

A Comparative Study of Conceptual Metaphors of Love in English and Kurdish

Asst. Instructor Khalid Ali Abdullah
University of Raparin
Faculty of Education
School of Languages
English Department

Abstract

This research makes a comparative study of love metaphors in English and Kurdish from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, with the aim of supporting the contemporary cognitive theory of metaphor from the viewpoints of both English and Kurdish languages. Traditionally, metaphor was viewed as a matter of language, as a figure of speech at the level of linguistics. From the cognitive point of view, metaphor is essential in language and thought. Metaphor in nature is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another. Metaphor allows people to understand unfamiliar and abstract concepts through familiar and concrete concepts. Emotion, which is abstract, is the most important experience of human beings, and love is the most special one among various kinds of emotions. The comparative study shows that there are both similarities and differences between love metaphors in English and Kurdish. The similarity shows that the same conceptual metaphors of love in English and Kurdish are primarily rooted in common physical and mental experiences of human beings. The difference shows that culture plays an important role in the process of conceptualizing metaphor. In conclusion, metaphor is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also a cognitive tool. It is often through the metaphorical process that human beings conceptualize the world and make reality, and the diversity of cultures also plays an important role in constructing metaphorical concepts.

1. Introduction

Traditionally, metaphor is viewed as the best-known form of figurative language. It is seen as a matter of usage. To Knowles and Moon (2006: 2), metaphor is the use of language to refer to other than what it was originally applied, in order to suggest some resemblance or make a connection between the two things. Moreover, Kreidler (1998: 301) defines metaphor as “a figurative expression in which a notion is described in terms usually used for a different kind of notion.” For instance, describing *the foot of mountain* which indicates ‘the lower part of mountain’ in terms of *foot* as ‘the lower a part of human’s body’. Thus, the word *foot* is metaphorically used, and it asserts a resemblance between *the lower part of mountain* and *the lower part of human’s body*. On the traditional view of metaphor, metaphor is assumed not to reveal anything fundamental about the nature of meaning. It was originally a category of literary and rhetorical analysis, not of linguistic description (Riemer, 2010: 246). Kövecses (2002: vii-viii) shows the characteristics of metaphors as below:

1. Metaphor is a property of words; it is a linguistic phenomenon.
2. Metaphor is used for some artistic and rhetorical purpose.
3. Metaphor is based on a resemblance between the two entities that are compared and identified.
4. Metaphor is a conscious and deliberate use of words, and people must have a special talent to be able to do it and do it well.
5. Metaphor is a figure of speech that people can do without; they use it for special effects, and it is not an inevitable part of everyday human communication.

In contrast, in the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon which basically relates to what happens in the mind. To Lakoff (1993: 244), metaphor is fundamentally conceptual, not linguistic, in nature. Furthermore, metaphor includes a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system to understand or think of one thing in terms of something else, such as time as motion, ideas as food, arguments as war, or organizations as plants. Metaphor helps people to understand a relatively abstract or inherently unstructured subject matter in terms of a more concrete, or at least a more highly structured subject matter (ibid: 203, 245). The concept of metaphor is further defined as “a cognitive mechanism whereby one experiential domain is partially ‘mapped’ i.e. projected, onto a different experiential domain, so that the second domain is partially understood in terms of the first domain” (Barcelona, 2000: 3).

2. Conceptual Metaphor

The cognitive-linguistic approach to metaphor is launched by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). In their work, *Metaphors We Live By*, they (1980: 3) show that metaphor is not just a matter of language but first and foremost a matter of thought and action i.e. metaphor is pervasive both in thought and everyday language. According to them (1980: 5), the essence of metaphor is “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.” In other words, there are two conceptual domains, and one is understood in terms of the other (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 62). For instance, understanding and experiencing *love* in terms of *journey*.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claim that (1) metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words; (2) the function of metaphor is to better understand certain concepts, and not just some artistic or esthetic purpose; (3) metaphor is often not based on similarity; (4) metaphor is used effortlessly in everyday life by ordinary people, not just by special talented people; and (5) metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning.

Since a conceptual metaphor is about two domains of thought and not just using one word instead of another, the structure of a conceptual metaphor is complex. Kövecses (2003: 311-312) lists ten interacting components that make up a conceptual metaphor:

1. Experiential basis – this is the motivation for choosing which source domain goes with what target domain.
2. Source domain – the source domain must be sufficiently different from the target domain, so that new meaning is in fact created, but at the same time the two domains share some important characteristics .
3. Target domain.
4. Relationship between the source and the target – a source domain can apply to several targets and a target domain can be attached to several sources. The source

domain “war”, for example, is mapped onto target domains as different as love, medicine and business.

5. Metaphorical linguistic expressions – the result of particular pairings of source and target domains.

6. Mappings – basic conceptual correspondences between source and target domains.

7. Entailments – additional mappings beyond the basic correspondences. They are also known as inferences.

8. Blends – material that is new in relation to both source and target.

9. Non-linguistic realization – conceptual metaphors do not only materialize in language and thought, but also in social reality, for example the way people treat time like money in accordance with TIME IS MONEY.

10. Cultural models – conceptual units that are larger than a conceptual metaphor

3. Some Aspects of Metaphor

According to Lakoff (1993: 245-246), metaphor has the following aspects:

- The system of conventional conceptual metaphor is mostly unconscious, automatic, and is used with no noticeable effort, just like humans’ linguistic system and the rest of their conceptual system.
- Humans’ system of conventional metaphor is alive in the same sense that their system of grammatical and phonological rules is alive; namely, it is constantly in use, automatically and below the level of consciousness.
- Humans’ metaphor system is central to their understanding of experience and to the way they act on that understanding.
- Conventional mappings are static correspondences, and are not, in themselves, algorithmic in nature. However, this by no means rules out the possibility that such static correspondences might be used in language processing that involves sequential steps.
- Metaphor is mostly based on correspondences in their experiences, rather than on similarity.
- Metaphorical mappings vary in universality; some seem to be universal, others are widespread, and some seem to be culture- specific (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999: 59).

4. The Structure of Metaphor

In the conceptual system, metaphor is across-mapping domain in which meaning is transferred from one conceptual domain to another (Lakoff, 1993: 203, 245). Thus, metaphor is the relation between two conceptual domains in which the meaning of one domain is mapped onto another different domain in order to help people to understand the second domain through the first domain. Kövecses (2002: 4) explains that the two domains involved in conceptual metaphor are called source domain and target domain respectively. Moreover, source domain refers to the conceptual domain used to help to understand another conceptual domain. Target domain refers to the conceptual domain which is understood via source domain (ibid: 12). Conceptual metaphor typically employs a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical concept as its source. For instance, in metaphor such as LOVE IS A JOURNEY, ‘love’ is the more abstract or target concept, while ‘journey’ is

the more concrete or source concept. Thus, people have coherently organized knowledge about *journeys* that they rely on in understanding *love*.

Kövecses (2002: 16-25) lists some common source and target domains. Source domains include the human body, health and illness, animals, plants, buildings and construction, machines and tools, games and sports, cooking and food, heat and cold, light and darkness, forces, movement and direction, etc. Target domains can be put into categories such as emotion, desire, morality, thought, society/nation, politics, economy, human relationships, communication, time, life and death, religion, events and actions.

The linking of a source and a target domain usually originates in childhood experiences involving humans' sensor motor skills. For instance, MORE is linked to UP as a result of the recurring human experience of seeing the level of a pile of objects or substance rise when more quantity is added (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 16).

To Kövecses (2002: 6-8, 12), mappings are a set of fixed correspondences between a source and a target domain. The constituent elements of the source domain correspond to constituent elements of the target domain. Moreover, mapping of the source domain onto the target are regarded as unidirectional, going from the source to the target, and fairly fixed (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 62) and (Kövecses, 2002: 7-10). For example, in the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, there are a set of correspondences between the two domains. All the elements of the domain *journey* correspond to the elements of the domain of *love*. In the sentence *We aren't going anywhere*, the expression *go somewhere* indicates traveling to a destination, in this particular sentence, a *journey* which has no clear destination. The word **we** refers to the travelers involved. The mentioned sentence includes three constituent elements of journeys: the travelers, the travel or the journey as such, and the destination. However, when someone hears this sentence in the appropriate context, he/she will interpret it to be about love, and it is known that the speaker of the sentence has in mind not real travelers but lovers, not a physical journey but the events in a love relationship, and not a physical destination at the end of the journey but the goal(s) of the love relationship. In the sentence *our relationship is spinning its wheels*, the lovers correspond to travelers, the love relationship corresponds to the vehicle and the lovers' common goals can be identified with their common destination on the journey (Lakoff, 1993: 207).

Lakoff (1993: 245) summarizes the structure of metaphor as below:

- Metaphors are mappings across conceptual domains.
- Such mappings are asymmetric and partial.
- Each mapping is a fixed set of ontological correspondences between entities in a source domain and entities in a target domain.
- When those fixed correspondences are activated, mappings can project source domain inference patterns onto target domain inference patterns.
- Metaphorical mappings obey the Invariance Principle: The image-schema structure of the source domain is projected onto the target domain in a way that is consistent with the inherent target domain structure.
- Mappings are not arbitrary, but grounded in the body and in everyday experience and knowledge.
- A conceptual system contains thousands of conventional metaphorical mappings, which form a highly structured subsystem of the conceptual system.
- There are two types of mappings: conceptual mappings and image mappings; both of them obey the Invariance Principle.

a. Types of Conceptual Metaphor

Conceptual metaphors can be classified into different kinds in terms of conventionality, function, nature, and level of generality of metaphor (Kövecses, 2002: 29). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002: 33-36) classify conceptual metaphors into three types according to their cognitive function: structural, ontological and orientational. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 83-84) state that these metaphors are founded on humans' experience.

b. Structural Metaphors

Structural metaphor is the most common type of conceptual metaphor. To Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14), in structural metaphors "one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another". In this kind of metaphor, the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept. In other words, the cognitive function of these metaphors is to enable people to understand target **A** via the structure of source **B**. For example, the concept of *time* is structured according to *motion* and *space*. In the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MOTION, people understand *time* in terms of some basic elements: Physical objects, their locations, and their motion. On the basis of the background condition that the present time is at the same location as a canonical observer, a set of mappings can be found in the following: *Times are things*. The passing of time is motion. Future times are in front of the observer; past times are behind the observer. This set of mappings structures humans' notion of time in a clear way (Kövecses, 2002: 33).

c. Ontological Metaphors

Ontological metaphors provide much less cognitive structuring for target concepts than structural ones do. Their cognitive function is to give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 25) argue that ontological metaphors arise when "our experience of physical objects and substances provides a further basis for understanding." Understanding humans' experiences in terms of objects and substances allows people to pick out parts of their experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. To Kövecses (2002: 34-35), people conceive their experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers, in general, without specifying exactly what kind of object, substance, or container is meant. The knowledge about objects, substances, and containers is rather limited at this general level; therefore, people cannot use these highly general categories to understand much about target domains.

Source Domains

Target Domains

PHYSICAL OBJECT

⇒ NONPHYSICAL or ABSTRACT ENTITIES

(e.g., the mind)

EVENTS (e.g., going to the race)

ACTIONS (e.g., giving someone a call)

SUBSTANCE

⇒ ACTIVITIES (e.g., a lot of running in the game)

CONTAINER

⇒ UNDELINEATED PHYSICAL OBJECTS

(e.g., a clearing in the forest)

⇒ PHYSICAL AND NONPHYSICAL SURFACES (e.g., land areas, the visual field)

⇒ STATES (e.g., in love)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 30-32) state that people use ontological metaphors to comprehend events, actions, activities, and states. Events and actions are conceptualized metaphorically as objects, activities as substances, states as containers. Moreover, according to them (ibid: 29, 31), humans' body is considered as a container, with a bounding surface and an in-out orientation. Humans project their own in-out orientation onto other physical objects that are bounded by surfaces.

d. Orientational Metaphors

Orientational metaphors do not structure one concept in terms of another but instead organize "a whole system of concepts with respect to one another". Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14) define these kinds of metaphors as metaphors which "give a concept of spatial orientation". For example, HAPPY IS UP. The concept HAPPY is oriented UP leads to English expressions like "I'm feeling *up* today."

Orientational metaphors are grounded in the physical experience of humans' bodies and the way they function in relation to their physical environment; most of them are spatial in character, such as up-down, front-back, near-far, etc. Orientational metaphors organize entire systems of concepts in a systematic way; for example up-down metaphors: HAPPY IS UP – SAD IS DOWN, HEALTH AND LIFE ARE UP – SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN, MORE IS UP – LESS IS DOWN, and many more (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 15-17). Although these metaphors have a basis in humans' physical experience, and physical experience is common to all humans, but they are also determined by culture; for example, in some cultures the future is ahead, and in others it is behind them (ibid: 14).

5. Conventional Metaphor

Another way to classify metaphors in terms of their degree is conventionality. To Kövecses (2002: 29), conventional metaphor is a metaphor that is well worn or deeply entrenched in everyday use by ordinary people for everyday purposes. For example:

ARGUMENT IS WAR: I *defended* my argument.

LOVE IS A JOURNEY: We'll just have to *go our separate ways*.

LIFE IS A JOURNEY: He had a *head start* in life.

To Barcelona (2001: 137), an expression is conventionalized in a language if it is used frequently by the speakers. Therefore, it opposes to novel metaphors. The metaphorical expressions given above are highly conventionalized, because they are well worn or even clichéd in the usage of a linguistic community. Speakers do not even notice that they use metaphors when they use the expression *defend* in connection to arguments, *go our separate ways* in connection to love and *head start* in connection to life. Thus, these conventional metaphorical expressions are deeply entrenched ways for people to think about and understand an abstract domain (Kövecses 2002: 30).

6. Conceptual Metaphor of Love in English

Love is a strong emotion and feeling for someone. In everyday language, *love* is used metaphorically in many linguistic expressions. As one of the conceptual domains, *love* can be expressed and understood in terms of many other conceptual domains, such as: journey, fire, madness ...etc.

1. LOVE IS A JOURNEY

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is a target domain and JOURNEY is a source domain. The metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, *love*, in terms of a very different domain of experience, *journeys*. More technically, the metaphor can be understood as a mapping from a source domain to a target domain. To Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 44-45), Lakoff (1993: 206-209) and Kövecses (2000: 26; 2002: 5-7, 30), *love* is being conceptualized as a *journey* as the following expressions show:

1.
 - a. Look *how far we've come*.
 - b. We're *at a crossroads*.
 - c. We'll just have to *go our separate ways*.
 - d. We can't *turn back now*.
 - e. I don't think this relationship *is going anywhere*.
 - f. *Where are we?*
 - g. We're *stuck*.
 - h. It's been a *long, bumpy road*.
 - i. This relationship is a *dead-end street*.
 - j. We're just *spinning our wheels*.
 - k. Our marriage is *on the rocks*.
 - l. We've gotten *off the track*.
 - m. This relationship is *foundering*.

In the above cited examples, the lovers are travelers on a journey together, with their common life goals seen as destinations to be reached. The relationship is their vehicle, and it allows them to pursue those common goals together. The relationship is seen as fulfilling its purpose as long as it allows them to make progress toward their common goals. The journey isn't easy. There are impediments, and there are places where a decision has to be made about which direction to go in and whether to keep traveling together.

Kövecses (2002: 5-7) shows mapping between the source and the target domain as a set of ontological correspondences in which the entities in the source domain correspond systematically to the entities in the domain of a LOVE as below:

<u>Source: JOURNEY</u>	<u>Target: LOVE</u>
– the travelers ⇒	the lovers
– the vehicle ⇒	the love relationship itself
– the journey ⇒	events in the relationship
– the distance covered ⇒	the progress made
– the obstacles encountered ⇒	the difficulties experienced
– decisions about which way to go ⇒	choices about what to do
– the destination of the journey ⇒	the goal(s) of the relationship

2. LOVE IS WAR

To Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 49) and Kövecses (2000: 26), *love* is a conceptual domain which is partially structured and understood in terms of *war* as the following expressions show. In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is a target domain and WAR is a source domain. In LOVE IS WAR metaphor, some elements respectively refer to the lovers, the result of the verbal battle and the disagreement between lovers. Consider the expressions below:

2.

- a. She *conquered* him.
- b. He is known for his many rapid *conquests*.
- c. She *fought for* him, but his mistress won out.
- d. He *fled from* her *advances*.
- e. She *pursued* him *relentlessly*.
- f. He is slowly *gaining ground* with her.
- g. He *won* her hand in marriage.
- h. He *overpowered* her.
- i. She is *besieged* by suitors.
- j. He has to *fend* them *off*.
- k. He *enlisted the aid* of her friends.
- l. He *made an ally* of her mother.

From the above examples, it can be seen that the consequence of *love* is the consequence of *war*. In the example of (2g), the word 'won' indicates that in love relationship there is a fight between the lovers to win the love for the sake of marriage. Similarly, in a battle field, the soldiers fight each other in order to win the war. In *love*, the person who pursues the beloved can be corresponded to the attackers in a war. If another pursuer appears in midway, this pursuer will be regarded as opponent or enemy who should be wiped out. In the end, one of them wins and the other is defeated. Thus, achieving the goals of love is winning the war. The set of mapping between the two domains can be conceptualized as below:

Source: WAR

- soldiers ⇒
- weapons ⇒
- being hurt physically ⇒
- attackers in a war ⇒
- battles in a war ⇒
- winning a war ⇒
- losing a war ⇒

Target: LOVE

- lovers
- love relationship
- being hurt mentally
- pursuers in love
- competition between pursuers in love/
conflicts between lovers
- achieving the goals of love
- failing in getting love (being apart)

3. LOVE IS FIRE

In this conceptual metaphor, FIRE is the source domain and LOVE is the target domain. The examples of (3) reveal that *love* as one of the experiential domains which is an abstract can be conceptualized and understood in terms of the experiential domain of *fire* which is a concrete one (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 106-107) and (Kövecses, 2000: 26; 2002: 46, 203).

3.

- a. The *fire* between them finally went out.
- b. I am *burning* with love.
- c. She carries a *torch* for him.
- d. The *flames* are gone from our relationship.

The words 'burning' in (3a), 'torch' in (3c) and 'flame' in (3d) indicate *fire*. On the other hand, the words 'between them' in (3a), 'I' in (2a), 'she/ him' in (3c) and 'our relationship' in (3d) identify lovers in the domain of *love*. Humans can link different stages of fire burning with different stages of being in love. Sometimes a conceptualization such as in (3a) indicates that *love*, as well as *fire*, has its

beginning, duration and the end. The damage resulted from the intensity of fire can refer to the lovers' psychological damage because of the letdown in love.

4. LOVE IS MADNESS

To Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 49) and Kövecses (2000: 26), LOVE can be expressed in terms of MADNESS as the expressions in (4) explain. In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is the target domain and MADNESS is the source domain. Here, *love* is presented as a state of insanity. When someone is in love, she/he experiences certain kinds of emotions which are similar to mental states of madness because of having strange behaviour. Only intensity distinguishes these emotions from each other.

4.
 - a. She *drives me out of my mind*.
 - b. I'm *crazy* about her.
 - c. I'm *insane* about her.
 - d. He's *gone mad* over her.
 - e. He *constantly raves* about her.
 - f. I'm just *wild* about Harry.

In this metaphor the insane person corresponds to the person in love. The person who makes people insane is the person that they are in love with. And the behavior of the insane person corresponds to that of the person in love. Insanity is the ultimate lack of control. The insane person is not responsible for his/ her actions. If and when the MADNESS metaphor is applied to love, it follows that a person in love is not responsible for what he or she does either.

5. LOVE IS A PATIENT

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE target is the domain and PATIENT is the source domain. Here, the lovers are assumed to be patients. The patients' health state represents the state of the relationship or marriage as the following expressions explain:

5.
 - a. This is a *sick* relationship.
 - b. They have a *strong* marriage.
 - c. Their marriage is *dead*, it cannot be revived.
 - d. We are getting *back on our feet*.
 - e. Their marriage is *on its last legs*. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 49)

All the expressions in (5) are metaphors in which the elements of *love* domain are described by using the elements of *patient* domain. For instance, in (5d), it can be assumed that the patient may get well and heal after illness. Likewise, in the love relationship, the lovers' relationship may end with marriage after facing many problems.

6. LOVE IS A UNITY

In the metaphor LOVE IS A UNITY, LOVE is the target domain and it is conceptualized in terms of A UNITY as the following expressions show:

6.
 - a. We are *as one*.
 - b. They are *breaking up*.
 - c. We are *inseparable*.

d. *We fused together.*

e. *She is my better half.* (Kövecses, 2002: 46; 2000: 26, 28, 119)

The metaphorical expression in (8a), 'We are one' indicates that lovers are parts of a whole. Unity of lovers makes them a whole. In the source domain A UNITY, there are two parts which form a whole and fit one another, and make up a unity that functions as a whole. *Love* is considered as the spiritual merger of two souls into one. Kövecses (1986: 63) regards the harmonious state of LOVE IS A UNITY to be two perfectly fixed parts that form an ideal unity in which the two parts maximally complement each other. One part is incomplete and cannot function without the other part. Moreover, he (1986: 63) believes that people consider love relationship as two halves: one half for the lover and another half for the beloved one. The set of mapping can be seen as below:

Source: UNITY

- The two physical parts ⇒
- The physical joining of the parts ⇒
- The physical unity ⇒
- The physical fit between the parts ⇒

Target: LOVE

- two lovers
- the union of the lovers
- the spiritual mergers of the two souls
- the harmonious relationship between the two lovers

7. LOVE IS SPORT/ A GAME

In English, sometimes *love* is conceptualized in terms of *sport* as the expression (7) shows. In LOVE IS SPORT metaphor, *love* is the target domain and *sport* is the source domain. Here, the elements of *love* are explicated by using the elements of *sport*. For instance, the lovers, in the target domain, can be described as the game players in the source domain and the rules in sport can be considered as the promises between the lovers with their common goal.

7. He made a *play* for her. (Kövecses, 2000: 26)

There is a set of mappings between the source domain and the target domain that can be shown as below:

Source: SPORT

- Game players ⇒
- Rules in a game ⇒
- Winning the match ⇒
- Losing the game ⇒

Target: LOVE

- lovers
- promises in love
- achieving the goals of love
- being apart

The only purpose of players engaged in sport activity is to win the match. The goal of achieving the gold medal in a sport match is similar to achieving the goals of love. In *sport*, in order to achieve the gold medal, two groups will compete each other. Similarly, in *love*, a boy and a girl will compete each other. The activity processes in *love* are understood in terms of sport terms. The role of the lovers can be understood via the concept of game players in a match.

8. LOVE IS A NUTRIENT: FOOD OR DRINK

In this conceptual metaphor, NUTRIENT is the source domain and LOVE is the target domain. Here, *love* is seen as a need. People try to comprehend the aspects of *love* in terms of the concept of a *nutrient* as the following examples show:

- 8.
- I'm *starved* for affection.
 - He *thrives* on love.
 - She is *sustained* by love.
 - She's *love-starved*.
 - I *can't live without* love.
 - He *hungered* for love.
 - I *need* love. (Kövecses, 1986: 5-6; 2000: 26 and 2002:81-83 46, 203;)

This metaphor highlights the aspects of desire for love and the consequence of *love*, while it utilizes the hunger and nourishment aspects of the concept of *nutrient*. But this correspondence of the aspects of *nutrient* and *love* is achieved via detailed mappings, as shown below:

Source: NUTRIENT

Target: LOVE

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| - the hungry person ⇒ | the person who desires love |
| - food ⇒ | love |
| - hunger ⇒ | the desire for love |
| - physical nourishment ⇒ | psychological strength |
| - the effects of nourishment ⇒ | the consequences of love |

9. LOVE IS RAPTURE/ A HIGH

In this conceptual metaphor, RAPTURE is the source domain and LOVE is the target domain. Sometimes people conceive love as rapture as the following expressions show:

- 9.
- I'm *giddy* with love
 - I've been *high on* love for weeks
 - She is *drunk with* love
 - He is *intoxicated* with love. (Kövecses, 1986: 92)

In this metaphor, corresponding to the person under the influence of the drug is the person who is in love, and to the drug, love itself. The existence of such a metaphor proves that the behaviour of people who are in love resembles the conduct of those being on a drug- induced high. In this metaphor, there is the correspondence between the pleasantness of the rapture or high and the pleasantness of the love experience. In the RAPTURE metaphor, *love* involves of a lack of control. When people are in love, they lose their common sense and become different people. A rapture, similarly to insanity and being spellbound, is a state in which a person is not in possession of his or her faculties. What the RAPTURE metaphor adds to this is that *love* is also a pleasant state.

10. LOVE IS AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE

In this metaphor, LOVE is the target domain which is understood through the source domain AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE as the expressions in (10) show.

- 10.
- This relationship *isn't worth anything* anymore.
 - I *didn't get* much in return.
 - I've *lost* all my love for her.
 - He *received* a lot of love from her.

- e. She *rewarded* his love by taking care of him.
- f. What am I *getting out* of this relationship anyway?
- g. I am *putting more into* this than you are.
- h. She's *invested* a lot in that relationship.
- i. I *gave* her all my love. (Kövecses, 1986: 95; 2000: 26 and 2002: 46)

The concept of LOVE is viewed as and comprehended in terms of commercial transactions. Here, *love* is seen as a situation in which love functions as a valuable commodity and the lovers as merchants exchanging goods. Lovers, in the target domain, correspond to the merchants in the source domain.

11. LOVE IS A NATURAL FORCE (FLOOD, WIND, STORM, etc.)

In this conceptual metaphor, A NATURAL FORCE is the source domain and LOVE is the target domain.

11.

- a. She *swept me off my feet*.
- b. Waves of passion *came over* him.
- c. She *was carried away* by love.
- d. It was a *whirlwind* romance.
- e. She *let herself go*.
- f. I *was swept away* by love.
- g. We *were riding* the passions.
- h. It was a *surging* love.
- i. She *was deeply immersed* in love.
- j. We *were engulfed* by love. (Kövecses, 1986: 88-89).

According to Kövecses (1986: 89), this metaphor focuses on three aspects of love: *passivity*, *lack of control*, and *pleasantness*. In the metaphor above, the NATURAL FORCE embodies love itself and, consequently, the person carried away by the flood or wind corresponds to the person in love. The person who is *carried away* plays a passive role with respect to the force in the sense that he can't help being transported. Similarly, in love, the person who falls in love can't help falling in love either. *Falling* is something that happens to people and not something that they do. Thus, metaphor love is a force independent from people which can affect them without their active participation. Also, this metaphor contains the idea of lack of control. The person who is carried away by the flood or wind has no control over the situation. It is the force that has the upper hand. Likewise, the person in love is unable to function normally. The third aspect that can be presented by the NATURAL FORCE metaphor is pleasantness. People think of being carried away by a force outside them as something pleasurable. Expressions like 'letting oneself go' in (9e), and 'riding the passions' in (9g), indicate that people take part in this (ibid).

12. LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is the target domain and A PHYSICAL FORCE is the source domain. Here, *love* is conceptualized as a *physical force* as the expressions in (7) show.

12.

- a. I could feel the *electricity* between us.
- b. I was *magnetically drawn* to her.
- c. They *gravitated* to each other immediately.
- d. There were *sparks*
- e. His whole life *revolves* around her.
- f. The *atmosphere* around them is always charged.
- g. They are *uncontrollably attracted* to each other.
- h. There is incredible *energy* in their relationship.
- i. They lost their *momentum*. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 49)

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE metaphor highlights an imperious feature of love over other emotions that humans can feel. In this metaphor, humans comprehend love as a force such as magnetism, gravity and electricity. *Force* is something that humans cannot control or have an influence on. If someone assumes that such a feeling as love cannot be restricted, people have to confess that also lovers cannot be restricted. The existence of magnetism between lovers signifies the need of living together or spending as much time as possible with each other, whereas the electricity between lovers presents the power of love that bonds them.

According to Kövecses (1986: 90), a person in love is like a physical object that obeys a larger physical force. The aspect of passivity is reflected, in this metaphor, by expressions like *magnetically drawn*, *attracted to*, *gravitate to*, *revolve around*. What all of these examples indicate is that the object of the physical force (i.e. the person in love) obeys a stronger, larger physical force (i.e. love), it merely undergoes the effect of the force without having any active role in the interaction. The object of the force cannot do anything but obey the physical force. This way of conceptualizing love has the consequence that love is viewed as something for which people are not responsible and in which people have no choice, just as the object of the force cannot be responsible for what happens to it (since it is only an object affected by a larger force) and, for the same reason, has no alternative in its reactions to the force.

13. LOVE IS MAGIC

In LOVE IS MAGIC metaphor, *love* as a target domain is comprehended in terms of *magic* which is a source domain. This metaphor emphasizes the existence of an almost magical connection that bonds lovers, while hiding the side of the mortality of partners and their incapability to use magic.

13.

- a. She *cast her spell over* me.
- b. The *magic* is gone.
- c. She is *bewitching*.
- d. I was *entranced* by him.
- e. He has me *in a trance*.
- f. She had me *hypnotized*.
- g. I was spellbound. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 49)

To Kövecses (1986: 91), in MAGIC metaphor, there is a psychological force (the magic) whose effect the person in love undergoes. If a person is *spellbound*, *hypnotized* or *in a trance*, he or she is unable to function normally. A person in love is a person who lacks control over the state he or she happens to be in. The more control people have over their emotion, the less in love they will be.

14. LOVE IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE as a target domain is conceptualized in terms of A FLUID IN A CONTAINER which is regarded as the source domain. Here, human's body is considered as a container for emotion such as love. Love is described as the substance in the container. The level of the fluid in the body represents the amount of love between the lovers, as the expressions in (14a), (14b) and (14c) explain. Thus, the rise of the FLUID in the CONTAINER indicates the increase in love.

14.

- a. She was *overflowing with* love.
- b. She was *filled with* love.
- c. He *poured out* his affections on her.
- d. He is *in love*.
- e. We *fell in love*. (Kövecses, 1990: 144-159; 2000: 26)

To Kövecses (1990: 144-159), LOVE, in (14d) and (14e), is conceptualized as forming a CONTAINER itself, which is outside of the body. Instead of having the emotion inside humans, humans seem to move into the LOVE CONTAINER when they feel this emotion. Here, the role of the lovers is passive. *Falling in love* is something that happens to the lovers and not something that the lovers want to do.

15. LOVE IS AN OPPONENT

LOVE as a target domain can be conceptualized in terms of AN OPPONENT as the expressions in (15) explain:

15.

- a. He tried to *fight off* his feelings of love.
- b. Eventually he *surrendered* to his love.
- c. She was *struggling with* her feelings of love.
- d. He tried to *suppress* his feelings in vain.
- e. She was *overcome* by love.
- f. Love took *complete* control over him.
- g. She was *seized* by love. (Kövecses, 1986: 98).

To Kövecses (1986: 98), the OPPONENT metaphor mainly focuses on the control related aspects of the concept *the attempt to avoid lack of control in love*. The OPPONENT metaphor is constituted by a number of correspondences between the source domain (OPPONENT) and the target domain (LOVE). These are the following:

Source domain: OPPONENT

Target domain: LOVE

- the opponent is love
- the fight against the opponent is an attempt to avoid loss of control over love.
- losing to the opponent is getting into a state of lack of control.
- winning is being successful in maintaining control over love.
- surrender is giving up the attempt to maintain control and accepting love's control over people.

7. Conceptual Metaphor of Love in Kurdish

Metaphorical expressions of love are pervasive in Kurdish just like in English. Some of them are conceptualized in similar ways. On the other hand, some of them are different. The following conceptual metaphors of love are the most common types in Kurdish:

1. Container Metaphors of Love.

In Kurdish, similarly to English, the container metaphors are important concepts in the field of emotions and that they work in two ways. The emotions are either comprehended as a “FLUID (SUBSTANCE) IN A CONTAINER”, with the container in most situations supplied by the human body, or being a CONTAINER itself.

Container metaphors in Kurdish are mostly body parts including heart, brain, blood and the body itself. For instance, in (16a), HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE, and in (16b), LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER. In (16b), *love* is conceptualized as a *substance* and the human’s body is regarded as a *container*. But, in (16c), *love* is conceptualized as A FLUID IN A CONTAINER. In this example, the heart is comprehended as the *container*. In (16d), BRAIN IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE. In (16e), BLOOD IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE. In contrast, in (16f) and (16g), *love* is being conceptualized as a CONTAINER itself (LOVE IS A CONTAINER). To Kövecses (1990), the metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER is very common in English. Similarly, in Kurdish *love* is regarded as a container that is outside of humans’ body. For instance, the example (16g) shows that the container is a kind of string and the people who feel love move into that container. Thus, this string corresponds to love relationship between the lovers and links them. Moreover, a person who falls in love string is regarded as a hunted person. The role of the lovers is passive that is regarded as something happens to them.

16.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Dilîtoye şwênu penam
Dil’ megoře kesîtirî
Mexere cêgam (Uns, 2008: 33). | (Your heart is my place and shelter
Do not change your heart
do not put anyone else into my place) |
| b. Azîz le xoşewîstî to piřim min
Xoşm ewêy dil’darim dil’ teřm min
(Uns, 2008: 194) | (Darling I am full of your love
I love you my lover, I am so emotional) |
| c. Xoşim dewêyt piř be dil’. | (I love you full of my heart) |
| d. To hemîşe le mêşîkmayt | (You are always in my mind) |
| e. Wa hest ekem dil’darî to
Çote xwênim bote hestim
(Uns, 2008: 177) | I feel that your love
has flowed into my blood and it became
my emotion) |
| f. Baranî eşiq dabarî
Kewtme nêw dinyay dil’darî
(Uns, 2008: 40) | (Rain of love rained
I fell into the world of love) |
| g. Dana kewte dawî xoşewîstî kiçeke. | (Dana fell in the girl’s love string) |

2. LOVE IS WAR

Love in Kurdish, like in English, can be comprehended in terms of *war* as the example (17) shows. The words ‘dagîrt kird dil’m’ (you occupied my heart) indicate war between the lovers to achieve their own goals of love.

17. Her ke destit xiste naw destim, *dagîrt* kird dil’ u hestim

(As soon as you put your hand into mine, you occupied my heart and emotion)

3. LOVE IS FIRE/ LOVE IS MADNESS/ LOVE IS A JOURNEY

From the examples of (18), it can be seen that *love* in Kurdish, as well as in English, can be conceptualized as *fire*, *madness* and as *journey*. The word ‘sutawa’ (burnt) in (18b) in the first line, indicates fire and ‘sheti’ (crazy) in (18b) in the second

line, indicates *madness*. Also, from the second line in (18a), *love* is understood in terms of *journey*.

18.

- a. Ew eşqey min agrêkew le rûhmaye (This my love is a fire in my soul
Dûru nizîk seferêkew le rêmaye Far and near, it is a journey ahead of me)
(Xurmalî, n.d).
- b. Ta êstakêweku min bot sutawe (Till now who has burnt to you as me
kirdim nîgy ew cute çawe The glance of that pair of your eyes made
(Uns, 2008: 41) me crazy)

4. LOVE IS A BREATH

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is the target domain and BREATH is the source domain as the example (19) explains. Here, *love* is conceptualized in terms of *breath* that is similar to the conceptual metaphors of LOVE IS A NUTRIENT in English. In addition to people cannot live without food and drink, people also cannot live without breathing. The people who cannot live without breath correspond to those people who cannot live without love. Thus, *love* is considered as something necessary for life.

19.

- Taze duaî çî eroy u becêmdêlî (Now after what, you are going and leaving me
Eşq u nawit jyanme henaseme Your name and love are my breath and life)
(Uns, 2008: 153)

5. LOVE IS A UNITY

Love in Kurdish as well as in English can be comprehended in terms of *a unity* as the example of (20) shows.

20.

- Pêt ewitim ême êkîn u (You were telling me that we are one and
Qet di'lm nayêt I never can
Di'ft tenya kem Make your heart feel alone)
(Uns, 2008: 118)

6. LOVE IS A RAPTURE

Both Kurdish and English are similar in terms of conceptualizing of *love* as *a rapture* as the example of (21) shows.

21.

- a. Xoşewîstîf *mestî* kirdim. (Your love intoxicated me)
b. Bekê hest u rûhm *serxôş* kem (To whom I drink my soul and emotion)

7. LOVE IS BLINDNESS

In this conceptual metaphor, LOVE is the target domain which is conceptualized in terms of BLINDNESS. In the example (22), the word 'kwêr' (blind) indicates *a person who is blind* that is corresponding to *the person who is in love* in the domain of LOVE. Thus, a blind person who is incapable of seeing anybody is similar to the lover who is incapable of seeing anybody except of his/her beloved one.

22. Xoşewîstîfî *kwêrî* kirdim. (Your love blinded me)

8. LOVE IS A MEDICINE

In this metaphor, LOVE is the target domain and A MEDICINE is the source domain. In Kurdish, the term of *love* is mostly conceptualized in terms of *medicine* as the example (23) shows. In contrast, in English, the term *love* is mostly conceptualized in terms of *patient*. In the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A MEDICINE, there are many correspondences between the source domain and the target domain. The way that a patient suffers from a disease corresponds to the way the lovers suffer from some problems in their relation. The way the medicines treat patients corresponds to the way the lovers' relationship becomes better because of love, after having such problems. Here, the lovers are assumed to be patients and their problems in love relation correspond to diseases. Thus, curing a disease is comprehended as reinforcing love relation between the lovers. Moreover, a disease cannot be cured without medicine and the problems of the lovers cannot be solved without love.

23. Her toy *dermanî derdî* dil'. (Only you are curable medicine to my sick heart)

Conclusions

1. Metaphor is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also a cognitive tool.
2. Conceptual metaphors are basic to human understanding, thinking, and reasoning.
3. In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is the systematic mappings between a source and a target domain.
4. Conceptual metaphors are acquired automatically and unconsciously.
5. Some conceptual metaphors are universal across culture. In Kurdish and English, some conceptual metaphors of *love* are conceptualized in similar ways. For instance, there are LOVE IS WAR, LOVE IS FIRE, LOVE IS MADNESS, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LOVE IS A UNITY and LOVE IS A RAPTURE in the two languages. But there are also differences between love metaphors in English and Kurdish, for example, LOVE IS BLINDNESS, LOVE IS A MEDICINE and LOVE IS A BREATH.
6. Love is a universal emotion shared by people from different languages.

References

- Barcelona, A. (2002). "Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast". In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (eds.). *Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 207-277.
- Barcelona, Antonio (2001). "On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors: case studies and proposed methodology". In M. Pütz, S. Niemeier and R. Dirven (eds.). *Applied Cognitive Linguistics II: Language Pedagogy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 117-146.
- Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach To The Structure Of Concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion Concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2003) "Language, Figurative Thought and Cross-Cultural Comparison", *Metaphor and symbol*. vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 311-320.
- Kreidler, Charles (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. New York: Routledge.
- Knowles, M. and Moon, R. (2006). *Introducing Metaphor*. New York: Routledge.
- Riemer, Nick. (2010). *Introducing Semantics*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to the Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. (1993). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In Ortony, Andrew (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202-251.
- Uns, Derbaz. (2008). *Xamî Xurbetîş Exom*. Hewlêr: Çwar Çra.
- Xurmalî, Ismahil. (n.d). *Beharêk le Srûştî Ew Şîhraney Bûn be Bûky Goranî u Bûn be Xermenî Çray Ma'an*. Available from [http://hemin. dk/ DAQIKURDI/ix/ SheeriGorani.htm#\(_21_\)_](http://hemin.dk/DAQIKURDI/ix/SheeriGorani.htm#(_21_)_) [Accessed 20 July 2015].

پوخته

ئەم توێژینە وەبەرهێنەرەکی بێکۆڵینە وەبەرهێنەرە، دەربارەیی خوازەیی خۆشەوێستی لە زمانی ئینگلیزی و کوردیدا لە روانگەیی زانستی زمانی ھۆشەکییدا، بە ئامانجی پشتگیری کردنی تیوری ھۆشەکی ئیستا لە روانگەیی ھەردوو زمانی ئینگلیزی و کوردیدا. لە کۆندا، خوازە وەکو بابەتیکی زمان دەبینرا، وەکو شیوەییەکی گوتار لە ئاستی زانستی زماندا. لە روانگەیی ھۆشەکیەو، خوازە بێچینەیی زمان و بیرە. خوازە لە سروشتدا تیگەپشتن و ئەزمونکردنی جۆریکە لە شتیک لە زاراویکی تردا. خوازە وەلە خەلک دەکات، بۆئەووی لە چەمکی واتایی و نا ئاشنا تیگات لە ریگەیی چەمکی کۆنکریتی ئاشناوە. سۆز، کە واتاییە، گرنگترین ئەزمونی مرفقە و خۆشەوێستی لەھەمویان تاییبەترە لەنیو جۆرەکانی سۆزدا. لیکۆلینەو بەراوردکاریەکە وانیشانەدات کەوا لە نیوان ھەردوو زمانی ئینگلیزی و کوردیدا لیکچوون و جیاوازی ھەبە لە خوازەیی خۆشەوێستیدا. لیکچوونەکە وانیشانەدات کەوا ھەمان خوازەیی بەزەینکراوی خۆشەوێستی لە ئینگلیزی و کوردیدا بەشیوەیی سەرەکی رەگی داکوتاوە لە ئەزمونی ھاوبەشەکانی میشکی و لاشەیی مرفقەکان. جیاوازیەکە وانیشانەدات کەوا کەلتور رۆلێکی گرنگ دەگێرێت لە پڕۆسەیی بەزەینکردنی خوازەدا. لە ئەنجامدا، خوازە تەنھا دیاریدەییەکی زمانەوانی نییە، بەلکو ھەروەھا کەرستەییەکی ھۆشەکیە. زۆرجار لە ریگەیی پڕۆسەیی خوازەوێستی کەوا مرفقەکان بونیاد بەزەین دەکەن و راستی دروست دەکەن و ھەروەھا کەلتوری جۆراوجۆر رۆلێکی گرنگ دەگێرێت لە بنیادانی چەمکی خوازەدا.

مستخلص البحث

يعمل هذا البحث على دراسة مقارنة لاستعارات الحب في اللغة الإنجليزية والكردية من منظور اللغويات المعرفية، وذلك يهدف أيضا الى دعم النظرية المعرفية المعاصرة للاستعارة في كلا اللغتين الانكليزية الكردية. عادة ينظر الى الاستعارة على انها مسألة لغة، كونها جزء من الكلام على مستوى اللغات. من وجهة نظر معرفية، الاستعارة أساسية في اللغة والفكر. الاستعارة في طبيعتها هو فهم وتجريب نوع واحد من شيء آخر. الاستعارة تتيح للناس فهم موضوع غير مألوف ومجرد من خلال مفاهيم مألوفة وملموسة. العاطفة، وهي مجردة، هي أهم تجربة البشر، والحب هو الأكثر خصوصية بين أنواع مختلفة من المشاعر. وتبين الدراسة المقارنة أن هناك أوجه شبه وأوجه الاختلاف بين استعارات الحب في اللغة الإنجليزية والكردية. ويظهر التشابه أن نفس مفاهيم استعارات الحب في اللغة الإنجليزية والكردية متجذرة في المقام الأول في التجارب الفيزيائية والنفسية الشائعة بين البشر. الفرق يدل على أن الثقافة تلعب دورا هاما في عملية تصور المجاز. في الختام، الاستعارة ليست مجرد ظاهرة لغوية، ولكن أيضا أداة معرفية. غالبا ما تكون من خلال عملية مجازية وهي أن البشر يتصور العالم ويكون الواقع، وتنوع الثقافات أيضا تلعب دورا هاما في بناء المفاهيم مجازية.