

“IS *LOVE* A TENDER THING?”

METAPHORS OF THE WORD *LOVE* IN SHAKESPEARE’S PLAYS¹

HELI TISSARI

1. Introduction

1.1. On the origins and aim of this article

Partridge (1968 [1947]: 140) says of the word *love* in Shakespeare that “... the subject has never been more than skimmed, which is an astounding omission ...” This is a companion article to “Love shakes the spheres” (Tissari 1999, reprinted in Tissari 2003: 273–288), in which I treated six senses of the verb and noun *love* as they occur in Shakespeare’s plays. I parcel the verb and noun *love* by calling them the word *love*, assuming that they share these senses and, consequently, a considerable amount of conceptual content. Five of these senses were labelled *storge*, *philia*, *eros*, *agape*, and ‘love of “things”’ in agreement

¹ The question is originally Romeo’s (*Romeo and Juliet* 1.4.25). I am currently working on a project concerning an even larger range of emotion words. As for this article, I discussed the same findings in a paper “Shakespeare’s imagery revisited: Conceptual metaphors of love” in the panel “The idea of love in early modern England” at the FINSSE 2 conference at the University of Tampere, Finland, August 22, 2003 (FINSSE = the Finnish Society for the Study of English). My research for this paper was supported in part by the Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence funding for the Research Unit for Variation and Change in English at the Department of English, University of Helsinki.

with Lewis (1968 [1960]), but I have since also used the English equivalents ‘family love’, ‘friendship (love)’, ‘sexual love’, and ‘religious love’ for the Greek terms. The sixth, additional sense, is a combination of *storge* and *eros*, or ‘marital love’.

Although Tissari (1999) is a fairly brief article, it is based on a quite laborious analysis of the verb and noun *love* in the plays contained in the Oxford electronic edition of Shakespeare’s *Complete Works* (Wells & Taylor 1989). Apart from sporadic notes, it omitted a substantial part of the work which concerned cognitive metaphors occurring in the immediate context of the word *love* and which was mainly inspired by Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) and Lakoff’s (1987) first treatments of the cognitive metaphor theory (CMT). The aim of this article is to make the remaining findings available, which in turn can be compared to results on the word *love* in late middle (ca. 1420–1500), early modern (ca. 1500–1700) and present-day English (1960s, 1990s), as in Tissari (2003).

Although aware of some shortcomings of my earlier analysis, I have not attempted to amend it, simply commenting on it on the basis of the knowledge acquired during my later work on the metaphors of *love* (Tissari 2003), *fear* (Koivisto-Alanko & Tissari 2006, Tissari 2004), and *hope* (Tissari 2004). The earlier analysis is also complemented by some detailed comments on *Romeo and Juliet*.

1.2. Data

The verb and noun *love* occur altogether ca. 2,680 times in Shakespeare's drama (Tissari 1999: 189, 2003: 273). Although the number of items studied for this article is slightly less, excluding compounds such as *love-song*, and the word *lover*, it follows that this is a general survey rather than a detailed analysis. Consequently, I prefer referring to metaphor *types* rather than *tokens*, some of which probably remained undetected, considering layers of metaphors, for example. If you wish, a *type* corresponds to a *cognitive / conceptual metaphor*, but a *token* is not exactly the same as its verbal realization (*verbal metaphor*), since the latter, for example, *I am in love* for LOVE IS A CONTAINER, may occur many times in precisely the same format in the data (cf. Nerlich & Clarke 2002: 556).²

This study concerns the following thirty-seven (37) plays (listed in the order and with the titles suggested by Wells & Taylor 1989): *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, *Richard III*, *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The First Part of the Contention*, *Richard II*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *All's Well What Ends Well*, *Cymbeline*, *1 Henry VI*, *2 Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Othello*, *Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Richard, Duke of York*, *The Tragedy of King Lear* (folio, quarto excluded), *1 Henry IV*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Measure for*

² Deppert (2003: 64) provides the German terms *konzeptionelle Metapher* and *Einzelmetapher*, but does not make the relevant distinction either.

*Measure, The Taming of the Shrew, As You Like It, Titus Andronicus, King John, Much Ado About Nothing, The Merchant of Venice, Pericles, Prince of Tyre, Timon of Athens, Macbeth, The Tempest, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Comedy of Errors, and A Midsummer Night's Dream.*³

2. Theoretical and methodological issues

2.1. Metaphor

As stated above, the analysis is mainly based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) and Lakoff's (1987) first publications on cognitive metaphor and only takes Kövecses's (1986) first book on the metaphors of emotion into account (cf. Kövecses 1990, 2000). Cognitive metaphor is understood as a (mental) correspondence relationship between two different conceptual domains such as LOVE and FIRE (see Lakoff 1987: 386–388), in which LOVE receives some characteristics of FIRE through a direct verbal equation. For example, Romeo claims that (both the word *love* and the words suggesting FIRE are highlighted):

³ The summary of the earlier analysis will also make more sense if the abbreviated titles provided are replaced by those given here in this order (Tissari 1999: 189, 2003: 286). Because the corpus does not provide any line numbers for the quotations, these are recovered from Spevack (1970), except for *Romeo and Juliet* (Blakemore Evans 1984).

(1) *Love is a smoke made with the fume of sighs,
Being purged, a fire sparkling in lover's eyes ...*
(*Romeo and Juliet* 1.181—182)

2.2. Procedure

A list of possible metaphors (and metonymies) of LOVE was extracted from Lakoff & Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (1986) in order to see if these occur in Shakespeare:

LOVE IS BLIND(NESS), LOVE IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL, LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART, LOVE IS A CONTAINER, LOVE IS AN ENTITY, LOVE IS A FLUID (IN A CONTAINER),⁴ LOVE IS A GAME, LOVE IS FIRE, LOVE IS HEAT, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT, LOVE IS A NATURAL/PHYSICAL FORCE, LOVE IS MADNESS, LOVE IS MAGIC, LOVE IS A NUTRIENT, LOVE IS AN OPPONENT, LOVE IS A PATIENT, LOVE IS A (sic) RAPTURE, LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY (IN AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE), LOVE IS WAR, LOVE IS UNITY

This list does not categorise the metaphors of love any further, although one might see HIDDEN OBJECT and VALUABLE COMMODITY as sub-categories of ENTITY, FIRE as a sub-category of HEAT, MAGIC as a sub-

⁴ The container is the body, as Lakoff (1987: 387) and Kövecses (1990: 144–159) explain.

category of FORCE, and so on. An awareness of several layers of metaphor might have refined the analysis (cf. Grady 1997, Kövecses 1995).

The possibility that metaphors absent from the list might occur was not excluded. Spurgeon (1968), for example, treats metaphors not mentioned by authors on CMT, but her method is quite different from the present. I read each occurrence of the word *love*, verb or noun, in a context of seven lines, rather than looking at larger contexts. Many metaphors for love in the plays do not require the word *love*.

2.3. Kinds of love

The instances of the word *love*, verb and noun, were first categorised according to their participants, at least one of whom (or which) experiences love, and one is the target/cause(r)/object of love, mutuality being ideal. The notion of *participant domains* is included in the definitions, because one cannot always strictly pinpoint who or what (animal, imaginary being, etc.) is experiencing the emotion, while it does tend to be possible to say whether the love being expressed concerns romance or family relationships, for example. The definitions of the kinds of love run as follows (adapted from Tissari 2003: 2, 360–361):

(α) The participants of family love (*storge*) are members of the same family. This love occurs in the participant domain of family.

(β) The participants of marital love (*storge-eros*) are spouses. This love occurs in the participant domain of marriage.

(γ) The participants of sexual love (*eros*) are (potential) lovers. This love occurs in the participant domain of sexuality.

(δ) The participants of friendship love (*philia*) are neither members of the same family, spouses of one another, or (potential) lovers, but this love occurs in the domain of friendship, between people who share thoughts or interests, or out of a wish to do something good to another human being.

(ε) The participants of religious love (*agape*) include God, or a god, at least indirectly through a divine command or inspiration, and this love occurs between a human and a divine being, or pertains to someone who acts out of faith.

(ζ) At least one of the participants of ‘love of “things”’ is non-human (animal or inanimate). This love occurs in the participant domain of the “rest of the world”, in contrast to the above.

It is difficult to perfect these definitions logically, but it is also assumed that these categories attest prototype effects and partly overlap with each other (Lakoff 1987: 91–114, Taylor 1991: 54–55, Tissari 2003: 9–78, 242–244). As regards the present data, the analysis is facilitated by one’s knowledge of which character is speaking and to whom, even if Shakespeare also loves secrets, surprises, and puns.

In general, the categorisation seemed fairly easy, but I mention a passage which could not be categorised into any of the above from *Two Noble Kinsmen*, discussing the love of the two brothers who are each other's friends. Note how various kinds of love mingle (or blend) in the passage (see Coulson & Oakley 2000 for *blending*). It also contains the metaphor LOVE IS PROGENERATION (Turner 1996: 52–56):⁵

(2) We are an endless mine to one another:
We are one another's *wife*, ever *begetting*
New *births* of *love*; we are *father*, friends, acquaintance;
We are in one another, *families*.
I am your *heir*, and you are mine.
(*Two Noble Kinsmen* 2.02.81)

3. Introducing examples of metaphor types

To make the analysis more transparent, this section offers examples of metaphor types found specifically in *Romeo and Juliet*, and in the plays in general. This play has been chosen for reasons of familiarity, and since Romeo and Juliet can be considered “archetypal lovers” (cf. section 4.1.). However, since a part of the metaphors can only be found in other plays, it seems reasonable to exemplify these as well.

⁵ I made a note of this metaphor, but it was not frequent enough to enter the final results as presented below. This does not mean that it is not of interest, pertaining as it does to the characteristics of the metaphor LOVE IS A HUMAN BEING, which overlaps with LOVE IS AN ANIMATE ENTITY.

3.1. *Romeo and Juliet*

This section will start with metaphors of containment, which characterize the word *love* in both early modern and present-day English data (Tissari 2003: 333–336, 380, 428, cf. Kövecses 1990: 144–159). Another, even more popular metaphor is LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY (IN AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE) (Kövecses 1986: 95, 1998: 58, 2000: 28, 178, Tissari 2003: 338–343, 380). Renaissance English discussions of love often involve a personification of love in the figure of Cupid (attested even in letters by a nun; see Tissari 2003: 372), so he will be discussed separately, continuing with the juxtaposed elements of fire and water (cf. Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995: 158), and with LOVE AS A PLANT. I will also briefly introduce expressions which involve religious elements.

3.1.1. Metaphors of containment

Metaphors of containment attest a crux of CMT, since linguists seem especially to disagree about the likelihood that the following usage of prepositions

(3) BENVOLIO. What sadness lengthens Romeo's hours?
ROMEO. Not having that, which, having, makes them short.
BENVOLIO. *In love?*
ROMEO. *Out –*
BENVOLIO. *Of love?*
ROMEO. Out of her favour where I am *in love*.

(1.1.154–159)

is based on people's experiencing love as some kind of CONTAINER (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 29–32, Kövecses 1990: 144–159).⁶ On the other hand, it seems quite natural for people to imagine, for example, that the womb is a safe place for a baby and that people miss that kind of safety later. As long as we are working in the framework of CMT, these cases are in any case relevant, and Shakespeare seems to love to play with (the idioms) *in* and *out of love* (see, e.g., *1 Henry IV* 4.01.8, *Two gentlemen of Verona* 2.01.79, 81, 5.04.53 for *in love*, and *2 Henry IV* 2.02.12, *King John* 2.01.157 and *Timon of Athens* 1.02.182 for *out of love*). (See sections 3.1.4. for the metaphor THE HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE and 3.1.5. for the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR THE EMOTIONS.)

3.1.2. LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY

This metaphor, a general favourite in both early modern and present-day English, is infrequent in *Romeo and Juliet*, although the phrase *dear love* occurs several times. Whether one should consider *dear* in this case as a word related to money is debatable, although originally I did so, and from a somewhat ironic point of view, the pun works. Indeed, the young lovers do not seem to focus on realistically estimating the cost of their love. A different example of this metaphor occurs in Act five,

⁶ The references given support the said claim. As for opposition to this claim, I have often encountered it when discussing my research publicly.

where Romeo looks back to the time when he enjoyed the company of Juliet:

(4) ROMEO. Ah me, how sweet is *love* itself *possessed*,
When but *love's* shadows are so *rich* in joy!
(5.1.10–11)

Note that Romeo does not really think about love and marriage in terms of an economic exchange – he is not a beggar who has found a rich man's daughter and dreams of wealth, gold lighting up in his eyes. In this sense the metaphor is genuinely metaphorical, while money and marriage can also go hand in hand, the metaphor thus having a possible metonymic basis (cf. e.g. Lévi-Strauss 1969 [1949]: 52–68 et passim, Westermarck 1926: 156–183).

3.1.3. Cupid, personification and violence

Many metaphors of LOVE meet in the person of Cupid: he is love personified (LOVE IS A HUMAN BEING), he employs FORCES, he can use MAGIC and, being mischievous, he likes to make A GAME or even WAR of love. BLINDNESS is also associated with Cupid, because good eyesight is necessary for aiming his arrows at the right people. Eros, the god of love, “is associated with Chaos” (Shestakov 1996: 5, cf. Hutton 1980: 170), which may well comprise both FORCES and BLINDNESS. The following quote hovers between a reference to Cupid and a sexual innuendo:

(5) *If love be blind, love cannot hit the mark.*
(2.01.33)

The art historian Nevitt (2003: 217) suggests that the “darkness to which the lovers repair ... has both erotic and aesthetic connotations. Love by definition seeks privacy.” He notes an emblem in which Cupid embraces a woman “in the darkness of a cave” (218).

The next quote reminds us of Cupid belonging to a larger group of mythical figures, including the beautiful, virginal, and easily angered Diana, among others:

(6) ROMEO. Well, in that hit you miss: she'll not be *hit*
With Cupid's arrow, she hath Dian's wit;⁷
And in strong proof of chastity *well armed*,
From *Love's weak childish bow* she lives *uncharmed*.
She will not stay *the siege* of loving terms,
Nor bide the *encounter of assailing eyes*,
Nor ope her lap to saint-seducing gold.
(1.1.199–205)

Beside being associated with WAR, the *arrow* and *bow* also remind one of HUNTING, and *uncharmed* of MAGIC.⁸ The adjectives *weak* and

⁷ In a recent presentation, Päivi Koivisto-Alanko (2005, cf. 2000) pointed out that the noun *wit* has “bawdy uses” in Shakespeare. In other words, Romeo is not only assessing the woman’s intelligence and character, but already directing his hearer towards well-protected chastity. Consider also Hardin 2000: 52–78.

childish are interesting as well, providing a description of Cupid, and perhaps also suggesting that she controls her emotions through reason. The last line in example six reminds one of the metaphor LOVE IS AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE, perhaps even hinting at paid love and, since this is not a description of Juliet, Romeo may well have money in mind.

Both the sixth and the seventh examples incorporate so many metaphors and images that it might be preferable to discuss them through blending theory (Coulson & Oakley 2000), but I will remain faithful to the original analysis despite its limitations. As regards example five, the original notes only mention the personification of love. To be more precise, Cupid attracts a cluster of metaphors in *Romeo and Juliet*.

One of the problems of analysing a good number of brief extracts from the plays (corpus data) is that one does not necessarily pay enough attention to recurring images, such as that of Cupid, whose wings reappear elsewhere in the play (2.02.66, cf. Hutton 1980: 170). Wings may also be associated with birds, following Spurgeon (1968: 48–49). The BIRD interpretation seems equally valid on the basis of reading a few lines, but does not create as much cohesion in the play as a whole, and between the play and its times.

The list of the cognitive metaphors of LOVE (cf. section 2.2.) apparently guided me to notice some metaphors at the cost of others, in

⁸ Cf. Coleman (1999: 109) and Caitlin (1999b: 14, 16) on metaphors of love in English, Spurgeon (1969: 99–106) for Shakespeare's hunting imagery or Baider & Gesuato (2003: 27, 29, 30, 33–34) for Italian and French.

spite of the attempt to identify all and every metaphor. As regards example seven, the notes include love as A FORCE (including BURDEN),⁹ and as A CONTAINER (*to sink in it*), plus a reference to the personification of love (Cupid, LOVE AS A HUMAN BEING):

(7) MERCUTIO. You are a *lover*, borrow Cupid's *wings*,
And *soar* with them *above a common bound*.
ROMEO. I am too *sore enpiercé*d with *his shaft*
To soar with his *light* feathers, and so *bound*
I cannot bound a pitch above dull woe:
Under *love's heavy burden* do I *sink*.
MERCUTIO. And *to sink in it* should you *burden love*,
Too great oppression for a *tender* thing.
ROMEO. Is *love a tender* thing? it is too *rough*,
Too rude, too *boist'rous*, and it *pricks like thorn*.
MERCUTIO. If *love be rough* with you, be *rough with love*:
Prick love for pricking, and you *beat love down*.
(1.4.17–28)

However, other metaphors could certainly be discerned here, such as LOVE IS UP (cf. HAPPY IS UP, LIFE IS UP, GOOD IS UP, Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14–24, or Hampe 2005), and LOVE IS A GAME / WAR.

A further detail about personification is that while Cupid can be called *Love* (or *love*), the noun *love* can also be used to refer to the beloved (perhaps even the lover; see example five). In this passage, we are not necessarily meant to be quite sure whether the one who is rough is

⁹ A force which makes one *sink*.

Cupid or the female lover. We could also read into the passage a metonymic interpretation of love as standing for sex, or the female body, even her genitals (cf. Baider & Gesuato 2003: 17 et ibid, Hines 1994: 298, 300, 1999a: 148, 150–151). A thorough analysis of Shakespeare's *love* metaphors should also take all the sexual puns into account.

The relatively brief examples six and seven amply illustrate the limits of my original analysis. Even if the metaphors could be objectively captured in numbers, which is debatable, my findings are tentative rather than final.

3.1.4. LOVE IS A PLANT

The theme of *love* as the beloved person, or the female body, continues in the image of A PLANT. Beside being an emotion which grows like a flower, *love* in example eight can also be understood as Juliet's body, still budding in virginity:

(8) JULIET. Sweet, good night:
This *bud of love*, by summer's ripening breath,
May prove a *beauteous flower* when next we meet.
Good night, good night! as sweet repose and rest
Come *to thy heart* as that *within my breast*.
(2.2.120–124)

Such flower rhetoric had mediaeval, courtly origins (Wayne 1992: 66–68), and was related to the image of a garden of love, which was

depicted in paintings, among other things (Nevitt 2003: 24–35 et passim). One might investigate whether the metaphor LOVE IS A PLANT changes its character with time. Do present-day English texts as frequently suggest an understanding of the noun *love* as the female body? (I would suggest not.) Are characteristics of plants come to be understood as corresponding to characteristics of the emotion love rather than those of the beloved person? Flower and plant imagery does, of course, continue in metaphors for (beloved) women and their parts (Caitlin 1994: 297, 303, 1999a: 151, 158, Coleman 1999: 54–64). Flowers and gardens could also be associated with innocence, the paradise and the pastoral (as in Hardin 2000: 61–62).

Another metaphor in this passage is THE HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE (or, LOVE IS IN THE HEART; see Kövecses 1986: 83, 1988: 43–44). In Shakespeare’s contemporary theory of the body and mind, as presented by Harvey (1975: 51–52), the heart was the “most important of all the organs” because it emitted the so-called bodily spirit. However, a person’s soul could not be contained in the heart. Thus it may be that the LOVE IS IN THE HEART metaphor underscores love as a “felt emotion”, i.e., a physiological experience. However, it was also thought that after a lover’s eyes had caught an image of the beloved, this image was stored in the heart (Burnley 1979: 106–109, Karnein 1985: 145).

Even Shakespeare uses the LOVE IS A PLANT METAPHOR in a different way. Consider the reference to peaceful cohabitation in the following example (cf. example [16] below):

(9) ... Th' honoured gods
Keep Rome in safety and the chairs of justice
Supplied with worthy men, *plant love* among 's,
Throng our large temples with the shows of peace,
And not our streets with war!
(Coriolanus 3.03.35)

3.1.5. FIRE and WATER

In *Romeo and Juliet*, love is also associated with the elements fire and water, mental disorder (MADNESS), gall (bitterness), sweetness (NUTRIENT), and melancholy. The meeting-point for all these is the doctrine of bodily humours, in which the idea of the emotions as contained in the body may partly originate (Geeraerts & Grondealaers 1995, Gevaert 2005).¹⁰

Romeo describes a melancholic lover as follows:

(10) ROMEO. *Love is a smoke made with the fume of sighs,
Being purged, a fire sparkling in lover's eyes,
Being vexed, a sea nourished with loving tears.
What is it else? a madness most discreet,
A choking gall, and a preserving sweet.*

¹⁰ For melancholy and the humours see Gellert Lyons (1971: 1–6 et passim).

(1.1.181–185)

In the original analysis, this passage started with the metaphor LOVE IS FIRE, continued with LOVE IS A NATURAL FORCE / A SEA, and ended with the metaphor LOVE IS MADNESS. Because the seven-line passage containing the word *love* ended with line 184, the metaphor LOVE IS A NUTRIENT remained undiscovered,¹¹ despite the presence of *loving* in line 183. *Loving* occurs with both the nouns *kisses* and *tears* in Shakespeare's drama, characterizing the behaviour of the lovers.

The fireplace was the source of both warmth, possible nuisance (*smoke*), and food. If it corresponds to the lover, then the LOVER IS A CONTAINER FOR (THE FIRE OF) LOVE. Caitlin (1994: 295–296) terms fireplace type of metaphors PEOPLE ARE OBJECTS. The fact that the physiologically based metonymy LOVE IS HEAT is absent from the general findings of this analysis suggests that the kind of HEAT associated with the word *love* in Shakespeare tends to be FIRE (cf. Gevaert 2005, Kövecses 1986: 86–87, 1988: 46–47).

Tears and *gall* might be associated with the crucifixion of Christ. The paradox of love is that it comprises suffering and life (is bitter-sweet, destroys as well as preserves). Perhaps *gall* should be considered A NUTRIENT as well.

¹¹ This does not affect the final results, because these only concern metaphor types per play, and a couple of other instances of this metaphor were discovered in *Romeo and Juliet*.

In the analysis of the word *sea*, the interpretation that it attests the metaphor LOVE IS A NATURAL FORCE was based on the preceding characterization of the sea as *vexed*. This verbal adjective may characterize the inner turmoil of the lover (THE BODY IS THE CONTAINER FOR LOVE), as well as a sense of being contained in a violent mass of water, thus producing the metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER. Note that in Kövecses's present-day English examples (1990: 130), the NATURAL FORCE metaphors tend to characterize LOVE as something eventually rather pleasant. Although the melancholic lover may well have enjoyed loving to a great extent, the elements in the melancholic picture of love seem less "happy" than those in Kövecses's ideal scenario for love (1986: 93–96, 1998: 56–59). We would probably need a different scenario for Renaissance melancholic love.

The related metaphor LOVE IS AN ILLNESS (/ A DISEASE) (Kövecses 1988: 75, 2000: 26) is suggested by such words as the verb *suffer*, and even more directly by the adjective *sick*:

(11) BENEDICK: *Suffer love* – a good epithet. I do *suffer love*
Indeed, for I *love* thee against my will.
(*Much Ado About Nothing* 5.02.67; *eros*)

(12) My talk to thee must be how Benedick
Is *sick in love* with Beatrice ...
(*Much Ado About Nothing* 3.01.21; *eros*)

3.1.6. Love and religion

Although there are not many examples of this in *Romeo and Juliet*, an analysis of the word *love* in Shakespeare's drama also suggests that romantic / sexual love is associated with religion, which probably dates back to the mixing of the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the adoration of the beloved in courtly love (Boase 1977: 83–86). This kind of examples might fit under the metaphor LOVE IS A RELIGION / RELIGIOUS RITE. Of course, marriage itself is a Catholic sacrament, so it really is a central rite, and contains an association with the domain of the miraculous and the mystical, even if this can be profaned (cf. *holy deadlock*, Coleman 1999: 333). Example (13) also relates to the burial rite (*obsequies*). Paris, a former betrothed of Julia, is visiting her tomb:

(13) PARIS. What cursèd foot wanders this way tonight,
To cross my obsequies and *true love's rite*?¹²
(5.3.18–19)

3.2. More metaphors

Not all the metaphors included in the preliminary list (cf. section 2.2.) occur in *Romeo and Juliet*, while they may occur in other plays. This calls for another section on metaphors, discussing some further metaphors and the difficulty in defining them.

¹² Note that the cross is a sign of the curse (Ga. 3: 13).

3.2.1. LOVE IS AN ENTITY

This ontological metaphor is actually a super-category; for example, of LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT (Kövecses 1986: 97, 1988: 60–61, cf. Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 25). Sometimes the nature of the entity remains rather unspecific, as in example (14):

(14) It shows but *little love* or judgement *in him*.
(*Timon of Athens*, 3.03.10; *philia*)

Extract (14) is also an example of the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR LOVE, as well as attesting an assessment of the quantity of love (cf. Tissari 2003: 336–338).

Sometimes it seems that the ENTITY can be defined more specifically, as A HOUSE / BUILDING, for example (or, more generally, A STRUCTURED OBJECT, cf. Kövecses 1998: 80–82):

(15) Shall *love*, in *building*, grow so *ruinous*?
(*The Comedy of Errors*, 3.02.4; *storge-eros*)

Metonymy is fairly strongly present as well. Consider, for example, an example from *Othello* which clearly refers to the battlefield (communicating peace with flags; in early modern English, the word *love* is also used for peace between nations and people[s], as in example [9]):

(16) I must show out a *flag* and *sign* of *love*
(*Othello* 1.01.156; *philia*)

3.2.2. LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT

In another example from *Othello*, we see not simply an assessment of the quantity of love, but also the idea that love is sought and can be found:

(17) Honey, you shall be well desired in Cyprus,
I have *found great love* amongst them.
(*Othello* 2.01.205; *philia*)

Note that in present-day English, this metaphor typically refers to people seeking romance rather than friendship and hospitality, like *Othello* (Kövecses 1986: 97, 1988: 60, cf. Tissari 2003: 370). In Shakespeare, romantic interest is also hidden on purpose, and not necessarily from the object of love, but from other people concerned (the word *friend* often referring to family members as well):¹³

(18) This we came not to
Only for propagation of a dower
Remaining in the coffer of her friends,
From whom we thought it meet *to hide our love*
Till time had made them for us.
(*Measure for Measure* 1.02.152; *eros*)

¹³ Nevitt (2003: 184–219) discusses paintings by Rembrandt in which lovers hide from other people's view.

3.2.3. LOVE IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL

According to Lakoff (1987: 392–395), this metaphor characterizes our attempts to control our “wild” and irrational emotions. In (19), the animal which could be captured is another person’s emotion:

(19) Her *love* is not the *hare* that I do *hunt*.
(*As You Like It* 4.03.18; *eros*)

It could be asked whether this is still the same metaphor, or should one call it, for example, LOVE IS AN ANIMAL TO BE CHASED / OBJECT OF PURSUIT (cf. OED *game* n10), which relates to the image of LOVE as HUNTING.¹⁴

3.2.4. LOVE IS A NATURAL/PHYSICAL FORCE

Since the metaphor LOVE IS A BURDEN was included among the FORCE metaphors in this analysis, it became a typical instance. In early modern English, people often *bear love* towards each other (Tissari 2003: 259, cf. OED *love* n1: 3, 4c). This usage often functions as a confirmation of loyalty (cf. also example [7] for the sexual connotations of bearing a *burden*):

¹⁴ Cf. section 3.1.3., or Nevitt 2003, for instance, who discusses FISHING as a “metaphor for amorous pursuit” on 189–190. That the hunting and fishing metaphors are quite alive in present-day English is suggested by Bank’s (1999) title, for example.

(20) The tender *love* I bear your grace, my lord ...
(*Richard III* 3.04.63; *philia*)

Then a couple of metaphors from the *Taming of the Shrew*:

(21) TRANIO: I pray, sir, tell me: is it possible
That *love* should of a sudden *take such hold*?
(1.01.147; *eros*)

(22) If *love* have *touched* you, naught remains but so
{Redime te captum quam queas minimo}.
(1.01.161; *eros*)

These examples relate to the stages in Kövecses's models of ideal and typical love (1986: 93–96, 103–105, 1998: 56–59, 67–70) in which the experiencers of love are attracted by another person and then lose their self-control. They could be associated with personification and Cupid as well as FORCES which intervene in a person's emotional life. In fact, the FORCES in Shakespeare are often physical in a way which reminds one of human action. The last example in this group involves the word *restrain* (a controlling force):

(23) They think my little stomach to the war
And your great *love* to me *restrains* you thus.
(*Troilus and Cressida* 3.03.221; *eros*)

3.2.5. LOVE IS A RAPTURE

The metaphor LOVE IS A (sic) RAPTURE (Kövecses 1986: 92, 1988: 54) was fairly difficult to discern from the FORCE metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 49, Kövecses 1986: 88–89, 49–51). The following is a rather good candidate, as it clearly differs from the above examples (20) – (23):

(24) This is the very *ecstasy of love* ...
(*Hamlet* 2.01.9; *eros*)

3.2.6. LOVE IS A UNITY (OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS)

According to Kövecses (1986: 62–67, 1988: 18–26, 2000: 27–29), this is a central metaphor of LOVE. While it was not very frequent in my data on the word LOVE in general (cf. Tissari 2003: 366, 380), it does play a more important role in Shakespeare's language. In (25), the love between two brothers is a knot:

(25) Their *knot of love*
Tied, weaved, entangled with so true, so long,
And with a finger of so deep a cunning,
May be outworn, never undone.
(*Two Noble Kinsmen* 1.01.41; *storge* [or *philia*])

Coleman (1999: 125) suggests that knots were used as tokens of love. She also includes the expression *knot of marriage* (1999: 395, 518).

In agreement with my previous research on the lexicon of love (Tissari 2003: 397–399, 2005: 150–152; see also Coleman 1999: 86–108), the LOVE IS A UNITY metaphor nevertheless seems to characterize friendship as well as romance:

(26) Whose *double bosoms seem to wear one heart*,
Whose hours, whose bed, whose meal and exercise
Are still together, who *twin* as ‘twere *in love*
Unseparable ...
(*Coriolanus* 4.04.15; *philia*)

Note also the metaphors LOVE IS IN THE HEART (Kövecses 1986: 83, 1988: 43–44) and LOVE IS A CONTAINER in extract (26). These friends appear like Siamese twins.

3.2.7. Love of ‘things’

For the sake of illustration, let us take a brief glimpse at the category ‘love of “things”’, which features the metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER and borders *storge* (*philia*):

(27) Tell them that you
know that Hero loves me. Intend a kind of zeal both
to the Prince and Claudio as *in love* of your brother’s
honour ...
(*Much Ado About Nothing*, 2.02.37)

3.2.8. Love and time

Time also clearly plays a role in Shakespeare's *love* metaphors (cf. Tissari 2003: 345–346). Sometimes one might say that this is because of the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, but although LOVE, like a JOURNEY, *begins* in (28), it is disputable whether journeys *persever*:¹⁵

(28) Say thou art mine, and ever
My love as it *begins* shall so *persever*.
(*All's well that ends well* 4.02.37; *eros*)

4. Findings

Since it is clear, especially with hindsight, that the analysis did not capture all of the metaphors occurring in connection with *love*, I decided to restrict myself to twenty types of metaphor. These are:

LOVE IS AN ANIMAL, LOVE IS BLIND(NESS), LOVE IS A CONTAINER,
LOVE IS A (VALUABLE) COMMODITY, LOVE IS AN ENTITY, LOVE IS
FIRE, LOVE IS A FLUID (IN A CONTAINER), LOVE IS A (NATURAL OR
PHYSICAL) FORCE, LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT, *LOVE IS ILLNESS,
LOVE IS MADNESS, LOVE IS MAGIC, LOVE IS A NUTRIENT, LOVE IS A
PATIENT, LOVE IS A PLANT, LOVE IS RAPTURE, *LOVE IS A RELIGION

¹⁵ See Coleman 1999: 118–119 for *Inconstancy*.

(OR RELIGIOUS RITE), *LOVE IS TIME (?), LOVE IS A UNITY (OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS), and LOVE IS WAR OR A GAME.

The metaphors LOVE IS ILLNESS, LOVE IS A RELIGION and LOVE IS TIME are marked with an asterisk, because they were not included in the original list (cf. section 2.2.). Besides, the question mark after LOVE IS TIME suggests that this may not be the best possible way of dealing with the phenomenon of discussing love in terms of time (cf. section 3.2.8.). The metaphors LOVE IS WAR and LOVE IS A GAME are bundled together, because WAR is difficult to distinguish from (VIOLENT) GAMES, and because both can attest ‘rules’ (coded ways of behaviour), sometimes quite similar to each other, especially in metaphorical language.

This section is divided into three parts. It will first deal with metaphor types per play, then with kinds of love, and lastly, with the general frequency of the metaphors.

4.1. Metaphor types per play

Table 1 shows how many metaphor types occurring close to the word *love* I originally noted per play. It suggests that *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *As You Like It* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* offer the most extensive repertoire of metaphors, and the richest discussion of *love* in metaphors. *Titus* and *The Tempest* seem to offer the least types. These figures are not likely to correlate with anything like the

general richness of imagery in the plays, but it seems that plays dealing with the history of England are more straightforward in their usage of the word *love* than plays involving romance. The results form a fairly neat continuum with small differences between adjoining plays.

Table 1. Cognitive metaphor types of the word *love* / concept LOVE per play (out of a total of types: 20).

<i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i>	14
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	13
<i>As You Like It</i>	12
<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor</i>	12
<i>Hamlet</i>	11
<i>King Lear</i>	11
<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	11
<i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	11
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i>	11
<i>Julius Caesar</i>	10
<i>Two Noble Kinsmen</i>	9
<i>Pericles</i>	9
<i>Twelfth Night</i>	9
<i>Coriolanus</i>	9
<i>Cymbeline</i>	9
<i>Troilus and Cressida</i>	9
<i>Love's Labour's Lost</i>	9
<i>All's Well That Ends Well</i>	8
<i>Henry V</i>	8
<i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	8
<i>King John</i>	8
<i>Othello</i>	8
<i>The Winter's Tale</i>	7
<i>1 Henry VI</i>	7
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	7
<i>Measure for Measure</i>	7
<i>Richard III</i>	7

<i>2 Henry IV</i>	5
<i>The First Part of the Contention</i>	5
<i>Richard II</i>	5
<i>Richard, Duke of York</i>	5
<i>1 Henry IV</i>	5
<i>Timon of Athens</i>	5
<i>Macbeth</i>	5
<i>The Comedy of Errors</i>	4
<i>The Tempest</i>	4
<i>Titus</i>	3

There is a connection between the number of instances of the word *love* in each play, and the number of metaphor types per play, although the correlation is not completely straightforward. One finds most instances of the word in the plays *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *As You Like It*, and *Romeo and Juliet*. However, the word is not quite as frequent in *Hamlet*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *King Lear*. To illustrate, *love* items occur 209 times in the *Two Gentlemen*, but only 85 times in *Hamlet*. It is also worth our notice that *love* occurs 140 times in *Love's Labour's Lost*, but this play does not rank as high as *Hamlet*, for example. Clearly then, the plays differ in the extent to which the word *love* is used metaphorically. Moreover, Shakespeare does not need the word *love* to create spellbinding accounts of love. The word is fairly infrequent in *Antony and Cleopatra* (cf. Tissari 1999: 189 et passim, 2003: 286).

4.2. Kinds of love and metaphors

Table 2 shows how the metaphor types join with kinds of love. It agrees with *eros* being the most frequent sense category of the word *love* (55%), and *philia* the second most frequent (22%). These attest the most metaphor types as well. ‘Family love’ (*storge*) and ‘marital love’ (*storge-eros*) attest proportionally more metaphor types than might be expected given that these categories are clearly less frequent with regard to the word *love* (7% and 6%). Compared to these, ‘love of things’ (6%) does not seem to invite metaphors. ‘Religious love’ (*agape*) is very infrequent (1%), providing a couple of metaphors. It should be noticed that Shakespeare tends to treat religious love indirectly (Tissari 1999: 184, 2003: 286; for a more detailed treatment see Morris 1972).

Table 2. Kinds of LOVE and their metaphors (in connection with the word *love*) in Shakespeare’s plays.

Metaphor /Kind	Family	Marital	Sexual	Friendship	Religious	“Things”
ANIMAL	X		X	X		
BLIND(NESS)		X	X	X		
CONTAINER	X	X	X	X	X	X
COMMODITY	X	X	X	X		X
ENTITY	X	X	X	X	X	X
FIRE	X		X	X		
FLUID		X	X	X		
FORCE	X	X	X	X		X
HIDDEN OBJECT	X		X	X		X
ILLNESS			X			
MADNESS	X	X	X	X		

MAGIC		X	X	X		
NUTRIENT	X	X	X	X		
PATIENT			X			
PLANT			X	X		
RAPTURE			X	X		
[religion]			X	X		
[time]	X	X	X	X		
UNITY	X	X	X	X		
WAR/GAME	X		X	X		

Only two metaphors, LOVE IS A CONTAINER and LOVE IS AN ENTITY seem to apply to all kinds of love. At the other extreme are LOVE IS AN ILLNESS (OR DISEASE) and LOVE IS A PATIENT, which only characterize ‘sexual (/romantic) love’. However, further research on the metaphors of the word *love* suggests that the more a kind of love is discussed in a text, the more metaphor types are likely to appear. In other words, it has not been ascertained that some metaphors only go with some kinds of love, and others with other kinds, although *eros* clearly dominates any general account of metaphors (Tissari 2003: 367–369).

Table 2 could also be interpreted to mean that Shakespeare’s favourite metaphors in connection with the word *love* are: LOVE IS A CONTAINER, LOVE IS A (VALUABLE) COMMODITY, LOVE IS AN ENTITY, and LOVE IS A FORCE. This would, however, underestimate the role of the personification of love and of Cupid. As such, the result is fairly neutral as regards the question of whether love is tender or violent in Shakespeare.

4.3. On the frequency of the metaphors

Table 3, containing results on the frequency of the types of metaphors in the plays, measured in terms of how many plays these occur in, sheds some more light on this issue. The highest ranking LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY is not violent, but the next category, LOVE IS A FORCE, suggests that the word *love* is conceptualized as more violent in Shakespeare than in early modern and present-day English in general, which prefer the metaphors LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY and LOVE IS A (FLUID IN A) CONTAINER to LOVE IS A FORCE (Tissari 2003: 380). Moreover, the metaphor LOVE IS MADNESS is more frequent in Shakespeare than in the other data which I have studied (Tissari 2003: 366).

Table 3. On the frequency of cognitive metaphors of *love* / LOVE in Shakespeare's plays.

Metaphor	Occurs in X of 37 plays
LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY	36
LOVE IS A (NATURAL/PHYSICAL) FORCE	32
LOVE IS AN ENTITY	31
LOVE IS A CONTAINER	30
LOVE IS MADNESS	20
LOVE IS FIRE	18
LOVE IS A UNITY	17
LOVE IS A FLUID (IN A CONTAINER)	14
LOVE IS A NUTRIENT (/FOOD)	13
LOVE IS WAR / A GAME	11
LOVE IS MAGIC	11
LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT	11

[religion]	11
[time]	10
LOVE IS BLIND(NESS)	7
LOVE IS AN ILLNESS	6
LOVE IS A (CAPTIVE) ANIMAL	6

One might also interpret these results by saying that *love* is more dynamic in Shakespeare than in early modern English in general. This certainly underlines his dramatic talent, including fun and puns. In drama, the experience of love is presented as more intense than in everyday life. One could also try to trace the preference for the FORCE and MADNESS metaphors back to Shakespeare's time and contemporary philosophy, if not to his person and idiolect.

5. Conclusions

Although this analysis of cognitive metaphors occurring with the word *love* in Shakespeare's plays cannot do justice to all the subtlety of his language, it suggests several things:

(a) Shakespeare's metaphorical usage of the word *love* (verb and noun) does differ from early modern (and present-day) English in general, but it remains to be seen how much it differs from that of other early modern English plays.

(b) Shakespeare's plays themselves differ from one another as regards the extent to which the word *love* is used metaphorically. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *As You Like It* and the *Merry Wives of Windsor* seem to contain the largest range of metaphor types per play.

(c) Although the most frequent sense of the word *love*, 'sexual love', also attracts the most metaphor types, 'friendship love' comes quite close, and Shakespeare also uses a majority of the metaphor types listed in the three tables above to discuss 'family love' and 'marital love'.

(d) As expected, the metaphor LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY tops the metaphors frequency list but, somewhat surprisingly, LOVE IS A (NATURAL/PHYSICAL) FORCE is the second most frequent metaphor. It appears that love is violent rather than tender in Shakespeare. This suggestion of violence agrees with the mischievous characteristics of Cupid, and the directness with which Shakespeare's plays talk about sex, all the jokes and banter considered.¹⁶ One way of continuing this line of research would be to consider the FORCE metaphors in terms of gender (see Koller 2004: 116–119, 178 et passim).

¹⁶ I cannot help thinking of the plays the *Taming of the Shrew*, in which the taming is rather physical, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in which the revenge of the ladies on their proclaimed lover also involves torturing his body. Jokes and banter also recall of *Twelfth Night*, but the list does not stop there.

(e) To pursue the metaphors occurring with the word *love* in Shakespeare, it would, however, be also necessary to differentiate between “true and false friends”, so to say, among the metaphor types. Some of the seemingly familiar metaphors of LOVE may actually have different characteristics in Shakespeare than in present-day English, and his metaphors may also form scenarios different from those of the ideal and typical love presented by Kövecses (1986:93–96, 103–105, 1998: 56–59, 67–70).

(f) Another interesting topic for further research that suggests itself is the concept of LOVE as (metaphorically) occurring inside and outside bodies, the self and others, including the personification of love in Cupid, and LOVE as surrounding the lover, for example, as A SEA (Spurgeon 1968: 47–48). This would require some work on the interrelationships between these CONTAINER metaphors and other metaphors such as LOVE IS A (NATURAL/ PHYSICAL) FORCE, which is why I did not include personification in tables one to three. The findings thus seem to converge into the topic of embodiment, discussed by both Lakoff and Johnson (1999), and Spurgeon (1968: 49) in the context of Shakespeare’s imagery – she points out that “[o]f the images grouped under ‘daily indoor life’, by far the largest section is that taken from the body and its movements.”

To develop this study, one might also take into account that the plays have to do with tensions between people and their desires, between good and bad, and between men and women (cf. Hawkins 2001, Muir 1985). In Shakespeare's drama, love is not as much a thing as a human characteristic, and further work would invite value judgements as well (cf. Pires de Oliveira 2001: 32–36 et passim).

Heli Tissari

Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki

heli.tissari@helsinki.fi

Bibliography

- Baider, Fabienne H. & Sara Gesuato (2003): "Masculinist metaphors, feminist research", at: *metaphorik.de* 05/2003, 6–35.
- Bank, Melissa (1999): *The girls' guide to hunting and fishing* (a novel), New York: Penguin.
- Blakemore Evans, G. (Ed., 1984): *Romeo and Juliet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boase, Roger (1977): *The origin and meaning of courtly love: A critical study of European scholarship*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Burnley, J.D. (1979): *Chaucer's language and the philosophers' tradition*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Coleman, Julie (1999): *Love, Sex, and Marriage: A Historical Thesaurus*, Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Coulson, Seana & Todd Oakley (2000): "Blending Basics", in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 11–3, 175–196.
- Deppert, Alex (2003): "Die Wahl der Metaphern: Kontextbedingte Bedeutungsverschiebung bei Metaphern mit unterschiedlichem Lexikalierungsgrad", at: *metaphorik.de* 05/2003, 62–89.
- Geeraerts, Dirk & Stefan Grondelaers (1995): "Looking back at anger: Cultural traditions and metaphorical patterns", in: Taylor, John R. & Robert E. MacLaury (Eds.): *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 153–179.
- Gellert Lyons, Bridget (1971): *Voices of Melancholy: Studies in literary treatments of melancholy in Renaissance England*, New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Gevaert, Caroline (2005): "The ANGER IS HEAT question: Detecting cultural influence on the conceptualization of ANGER through diachronic corpus analysis", in: Delbecque, Nicole, Johan van der Auwera & Dirk Geeraerts (Eds.): *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 195–208.

- Grady, Joseph E. (1997): “THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS revisited”, in:
Cognitive Linguistics 8–4, 267–290.
- Hampe, Beate (2005): “When *down* is not bad, and *up* not good enough:
A usage-based assessment of the plus-minus parameter in image-
schema theory”, in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 16–1, 81–112.
- Hardin, Richard F. (2000): *Love in a Green Shade: Idyllic romances
ancient to modern*, Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska
Press.
- Harvey, Ruth E. (1975): *The Inward Wits: Psychological Theory in the
Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, London: The Warburg Institute,
University of London.
- Hawkins, Bruce (2001): “Incorporating Tensions: On the Treatment of
Ideology in Cognitive Linguistics”, in: Dirven, René, Bruce
Hawkins & Esra Sandikcioglu (Eds.): *Language and Ideology.
Volume 1: Theoretical cognitive approaches*, Amsterdam &
Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–22.
- Hines, Caitlin (1994): “ ‘Let me call you sweetheart’: The WOMAN AS
DESSERT metaphor”, in: Bucholtz, Mary, A.C. Liang, Laurel A.
Sutton & Caitlin Hines (Eds.): *Cultural Performances: Proceedings
of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 8, 9
and 10, 1994*, Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group,
University of California, 295–303.

- Hines, Caitlin (1999a): “Rebaking the pie: The WOMAN AS DESSERT metaphor”, in: Mary Bucholtz, A.C. Liang & Laurel A. Sutton (Eds.): *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*, New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 145–162.
- Hines, Caitlin (1999b): “Foxy chicks and Playboy bunnies: A case study in metaphorical lexicalization”, in: Hiraga, Masako K., Chris Sinha & Sherman Wilcox (Eds.): *Cultural, Psychological and Typological Issues in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9–23.
- Hutton, James (1980), *Essays on Renaissance Poetry* (Ed. by Rita Guerlac), Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Karnein, Alfred (1985): *DE AMORE in volkssprachlicher Literatur: Untersuchungen zur Andreas-Capellanus-Rezeption in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi (2000): *Abstract Words in Abstract Worlds: Directionality and Prototypical Structure in the Semantic Change in English Nouns of Cognition*, Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi (2005): “Etymological dictionaries meet cognitive metaphors: Detecting and analysing semantic change”, paper given at the symposium HEL-LEX *New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*, Helsinki 19 March 2005.
- Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi & Tissari, Heli (2006): “Sense and sensibility: Rational thought versus emotion in metaphorical language”, in:

- Anatol Stefanowitsch & Stefan Gries (Eds.): *Corpus Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 185–207.
- Koller, Veronika (2004): *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse: A Critical Cognitive Study*, Houndmills, Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (1986): *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (1988): *The Language of Love: The Semantics of Passion in Conversational English*, Lewisburg, London & Toronto: Bucknell University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (1990): *Emotion Concepts*, New York etc.: Springer.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (1995): “American friendship and the scope of metaphor”, in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 6–4, 315–346.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2000): *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George (1987): *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson (1999): *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books.
- Lewis, C.S. (1968 [1960]): *The Four Loves*, London & Glasgow: Collins.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1969 [1949]): *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Morris, Ivor (1972): *Shakespeare's God: The Role of Religion in the Tragedies*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Muir, Kenneth (1985): *Shakespeare: Contrasts and controversies*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Nerlich, Brigitte & David D. Clarke (2002): "Blending the past and present: Conceptual and linguistic integration, 1800–2000", in: René Dirven & Ralf Pörings (Ed.): *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 555–593.
- Nevitt, H. Rodney (Jr.) (2003): *Art and the Culture of Love in Seventeenth-Century Holland*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OED = *Oxford English Dictionary*, the. *OED Online* at
<<http://dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl>> [consulted August 2005]
- Partridge, Eric (1968 [1947]): *Shakespeare's bawdy: A literary & psychological essay and a comprehensive glossary*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Pires de Oliveira, Roberta (2001): “Language and Ideology: An interview with George Lakoff”, in: Dirven, René, Bruce Hawkins & Esra Sandikcioglu (Eds.): *Language and Ideology. Volume 1: Theoretical cognitive approaches*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 23–47.
- Shakespeare, William > see Blakemore Evans, Spevack, Wells & Taylor
- Spevack, Marvin (1970): *A Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare Volume 5*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F.E. (1968): *Shakespeare’s imagery and what it tells us*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shestakov, Vyacheslav P. (1996): *The philosophy of Eros and European art*, Lewiston, Queenston & Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Taylor, John R. (1995 [1989]): *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tissari, Heli (1999): “Love Shakes the Spheres: Five Prototypical Meanings in Shakespeare’s Plays”, in: Tanskanen, Sanna-Kaisa & Brita Wårvik (Eds.): *Proceedings from the 7th Nordic Conference on English Studies*, Turku: University of Turku, 175–191.
- Tissari, Heli (2003): *LOVEscapes: Changes in prototypical senses and cognitive metaphors since 1500*, Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Tissari, Heli (2004): “Vistas of fear and hope: On metaphors occurring with the English words *fear* and *hope*”, in: Nenonen, Marja (Ed.):

- Papers from the 30th Finnish Conference of Linguistics, Joensuu, May 15–16, 2003*, Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 214–220.
- Tissari, Heli (2005): “LOVE in words: Experience and conceptualization in the modern English lexicon of LOVE”, in: Delbecque, Nicole, Johan van der Auwera & Dirk Geeraerts (Ed.): *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 143–176.
- Turner, Mark (1996): *The literary mind*, New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wayne, Valerie (1992): “Introduction” to *The Flower of Friendship: A Renaissance Dialogue Contesting Marriage by Edmund Tilney*, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1–96.
- Wells, Stanley & Gary Taylor (Eds., 1989): *William Shakespeare. The Complete Works: Electronic edition for the IBM PC*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Westermarck, Edward (1926): *A Short History of Marriage*, London: Macmillan.