

Metaphors in Wine-tasting Notes in English and Spanish*

El lenguaje metafórico en las fichas de cata de vino en inglés y en español

BELÉN LÓPEZ ARROYO

ACTRES-Universidad de Valladolid. Departamento de Filología Inglesa. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Plaza del Campus s/n. 47011 Valladolid. Spain

Dirección de correo electrónico: belenl@lia.uva.es

ORCID: 0000-0002-9171-1910.

RODA P. ROBERTS

ACTRES-University of Ottawa. Bilingual Canadian Dictionary. 40 Stewart, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5.

Dirección de correo electrónico: roberts@uottawa.ca

Recibido: 18/6/2015. Aceptado: 27/9/2016.

Cómo citar: López Arroyo, Belén and Roda P. Roberts, «Metaphors in Wine-tasting Notes in English and Spanish», *Hermēneus. Revista de traducción e interpretación* 19 (2017): 139-163.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24.197/her.19.2017.139-163>

Abstract: Conceptual metaphor in cognitive linguistics involves understanding one semantic domain in terms of the other. Conceptual associations between domains have been considered universal, unidirectional and usage-based. However, the concept of universality is rather controversial, since it contradicts that of culture: different cultures may convey the same reality by using different metaphorical sources. The purpose of this paper is to examine to what extent the concept of universality holds true for metaphors found in wine-tasting notes written by wine experts. Our corpus-based methodology involves identifying metaphors linked to selected key terms and analyzing them both quantitatively and qualitatively. Our results show that the differences in English and Spanish cultures do not seem to affect the metaphorical use of language in wine-tasting notes.

Keywords: Conceptual metaphor; metaphorical expression; culture; English and Spanish contrastive analysis; corpus-based studies.

Resumen: La metáfora conceptual, para la lingüística cognitiva, implica entender un dominio semántico en términos de otro. A menudo se ha considerado que las asociaciones conceptuales son universales, unidireccionales y dependientes del uso. Sin embargo, el concepto de

* Research for this article has been undertaken as part of the ACTRES program, partly funded by the Castilla and León Regional Government (LE227413), and the Ministry of Education (FFI2013-42994-R). ACTRES stands for Análisis Contrastivo y Traducción Especializada / Contrastive Analysis and Specialized Translation.

universalidad es muy controvertido ya que enfrenta dos conceptos, el de universalidad y el de cultura; es decir, diferentes culturas pueden transmitir la misma realidad usando diferentes recursos metafóricos. El objetivo de este artículo es comprobar el concepto de universalidad en el lenguaje metafórico de fichas de cata escritas por expertos. Nuestra metodología implica la identificación de las metáforas de acuerdo con determinados términos clave y su posterior análisis en términos cualitativos y cuantitativos. Nuestros resultados demuestran que las diferencias entre las culturas implicadas no parecen afectar al uso metafórico en las fichas de cata.

Palabras clave: Metáfora conceptual; expresión metafórica; cultura; análisis contrastivo inglés / español; lingüística del corpus.

Summary: 1. Introduction; 2. Literature review; 3. Methodology, 3.1. Selection of terms for analysis, 3.2. Description of the corpus, 3.3. Methodological issues, 3.3.1. Metaphor identification, 3.3.2. Role of context, 3.3.3. Contexts, 3.3.4. Source domains, 3.3.5. Metaphor types; 4. Results; 5 Comparison of metaphors in English and Spanish wine language; 6. Conclusion.

Sumario: Introducción. 2. Estado de la cuestión. 3 Metodología. 3.1 Criterios de análisis. 3.2 Descripción del corpus. 3.3 Aspectos metodológicos. 3.3.1 Identificación de las metáforas. 3.3.2 Aspectos pragmáticos. 3.3.3 Contextos. 3.3.4 Mapas conceptuales de las metáforas en el lenguaje del vino 3.3.5 Tipos de metáforas. 4 Resultados. 5. Análisis contrastivo de las metáforas del lenguaje del vino en Inglés y en Español. 6 Conclusión.

1. INTRODUCTION

Conceptual metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics (CMT) is understood as a mapping between two conceptual domains, where properties from one domain (the source) are transferred onto another domain (the target) (Caballero and Ibarretxe, 2013: 268). Metaphor is seen as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5). Metaphor is considered a cognitive mechanism and is differentiated from metaphorical language, that is, the instantiation of conceptual metaphor.

The conceptual associations between source and target have usually been considered universal in that they are based on experience shared by all human beings (Caballero and Ibarretxe, 2013: 269). They are also deemed to be unidirectional since the usually abstract target domain is understood by means of information mapped from the usually physical or more concrete source domain, but not vice versa (Caballero and Suárez Toste, 2008: 250). CMT also focusses on what are known “as usage-based approaches to language, given the emphasis placed upon exploring and discussing real instances of verbal interaction” (Caballero and Ibarretxe, 2013: 268).

However, the notions of universality, unidirectionality and usage as they stand in mainstream CMT are controversial. This is especially true of the concept of universality, which clashes to some extent with that of culture (Caballero and Ibarretxe, 2013: 269). The critical role of culture in characterizing conceptual metaphors is still underexplored in the theory. Two cultures may convey the same ‘reality’ by drawing upon different metaphorical sources (e.g., understanding is seeing vs. understanding is hearing). A look at various discourses and communities suggests that metaphors depend, to a large extent, on their interaction with the world, i.e., culture (e.g., the use of different perception sources to articulate cognition targets) (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5).

In this paper culture is seen as “encompassing two related notions: on the one hand, it refers to the shared beliefs, knowledge and world view(s) characterizing ‘broad’ communities (national, ethnic, or speech communities); on the other, culture also refers to the particular communities –or sub-cultures– that share specific knowledge schemas, needs, interests and language, and are subsumed within the aforementioned broad cultural frame –or Culture with capital C” (Caballero and Ibarretxe, 2013: 270).

The purpose of this paper is to see how metaphor is used in two different languages by two different cultures (speech communities), using wine tasting notes as our source of data and therefore dealing with the same sub-culture, that of wine experts. More specifically, we want to investigate the following aspects:

1. Is a metaphoric expression in one language usually rendered by a metaphoric expression in another language?
2. If so, does the conceptual domain remain the same in both languages?
3. Are metaphoric expressions used more frequently in one language than another?
4. Are the metaphors used more conventional than creative in one language than another?

According to Caballero, “the tasting note is one of the most representative and popular genres in wine discourse, as well as a key

instrument in the process of acculturation” and “metaphors underlying the wine discourse cut across languages and cultures as well as across national and regional differences” (Caballero 2007: 2100). We wish to see to what extent this is true.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Although Caballero (2007: 2100) observed that figurative language, especially metaphorical language and its subgroups, has been neglected in most studies on wine writing, many articles have focused on metaphor in wine language, both before and after Caballero made that statement (Coutier, 1994; Amoraritei, 2002; Gluck, 2003; Lehrer, 2007, 2009; Suárez-Toste, 2007; Negro 2011; among others). Most of these studies deal with wine writing in a single language: primarily English, but also French and Spanish. We have been able to identify only a few relatively recent studies which are clearly a comparative analysis of metaphors in wine writing in two languages, Rossi’s *Pour une description du processus de création des métaphores dans le langage du vin – étude comparative français-italien* (2012) and Bratoz’s *The Anthropomorphic Metaphor in Slovene and English Wine Tasting Discourses* (2013).

These works highlight the dominance of metaphors in wine language, and they generally attribute the widespread use of metaphor to the fact that the tasting vocabulary is rather poor. According to Coutier (1994: 662), “Gustatory impressions do not correspond to an objective referential vocabulary and as these impressions are often highly subjective, the vocabulary describing them is marked by analogy and metaphor ...” While most wine-language researchers seem to not only accept but also welcome the use of metaphors, Peynaud’s opinion of the role of metaphor seems to be that of a necessary evil, if used in moderation: “There are circumstances where a little fantasy is appropriate ... But a word of advice: do not overdo it. Not all wines can stand exaggerated descriptions and not all audiences can put up with the absurd” (in Bruce, 1999: 158).

Several researchers (Suárez-Toste, 2007; Bratoz, 2013) point out that, while conceptual metaphors may refer to the wine itself, these are often expanded endlessly to cover other, more specific aspects (color, tannin, etc). So, for example, the adjective *seductive* can be used to describe a wine in general or one of its aspects (e.g., *seductive currant and blackberry fruit*).

After indicating the problems of metaphor identification, researchers have generally set about the task of classifying the metaphors they have identified, initially on the basis of the experiential domains where the lexis seems to originate—the source domains. Their source domain classifications are remarkably similar, which some have interpreted as being indicative of the universality of metaphors. However, as Negro points out, the French wine discourse has exclusive characterizations of wine in terms of food and music imagery (2011: 482).

Finally, a few researchers take the classification of metaphors a step further and comment on the conventional/creative nature of wine-related metaphors. While the majority of these metaphors are conventional, creative metaphors are also found in wine writing.

3. METHODOLOGY

Our corpus-based contrastive study of metaphors in English and Spanish wine language involves the following steps:

1. Selecting terms to be analyzed for metaphorical use in our corpus.
2. Searching for terms in the corpus and classifying them as retained for further analysis, not retained for further analysis at this stage, not retained for further analysis and deleted from our list.
3. Analyzing the metaphorical expressions identified both quantitatively and qualitatively.
4. Arriving at conclusions based on our corpus findings, bearing in mind the culture-related questions posed above.

3. 1. Selection of terms for analysis

One way to identify metaphorical expressions in a corpus is to read through all (or a given number of) texts and pinpoint all items that seem metaphorical in nature. This is a very long and painstaking process which does not take advantage of computerized tools, the results of which may not justify the time and effort involved. Another way to identify metaphorical expressions in a corpus is to choose a source domain (e.g., Human beings) by means of which information is mapped onto the target domain (e.g., wine), then select a number of key terms related to human beings (e.g., *age, young, old, character, strong, robust*) and finally, using a browser, identify contexts in the corpus containing these words to see if

they are indeed used metaphorically in wine discourse. While this method does allow for the use of a browser, the research is necessarily limited to one or two source domains. We chose a different method, which we considered more inclusive and also more objective, i.e., less dependent on the researcher's personal choices or their total reliance on intuition to pinpoint metaphors.

We began with a list of 145 wine descriptors drawn up by Lehrer (2009: 99-100) for use in her wine tasting experiments, which were designed to investigate systematically how speakers actually describe and discuss wines when they are drinking them. These terms were selected from wine descriptors found in the published literature on wine, and those selected were the most frequently used and those for which definitions or characterizations could be found. This original list was later shortened by Lehrer to 117 words, mostly by deleting some words that the earlier subjects never or rarely used, although a few new words that these subjects found useful were added. Given that Lehrer's list included items other than metaphoric expressions, we attempted to further reduce her list by comparing the items it contained with items found in four articles on metaphors in wine language: Bratoz (2013), Suarez-Toste (2007), Caballero and Ibarretxe (2013), and Caballero and Suarez-Toste (2008). We retained those items marked as metaphorical or found in a metaphorical example in at least one of these articles. This stage of elimination left us with a total of 59 items in English that were potentially metaphorical in wine language.

In order to be able to do a comparative study of metaphors in English and Spanish, we elected to use the Spanish equivalents of the English terms as our starting point in Spanish. Thus the 59 terms or term combinations in English are matched with 59 terms or term combinations in Spanish. By term combinations we mean derivatives grouped together (e.g., ES *elegante* + *elegancia*), or simple terms and compounds grouped together (e.g., EN light + light-bodied), or two Spanish equivalents used to translate the same English word (e.g., ES *gordo* + *grueso* used to render EN fat)¹. So, although we have based all our analytical remarks on

¹ However, in two cases, two English words have a single equivalent in Spanish (EN smooth and soft = ES *suave*; and EN firm and solid = ES *firme*. Several other groupings have been included in our analysis: *elegante* and *elegancia* because of the common features they share; *fine* and *finesse* and their Spanish counterparts *fino* and *finura* because they are part of the same family and share common features; *alegre* and *vivaz* as they share common features; and *poderoso* and *potente*.

59 terms and term combinations examined in each language, we are actually dealing with a larger number of different terms. Presented below are the English and Spanish terms:

Table 1

ENGLISH	SPANISH	ENGLISH	SPANISH
aged	envejecido	Nutty	nuez
aromatic	aromático	Oaky	amaderado
austere	austero	Old	de guarda
big	amplio	Perfumed	perfumado
bouquet	Buqué	Powerful	poderoso + potente
bland	insípido	Rich	rico
character	(con) character	Ripe	maduro
clean	limpio	Robust	robusto
complex	complejo	Round	redondo
delicate	delicado	Savory	sabroso
earthy	terroso	Scented	(con) esencia
elegant	elegante + elegancia	Sharp	anguloso
fat	gordo + grueso	Smooth	suave
feminine	femenino	Soft	suave
fine + finesse	fino + finura	Solid	firme
firm	firme	Sour	agrio
flabby	flojo	Spicy	especiado
flat	plano	Strong	fuerte
fresh	fresco	Succulent	suculento
fruity	afrutado	Subtle	sutil
full-bodied	(con) cuerpo	Sweet	dulce
grap(e)y	varietal	Tannic	tánico
graceful	elegante	Tart	ácido + amargo
green	verde	Thin	delgado
heavy	pesado	Velvety	aterciopelado
honest	honesto	Vigorous	vigoroso
light (+ light-bodied)	ligero	Weak	débil

lively	alegre + vivaz	Wild	salvaje
metallic	metálico	Young	joven
mineral	mineral		

These 59 English terms (or term combinations)² and their Spanish equivalents were searched in our corpus using a browser.

3. 2. Description of the corpus

Our corpus is an English and Spanish comparable corpus of wine tasting notes, selected from specialized websites such as the websites for Denominations of Origin in Spain and the VQA Ontario Appellations of Origin website in English (among others). All the wine-tasting notes chosen were included in wine-tasting technical sheets released by wineries. The corpus contains over 700 notes in each of the languages.³

The 59 English lexical items and their Spanish equivalents were each examined in turn, as follows:

Step 1: The lexical item was searched in the corpus. If the item was not found there, it was eliminated from our list. If it was found in the corpus, we continued with the following steps.

² *Light-bodied* was not on Lehner's list but showed up in our EN corpus when we browsed for contexts with *light*. It was therefore added to *light* and grouped with it because of their semantic relationship;

³ Each of the texts in the comparable corpus is individually labelled for rhetorical structure, using a specially created computer program. The Tagger is an on-line software component designed to signal the rhetorical moves in every corpus as well as to manage and store the labelled files (for further information see <http://contraste2.unileon.es/apps/suite/app.php/login?u=public&p=actres>). Once the English and Spanish texts are tagged with rhetorical labels, the various moves and steps can be further compared and analysed using a specially created browser, whose search menu includes an option to analyze and contrast rhetorical structures as well as a concordancer, <http://contraste2.unileon.es/apps/suite/app.php/login?u=public&p=actres>. The browser allows the user the possibility of restricting the searches to a given move and/or step/substep. The concordancer allows the user to examine linguistic items in context. These were the tools used to analyze potential metaphorical expressions in our corpus.

Step 2: The concordance lines for the lexical item in question were examined to see if the item was used metaphorically in all, some or none of the contexts.

- If the item was not used metaphorically in any contexts or in any pertinent contexts, it was not retained for further analysis.
- If the item was used metaphorically only in a single pertinent context, it was not retained for further analysis at this stage, since a larger corpus would be required to confirm metaphorical use.
- If the item was used metaphorically in more than one context, those contexts were further analyzed to see what accounted for the metaphorical use of the item.

Step 3: Finally, for those items deemed to exhibit metaphorical use, we attempted to identify the source domain of the metaphor and then determine whether the metaphor was conventional or creative.

3.3. Methodological issues

3.3.1. Metaphor identification

Caballero and Ibarretxe (2013: 274) discuss the problem of metaphor identification. While they indicate that this has given rise to recent attempts to build an objective, scientific identification procedure by some scholars (Pragglejaz Group, 2007; Steen, 2007; Steen et al., 2010), research which has led to some interesting insights, they feel that metaphor identification remains an issue in all those approaches. And they point out, using a concrete example, that different individuals have different opinions on whether the use of a given word is metaphorical or not. They suggest that the different reactions show that the metaphorical status of a given expression may result from the disparity of the experiential domains involved as well as from the way it appears in a particular text.

3.3.2. Role of context

According to Caballero and Ibarretxe (2013: 274), the formal and contextual aspects intrinsic to the actual instantiation of metaphors need to be considered if we want to gain some insight into metaphor. And

there is no doubt that context is required to determine metaphorical use. A problem arises when trying to determine, on the basis of context, whether a term can generally be used metaphorically or whether an apparently metaphorical use of a term is due primarily to another element in the context. Let us consider the following contexts:

The supple tannins coupled with the oak give a STRONG, supportive backbone to this wine

The metaphorical use of ‘strong’ applied to a given wine is heightened in this context by the combination of *strong* with the words *supportive* and *backbone*. However, merely adding a descriptive term to *backbone* does not automatically mean that term is used metaphorically, as the following example reveals:

The palate offers beautifully ripened fruit, a firm yet not too TANNIC backbone, with a rich and extremely long flavorful finish.

In this example, *tannic backbone* simply means ‘a backbone of tannins’. While *backbone* is used metaphorically here, *tannic* is not.

3.3.3. Contexts

Contexts for each of the terms in our original list were carefully examined, both globally and in terms of their constituents, before we decided if the term was used metaphorically or not in each case. Moreover, we required a minimum of two contexts of metaphorical use before declaring that the term represented a metaphor.

3.3.4. Source domains

Following the cognitive theory of metaphor, metaphor involves understanding a domain of experience (the target domain) in terms of a more concrete domain (the source domain). Our target domain, as indicated by our corpus, is wine, and more specifically all aspects of wine involved in wine tasting. Rather than reinvent the wheel in terms of source domains, we have borrowed our source domain categories from different researchers working on metaphor in the language of wine:

Coutier (1994), Caballero and Suárez-Toste (2008), Negro (2011), Bratoz (2013), among others.

Caballero and Suárez-Toste (2010: 281-286) have identified five metaphors in the language of wine tasting in the English language:

- Wines are living beings. This generic-level metaphor subsumes the specific-level metaphors: wines are people, wines are animals and wines are plants, which are instantiated by terms like *muscular*, *feminine*, *bold*, *expressive*, *shy*, *austere*, *intellectual*, *ambitious*, *feline* and *fragrant*.
- Wines are clothes. Wines may be described as *silky*, *velvety smooth* or have a *glove* or *mantle*.
- Wines are three dimensional objects. Wines can be regarded as *square*, *angular* or *round*.
- Wines are buildings, as suggested by their being *fortified*.
- Wines are malleable wood or metal building material and are thus represented as *rough* or *molten*.

Negro's corpus-based research in French (2011: 481-484) gives evidence of five conceptual metaphors (i.e., wines are people, wines are clothes, wines are buildings, wines are objects and wines are food) and a set of synaesthetic metaphors drawn from the perceptual mode of hearing.

Basing ourselves on the source domains suggested by the researchers cited above, we have retained the following source domains and subdomains for our use, since they apply to our terms:

- Human beings: Age, Physical body, Personality, General appearance, Clothes, Economic condition
- Plants: Development
- Objects: Shape, Size, Firmness, Feel
- Buildings: Structure, Size
- Textiles: Feel
- Food: Taste

Where a metaphor can be interpreted as being derived from either of two source domains, both are indicated.

3.3.5. Metaphor types

Finally, all metaphorical expressions are classified as either conventional or creative, a distinction traditionally used by researchers on metaphor. Put very simply, “conventional metaphors are metaphorical usages which are found again and again to refer to a particular thing. Cases in point are the metaphors of cells *fighting off* infection and of micro-organisms *invading*; the metaphorical meaning of *divorced* to mean ‘completely separated’ and *field* to refer to a specialized subject or activity. These kinds of metaphors are institutionalized as part of the language. Most of the time we hardly notice them at all, and do not think of them as metaphorical when we use or encounter them” (Knowles and Moon, 2006). Creative metaphors, on the other hand, are original comparisons that call attention to themselves.

How does one distinguish between conventional and creative metaphors? Given that conventional metaphors are those that are commonly used, frequency has been proposed as a criterion. However, Keysar et al. (2000) suggest that the difference between them lies in how we understand them.

People can understand conventional expressions, such as I’m depressed, without recourse to any mappings between domains or, in Lakoff and Johnson’s terms, conceptual mappings such as Sad is down (2000: 591).

When, on the other hand, an expression or metaphor is novel, more inferential work must be done. To understand an expression such as the crime rate has reached meltdown proportions, people might either access or create an analogy between crime situations and nuclear reactors. If nuclear reactors had previously been encountered as a metaphor for dangerous situations, then the conceptual mapping between nuclear reactors and dangerous situations could be accessed and instantiated in terms of criminal activities (2000: 578).

We have based our categorization of metaphors as conventional or creative on two criteria: a) our ease of understanding the metaphor; and b) the inclusion of the terms under study in other studies on metaphors in wine language.

4. RESULTS

After an initial search for the 59 English terms or term combinations and 58 Spanish terms or term combinations (step 1 of the methodology), 10 were deleted from our English list and 14 from our Spanish list, because no examples were found in the corpus. This was the case for the English terms *austere*, *bland*, *flabby*, *flat*, *grap(e)y*, *honest*, *metallic*, *nutty*, *oaky and weak*, and for the Spanish terms *insipido*, *gordo + grueso*, *flojo*, *plano*, *verde*, *pesado*, *honesto*, *metálico*, *amaderado*, *anguloso*, *agrio*, *suculento*, *delgado*, *débil*.

After examining the corpus examples for the remaining 49 English and 44 Spanish terms and term combinations (step 2 of our methodology), 19 English terms and 14 Spanish terms were not retained for further analysis, for one of the following four reasons.

In a number of cases, we found only one example of metaphorical use in the corpus, which we considered insufficient evidence for our purpose. This was true, for instance, of the Spanish *salvaje*, which was used metaphorically in only one of four corpus examples: *Rico, ahumado y SALVAJE en la nariz con aromas de ciruelo aconfitado, licor de cereza, carne carbonizada, cafe, tabaco y caja de cigarros*.

In some cases, the examples were not pertinent, i.e. not related to wine; e.g. the only example for *fat* in the English corpus referred not to the wine being described, but to peaches: *The first impression is of FAT, ripe, golden peaches*.

In other cases, the corpus examples were wine-related, but the terms were not used metaphorically; e.g., the English *fruity* is used to qualify wine, its aromas, its flavours and its tannins, but it is always used in its literal sense as in the following context: *The 2006 Dolce is intensely FRUITY, driven by aromas of citrus and stone fruits*.

Finally, in a few instances, the corpus examples revealed that the apparent metaphorical use of the term was related not to wine, but to another element in the context. This is the case of the descriptor *solid* in the example *The SOLID partnership between the spicy Shiraz and the vivacious Mourvedre is supported by the perfumed flowery notes of the Viogier*, where *solid* is used metaphorically in the sense of ‘close-knit’, but this use is due to its association with the word “partnership” and not directly with the blended wine being described.

At this stage of analysis, the following terms were eliminated. English: *bouquet*, *fat*, *fruity*, *green*, *heavy*, *mineral*, *scented*, *sharp*, *solid*, *sour*, *spicy*, *succulent*, *subtle*, *sweet*, *tannic*, *tart*, *thin*, *vigorous*, and *wild*.

Spanish: *buqué, complejo, femenino, afrutado, varietal, mineral, nuez, sabroso, esencia, especiado, dulce, tánico, ácido + amargo, and salvaje*. After this process of elimination, we ended up with a list of 30 English and 30 Spanish terms used metaphorically, although the matching number of terms was purely coincidental. The following table presents these terms along with their equivalents in the other language. When the equivalent term in one language did not provide evidence of metaphorical use, it is presented in square brackets.

Table 2

ENGLISH	SPANISH
aged	envejecido + envejecimiento
aromatic	aromático
[austere]	austero
big	amplio
character	carácter
clean	limpio
complex	[complejo]
delicate	delicado
earthy	terroso
elegant	elegante + elegancia
feminine	[femenino]
fine + finesse	fino + finura
firm	firme
fresh	fresco
full-bodied	con cuerpo / de cuerpo
graceful	elegante
light +light-bodied	ligero
lively	alegre+vivaz
old	guarda
perfumed	perfumado
powerful	poderoso + potente
rich	rico
ripe	maduro
robust	robusto
round	redondo
savo(u)ry	[sabroso]

smooth	suave
soft	suave
[solid] strong	firme fuerte
[subtle]	sutil
velvety	aterciopelado
[vigorous] young	vigoroso joven

The first point that is worth mentioning is that these terms are used metaphorically not only when applied directly to wine (e.g., *young wine*, *aged wine*, *light(-bodied) wine*, *vino amplio*, *vino rico*), but also, in many cases, when applied to some important aspect of wine –i.e., nose, development, tannins, acidity, etc. (e.g., *big tannins*, *clean finish*, *finos taninos*, *estructura firme*). This finding supports Suarez-Toste’s conclusion (2007: 54) that conceptual metaphors that refer to the wine itself are often expanded endlessly to cover other, more specific aspects of wine.

The vast majority of the metaphors use “Human beings” as the basis of comparison; in other words, they are anthropomorphic. This is the case of 24 out of the 30 English terms and 23 out of the 30 Spanish terms demonstrating metaphorical use. Again, this confirms Suarez-Toste’s finding (2007: 54) that “if there is one inescapable schema in this context, that is surely anthropomorphic metaphor.” Other source domains are relatively rare: in English, “Plants” is the source domain for two metaphors, “Buildings” for two (but as an alternate domain, see below), and finally “Textiles” for one and “Food” for one; in Spanish, “Plants” is the source domain for three metaphors (although as an alternate domain for one), “Objects” for three (although in one case as an alternate domain), “Buildings” for three (again in two cases as an alternate domain), and finally “Textiles” for one.

However, in three cases in English (*firm*, *robust*, *round*) and in three cases in Spanish (*firme*, *robusto*, *maduro*), the metaphor could be interpreted in two different ways; in other words, there are two possible source domains for the metaphor, one of which is “Human beings”, the other being “Objects” (for *firm*, *round* and *firme*), “Buildings” (for *robust* and *robusto*), and “Plants” (for *maduro*). Although Lehrer (2009) has

pointed out the difficulty of interpreting certain words in winespeak,⁴ neither she nor any of those who have written on metaphor in wine have discussed the possibility of a wine-related metaphor having more than one potential source domain. However, Katz and Taylor (2008: 152) point out that conceptual metaphor theorists have posited multiple source domains that can be used to structure the target “LIFE” and it is possible that subsets of the participants in their empirical studies might employ different mappings or that even the same person might activate different mappings.

The possibility of different mappings, discussed above at the level of domains, is even more apparent at the level of subdomains. For example, the adjective *clean* in EN is clearly attached metaphorically to the source domain of “Human beings”, but it can be seen as relating either to the “Physical body” or “Clothes” of human beings. In the case of other terms like *delicate*, the subdomain could either be “General appearance” or the “Physical body” of human beings, depending on the context.

Of the 30 metaphorical expressions in English and the 30 in Spanish, the vast majority (28 in English and 29 in Spanish) presented conventional metaphors. Only three appear to be used more creatively: *aromatic* and *feminine* in English and *aromático* in Spanish. Although the English terms have been identified as metaphorical in other studies on wine language and would thus normally be categorized by us as conventional metaphors, some of the contexts in which they are found are rather original:

This rooster is sleek, suave and seductive. His AROMATIC presence reveals smoky oak, rich plum fruit, red licorice, black pepper, black cherry and clove spice scents.

The silky smooth palate is beautifully balanced; seamless, FEMININE and very approachable....

In both cases, there is obvious personification. In the context of *aromatic*, the wine, designated here as “this rooster” because it comes

⁴ Lehrer (2009: 31) cites as an example **pretentious (wine)**, which could be interpreted to mean a fairly expensive wine, labeled to imitate a wine that was better, or one that tries to surpass the noble wines in certain ways.

from the Red Rooster Winery, is seen as an attractive male. In the context for *feminine*, the taste of the wine is described as an attractive woman. While one might argue that *feminine* implies ‘woman’ and that there is no originality in this case and perhaps even no metaphorization, it seems unusual to present the palate (i.e. the sense of taste) as an attractive but approachable female. But such cases are rare. All in all, wine discourse in English, while full of metaphors, contains mainly conventional metaphors.

The same is true of Spanish, where only certain contexts for *aromático* revealed creative metaphorical use. *Aspecto aromático* was used ten times when describing aroma, that is to say, smell, despite the fact that “aspect” means ‘appearance to the eye; visual effect’, according to the Collins Dictionary and hence would normally be used to describe the appearance of a wine and not its “aromas”.

However, if we were to examine wine-related metaphors on a continuum with respect to their level of conventionality, from metaphorically-motivated terminology to creative linguistic metaphors, the picture would be slightly different. Firstly, words such as *savo(u)ry* in metaphorically motivated terms such as *savory tannins*, where the metaphor is no longer evident, would be considered metaphorical. Secondly, the eight English terms and three Spanish terms which we did not retain for further analysis at this stage because we found only a single example of metaphorical use in our corpus could be considered to be in the process of metaphorization, at the very least. If metaphoricity is seen as a question of degree rather than a series of dichotomies (metaphor vs. non-metaphor; conventional metaphor vs. creative metaphor), then the percentage of metaphors in wine language increases dramatically (by 15% in English).

5 COMPARISON OF METAPHORS IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH WINE LANGUAGE

In this final section of our paper, we will do a head-to-head comparison of metaphors in English and Spanish wine language, with the goal of answering the four questions posed in the Introduction. Partial answers have already emerged in our presentation of results. However, more direct comparison between the two languages should lead to clearer conclusions.

1. Is a metaphoric expression in one language usually rendered by a metaphoric expression in another language?

Our study has shown that a metaphoric expression in English is usually rendered by a metaphoric expression in Spanish. This was the case for 27 English terms or term combinations (out of 30), which are presented below:

Table 3

ENGLISH	SPANISH
aged	envejecido + envejecimiento
aromatic	aromático
big	amplio
character	(con) carácter
clean	limpio
delicate	delicado
earthy	terroso
elegant	elegante + elegancia
fine + finesse	fino + finura
firm	firme
fresh	fresco
full-bodied	(con/de) cuerpo
graceful	elegante
light + light-bodied	ligero
lively	alegre + vivaz
old	guarda
perfumed	perfumado
powerful	poderoso + potente
rich	rico
ripe	maduro
robust	robusto
round	redondo
smooth	suave
soft	suave
strong	fuerte
velvety	aterciopelado

young	joven
-------	-------

There were only six cases where either the English term or the Spanish term was metaphorical but not both: EN *complex, feminine*, ES *austero, firme, sutil, vigoroso*. And in the case of the equivalents for three of these six (ES *femenino*, EN *subtle* and *vigorous*), there was some indication of metaphorical use, but as there was only one example, we did not classify them as metaphorical expressions. Overall, it is abundantly clear that a metaphoric expression in English is usually rendered by a metaphoric expression in Spanish.

2. Does the conceptual domain remain the same in both languages?

Given that metaphoric expressions in English usually have metaphoric equivalents in Spanish, the next question that arises is the source domain of the terms in the two languages. Do they both draw from the same source domain to create metaphor? The following table shows side by side both the source domain and subdomain of the English terms or term combinations and their Spanish equivalents.

Table 4

ENGLISH	SPANISH
<i>aged</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age	<i>envejecido + envejecimiento</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age
<i>aromatic</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality	<i>aromático</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality
<i>big</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Buildings: Structure	<i>amplio</i> Source domain: Buildings: Size or Objects: Size
<i>character</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality	<i>con carácter</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality
<i>clean</i> Source domain: Human beings:	<i>limpio</i> Source Domain: Human

Physical body or Clothes	beings: General appearance
<i>delicate</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Physical body	<i>delicado</i> Source Domain: Human beings: General appearance
<i>earthy</i> Source domain: Plants	<i>terroso</i> Source domain: Plants
<i>elegant</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Personality	<i>elegante + elegancia</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Personality
<i>fine + finesse</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Personality	<i>fino + finura</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Physical body or Personality
<i>firm</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Objects: Firmness	<i>firme</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Objects: Firmness.
<i>fresh</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality	<i>fresco</i> Source domain: Plants
<i>full-bodied</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body	<i>con cuerpo</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body
<i>graceful</i> Source domain: Human beings : General appearance	<i>elegante</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Personality
<i>light + light-bodied</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body	<i>ligero</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body
<i>lively</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality	<i>alegre + vivaz</i> Source domain: Human beings: Personality
<i>old</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age	<i>de guarda</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age

<i>perfumed</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance	<i>perfumado</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance
<i>powerful</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Personality	<i>poderoso + potente</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Personality
<i>rich</i> Source domain: Human beings: Economic condition	<i>rico</i> Source domain: Human beings: Economic condition
<i>ripe</i> Source domain: Plants: Development	<i>maduro</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age or Plants: Development
<i>robust</i> Source domain: Human beings: Physical body or Buildings: Structure	<i>robusto</i> Source domain: Human beings: General appearance or Buildings: Structure
<i>round</i> Source domain: Objects: Shape or Human beings: Physical body	<i>redondo</i> Source domain: Objects: Shape
<i>smooth</i> Source domain: Objects: Feel	<i>suave</i> Source domain: Objects: Firmness or Feel
<i>soft</i> Source domain: Objects: Feel	<i>suave</i> Source domain: Objects: Firmness or Feel
<i>strong</i> Human beings: Physical body	<i>fuerte</i> Human beings: Personality or Physical body
<i>velvety</i> Source domain: Textiles: Feel	<i>aterciopelado</i> Source domain: Textiles: Feel
<i>young</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age	<i>joven</i> Source domain: Human beings: Age

The above table reveals that the equivalent metaphorical expressions in English and Spanish generally draw upon the same source domain, which in most cases is “Human beings”. There is some discrepancy

between the two languages where two source domains are possible in one or both languages: in three such cases (*big/amplio*, *ripe/maduro*, *round/redondo*), the English and Spanish terms share one source domain but not the other.

There is greater discrepancy when it comes to subdomains, but even there the differences occur most often when more than one subdomain comes into play. Overall, then, we can say that the conceptual domain remains the same in both languages.

3. Are metaphorical expressions used more frequently in one language than another?

The answer to this question is to be found in section 5 Analysis of Results, where it was noted that 30 English terms and term combinations and 30 Spanish terms and term combinations demonstrate metaphorical use. The similarity between the two languages is significant enough for us to conclude that metaphorical expressions are equally frequent in both.

4. Are the metaphors used more conventional than creative in one language than another?

This issue has also been discussed in section 5 Analysis of Results, where it was noted that, of the 30 metaphorical expressions in English and in Spanish, the vast majority (28 in English and 29 in Spanish) presented conventional metaphors. Only three appear to be used more creatively: *aromatic* and *feminine* in English and *aromático* in Spanish. Given the very small number of creative metaphors, it would be ill-advised to state that one language (English) uses more creative metaphors than the other (Spanish) at this time.

6. CONCLUSION

This study of metaphors in English and Spanish wine tasting notes has confirmed what others have said about metaphors in wine language:

- A large number of metaphors are used in wine language
- These metaphors are primarily anthropomorphic in nature
- They are primarily conventional metaphors

What the comparative analysis of English and Spanish wine language also reveals is that, contrary to what Caballero and Ibarretxe (2013) seem to suggest, the differences in English and Spanish cultures do not seem to affect the metaphorical use of language in our corpus. Although these researchers have stated that two cultures may convey the same ‘reality’ by drawing upon different metaphorical sources, we found that, by and large, both cultures conveyed the same reality by drawing upon the same metaphorical source domain. However, further bilingual studies need to be conducted before the universality of metaphors can be proven or disputed.

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Amararitei, Loredana (2002), “La Métaphore en Oenologie [Metaphores in Oenology]”, *Metaphorik.de*, 3, pp. 1-12.
- Bratoz, Silva (2013), “The Antropomorphic Metaphor in Slovene and English Wine Tasting Discourses”, *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, X, pp. 23-35.
- Bruce, Nigel (1999), “Classification and Hierarchy in the Discourse of Wine: Émile Peynaud’s The Taste of Wine”, *ASp*, 23-26, pp. 149-164.
- Caballero, Rosario (2007), “Manner-of-Motion Verbs in Wine Description”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, pp. 2095-2114.
- Caballero, Rosario (2009), “Cutting across the Senses: Imaginery in Winespeak and Audiovisual Promotion”, in Charles Forceville and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (eds.), *Multimodal Metaphors*, Berlin / NewYork: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 73-94.
- Caballero, Rosario and Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2013), “Ways of Perceiving, Moving and Thinking: Re-Vindicating Culture in Conceptual Metaphor Research”, *Journal of Cognitive Semiotics*, 5 (1-2), pp. 268-290.
- Caballero, Rosario and Emilio Suárez-Toste (2008), “Translating the Senses. Teaching the Metaphors in Winespeak”, in Frank Boers and Seth Lindstromberg (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology*, Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter,

pp. 241-260.

Caballero, Rosario and Emilio Suárez-Toste (2010), “A Genre Approach to Imagery in Winespeak”, in Graham Low, Zaziza Todd, Alice Deignan, and Lynne Cameron (eds.), *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World*, Antwerp, John Benjamins, pp. 265–287.

Coutier, Martine (1994), “Tropes et termes: le vocabulaire de la dégustation du vin [Tropes and Terms:WineTasting Vocabulary]”, *Meta*, 39 (2), pp. 662-675.

Fischer, John (2001), *The Evaluation of Wine. A Comprehensive Guide to the Art of Wine Tasting*, New York, Writers Club Press.

Gluck, Malcolm (2003), “Wine Language. Useful Idiom or Idiot-Speak?”, in Jean Aitchison and Diana M. Lewis (eds.), *New Media Language*, London: Routledge, pp. 107-115.

Katz, Albert N. and Tamsen E. Taylor (2008), “The Journeys of Life: Examining a Conceptual Metaphor with Semantic and Episodic Memory Recall”, *Metaphor and Symbols*, 23, pp. 148-173.

Keysar, Boaz et al. (2000), “Conventional Language: How Metaphorical is it?”, *Journal of Memory and Language*, 43, pp. 576-593.

Knowles, Murray and Rosamund Moon (2006), *Introducing Metaphor*, London, Routledge.

Lakoff, John and Mark Johnson (1980), *Metaphors We Live by*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Lehrer, Adrienne (2007), “Can Wines be Brawny?”, in Barry Smith (ed.), *Questions of Taste: the Philosophy of Wine*, New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 127-140.

Lehrer, Adrienne (2009), *Wine & Conversation*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Negro Alousque, Isabel (2011), “La metáfora en el discurso enológico español [Metaphors in Spanish Winespeak]”, in M.^a Luisa Carrió Pastor et al. (eds.), *La investigación y la enseñanza aplicadas a las nuevas tecnologías*, Valencia, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, pp. 479-489.

Pragglejaz Group (2007), “MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse”, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), pp. 1-39.

Rossi, Micaela (2012), “Pour une description du processus de création des métaphores dans le langage du vin – étude comparative français-italien”, paper presented at the symposium Unité et Diversité dans le discours sur le vin en Europe, Innsbruck, University of Innsbruck.

Steen, Gerard (2007), *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage*, Antwerp, John Benjamins.

Steen, Gerard et al. (2010), *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification in Natural Discourse: A Casebook*, Antwerp, John Benjamins.

Suárez-Toste, Emilio (2007), “Metaphor inside the Wine Cellar: on the Ubiquity of Personification Schemas in Winespeak”, *Metaphorik.de*, 12, pp. 53-64.