript of the ad alternates with specific comments on the frames and categories evoked by each portion; in the next section of the paper, analysis of the metaphoric significance of these frames and categories is laid out.

(1) And on the eighth day
[image of American white wooden Protestant country church],
God looked down on his planned paradise
[image of small Midwestern country ''family'' farm seen from above]
and said, ''I need a caretaker.'' [image of man with dog]
So God made a farmer. [image of old man farmer]

Perhaps what is most notable in this first section of the ad is its appeals to *category structure* (as described in Lakoff, 1987). The word *farmer* could potentially refer to a much wider range of people, indeed anyone who does farming activities, and certainly including employees (and possibly owners) of large agribusiness. But here the images make clear that it refers to a particular *prototype* of the category. That is, the ad is not praising anyone who farms, but specifically means an old-fashioned family owner-farmer, probably Midwestern.

(2) God said, ''I need somebody willing to get up before dawn, milk cows, work all day in the fields,
[image of barn with haybales loaded on Dodge Ram],
milk cows again, eat supper, then go to town and stay past midnight at a meeting of the school board.''
[image of wooden building with American flag in window]
So God made a farmer. [image of woman ''farmer'']

Frame-evocation is potent here. This prototypical farmer is now associated with the frames of Hard Work, Civic Responsibility, and Patriotism. And the Dodge Ram is present in the representations of these frames; although not mentioned in the linguistic track, it is apparently the vehicle used by the farmer to do hauling on the farm, as well as go to town to attend civic events in a building with a flag on it.

(3) God said, ''I need somebody willing to sit up all night with a newborn colt and watch it die, then dry his eyes and say, 'Maybe next year.'
[image of sad man standing in a church with pews]
I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout,
[image of weather-worn hands clasped]
shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire,
[image of horse with gear],
who can make harness out of hay wire, feed sacks and shoe scraps.
[image of African American man sitting on back of Dodge Ram truck]

In this section, it becomes even clearer that it is a *mythical past prototype* of American Family Farmer which is being referred to: modern American farmers do not make ax handles from trees, shoe horses with car-tires, and so on. On the other hand, the categorial structure is broadened by presentation of an African American exemplar of the category. And the new truck being sold is connected visually (though still unmentioned linguistically) with both this broadened category and – rather oddly – with the mythic past prototype. One might perhaps be concerned by a clash here: fancy new high-tech pickups were not used by the kind of farmer who once made ax handles from trees. But this, I think, is part of the ad's appeal: a sturdy, if high-tech, pickup is to be seen as the updated version of the horses shod with car-tires. A new Blend emerges to resolve the clash: a life-style mixing ''traditional'' values with ''modern'' technology, which certainly appeals to the relevant American audience (and finding a ''comfort zone'' in the mix of tradition and innovation could be seen as an ongoing issue in much of the globalized world).

(4) Who, planting time and harvest season, will finish his 40-hour week by
Tuesday noon
[images of tractor, then of Dodge Ram with cattle]
and then, paining from tractor back,
[image of tractor plowing a field from above]
put in another 72 hours.''
So God made a farmer.
[image of white middle-aged man]

The rhetorical effect here appears to be twofold. The mythic American Farmer prototype is reinforced by depiction of an apparently prodigious Work Ethic. And the Dodge Ram is also associated with this ethic – indeed, perhaps is a necessity for it, since contemporary viewers can only imagine how impossibly hard this work would be (and once was) without machinery such as the tractor and the Dodge Ram.

(5) God said, ''I need somebody strong enough to clear trees and heave bales,
[image of man putting bales in back of Dodge Ram]
yet gentle enough to yean lambs and wean pigs
[image of father and little boy farmers from above]
and tend the pink-comb pullets,
who will stop his mower for an hour
[image of very large tractor with man sitting on back of it]
to splint the broken leg of a meadowlark.''
[image of birds flying away from a farm field]
So God made a farmer.
[image of little girl in checked shirt in front of a field]
It had to be somebody who'd plow deep and straight and not cut corners.
[image of large plowed field with straight rows]
Somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed, and brake, and disk, and plow, and plant, and
tie the fleece and strain the milk.
[images of corn piled, of a baby chick in large hands, of hands holding peppers, of people selling produce at a stand]

The mythic prototype is further fleshed out here: farming may hurt meadow-larks nesting in the fields, but efforts to splint their limbs are unlikely to be successful, and extremely unlikely to be undertaken by actual farmers. This action is one among many listed which indicate the *kind* and *caring* nature of this prototypical American Farmer. Related to this is the depiction of the Farmer as part of a Caring Family frame, instantiated specifically by the Family Dinner shot, the father-and-son farmer shot, and the little girl in the pink checked shirt. In addition, the Work Ethic is augmented by the ideas of (1) hard physical labor, (2) particularly high standards (literal corners are not ''cut'' in the plowing) and (3) the added frames of Local Farming and Local Produce (roadside farm-stands are not outlets for produce trucked long-distance) as well as Family Farming (large agribusiness does not primarily sell by roadside stands but via supermarkets). And the pickup truck fits this ''local marketing'' aspect of the frame. Long-distance 18-wheeler (possibly refrigerated) trucks are used to transport food cross-country to supermarkets, while pickup trucks are for local transport, and are even frequently seen alongside roads in the U.S. as actual sales points for produce – informal replacements for a farm-stand building.

(6) Somebody who'd bale a family together with the soft, strong bonds of sharing,
[image of ''family dinner'' in a farmhouse kitchen – white family]
who would laugh, and then sigh and then reply with smiling eyes
[image of Hispanic male farmer]
when his son says that he wants to spend his life doing what Dad does.
[image of small white boy holding hat against chest]
So God made a farmer.
[image of Dodge Ram with farm in background, writing: *To the farmer in all of us*]
[final displayed logo: *Ram: Guts and Glory*]

This final segment primarily displays the Family Farm prototype, including the idea of specifically a son who wants to succeed his father in the family farm business (clearly a traditional conservative family, though a girl was also displayed in (5)). The category structure is enlarged both by the depiction of the Hispanic farmer character, and by the slogan *To the farmer in all of us*, which suggests that farmers are the prototype of American values, so all real Americans (and in particular the Super Bowl audience) share in their mythic values to some extent. (Even leftist non-football fans: as George Lakoff has reminded us again and again in his overall scholarship, if you are really angered by some expressions of value, that clearly indicates you participate in and understand the relevant frames.) Again, the Ram truck is displayed but not mentioned; finally it gets linguistic mention in the logo which ends the ad: *Ram: Guts and Glory*. The ''guts'' part of this logo is easy to tie to the content of the ad; a farmer would need guts to work as hard as the depicted characters do. The ''glory'' part is less obvious, since the farmers depicted don't seem to be rich or fame-seeking; of course, Farmers are being glorified specifically in this ad, but they are portrayed as largely unsung heroes. I argue below that the word *glory* is what brings Football Players explicitly into the blend.

4. Metaphors and metonyms that tie it all together

Nowhere in the ad is it stated that the eulogized mythic Farmer character is *metaphoric* for the Ram truck: THE RAM TRUCK IS AN AMERICAN FARMER. Yet, helped by general relevance principles, the mappings emerge very clearly. The Farmer is literally represented as over-the-top with respect to characteristics such as:

Hard Work
Versatility (he can turn his hand to shoeing horses with tires, etc.)
Endurance (he gets to those meetings in town after the long farm day, and he manages to live through reverses and losses),
Honesty (via another metaphor: he plows ''straight'' and doesn't ''cut corners'')
Thoroughness (he doesn't ''cut corners'' when he plows)
Effectiveness (he ''gets the job done'')

In the visuals, the Dodge Ram truck is clearly shown to be capable of doing rough work like hauling over farm roads (A STURDY AND HIGH-POWERED VEHICLE IS A STRONG, HARDWORKING PERSON); it is multi-purpose, serving as a family vehicle as well as a farm truck (A MULTIPURPOSE OBJECT IS A VERSATILE AGENT); it apparently is capable of constant and lengthy usage in rough circumstances, since it is always there (PHYSICAL DURABILITY IS PSYCHOLOGICAL ENDURANCE AND DETERMINATION); and it's useful for all these things, it gets the job done (A USEFUL OBJECT IS AN EFFECTIVE AGENT). Thus, although the truck is never linguistically mentioned till the end of the ad, the entire ad is both a literal mythic hymning of the Farmer, and a metaphoric paean to the Dodge Ram.

Likewise, the truck *metonymically* participates in the frames of the mythic Farmer's life, which visually includes not only the frames mentioned above, but also Family, (Protestant) Religious Faith (remember the depicted church), Rural Community, Citizenship (people who go to PTA school meetings also probably vote), and more. And via a phrase such as *the farmer in all of us* we know that these frames are supposed to characterize the prototype of the larger category of Americans – and thus the target viewing audience of the prototypical American sport, football. Prototypical American *values* are thus part of what is glorified in the Super Bowl: not coincidentally, professional football players do work hard to achieve versatile high skills in their sport, and they have Guts which bring them victory – the Glory of the logo. So football itself is hymned, metonymically.

We must also return to the linguistic framing of the ad, which specifically states that God created the Farmer on an imagined ''8th Day'' of Creation, specifically as guardian for his earthly paradise. There is little need to point out the cynicism of such a claim, given what we said above about large agribusiness and the decline of the traditional family farm. But the ethics of the ad's mythic Farmer are not just abstract ethics, they are Protestant religious values, and his Work Ethic is a Protestant one. We might feel differently about this claim if we saw a Hispanic Catholic church depicted, for example, or more non-white people; but the only church depicted is the ''standard'' Midwestern one, presumably Protestant. We do not know which kind of Protestant, of course; but the frame of Creation could potentially bring up frames such as Creationism, and hence an evangelical Christianity. On the other hand – particularly since the Bible mentions no 8th Day! – viewers are free to take this ''Creation Story'' of the Farmer metaphorically, as a way of tying the Farmer closely to the land as a caretaker without very specific claims about any relation to God and the book of *Genesis*.

All of these frames are extremely far from the Dodge Ram's actual primary market, as manifested in Super Bowl viewers. Most Super Bowl viewers are naturally not family farmers. A majority of them are likely to be urban, since a majority of Americans are. And most new Dodge Rams are going to be sold to non-farmers; insurance rates are extremely high on new pickup trucks in the U.S., in significant measure because a large number of buyers are urban people who get into accidents when they take their first 4-wheel-drive vehicle off-road. But some of those purchasers may somehow feel as if they are connecting to an ethos of ''rurality'', if not of farming, by buying a 4-wheel-drive truck, even an expensive new one with many high-tech ''features'' and high levels of gasoline consumption. And this ad is helping them to buy into that ethos. Of course, any successful ad draws viewers into the producer's intended viewpoint frames – but this ad has a particularly large distance to cross, at least at first glance. How does it cross that gap?

5. Multiple spaces and blending

The core Farmer/Dodge Ram metaphor is never linguistically laid out in the ad, but emerges primarily from the juxtaposition of the Farmer-related text and images with the presence of the Ram truck in some of those images, and the final Ram logo. Another level of examination, however, suggests that we really need a *multi-space* blend, rather than just a two-space metaphoric mapping set, to understand this data. First of all, the truck can only be a metaphoric Farmer via input from other pre-fab metaphor structures. The basic metaphor for English speakers is a construal of psychological Self in terms of physical Self, not the reverse. Words like *fragile* and *sturdy* refer primarily to physical entities, and then metaphorically to psyches. Thus, we have to first understand the Farmer's psychological endurance in terms of his physical endurance (for example), and then subsequently understand the Ram truck's physical durability and strength in terms of the Farmer (who is psychologically determined and persistent, not just physically strong). The Farmer's simple physical endurance is not morally laudable, as his psychological determination and work ethic certainly are. Thus we finally understand the truck as not just a physically well-made object but an admirably hardworking Person. This is a multi-frame structure, with one metaphoric blend as input to another.

And on top of that, the final logo *Ram: Guts and Glory* reminds us that football is part of this multi-space blend as well. The Farmer is presented as an ''unsung'' hero; glory is attached, rather, to the prominent football players involved in the Superbowl, for which the Ram ad was made. Pragmatic context is the primary factor evoking this mapping: if this were not a Superbowl ad, we might not feel Football Players as a major input to the blended space. But they have a good fit to the Farmer/Ram blend: top athletes must have strength and endurance, must work exceptionally hard to reach their skill level, and need to be (at least within the context of the game) extremely versatile and adaptable to changing contexts. In other words, they too exemplify some of the prototypically American literal virtues of the Farmer (metaphorically attributed to the Ram truck). Football is a quintessentially American sport, so American football players are prototypes for the Star Athlete and for the American. The Farmer, the Football Player and the Truck are thus all Ideal Americans.

Also, the high-powered high-tech pickup truck, unlike the Farmer, is evoking frames of Speed and Adventure/ Excitement – which are strongly linked to the Football Star rather than to the Farmer. Dodge wants viewers to see the Ram as exciting – which the Farmer isn't. Many new pickup trucks are bought not by purchasers who need a pickup for work, but by urban Americans who like them for their powerful engines and may want to take them off-road (Adventure). Thus, in a complex three-space blend, the Truck is not just a metaphoric Farmer, but a metaphoric fast and exciting Football Star. And the Football Star (despite being so exciting) is also a metaphoric Hardworking Farmer, with an American work ethic.

The ''ideal American'' paean to the Farmer is thus addressed both to the Truck and to the athletes whose game is the occasion for the ad. (Given the constant salience of those athletes in the Superbowl context, there is no need to mention them inside the ad.) And, since the Farmer and the Football players have been identified as prototypes of the very category to which the Superbowl viewers are assumed to belong (blue-collar, hardworking – and largely white – male Americans), the ad ends up metonymically offering praise to the viewers as well, since they too are presupposed to share these Ideal American values.

6. Visual and other viewpoints

There are cases where both source and target frames are simultaneously presented visually in an ad, leaving little but a brand-name for the text track to add. Most typically these are cases of *image metaphor*, the mapping of one visual image onto another (cf. Lakoff and Turner, 1989; Dancygier and Sweetser, 2014). A classic example in advertising can be found in Toyota Prius advertisements of the first decade of the 21st century, which repeatedly showed the image of the Prius car shape (a visually distinctive car shape) onto the shape of a leaf. We can also cite the apparently pervasive use of bent cigarette images in anti-smoking ads, which apparently originated with ads linking smoking causally to sexual impotence in men (cf. Fauconnier and Turner, 2002). Early adopters of the Prius (the first broadly marketed hybrid car) might well have found fuel efficiency a financial advantage; but Toyota's ad is not about financial benefit. There is structural mapping of the shape of the leaf onto the shape of the car; and there is also (via an added metonymy of the green leaf for Nature) added inferential structure about the car as a result, specifically about the benefits of fuel efficiency for ecology. Our viewpoint on Nature will thus (it is intended) shape our viewpoint on this car. Likewise, image-mapping a bent (always downwards bent, not upwards) cigarette onto a non-erect penis is in fact mapping two non-favored scenarios onto each other. But the non-depicted scenario of the non-erect penis is of course far more strikingly negative – and the negative evaluator viewpoint is intended to transfer to the cigarette, and (metonymically) to the frame of cigarette-smoking. Thus, blended visual viewpoint is intended to evoke a blended social evaluative viewpoint.

In more complex scenes, camera viewpoint can be as powerful in ads as in feature films, and can shape viewpoint for the larger network of spaces evoked. The manipulation of physical viewpoint in the Dodge Ram ad is particularly striking. At the start of the ad, in particular, the photos are from above: a ''God's-eye'' viewpoint of this ''paradise'' inhabited by the Farmer, as the ad describes God looking down on the imagined 8th Day. But the rest of the ad is framed visually as a ''documentary'' of events in the lives of farmers; and the speaker takes the viewpoint of an admiring onlooker who sees the farmers' virtues (and apparently no shortcomings to speak of). But the visuals, as will be discussed a bit more below, make it clear what racial and gender viewpoint is taken – the depicted and admired Farmer is a white male head of a family (and of a family farm). Thus, it is easy to align the social viewpoint of the ad's linguistic content and of its chosen visual images, if not the physical viewpoint of those images, with the social viewpoints of likely Superbowl viewers, mostly male Americans and many of them white.

We may note here the major difference between the ad's viewpoint and that of the original Paul Harvey speech. Paul Harvey was speaking not to American football fans in general but to members of the farming community. No matter how dedicated to farming these young audience members might be, they would be unlikely to idealize it as impractically and non-humorously as the ad sound track does. And, sincere as Paul Harvey's speech may have been (at any rate, unlike the ad, it was really intended to praise farmers, not trucks!) it was humorous too, in speaking to these young people – a humor which the Dodge advertisers deleted in using his text as part of their ad. The real question might be, how do the advertisers get away with this completely cynical use of the least cynical parts of a text about farmers, to sell a truck? And here we come back to the pragmatics.

This raises another question. Viewpoint in blends, as Dancygier and Sweetser argued, is often inherited from viewpoint in one of the input frames. If, by imposing a particular physical viewpoint in an ad (in one of the Source domains of a metaphoric ad), the advertiser can attract social viewpoint in the Target domain, this would be a potentially very insidious way to draw viewers into a desired sociocognitive viewpoint. We can potentially see this in some of the other ads mentioned: the Cymbalta ad, for example, seems primarily from relatively close physical viewpoints of the depressed subjects – perhaps the sympathetic (and suffering) viewpoint of relatives and friends who cannot get the depressed person to go outside or do more cheerful things.

Similarly, humor often results (Coulson, 2006) from contrasting viewpoints or framings. Paul Harvey's original speech was funny precisely because it simultaneously eulogized the prototype Farmer, and affectionately made fun of this prototype. In creating the new ad's voiceover, the second half of this was removed, thus limiting the linguistic viewpoint to a eulogistic one – though an over-the-top eulogistic one.

But in a series of questions, we can now ask what place the advertiser's viewpoint has in any complex multi-frame ad. Obviously viewers attribute to the advertiser any legally required text concerning, e.g. ingredients of an advertised food, or possible dangers of an advertised medication. But when the ad presents a fictional narrative, as the Ram ad does, how do we attribute that narrative? The Ram narrative says that farmers are so resourceful that they shoe horses from old tires;

this is obviously false in the outside world, but we can't accuse the ad of *lying* in this instance. But, in the context of the fiction, we would admire someone resourceful enough to do this; and our admiring viewpoint is potentially extended through the network to Ram trucks and even Football Players.

Advertising constantly creates such fictional narratives – but unlike fiction films, these narratives are about real-world products. A TV ad from the 1970s (here I rely on my personal memory) presented a scenario where an Italian American grandmother produces (a particular brand of) frozen lasagna to feed her visiting grandson, who is amazed by how wonderful it is (just like Grandma's). Viewers naturally sympathize with the viewpoint of the Grandma wanting to give her grandson a good meal, and with the viewpoint of the grandson who likes Grandma's supposed cooking. How do we analyze the viewpoint blend thus created? Viewers clearly don't really think the advertised frozen lasagna is up to the level of the prototypical Italian Grandma lasagna. But in the narrative world, it *is*. And the Grandson character endorses this. In such accepted fictional narratives, no Truth in Advertising issues intervene – but that allows corporate advertiser viewpoint to dominate from start to finish, with essentially no restrictions. This seems an important set of questions for future research.

7. Conclusion

Basically, then, multimodal advertising is using many of the same mechanisms used by clever artistic writers to give readers the satisfaction of feeling themselves *actively build* mental space blends (as Sweetser and Sullivan argue). *You*, the viewer, are dragged along into realizing that the farmer and the football player are metaphors for the truck, and the farmer for the football player. (Or maybe you aren't, but it may still be a fuzzy-sweet literal text.) Some of the spaces are presented implicitly rather than explicitly – as the Ram ad's Farmer narrative brings up the Ram frame by including the truck in the images, and evokes the Football frame purely from the Superbowl context and the word *Glory* – leaving blend construction to the viewer.

Physical viewpoint on an ad scene does not leave the viewer as much space to actively construe: viewers are certainly more passive recipients of camera angle, as well as of alignment of shapes in ad visuals. However, even there, the blend is not determined entirely by the physical viewpoint or the superimposition of image metaphoric mappings: viewers are not told how to build a Prius-leaf inferential mapping, even if the visual mapping is almost inescapable from the ad's image.

Generally, give viewers parts of the puzzle, and – aided by metonymy, generic spaces and conventional mappings – they'll build the whole complex space. A particular viewer may or may not end up with a full three-way mapping between Dodge Ram, farmer and (even more implicit in the ad, but there in the pragmatic context) tough versatile football player; or with a multiple blend of pain, darkness, isolation, and depression (in the Blend, though not in any one space, these are all cured by Cymbalta). In any case, the ad involves the viewer more actively by prompting such active construction rather than by listing mappings overtly.

Numerous scholars have pointed out (following the lead of Lakoff and Turner, 1989) that most creative literary metaphor could not exist without being built ''on the shoulders'' of everyday conventional metaphor structures. The same can be said of creative advertising, clearly. Both the creators of complex ads, and the viewers who are following their multimodal prompts to build complex blends, rely on the everyday cognitive currency of cognition and culture: familiar frames, frame metonymies to evoke those frames, pre-fab conventional metaphor mappings, and image blends. If we did not have A NATION IS A HOME, or SADNESS IS DARKNESS, creative ads could not be based on them. For an audience lacking an American Family Farm frame, the little white church would not help build up the Farmer side of the Dodge Ram ad. And, like literary authors – though for vastly different reasons – part of their strategy and intent is to guide the viewpoint of the audience by guiding such blend-construction.

Further, this analysis is by no means problematic for traditional Conceptual Metaphor Theory in itself – though it does add to that theory and problematizes some of its claims. Assuming, following Fauconnier and Turner (2002) (and Dancygier and Sweetser (2014)), that two-frame metaphors are just the simplest case of a broader potential for multi-space blending, we can readily identify particular unidirectional metaphoric mappings in the complex ads we examine here. We are *not* seeing Farmers, or Football Stars, as Dodge trucks (despite the rhetoric, the Dodge company is not ultimately boosting either of these groups, which it assumes are already highly valued), but rather we are seeing the trucks as Farmers and Football Players, and the Football Players as Farmers. But correct though they are, these individual mappings are no means enough to account for the complex result of this *combination* of mappings into a multi-space network, whereby (also thanks to category metonymy and the concept of the Ideal American), somehow a new Dodge Ram truck becomes a prototype of American values. For that we need a broader viewpoint, where individual metaphoric mappings form part of a multi-space network.

References

Cienki, Alan, Müller, Cornelia (Eds.), 2008. Metaphor and Gesture.

Coulson, Seana, 2006. Semantic Leaps: Frame Shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Dancygier, Barbara, Sweetser, Eve, 2014. Figurative Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Fauconnier, Gilles, Turner, Mark, 2002. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities. Basic Books, New York.
Forceville, Charles J., 1996. Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising. Routledge, London/New York.
Forceville, Charles J., 2009. Nonverbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: agendas for research. In: Forceville, Charles J., Urios, Eduardo (Eds.), Multimodal Metaphor. Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 19–42.
Forceville, Charles J., 2016. Pictorial and multimodal metaphor. In: Klug, Nina-Maria, Stöckl, Hartmut (Eds.), Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext. (The Language in Multimodal Contexts Handbook).Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 241–260.
Lakoff, George, 1987. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark, 1980. Metaphors We Live by. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark, 1999. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought. Basic Books, New York.
Lakoff, George, Turner, Mark, 1989. More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
McQuarrie, Edward F., Mick, David Glen, 1996. Figures of rhetoric in advertising language. J. Consum. Res. 22, 424–438.
McQuarrie, Edward F., Mick, David Glen, 1998. Visual rhetoric in advertising: text-interpretive, experimental and reader-response analyses. J. Consum. Res. 26, 37–54.
McQuarrie, Edward F., Mick, David Glen, 2003. Visual and verbal rhetorical figures under directed processing versus incidental exposure to advertising. J. Consum. Res. 29, 579–587.
McQuarrie, Edward F., Mick, David Glen, 2009. A laboratory study of the effect of verbal rhetoric versus repetition when consumers are not directed to process advertising. Int. J. Advert. 28 (2), 287–312.
Mittelberg, Irene, 2008. Piercean semiotics meets conceptual metaphor: Iconic modes in gestural representations of grammar. In: Tyler, Andrea, Kim, Yiyoung, Takada, Mari (Eds.), Language in the Context of Use: Discourse and Cognitive Approaches to Language. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 301–320.
Müller, Cornelia, 2008. Metaphors Dead and Alive, Sleeping and Waking: A Dynamic View. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Müller, Cornelia, Cienki, Alan, Fricke, Ellen, Ladewig, Silva H., McNeill, David, Tessendorf, Sedinha, 2013. Body – Language – Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Communication. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
Pérez Sobrino, Paula, 2017. Multimodal Metaphor and Metonymy in Advertising. John Benjamins, Amsterdam https://www.benjamins.com/#catalog/books/ftl.2/main (forthcoming)
Sweetser, Eve, Sullivan, Karen, 2012. Minimalist metaphors. Eng. Text Constr. 5 (2), 153–173.
van Mulken, M., le Pair, R., Forceville, Charles J., 2010. The impact of perceived complexity, deviation and comprehension on the appreciation of visual metaphor in advertising across three European countries. J. Pragmat. 42, 3418–3430.

Ads cited.

Most of the ads cited can still be found on the Internet. The Dodge Ram ad analyzed can be found at the time of writing at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AMpZ0TGjbWE or by searching for ''Dodge Ram Superbowl Farmer ad.''

Eve Sweetser is Professor of Linguistics and Cognitive Science at the University of California, Berkeley. She is past President of the International Cognitive Linguistics Association, and has been a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and of the Cinepoetics Institute at the Freie Universität Berlin. She is the author of *From Etymology to Pragmatics* (1990, Cambridge UP), and co-author with Barbara Dancygier of *Mental Spaces in Grammar* (2005, Cambridge UP) and *Figurative Language* (2014, Cambridge UP). Her central research interests include metaphor and figurative language, construction grammar, co-speech gesture, and multimodality.