

I. Literature Review

Research on conceptual metaphor began with the seminal work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), which details conceptual metaphors in English along with a theoretical explanation of conceptual systems and their relationship to linguistic metaphor. Their work has provided a foundation from which to study conceptual metaphor and inspired a larger body of literature which spans languages, and national borders. For example, the difficulties and implications of translating *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), are detailed in articles such as, “Translating the Metaphors We Live By” (Monti 2009) which discusses three translations of the text, into French, Italian, and Spanish respectively, and the potential issues and similarities which arise in these translations along with the validity of conceptual metaphor theory across languages (Monti, 2009, p. 207). However, while the work offers a thorough cross-cultural comparison of metaphors, it is primarily focused with the issue of translation rather than the variance between existing metaphors in the target languages. Instead of focusing on specific translations (Monti 2009), the work of Christina Schäffner (2003) discusses the different theoretical approaches to translating metaphors, using translation between English and German as a case-study. Nevertheless, this work is only focused on the theoretical challenges of metaphor translation and does not branch into the implications of such translations, as seen in (Fernández et al. 2005). In this article, Eva Samaniego Fernández, Marisol Velasco Sacristán, Pedro A. Fuertes Olivera argue that literal translations of metaphors from a source language actual introduce new linguistic metaphors into the target language, and by extension new conceptual systems, featuring evidence from Spanish translations of English newspaper articles (2005). This article offers compelling evidence that metaphor translation has the power to transfer metaphors from one language to another. Yet, the authors do not provide sufficient evidence that these newly

introduced metaphors actually result in the formation of new conceptual systems. Nonetheless, the article does highlight that many cross-cultural comparisons of metaphors overlook the etymological histories of metaphors, an oversight which some researchers have worked to remedy (Trim 2011), but still warrants further investigation. However, such historical investigations are beyond the scope of this study.

Furthermore, the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) has inspired specific inquiries into the connection which emotions, such as love, and conceptual metaphor. For example, the Hungarian linguist, Zoltán Kövecses, has written most extensively about the relationship between emotions and conceptual metaphors, in his books, *The Language of Love* (1988) and *Metaphors and Emotions* (2000). In the former, *The Language of Love*, Kövecses offers a careful analysis, based on conventionalized linguistic expressions, of twenty-five conceptual metaphors of love in English (1998). Some, but not all, of these metaphors were also found in the corpus research used in this paper.¹ Thus, Section IV features a discussion of those overlapping metaphors when relevant, and any divergence between Kövecses's analysis and my own. Additionally, in the latter, Kövecses builds upon his arguments in *The Language of Love*, forwarding a deeper understanding about the relationship between language, culture, and emotion. As such, the arguments detailed in his work about the cultural universality of conceptual metaphors, and considerations for cross-cultural analysis of such metaphors are particularly relevant to chapter six. Nonetheless, while Zoltán Kövecses has painted a clear picture of conceptual metaphors of love in English, his books do not extend too far into cross-cultural comparison beyond the aforementioned passage in *Metaphor and Emotions*.

¹ Here are those metaphors identified by Kövecses which were not confirmed in corpora sources: THE OBJECT OF LOVE AS (APPETIZING) FOOD, THE LOVERS AS DOVES, THE OBJECT OF LOVE AS A SMALL CHILD, THE OBJECT OF LOVE AS A DEITY, LOVE AS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL, LOVE AS HUNTING, LOVE AS A GAME. This is not to say that these metaphors are incorrectly, it is merely important to note that they did not occur in the sample used for this project.

Beyond the aforementioned works on translation (Monti 2009), (Schäffner 2003), (Fernández et al. 2005), and general discussions of cross-cultural metaphors (Kövecses 2000), there is little literature to be found on the existence of conceptual metaphors of love in French or comparisons of conceptual metaphors of love in French and English. Two notable attempts have come to my attention over the course of my research. One is the dissertation of Gloria Stoyanova Valeva-Gueorguieva, entitled “Il a gagné: Conceptual Metaphors in French and American Journalist Discourse” (1997), which offers a comparative analysis of metaphors found in journalistic coverage of elections in France and the United States. However, beyond shared source domains of “journeys” and “war” this piece offers little on the nature of metaphors of love. The second, and perhaps the closest work, to that of this paper, is an article by Regina Gutiérrez Pérez which features a comparative analysis of heart-metaphors in French, Italian, Spanish, German, and English, based on the work of Lakoff and Johnson, and Kövecses. The introduction to this article includes a comparison of the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, a discussion of which can be found in the fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters. However, the focus on heart-metaphors has surprisingly little overlap with metaphors of love, or perhaps more accurately, metaphors of the heart are a metonymic sub-set of love metaphors which are not explored in this paper.

In short, while there exists research on metaphors of love in English, and comparative analysis of French and English metaphors, there is not any substantial work that combines the two. As such the comparison of French and English metaphors of love featured in this paper, fills a gap in the understanding of conceptual metaphors between these two languages which are in close proximity, historically, culturally, and geographically. Thus, the conclusions of this essay

have wide-spread applications, from offering insights into second language education, translation and perhaps even international romance.