

# A Comparative Study on Basic Emotion Conceptual Metaphors in English and Persian Literary Texts

Shahrzad Pirzad Mashak (Corresponding author)

M.A. in TEFL

Department of Language, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khuzestan, Iran

Tel: 98-64-1527-0409 E-mail: shmashak@gmail.com

Abdolreza Pazhakh

Assistant Professor of Teaching

Islamic Azad University-Dezful Branch, Khuzestan, Iran

Tel: 98-64-1626-0052 E-mail: pazhakh@gmail.com or pazhakh@iaud.ac.ir

Abdolmajid Hayati

Assistant Professor of Linguistics

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Khuzestan, Iran

E-mail: Majid\_hayati@yahoo.com

Received: September 3, 2011 Accepted: September 26, 2011 Published: February 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ies.v5n1p200

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n1p200>

## Abstract

Metaphor becomes the subject of interest for many researchers in recent decades. The main purpose of the present study was to investigate the universality of emotion metaphorical conceptualization and the dominant pattern in English and Persian based on Kovecses's (2003) model for Linguistic expression of Metaphor. The emotions under study were happiness, anger, sadness, fear, and love. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory was adopted as a model for the purpose of comparison.

To do so, 782 emotive metaphorical expressions were compiled from different literary works and related articles on the field and Dictionaries in both languages. The study was conducted through two main phases of categorization and comparison. First expressions were categorized under their general and specific target and source domains. At the second phase, in each category, metaphorical expressions were compared with based on their conceptual metaphor and literal meaning. At this phase, three patterns of totally the same, partially the same, and totally different were identified.

Also the results of Chi-Square applied to these three patterns demonstrate that anger ( $\chi^2 = 108.85$ ,  $P < 0/000$ ) was the most universal emotion, whereas sadness ( $\chi^2 = 31.40$ ,  $P < 0/000$ ) was the least universal emotion during this study. In addition, the dominant pattern at the end of analysis was the pattern of totally the same.

**Keywords:** Metaphorical expressions, Basic emotions, Conceptual metaphor, Literal meaning, Persian, English

## 1. Introduction

Everyday language is colored with metaphors. We use metaphors when we find it difficult to describe a thing or an experience. So, we borrow a word or a phrase which appear similar to the thing or experience we want to describe. Aristotle, as the first thinker to elaborate a theory of metaphor, considered metaphorical language both a powerful means of persuasion and decorative linguistic tool adding no additional information to the discourse (Gibbs, 1994, p.74). However, current approaches in cognitive linguistics emphasize the importance of metaphor in language, and they consider it an essential and indispensable phenomenon in both language and thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gibbs, 1994).

Within the framework of the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993) emotion metaphors figure prominently as one of the best researched domains (Kövecses 1990, 2000). In ordinary language,

metaphors are used to make abstract notions more concrete. This cognitive process, “conceptualizing”, is employed to give any abstract notion such as emotional states a more physical and tangible essence or feeling. Since emotions are unobservable internal states, they are par excellence target domain to be expressed by means of metaphor.

## 2. Universality and Variation in Emotion Conceptual Metaphors

Since cognitive linguists (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) claim that metaphor is of the mind, the brain, and the body, many people who are familiar with Lakoff’s view of metaphor expect that “conceptual metaphors” are largely or mostly universal. It seems that several unrelated languages may share several conceptual metaphors for particular emotion concepts. One of these emotion concepts is happiness. There are a large number of conceptual metaphors for happiness in English (Kovecses, 1991), but three of them stand out in importance: “HAPPINESS IS UP” “I’m feeling up”, “HAPPINESS IS LIGHT” “She brightened up”, and “HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER” “He’s bursting with joy”. The Chinese cognitive linguist Ning Yu (1995) found the same conceptual metaphors in Chinese as well.

According to Kovecses (2005) metaphors tend to be universal and near-universal at generic-level and specific-level metaphors tend to be different cross-linguistically. For instance, HAPPINESS IS UP is a generic-level metaphor and a specific-level version of the metaphor HAPPINESS IS UP in English is HAPPINESS IS BEING OFF THE GROUND. As Ning Yu (1995) observed, this specific metaphor does not exist in Chinese. He also points out that Chinese shares with English all the basic metaphorical source domains for happiness, UP, LIGHT, FLUID IN A CONTAINER, but an alternative metaphor that Chinese has does not exist in English, is HAPPINESS IS FLOWER IN THE HEART.

Matsuki (1995) observed that all the metaphors for anger in English as analyzed by Lakoff and Kovecses (1987) can also be found in Japanese. At the same time, she points out that there are a large number of anger-related expressions that group around the Japanese concept of “hara” (Lit. “belly”). This is a culturally significant concept that is unique to Japanese culture, and so the conceptual metaphor “Anger is (in the) hara” is limited to Japanese.

Kovecses (2003) conducted a comparative study on metaphors in English and Hungarian. He investigated the metaphor TIME IS MONEY. In his study of linguistic expressions of metaphor in the two languages, four parameters were taken into consideration, namely linguistic form, literal meaning, metaphorical meaning and conceptual metaphor. Three patterns were identified, but the most highly frequent pattern was the same in all parameters in the two languages.

When investigating cross-cultural studies of metaphor, the researcher noticed that Persian is ignored from such a research in the realm of emotion. In fact, there is a vital need to study Persian metaphors from a cognitive linguistic viewpoint to uncover the conceptual structure of Persian speakers particularly in the case of emotions since metaphor is the best cognitive tool in expressing their intensity.

## 3. Method

### 3.1 Data Source and Collection

To conduct this research, around 782 metaphorical expressions describing emotions were collected from different sources in both English and Persian. Basic emotions introduced in Kovecses (2000) were adopted as the research materials including, anger, happiness, sadness, fear and love. The model as well as the instrument of the analysis and comparison of the two sets of data collected in the two languages were, however, adopted from Lakoff and Johnson (1980) as they have been introduced in their invaluable book of ‘Metaphor We Live By’. The research corpus was collected from several sources, from both written and spoken discourses in both English and Persian, including the works done by Lakoff and Kovecses on the field (Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Kovecses, 1983; Kovecses, 1990, 2005), British National Corpus (BNC), Persian Expressions were, in turn, extracted from Amsal-Al- Hekam (Dehkhoda, 1960), Farhang-e Kenayat-e Sokhan (Hassan Anvary, 2004).

### 3.2 Procedure

The recent study was conducted through two phases, namely grouping or juxtaposing the conceptual patterns in the languages and comparative analysis. First, the metaphorical expressions were grouped under their general and specific source and target domains; then they were compared based on the two discriminative parameters, conceptual metaphor and literal meaning. In addition, each Persian expression with its English phonetic representation and its English literal translation were listed in each conceptual metaphor. If expressions in each group can be found in other language with the same literal meaning and conceptual metaphor, they were considered as totally the same, while two expressions under the same conceptual metaphor with different literal meanings were considered as partially the same and if an expression was an instantiation of a different conceptual metaphor which

was absent in the other was considered as totally different. At the end, a Chi-Square test was applied to these three patterns in each category (i.e., anger) and the degree of similarities and differences were calculated.

#### 4. Data Analysis

Having chosen Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Kovecses' (2003) as the model of linguistic expressions of Metaphor, data from the study were both qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed. All English conceptual metaphors in describing emotions were observed in Persian, too. Such as "EMOTION IS FLUID IN A CONTAINER", "EMOTION IS ENEMY", "EMOTION IS INSANITY", "EMOTION IS FORCE" and etc. But because of space limitation some of them are discussed here.

##### 4.1 Happiness

The comparative analyses of data revealed that all conceptual metaphors of happiness found by Kovecses (1990, 2005) are shared by English and Persian. Some frequent ones are as follows.

##### 4.1.1 Orientational Metaphors

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), the first major group of conceptual metaphors gives happiness an upward orientation, which associates it with the state of being off the ground. This metonymic mapping "BEING HAPPY IS BEING OFF THE GROUND" leads to more common orientational metaphor mapping "HAPPINESS IS UP", "HAPPINESS IS BEING IN HEAVEN". Many English and Persian expressions used in describing happiness come under this metaphorical mapping.

English Expressions:

"I was flying high", "She was on cloud nine", "I'm six feet off the ground", "I was just soaring with happiness", "He was happy as a lark", "I was in seventh heaven".

Persian Expressions:

"*engar ru æbrâ râh mire*" (lit. walking on the clouds), "*ru zæmin bænd nemiše*" (lit. can't stand on the ground), "*mesle bolbol çæhçæh mizæneh*" (lit. he was chirping like a nightingale), "*qælbæm æz xošhâli tond tond mizæneh*" (lit. my heart is beating fast).

##### 4.1.2 Container Metaphors

Another major conceptual metaphor for expressing emotions in general and happiness in particular is CONTAINER metaphors (Kovecses, 1991, P. 33). In this metaphor happiness is depicted as a contained object within a container. Generally, the contained object is portrayed as fluid. Thus, this metaphor has the metaphorical mapping "HAPPINESS/JOY IS a FLUID IN a CONTAINER.", and "INTENSE HAPPINESS PRODUCES PRESSURE ON THE CONTAINER". The CONTAINER metaphor is very common in both Persian and English.

English expressions:

"We were full of joy", "The sight filled them with joy", "I brimmed over with joy when I saw her", and "She couldn't contain her joy any longer", "the sight filled them with joy", "I was brimmed over with joy", "She was bursting with happiness", "He was overflowed with joy, a

Persian Expressions:

"*por æz shur vâ shâdi*" (lit. full of joy), "*qænd tu deleš âb miše*" (lit. sugar melting in his heart), "*læbriz æz š âdi bud*" (lit. She was brimmed with joy), "*æz xošhâli dâšt miterekid*" (lit. s/he was bursting with joy) and "*æz xošhâli tu pusteš nemigond e*" (lit. s/he cannot stand in his/her skin).

##### 4.1.3 Animal Metaphors

Kovecses (1991) sees happiness as a thing that is hard to control and not necessary for happy person to control or contain it with force. These implications can be viewed in these animalistic behavior metaphors "A HAPPY PERSON IS AN ANIMAL THAT LIVES WELL", "HAPPINESS IS A PLEASURABLE PHYSICAL SENSATION", "HAPPINESS IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL". These metaphors considered as sub-categories of animal metaphors (Kovecses, 1991). English and Persian, similarly, employ these metaphors in describing happiness.

English expressions:

"She was crowing with excitement", "She was chirping like a cricket", "He was as happy as a pig in slop".

Persian Expressions:

"*kæbkeš xorus mixune*" (lit. his partridge is crowing like a rooster), "*bâdomeš gerdu miškæne*" (lit. s/he is breaking nuts with his/her tail), "*mesle xær keif mikone*" (lit. like a donkey he is enjoying himself).

The analyses of happiness expressions in Persian and English demonstrated that the two patterns of totally the same and partially the same were not significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ). That is, in describing happiness metaphorically, the pattern of totally different was absent and no difference was observed at general-level metaphor. Furthermore, the dominant pattern in happiness was the pattern of totally the same (TS=74, PS=67).

## 4.2 Anger

The concept of anger is characterized by several conceptual metaphors and metonymies (physiological and behavioral responses) represented by collected data in English and Persian. Some of them are discussed below.

### 4.2.1 Heat Metaphors

Lakoff and Kövecses (1987) claim the metaphor “ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER” is the central metaphor in the conceptualization of anger. This is primarily due to its numerous entailments. The metaphor “ANGER IS HEAT” (Kövecses, 2000) is divided into two subversions: “ANGER IS FIRE” and “ANGER IS THE HEAT OF FLUID IN A CONTAINER”. This kind of conceptualization can be seen in both Persian and English expressions.

English expressions:

“He was bursting with anger”, “I could barely contain my rage”, “When I told him, he just exploded”, “I suppressed my anger”, “You make my blood boil”, “I had reached the boiling point”.

Persian expressions:

“*âtiš gereftam*” (lit. I got fire), “*dâre d uš mijære*” (lit. he is boiling), “*æz ?æsæbâniæt dâšt miterekid*” (lit. he was bursting with anger), “*xunæm râ bedjuš âværd*” (lit. s/he made my blood boil).

### 4.2.2 The Opponent Metaphor

One of the most common metaphorical conceptualization between English and Persian is “ANGER IS AN OPPONENT”. In this metaphor anger is depicted as a person in struggle. In English this metaphor is present in a set of expressions:

“I’m struggling with my anger”, “You need to subdue your anger”, “I was seized by anger”, and “He lost control over his anger”.

Persian, likewise, involves too many expressions where anger is personified and depicted as an opponent to its victim.

Persian expressions:

“*qælæbe bæx xæšm*” (lit. to conquest anger) “*bar xæšm fa?eq âmædæn*” (lit. to overcome anger) “*færâr æz xæšme xoda*” (lit. to escape from God’s anger), “*mohæbæt piruzije bištæry dârad tâ xæšm*” (lit. kindness is more victorious than anger).

Analysis of anger expressions in Persian and English revealed just the two patterns of totally the same and partially the same; the dominant pattern was indeed ‘partially the same’ (TS=73, PS=119).

## 4.3 Sadness Metaphor

Metaphors for sadness were analyzed from a cognitive linguistic perspective by Barcelona (1986). He identified multiple source domains, which are presented in Kövecses (1990) with some modifications. Present study corpus revealed some of them as emerging in the followings.

### 4.3.1 Orientational Metaphors

Orientational metaphor as the first group of conceptual metaphor gives sadness a downward orientation (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003. p.15). The conceptual metaphor “SADNESS IS LOWDOWN” is very common and conventional in English language use. The downward oriented bodily posture is mapped to the emotional state in English expressions:

“I am feeling kind of low right now.”, “I have decided not to contact my ex because that gets me down as well.”, “However, she’s been getting quite depressed lately.”

The examples suggest that an increase of SADNESS is experienced as being physically nearer to the ground. One can be just low in one’s physical position, or even down on the ground as the afore-mentioned examples suggest. English speakers employ the words ‘down’ and ‘low’ directly to express their feeling of sadness such as, “I am feeling down”, “He brought me down with his remarks”, “Down in the mouth”, “He is really low these days”,

“I am feeling kind of low”. Contrary to English, Persian does not apply the words low/ down directly. The down/low orientation can be inferred from Persian metaphorical expressions:

“*kæštih âš qærx šodæn*” (lit. his ships were drowned), “*donjâ ru særeš xærâb šode*” (lit. the world has ruined on him), “*læbo ločæš âvizune*” (lit. his lips are hanging), “*æz xænde oftâde*” (lit. s/he is not laughing).

All the metaphorical expressions in this category are partially the same; that is, they represent the conceptual metaphor “SADNESS IS DOWN/LOW”, but their linguistic manifestations are not the same. The only totally the sameness here is related to the English expression “I am in low spirits” which in Persian means “*ruhijæm pæene*”. One of the salient difference in Persian and English was revealed in this category. When someone is in an intense sadness and sorrow state and is very sad, English expresses it with the word “depth” for instance, “in the depth of sadness”, whereas Persian uses the word “*odj*” (lit. climax) which literary means “climax” the opposite of depth and leads to the metaphorical mapping “INTENSE SADNESS IS BEING AT CLIMAX” in Persian. For example, “*djæve qæm æfzâ*” (lit. increasing sadness atmosphere), “*dær odje nârâhæti bud*” (lit. be at the climax of sadness and sorrow).

#### 4.3.2 Container Metaphors

Container metaphor as a highly productive metaphor in the case of emotions identified by Kovecses (1990) is shared within all emotions and is considered as a general source domain for them. In the case of sadness both “SADNESS IS A CONTAINER” and “SADNESS IS FLUID IN A CONTAINER” (Kovecses, 2000) with lack of heat leads to metaphorical mapping “BEING SAD IS BEING LACK OF HEAT” were identified with research data. They are common in both English and Persian. Containers in describing sadness are body parts including eyes, heart, chest and body itself. Following English expressions demonstrate these kinds of container metaphors.

“Heart filled with sadness”, “There was a sadness in Alina's eyes”, “May have sadness ingrained in them”, “Loosing his father put his fire out”, “He was filled with sadness”.

Persian expressions:

“*tu češâš qæm râ miše did*” (lit. sadness can be seen in her eyes), “*sineæš por æz dærd væ qæme*” (lit. chest full of sadness), “*bâ deli âkænde æz qæm væ ænduh*” ( lit. heart filled with sadness and sorrow ), “*tu xodeše*” (lit. he is inside himself), “*tu lâkeš foru ræfte*” (lit. sink in his shell), “*šur væ hæjædjânæš râ æz dæst dâde*” (lit. he is lack of excitement ), “*særd væ bi ruh šode, mesle mordehâ*” (lit. he is like the dead cold with no spirit).

One of the cultural differences existing between English and Persian lies in the fact that Persian considers sadness as a bird which nests in body parts of sad person including eyes and heart which leads to the metaphorical mapping “EYES / HEART ARE NESTS FOR SADNESS”. Persian metaphorical expressions such as, “*qæm tu češâš lune kærde*” (lit. sadness nest in his eyes ), “*qæm kondje deleš lune kærde*” (lit. sadness has nested in his heart) demonstrate this kind of mapping. Furthermore, Persian expression “*xune del xordæn*” (lit. drinking heart blood ) represents blood as sadness in sad person's heart, this leads to metonymic mappings “DRINKING HEART BLOOD STANDS FOR SADNESS” and “HEART FULL OF BLOOD STANDS FOR SDNESS” illustrate another difference, indicating the absence of such conceptual metaphors in English. In addition, “*qose xordæn*” (lit. eating sorrow or sadness) illustrates sadness as an eatable substance which constructs another conceptual metaphor “SADNESS IS EDIBLE” is a highly conventional metaphor in Persian and it is exclusively limited to Persian. In conclusion, three patterns were observed in relation to sadness including, totally the same, partially the same, and totally different and the dominant one was partially the same (TS=51, PS=54, TD=10).

#### 4. 4 Fear Metaphors

The metaphors for the concept of fear were described by Kovecses (1990). Fear is conceptualized via multiple source domains in English and Persian. Some of these conceptual metaphors are as follows.

##### 4.4.1 Container Metaphors

One of the general emotion metaphors is “FLUID IN A CONTAINER” metaphor Kovecses (1990). The collected data related to the current research in English and Persian revealed that CONTAINER may be body parts such as, heart, eyes, and face and fear itself. Hence, “FEAR IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER” metaphor has some subversions such as, “EYES/BODY/FACE ARE CONTAINERS FOR FEAR”, and “FEAR IS A CONTAINEE” in Persian; however, English metaphorical expressions signifying eyes as body part are the containers for fear in this study including:

“We went into a state of fear”, “Ralph read fear in his eyes”, and “The sight filled her with fear”.

Persian employs this kind of metaphor in expressing fear such as:

“*dær tærs vævæhšæt foru ræfte bud*” (lit. he sank in fear and terror), “*češmâš por æz tærs bud*” (lit. his eyes are full of fear), “*bænde deleš pâre šod*” (lit. his heart rope was torn), “*deleš hori rixt*” (lit. his heart was poured), “*zæhre tæræk šod*” (lit. his/her gall exploded), “*tu suræteš tærs næmâjân bud*” (lit. fear was visible in his eyes). Most of the metaphorical examples of fear in this category can be rendered in to Persian serving the same meaning and metaphorical sense.

#### 4.4.2 Opponent Metaphors

Metaphor "FEAR IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE" is presented with the recent research data in both English and Persian. It is revealed that this metaphor is common in the two languages. Many English expressions demonstrate the OPPONENT metaphor as follow:

“Fear took hold of me”, “Fear is a vicious enemy”, “To attack the fear”, “Fear kills the rich”, “Fear can be Defeated”, “Seized by fear”.

Persian Expressions:

“*qælæbe bær tærs*” (lit. to overcome fear), “*tærs u ra košt*” / / (lit. fear killed him), and “*xode šo bâxte bud*” (lit. he defeated himself).

Most English fear expressions can be literary rendered into Persian and serve the same metaphorical meaning and belong to the category of totally the same during research data analysis. As mentioned earlier, opponent metaphor personifies fear as a person or a being; hence, it can be conceptually structured as “FEAR IS BEING”, “he was haunted by fear”, and “FEAR IS A TORMENTOR” “my mother was tormented by fear”, The OPPONENT metaphor regarded as subcategory of BEING metaphor for fear. English expressions as “The fear grow stronger”, “Childish fear of father”, “Fear has many eyes”, “Love breeds fear” represent “FEAR IS BEING”.

Persian expressions as “*tærs umæd sorâqeš*” (lit. fear returned to him), “*in fekrhâ zâeedeje tærse*” (lit. these thoughts are born by fear), “*tærs kudæki u râ šekændje midâd*” (lit. his childish fear tormented him), “*tærs u râ gerefte bud*” (lit. fear hold him) all these expressions in Persian and English represent the OPPONENT/BEING metaphor in both languages. In the case of fear, three patterns were demonstrated by fear expressions, however the dominant pattern was totally the same (TS=92, PS=57, TD= 2).

#### 4. 5 Love Metaphors

The concept of love in English and Persian is conceptualized through several conceptual metaphors. Total 184 metaphorical expressions were gathered in both languages from different sources. Table 4.3 revealed that the two languages share most conceptual metaphors identified by Kovecses (1988). About 60% of total metaphorical expressions were totally the same, while partially the same category accounted for 40% of the total metaphorical expressions. This was due to the lexical choices and linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphors. However, the data showed no significant differences in conceptualizing the concept of love in both languages.

##### 4.5.1 Nutrient Metaphors

In metaphor LOVE IS NUTRIENT found by Kovecses (1986), the concept of love is regarded as something edible. Concerning the metaphorical concept of love in both English and Persian, the commonality goes with something which is edible, being a sort of material, But as for the metaphorical concepts of love, the difference lies in the fact that love is solidity in English, whereas it is liquidity in Persian. The following metaphorical expressions in both English and Persian will crystallize this issue.

English expressions::

“I am starving for love”, “She is starved for affection” “He is love-starved”, “Hungered for love”.

Persian expressions:

“*tešne ešq*” (lit. thirst for love), “*sirâb æz ešq*” (lit. full of water of love), “*mærâ æz âbšâre ešqæt sirâb kon*” (lit. make me full with your waterfall of love), “*tešne zire bârâne ešq*” (lit. thirsty under the rain of love), “*qæl bæm tešne ešq æst*” (lit. my heart is thirst for love).

##### 4.5.2 Container Metaphors

Kovecses (1990) points out that the container metaphor is an important concept in the field of emotions and that it works in two ways. The emotions are either conceptualized as a “FLUID IN A CONTAINER”, with the container in most cases supplied by the human body, or as being a CONTAINER itself. According to the analyzed data in this study, “LOVE IS A CONTAINER” is one of the most important conceptual metaphors revealed by English expressions. English expressions such as “He's in love”, “We fell in love.”, “We're falling out of love.”, “We are getting so lost in love.” demonstrate the use of this metaphor; in contrast, Persian does not employ this kind of

metaphor, instead they consider it as a “FLUID IN A CONTAINER”. The only Persian expression “*dar eshgh gom shodæn* (lit. be lost in love) retrieved from Persian poems and prose conceptualizes love as forming a container. Another CONTAINER metaphor for love is proposed by Kovecses (2000,p.26). He found that “LOVE IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER” is a conceptual metaphor of love and gives English expressions like:

“She was filled with love”, “She was overflowing with love”, “She is brimming with love”, “My heart being filled with your love”, “His eyes were full of love”.

The FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor is conventional in Persian, too. Persian metaphorical expressions which revealed such a kind of metaphor are as follows:

“*særšâr æz ešq*” (lit. overflow with love ), “*læbriz æz ešq*” (lit. brimming with love), “*vodjudešun por æz ešq bud*” / (lit. their soul is full of love), “*dær ešq qarq budæn*” (lit. sank in love).

CONTAINER metaphors in Persian are body parts including heart, eyes and head and body itself which are commonly used in Persian according to language data of the present study conceptual metaphors as “EYES ARE CONTAINER FOR LOVE”, “HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE” and “HEAD IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE” which was revealed from the examples such as:

“*ešq æz jek negâh šoru mišævæd*” ( lit. love is started with a look), “*češmaš por æz ešqe*” (lit. his eyes are full of love ), “*dær særæm sodâye ešqe*” (lit. I have the desire of love in my head), “*bâ deli særšâr æz ešq*” ( lit. with a heart full of love), “*ešqi bâ tamâmiye vodjud*” (lit. love with all soul).

#### 4.5.3 Unity Metaphors

Kovecses (2000, p.27) suggests that the central metaphor in the love system is the notion of UNITY, at least judged by the number of various metaphorical entailments and lexical elaborations on such source domains as “UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS”, BOND, and CLOSENESS. The conceptual metaphor “LOVE IS A UNITY” and two major subversions, namely “LOVE IS CLOSENESS” and “LOVE IS BOND” metaphors are employed in Persian, too. This kind of conceptualization is highly shared by English and Persian.

English expressions:

“I see love as something that guarantees the stability of the relationship”, “I view myself and others as forming a unity”, “We were made for each other”, “We are one”, “There is a perfect matched system”, “There is something between them”, “They are very closed”.

Persian employs such metaphors in conceptualizing love such as, “*bærâ hæm sâxte šodænd*” (lit. they have not been made for each other), “*engâr donæfær dær jek kâlbod hæstænd*” (lit. they seem to be two soul in one body), “*r âbete â šeq âne*” (lit. there is a lovely tie between them ), “*pejmâne ešq bæstænd*” (lit. they contracted love ).

Most English expressions in this category can be rendered into Persian and serve the same meaning and metaphorical sense. In conclusion, two patterns of ‘totally the same’ and ‘partially the same’ were observed of which the dominant one was the ‘totally the same’ category (TS= 110, PS= 74 ).

## 5. Conclusion

According to the above-stated comparative analyses of data, it can be concluded that although there were some cultural differences in conceptualizing these five basic emotions- namely anger, happiness, sadness, fear, and love in English and Persian due to the emphasis laid on some aspects of metaphor and entailments (partially the same pattern), the two languages share most of the general conceptual metaphors in describing these five emotions. That is, most Persian metaphorical expressions of emotions can be literally rendered into English and vice versa and serve the same metaphorical meaning and effects. The results of this study and the notion of universality in conceptualizations were highly supported with the previous works on emotions ( Matsuki, 1995; Kovecses, 1990; Barcelona & Soriana, 2004) . Also, the result of Chi-square test applied to the three cases in this study, including totally the same, partially the same and totally different revealed that the two languages are highly similar in the issue of emotion conceptualization. As far as emotion conceptualization is concerned, Persian and English have many features in common, and it could be claimed that both languages are 51 % totally the same, 47% partially the same and 2% are totally different in conceptualizing these five emotions. That is, the most frequent pattern in emotion conceptualization in English and Persian is totally the same or the pattern of “Different, Same, Same, Same” found by Kovecses (2003).

## References

- Anvary, H. (2004). *Farhang-e- Kenayat-e -Sokhan*. Tehran, Iran: Sokhan.
- Barcelona, A. (1986). The concept of depression in American English. In Z. Kovecses (2005). *Emotion concepts: from anger to quilt. A cognitive semantic Perspective. Cognitive Psychopathology*, 2(3), 13-32.
- Barcelona, A., & Soriano, C. (2004). Metaphorical conceptualization in English and Spanish. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8(3), 295-307. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277403>
- Dehkhoda, A. (1960). *Amsal-Al- Hekam*. Tehran, Iran: Amir Kabir.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1994). *The poetics of mind: figurative thought, language, and Understanding*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses (1988). *The Language of Love: The Semantics of Passion in Conversational English*. Lewisburg London.Toronto: Bucknell University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love. Pragmatics and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kovecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion concepts*. Berlin and New York: Springer-Verlag. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3312-1>
- Kövecses, Z. (1991). Happiness: A definitional effort. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6(1), 29-46. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0601\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0601_2)
- Kovecses, Z. (1995). Anger: Its language, conceptualization, and physiology in the light of cross-cultural evidence, In John R.Taylor, & Robert E. MacLaury (Eds.) *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World* (pp. 181-196). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110809305.181>
- Kovecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2003). Metaphor and linguistic expressions. In Z. Kovecses (2005) *Metaphor in Culture Universality and Variation* (pp. 130-140). Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2005). Emotion concepts: from anger to quilt. A cognitive semantic Perspective. *Cognitive Psychopathology*. 2(3), 13-32.
- Kovecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. New York/Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). Image Metaphors. *Metaphor and symbolic activity*, 2(3), 219-222. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0203\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0203_4)
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, (pp. 202–251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. New York & Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Kovecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland, & N. Quinn (eds) *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 195-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuki, K. (1995). Metaphors of anger in Japanese. In J. Taylor & R.E. Maclaury (Eds.), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World* (pp.137-151). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110809305.137>
- YU, N. (1995). Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in Chinese and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 10, 59-92. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1002\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1002_1)