



The Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTER'S THESIS

Study programme: English and Literacy Studies	Spring term, 2024 Open
Author: Lili Liu (signatur author)
Supervisor: Professor Merja Stenroos	
Title of thesis: A Comparison of Conceptual Metaphors of Love and Marriage in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> and <i>Bridget Jones's Diary</i>	
Keywords: Conceptual metaphor, love, romance, relationship, marriage, <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> , <i>Bridget Jones's Diary</i> , England, romantic and marital cultural changes	Pages: 96 + attachment/other: 16 Stavanger, May 2024 date/year

Abstract

This thesis analyses and compares conceptual metaphors of love and marriage in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) and Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones Diary* (1996) to observe romantic and marital cultural changes in the English society across the time span of these two novels. The major theory applied in the study is Lakoff and Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which proposes a correlation between metaphor and culture. This theory is used to identify and analyse conceptual metaphors of love and marriage in the two novels. Possible reasons are proposed as to why some metaphors appear in both novels while others are only found in one of them. It is discovered that the shared metaphors are either fundamental to the discourse of love and marriage or reflect their basic experience and nature. Metaphors that only appear in one novel reflect the liberation of sexuality, the progress in gender equality promoted by the feminist movement, and the new equilibrium and challenges posed by today's more equal relationships.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Merja Stenroos, who designed this thesis with me, recommended relevant books, guided my writing, and spoke the warmest encouragement when writing became difficult. All the email exchanges, supervision meetings, and countless comments have become memories of this unforgettable year of thesis composition.

I also want to thank my friends John, Stefan, Shijian, and Kathrine. All of you have graciously helped and supported me during my writing. I will remember this in my heart.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
List of Abbreviations.....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
2. The Metaphor and Linguistic Prototype Theories.....	9
2.1 A Brief History of the Study of Metaphor.....	9
2.2 Conceptual Metaphor Theory	13
2.3 Other Approaches to Metaphor	19
2.4 The Difference between CMT and Other Metaphor Theories	21
2.4.1 A Comparison of the Comparison, Substitution and Property Attribution Theories.....	21
2.4.2 A Comparison of CMT, Substitution, Comparison and Property Attribution Theories and The Analogical Model	22
2.5 The Linguistic Prototype Theory.....	25
3. Metaphors of Love and Marriage.....	28
4. Plot Summaries and Comparison of <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> and <i>Bridget Jones's Diary</i>	41
4.1 Plot Summary of <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	41
4.2 Plot Summary of <i>Bridget Jones's Diary</i>	43
4.3 A Comparison of <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> and <i>Bridget Jones's Diary</i>	44
5. Literary Metaphors in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	47
6. Methodology	50
7. Findings.....	53
7.1 Analysis of Metaphors in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	53
7.1.1 Love Is an Object.....	53
7.1.2 Love Is a Disease	55
7.1.3 Love Is a Force	56
7.1.4 Love Is a Catching Game.....	58
7.1.5 Love Is a Risky Thing.....	59
7.1.6 Love Is a Creature.....	61
7.1.7 Love Is a Union.....	62
7.1.8 Metonym: Love and Marriage Are Happiness.....	63
7.1.9 Metonym: A Person Is a Place.....	63

7.1.10 Marriage Is a Risky Thing.....	64
7.1.11 Marriage Is a Union.....	67
7.1.12 Marriage Is a Preservative.....	68
7.1.13 Marriage Is a Business.....	68
7.2.14 Discussion.....	70
7.2 Analysis of Metaphors in Bridget Jones’s Diary.....	70
7.2.1 Love Is an Object.....	70
7.2.2 Love Is Falling.....	71
7.2.3 Love Is a Disease.....	72
7.2.4 Love Is a Force.....	73
7.2.5 Love Is a Catching game.....	73
7.2.6 Love Is a Negotiation.....	74
7.2.7 Love Is a Union.....	75
7.2.8 Marriage Is a Union.....	76
7.2.9 Marriage Is a Trap.....	77
7.2.10 Marriage Is a Trade.....	78
7.2.11 Marriage Is a Place.....	79
7.2.12 Marriage Is a Machine.....	80
7.2.13 Discussion.....	80
8. Comparison.....	82
8.1 General Overview.....	82
8.2 Metaphors that are Used in Both Novels.....	83
8.3 Metaphors That Only Appear in Either Novel.....	89
9. Discussion and Conclusions.....	97
References.....	102
Websites.....	103
Appendix A: The metaphors in <i>Pride and Prejudice</i>	105
Appendix B: The metaphors in <i>Bridget Jones’s Diary</i>	110

List of Abbreviations

BJD – Bridget Jones’s Diary

CMT – Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Early Modern English – EModE

P&P – Pride and Prejudice

PM – Prime Minister

Present-Day English – PDE

1. Introduction

This thesis, which is a study of conceptual metaphors of love and marriage in two novels - Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) and Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones's Diary* (1996) - discusses how changes in romantic and marital cultures from 1813 to 1996 in England are reflected in the use of conceptual metaphors in the two novels. To achieve this, three main tasks have been carried out. First, all the metaphors of love and marriage from the two novels have been collected and analysed. Second, the metaphors of love and marriage in *Pride and Prejudice* have been compared to those in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, in order to find out which metaphors appear in both novels and which are confined to one of them. Third, these similarities and differences have been discussed in relation to the romantic and marital values to which the metaphors correspond, in order to draw inferences about how changes in the romance and marriage cultures have been reflected through the use of metaphors, across the time span of the two novels.

The study draws on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). A conceptual metaphor is defined as a *metaphorical concept* (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 6) that is constructed in terms of another concept. This theory presents an understanding of metaphors beyond the linguistic level, as they argue that metaphor is not only manifested in language, but is fundamentally based on human experiences, which include thoughts and actions. Consequently, metaphorical concepts are coherent with cultural values (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 22), which are the results of and regulate human activities.

CMT was chosen as the major theory of this thesis due to the interest in Lakoff and Johnson's claim that metaphors archive human experiences and align with cultural values. The topic of love and marriage is suitable for a discussion of cultural values because it is strongly influenced by the perception of gender roles and social norms. The two novels both focus on the ways in which the protagonists deal with romantic love possibly leading to marriage. However, many social, political, economic and technological changes occurred between the times of the publication of the two novels and account for the different discourses of love and marriage. This thesis also has a gender focus, since Jane Austen and Helen Fielding are both

female writers and their novels, *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*, consist mainly of romantic stories told from the heroines' perspectives.

The methodology for this study was mainly formulated with reference to CMT, with metaphors being identified based on Lakoff and Johnson's definition of the conceptual metaphor, that is, one concept is constructed in terms of another concept. In this study, a conceptual metaphor was considered to occur when the concept of love and marriage is presented or indicated by another concept. Metaphors that construct love or marriage as the same concept are grouped under one category, and are then discussed to show how the two concepts resemble each other and what the experiential basis of the resemblance might be. Finally, the metaphors from *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* are compared and the romantic and marital value differences between the two novels are discussed.

Chapter 2 presents an overview of theories that are relevant to the present study. These include earlier historical views on metaphor, CMT and four other metaphor theories, as well as the Linguistic Prototype Theory. The introduction of historical views starts from Plato (5-4th century BCE) and ends with scholarly opinions in the 1950s, showing that the understanding of metaphor has undergone an evolutionary development. Published in 1980, CMT is a continuation of the previous studies of metaphor and a landmark work in the field. As the major theory on which this thesis is based, it is introduced in section 2.2. The remaining four theories are the Comparison Theory, the Substitution Theory, the Property Attribution Theory and the Analogical Model. These five metaphor theories are compared in terms of how they organise and interpret metaphors and what types of metaphors each of them can be applied to. Finally, the Linguistic Prototype Theory is introduced and its implications for the categorization of metaphors are discussed. After this general discussion of theories relevant to the study of metaphors, Chapter 3 deals in particular with metaphors for love and marriage.

Chapter 4 provides brief summaries of the plots of *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*, and a comparison of how these two novels resemble each other and differ in social background, theme, plot, character setting and values concerning romance and marriage. The plot summaries and comparison are intended to provide a background for the analysis of metaphors vis-à-vis the context of the books. Chapter 5 discusses earlier work on metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice*; such studies on *Bridget Jones's Diary* have not been identified.

Chapter 6 describes the methodology of this project, including both the collection and analysis of the metaphors. Chapter 7 presents the analysis of metaphors for romantic love and marriage in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* respectively. Finally, Chapter 8 compares the metaphors for romantic love and marriage in the two novels and discusses how they relate to romantic and marital value changes across time, from 1813 to 1996.

2. The Metaphor and Linguistic Prototype Theories

2.1 A Brief History of the Study of Metaphor

For a long time, scholarly accounts of metaphor tended to consider it as something marginal, even suspicious, in the study of language (Johnson 1981: 4). Metaphors were commonly viewed as ornaments of language for linguistic aesthetics, sometimes at the cost of deviating from the truth. From the 1960s onwards, academic interest in metaphor burgeoned, as evidenced by the explosion in research papers and books re-evaluating the role of metaphor as integral to language and central to epistemology (Johnson, 1981: 3). This section provides a brief overview of philosophical and scholarly approaches to metaphor, based to a large extent on Johnson (1981).

Plato (428/27-348/47 B.C.) is one of the earliest philosophers who indirectly criticizes and casts doubt on metaphor. He held that imitative poetry represents distorted knowledge, as it produces ‘imitations of imitations of the real’ (qtd. in Johnson 1981: 4), and that poetry overflows with passion instead of promoting virtue and caring for the happiness of mankind. Although Plato does not condemn figurative language directly, he indicates his worries that the misuse or overuse of metaphor could obscure truth and lead to impracticality (Johnson, 1981: 4).

Later on, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) expresses his view of metaphor in the work *Poetics*, in which he defines metaphor as the art of transferring the name of one object to another. He recognises metaphor’s artistic and creative function in the transmission of knowledge, which still remains a consensus today, but, like Plato, he fears the harmful results of employing metaphor improperly. Besides, he considers that metaphoric transfer of meaning happens between two word units and that metaphor is a non-literal usage of language based on the similarity of two items. (Johnson 1981: 5-6)

Both these points conflict with some modern linguistic theories. Since the twentieth century, semantic units have been extended from the level of words to that of sentences, which undermines the prerequisite for Aristotle’s definition of metaphor (Johnson 1981: 5), and some scholars have discovered that metaphoric patterns in everyday language do not develop from

the resemblance of 'two units' but through the mechanism of human experience (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Finally, Aristotle considers similes as metaphors (Johnson 1981: 7).

Aristotle's thoughts on metaphor were generally revered by rhetoricians and medieval theologians for several centuries, but they departed from Aristotle in the importance they attached to metaphor. While Aristotle viewed metaphor as a major category in rhetoric, Cicero (106-43 B.C.) subordinated metaphor as a short form of comparison and Quintilian (c. 35-c. 100) argued that metaphors are compact similes. Otherwise, Latin rhetoricians followed the tradition of considering that appropriate metaphors enhance language and dismissing their improper usage. (Johnson 1981: 8-9)

During the medieval period (500-1500), rhetoric along with its traditional subcategory of metaphor suffered a drop in esteem. In the opinion of Bede (c. 673-735), figures and tropes as a styling tool are not aligned with logic. Alberic of Monte Cassino (ca.1030-1088) advised that one has to be alert to metaphors, considering them to be unnecessary but capable of increasing a work's credibility and style. In contrast, St. Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) viewed metaphors positively, but specifically in relation to religious writings. He considered them as 'both necessary and useful' (qtd. in Johnson 1981: 10) in Holy Scripture. His main argument was that it is natural for spiritual matters to be compared to material truths, since knowledge is often obtained through discovering similarities. (Johnson 1981: 10)

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the development of empiricism and rationalism pushed the mistrust and criticism of metaphor to a new height. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) mounted an empiricist attack on metaphor by stating that metaphorical words in speech interfered with and obstructed the communication process and the exchange of knowledge. Hobbes listed metaphors under the same category as ambiguous and meaningless words, about which reasoning was problematic if not impossible, and warned that argument, provocation and disrespect were their potential consequences. Aristotelian influence is still visible here, as the transference of a name from the original object to the designated object might indeed cause misunderstanding when the hearer or reader comprehends the designated object literally as the original object and fails to understand how metaphorization works. (Johnson 1981: 11)

Johnson (1981: 12) summarized three points extracted from the core of Hobbes's argument on metaphor and termed them 'the literal-truth paradigm', a characterization that has created a

considerable impact on philosophical thinking regarding figurative language. These three points are: (1) ‘The human conceptual system is essentially literal’, which signifies that literal language is the only means for expressing meaning and truth precisely, and that only then is correct reasoning possible; (2) Metaphor uses words in an aberrant way, divorced from their proper usage, hence can result in confusion and deception; (3) Even if metaphor manages to convey meaning and truth claims, they are paraphrased from literal expressions. The concept of the literal truth paradigm has been a philosophical consensus almost throughout the western history of metaphor.

Near the end of the eighteenth century, philosophical writing rarely mentioned metaphor; on such occasions that metaphor was commented on, writers generally repeated the typical opinions and reprovals inherited from former philosophers and reorganized in books of rhetoric, such as those authored by Richard Whately (1787-1863) and George Campbell (1719-1796). Accordingly, Hegel (1770-1831) claimed that metaphor is decorative for an independent representation or a work of art, while John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) declared that a metaphor can indicate the existence of an argument but does not form an argument. (Johnson 1981: 13)

However, Kant and Nietzsche bestow greater significance upon metaphor than any earlier thinkers do. While Kant (1724-1804) presents no extended examination of metaphor, he treats poetic metaphor with respect when he discusses genius and imagination in his work *The Critique of Judgement* (1790). He illustrates that artistic genius is the ability to translate imagination into aesthetical ideas such as painting, music and language in an original way. Here being original means that the art produced is neither equivalent to any existing concepts nor the result of following the standard rules for production. Consequently, the art produced could cause the perceiver to understand the artistic work as having adequately represented an object, event, meaning, etc., but this adequacy cannot be demonstrated in a conceptual way. If the thoughts of Kant are applied to metaphor, it can be concluded that (1) metaphor is a kind of creative ability as it often shines with originality and (2) metaphor can elicit more thought than its literal paraphrase. (Johnson 1981: 14)

Before the introduction of Nietzsche’s view on metaphor, it is necessary to mention Jacques Rousseau’s (1712-1778) postulation that all language originates from figurative expression and develops through meaning transfer. This might account for the celebration of

figurative language and poetic imagination by artists and poets of the Romantic era (1800-1850). Nietzsche (1844-1900) continues with this Romantic endorsement of metaphor and expands Rousseau's theory. He believes that human thought and language are infused with metaphoric understanding, which plays an essential role in the acquirement of knowledge. He rejects the idea that words are symbols of each individual experience. For Nietzsche, metaphor is created via neural-stimulus-induced percepts and is an innovative device that draws relations between things, enabling words to be used economically for countless cases which are to various extents similar. This fundamentally overthrows the traditional separation between metaphor and literal words. Moreover, he reads the truths of the western culture as normalized metaphorical understandings whose metaphoricity has been forgotten. (Johnson 1981: 15-16)

Most philosophers, however, disregarded Nietzsche's radical thought on metaphor, which partly recapitulates previous Romantic poets' remarks. Although these poets are earnest and enthusiastic supporters of metaphor, they further disassociate figurative language from scientific discourse for the sake of creativity. This might have delayed any close philosophical examination of metaphor's essence and workings (Johnson 1981: 16).

In the first half of the twentieth century, a positivist influence on metaphor was prevalent until it was challenged by some philosophers in the middle of the century. Positivism criticizes metaphor based on two beliefs: (1) language has cognitive and emotive functions which are distinct; its cognitive function is to make verifiable statements (this tree is two metres tall), while its emotive function is to evoke particular attitudes (this tree is a shelter); (2) the knowledge of science is literally recorded in verifiable statements. These two beliefs echo with the above-mentioned empiricist literal-truth paradigm in agreeing that metaphor deviates from the literal usage of language or cognition. Ogden and Richards (1923) briefly introduce the two different functions of language and the chief classification of metaphor under the emotive function in their co-authored work *The Meaning of Meaning*. However, this cognitive versus emotive division occasions objection from many linguists, such as Austin (1975), on the grounds that the model distorts and oversimplifies language's nature and various uses. (Johnson 1981: 16-18)

Richards officially abandons his positivist claim about metaphor later in his book *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936) and asserts that '[t]hought is metaphoric' (qtd. in Johnson 1981:

18) and that comparison and figurative language are then derived as by-products. He proposes that the world is understood through conventionalized metaphors which are in most cases used unconsciously, while new meaning exchanges (or metaphors) keep being superimposed on the perceived world. He also contributes two revolutionary notions: first, that metaphor is just as often based on differences between things as it is on similarities, and, second, that metaphor cannot be paraphrased in literal language because its meaning is an interplay of contexts. Richards' assertion received few responses from philosophical circles. (Johnson 1981:18-19)

After positivism had experienced many setbacks, Max Black's article *Metaphor* was published in 1954 and gained support from philosophers with exploratory spirits. Apart from agreeing with Richards that metaphor cannot be equivalently reduced into plainer sentences, Black (1954; qtd. in Johnson 1981: 19) argues that metaphors sometimes draw new similarities between things instead of demonstrating established ones. Black's work was a landmark in the subject of metaphor, as from then on philosophers' interest in metaphor grew tremendously. (Johnson 1981: 19)

2.2 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Having reflected on various views on metaphor and absorbed ideas from the more progressive ones, in 1980 Lakoff and Johnson formulated their Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), which is discussed meticulously in the book *Metaphors We Live By*. This book is an influential work, as it marks the starting point of cognitive linguistics (Leezenberg, 2009: 140) and CMT has subsequently been applied in multiple fields from law and politics to psychology and religion (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 243). This section will introduce Lakoff and Johnson's CMT, including both the general idea, and the definitions of various kinds of conceptual metaphors and their common features. There are example sentences for illustrating the definitions. They have been created on the basis of the key phrases listed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

The essential idea of CMT is that a relatively abstract concept is structured, understood and acted upon in relation to a more concrete concept based on similar physical or psychological experiences. For example, in the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, the aspect of love as an

ongoing process is compared to a passage from one place to another, because both activities involve travelling through time and space, unpredictability, emotional engagement, etc. The reason why an abstract concept is dependent on a concrete concept for comprehension is that the former is shapeless and not clearly delineated on its own and thus needs to borrow the latter's clear meaning and form (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 115).

In Lakoff and Johnson's theory, there are mainly three kinds of conceptual metaphor: structural, orientational and ontological.

A **structural metaphor** presents a binary relationship of two concepts where one is partially constructed according to the model of the other (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14). For instance, in the metaphor TIME IS MONEY, the concept of time is depicted in many ways the same as money is handled in contemporary industrialized society. Like money, time can be given, spent, saved, budgeted, lost, borrowed and run out of (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 8). Another example of structural metaphor is ARGUMENT IS WAR. The concept of argument is to a degree formulated in accordance with the actions deployed in a war. In both situations, positions can be attacked and defended, ground can be gained and lost, and strategies can be designed and employed (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 4).

An **orientational metaphor** demonstrates an interconnected network of concepts all encompassed by an overarching concept (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14). The term 'orientational metaphor' is derived from the large percentage of spatial-orientation-related metaphors under this category. Orientational indicators, such as 'up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, central-peripheral' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14), emerge from the physical existence of the human body and its movement in the environment. For example, since in most situations human beings and other animals lie down to slumber and rise when they wake up, relevant expressions are coherent with this fact: fall asleep, nod off, under hypnosis, but get up, wake up, arise at 5 a.m. These cases illustrate the orientational metaphors UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN and CONSCIOUS IS UP. Another example is the pair HAPPY IS UP and SAD IS DOWN, which are based on the fact that sadness usually causes one to slump, while happiness gives one the strength to be upright. This is displayed in the following phrases: feel up, boost spirits, a lift of mood, etc., and feel down, low spirits, depressed, etc. (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 15).

An **ontological metaphor**, finally, treats human experiences as entities and substances for the convenience of referring to, classifying, measuring and characterizing them (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 25). The following sentences serve as examples of the functions mentioned:

Referring: *Fear* soon spreads to every corner of the room.

Classifying: *The emotion jealousy* is very destructive in a relationship.

Measuring: It takes *lots of courage* to face dim reality.

Characterizing: His *unstable personality* is due to childhood abuse.

Furthermore, there could be several sub-metaphors under one ontological metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 27). For instance, the following sub-metaphors may be grouped under the general metaphor IDEAS ARE ENTITIES:

IDEAS ARE PEOPLE

The theory of relativity will *live* on forever.

Quantum physics was in its *infancy* in 1980s.

Galileo is considered as the *father* of science.

IDEAS ARE PLANTS

Their mutual idea on linguistics came to *fruition*.

A new theory is *budding*.

There are many *branches* in psychology.

IDEAS ARE FOOD

The content of the scheme will take a while for us to *digest*.

Their plan *smells fishy*.

This is a *meaty* article (47).

Another typical and common ontological metaphor is the container metaphor, which refers to objects and fields as containers. Buildings and transport vehicles are CONTAINER OBJECTS

for people and goods to enter and exit; the ocean, rivers and bodies of water such as lakes contain water, a CONTAINER SUBSTANCE, within which countless creatures reside (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 29-30). A country is deemed to be a division of space comprising its land, people and cultures (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 29). One's visual field can be reckoned as a container as it separates a 'framed' physical space from the larger surrounding environment. This is evidenced in the language utilized for the visual field: The cat is *in sight*. The puppy soon ran *out of sight*. Only *half* of the oak is *in sight*.

Events, actions, activities and states can also be understood by ontological metaphors. Events can be viewed as container objects because an event such as a concert unifies elements such as performers, instruments, audience and coordinators in a location during a determined time period, hence *in a concert*. Actions, conceptualized in the same way as events, can be grouped and categorized into sets. Activities and states can be perceived as container substances, since a person engaged in an activity or in a certain state requires concentration and therefore to various degrees is immersed in it (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 31).

The most explicit ontological metaphors employ personification to attach human motives, purposes, features and reactions to objects, phenomena and experiences, as elaborated by the following cases:

This paragraph *explains* in detail how a magnetic field can generate current.

The whirlpool in the ocean soon *devoured* the ship.

The taste of small wins *tricked* him into making an all-in bet.

The company's financial circumstance *does not allow* an increase in staff salary.

To bestow various human attributes to nonhuman entities can simplify understanding and elicit quick responses to deal with complex problems. For example, the specific causes of inflation including high consumer demand, surging production costs, currency devaluation, etc. (Tretina & Curry, 2022) are not readily comprehended by the majority of people, who do not have adequate economic knowledge, but the metaphor INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY serves as an easily-understood slogan indicating that inflation harms almost everyone ((Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 33-34).

In contrast to personification, which assigns human traits to the non-human, metonymy does the opposite by referring to a person or things via something pertinent and representative (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 35). If a spectator says to her friend while watching a marathon: ‘The green T-shirt has entered the final sprint’, the friend would not think that a piece of clothing had sped up toward the finishing line, but rather the athlete wearing that garment. The title of a report by CNN (Subramaniam et al, 2023) is, ‘White House will provide Ukraine with new aid package’, where White House refers to the US president and his direct subordinates.

All the major metaphor types share three features: (1) systematic: a metaphorical concept forms its system of metaphorical expressions according to the way it is structured in terms of another concept (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 7); (2) feature-highlighting and -hiding: each metaphorical concept highlights some features and hides the others; (3) partial: every metaphorical concept is only partially constructed according to another concept and never totally.

Systematic means ‘according to an agreed set of methods or organized plan’ (*Cambridge Dictionary*). A metaphorical concept is systematic, as its expression has to agree with the shared traits of the two concepts on which the metaphorical concept is based. Time is experienced as mobile, because it is observed that events are irreversible and the world is ever-changing. The concepts of time and a moving object share the trait of mobility, as crystallized by the metaphor TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT. When TIME appears as a metaphorical concept constructed in terms of A MOVING OBJECT, it adopts relevant language and forms a small linguistic system, where time is always mobile: time crawls by/flies/flows). Based on observing the shifts of celestial bodies, advances in physics, the development of new time-keeping technologies, etc. (Hardy, 2024), time can nowadays be calculated extremely precisely as uniform units. TIME IS A SEQUENTIAL UNIT fits this reality of time and points to a feature of order possessed both by time and lined-up units. When the concept of TIME is viewed from the perspective of SEQUENTIAL UNITS, the narrowed-down metaphorical concept, time as sequential units, generates a linguistic system characterizing numbers, order and units of time: 20:40 10/02/2024, the following week, one hour.

A metaphor highlights a specific feature of a concept while simultaneously cloaking other characteristics (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 10). When time is conceptualized in terms of money,

attention is drawn to the usage of time in a productive and profitable way. At the same time, it is temporarily forgotten that leisure is also a way to pass time. As indicated by ARGUMENT IS WAR, when a debater defends his ground and attacks the opponent's weak points, the battling feature of an argument is focused on and the cooperative feature is obscured. In fact, if the arguing parties do not aim to win, are reasonable and can listen, the cooperative function of an argument is strengthened and the battling atmosphere is reduced.

Concepts are metaphorically structured only to some extent, not fully, as shown by the vocabulary involved. The metaphor IDEAS ARE FOOD comprises phrases such as *raw facts* and *fishy plans* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 46), but stir-fried, steamed or aromatic ideas almost never appear (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 109). More examples can be found from the metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, whose common expressions include *the foundation of a theory*, *a shaky argument*, *construct a theory/an argument* but not *rooms and corridors of the theory* or *the corners and the ceiling of an argument*. Only a fraction of aspects or parts from the domains of food and buildings are frequently used in the domains of ideas and theories.

As listed above, these scarcely-used metaphoric expressions do not form part of everyday literal language, where literal metaphors predominate. They are classified as so-called figurative/imaginative language, which can be subdivided into three types:

- (1) Elaboration of a literal metaphor's used parts, e.g., 'the foundation of my argument is as solid as concrete'. Here the material of the foundation is pointed out as an extension of the literal metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS.
- (2) Usage of a literal metaphor's unused parts, e.g., 'the shortcut entrance to his theory is located at the conclusion'. The entrance is not a part used in the construction of the theory, but here it is employed to indicate a quick way to learn the theory.
- (3) Novel metaphors, e.g. a theory can serve as a lens through which one sees the reality of a situation from a distinct perspective. This metaphor falls outside the regular conceptual system, because the concept of a theory is not constantly related to the concept of a lens (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 53).

2.3 Other Approaches to Metaphor

This section will focus on four other approaches to metaphor: the comparison theory, the substitution theory, the property attribution theory and the analogical model. It will discuss how these theories interpret the workings of metaphor, with examples illustrating how the theories can be applied to specific metaphors.

The **comparison theory** regards a metaphor as an implicit comparison that likens one concept to another. In Albert Einstein's saying "All religions, arts and sciences are branches of the same tree", the structure of knowledge is compared to the shape of a tree, while a parallel is drawn between the subcategories of knowledge — religions, arts and sciences — and the branches of the knowledge tree. Similes are most similar to metaphors interpreted by the comparison model, by the mere distinction of placing an additional word, *like*, in the sentence (Ritchie, 2013:26). If Einstein's saying were constructed as a simile, it would become "All religions, arts and sciences are *like* branches of the same tree".

The **substitution theory** claims that a metaphor is created by substituting a word that denotes a particular characteristic of the topic with a word or expression from a totally different field (Ritchie, 2013:26). In the sentence 'love is a treasure', the noun phrase 'a treasure' takes the place of the adjective 'precious', which characterises both love and treasures. However, this model struggles to explain sophisticated cases without distorting their original meanings and effects (Ritchie, 2013:26). In Emily Dickinson's poem "'Hope' is the thing with feathers — /That perches in the soul — ", if the expression 'the thing with feathers' is replaced by the noun phrase 'a bird', then the degree of imagination in the original words is reduced. This is because both 'the thing with feathers' and 'hope' resonate with fuzziness and abstraction, but 'a bird' evokes a clear image of a bird, which is too concrete for the imagery of hope.

The **property attribution theory** emphasizes the transfer of attributes from the vehicle onto the topic. The terms 'tenor' (referred to as 'topic' here) and 'vehicle' are first introduced by Richards in *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936). The topic is the subject being modified by the vehicle, which is the figurative language (Nordquist, 2018). In the metaphor *he is a serpent*, the culturally-salient qualities of a snake as being cold-blooded, deceptive, sly and malicious can be attributed to the person. Searle (1993: 105) notes that the vehicle does not necessarily

actually possess the properties, which could be imposed by humans as a result of conventions. Snakes as animals in the natural environment could be perfectly innocent, but many stories and tales have portrayed them as evil creatures (Ritchie, 2013:28).

The **analogical model** (Gentner & Bowdle 2001: 226) proposes that a metaphor can be viewed as an analogy that reflects a linking relationship between two concepts, one in the target domain as the topic and the other in the base domain as the vehicle. The best-developed analogical model is the structure-mapping theory, which claims that a metaphor places the representations of the topic and the vehicle in alignment and thus creates a ‘one-to-one mapping’. In other words, one element in a domain is only mapped onto one element in the other domain and a relationship of elements in one domain corresponds uniquely to one in the other domain. It is noteworthy that the process of alignment follows the rule of priority. In Gentner and Bowdle’s words (2001: 226), ‘[a]alignments that form deeply-interconnected structures, in which higher-order relations constrain lower-order relations, are preferred over less systematic sets of commonalities’.

Gentner and Bowdle (2001: 227) illustrate the structure-mapping process with the metaphor ‘men are wolves’. Men are mapped as wolves for the aligned predatory actions of men on women and wolves on animals (sheep, deer, etc.). Applying the structure-mapping theory, Ritchie compiles more analogical pairs from Tony Blair’s political speech where the event of re-election is likened to a domestic dispute:

‘husband – Tony Blair’

‘aggrieved wife – party members; voters’

‘throwing crockery – criticizing harshly’

‘going off with another man – voting for another party leader’

Here the relationship between the former prime minister (PM) and his voters is mapped to a marital one during the phase of re-election when either *reconciliation* (successfully re-elected) or *divorce and re-marriage* (the former PM is not re-elected, and, a new PM is elected) could happen. If voters opt for another candidate, they could face *future potential political problems*, which is aligned with *future potential marital problems*. (Ritchie, 2013 31)

This re-election and marriage crisis metaphor demonstrates the advantage of structure-mapping theory in explaining clusters of chained metaphors derived from analogical scenarios. However, this theory requires extra interpretive guidance in some cases, such as the metaphor Norwegians are thermoses. The relation between Norwegians and thermoses is not immediately obvious. If a supplementary note adds that the people of Norway often appear to be distant and cold but are warm-hearted and helpful inside, then the theory can be applied more easily (cf. Ritchie, 2013:29-32).

2.4 The Difference between CMT and Other Metaphor Theories

The different theories discussed – CMT, comparison, substitution and property attribution theories and the analogical model – share some similarities but also have differences regarding the defining terms, organisation methods, and analytical processes they employ. Therefore, each of them provides a unique perspective for examining and understanding metaphors. This section will compare the similarities and differences between these metaphor theories. First of all, the subtle differences between the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories will be discussed and then the three theories will be seen as a group and compared to both CMT and the analogical model.

2.4.1 A Comparison of the Comparison, Substitution and Property Attribution Theories

The comparison, substitution and property attribution theories are similar in nature, as they all propose that the topic and the vehicle of a metaphor share at least one mutual attribute. Nevertheless, they differ in two distinct points; first, whether they suggest that the used attribute originally exists in the topic; and if not, then second, how the attribute is transferred from the topic to the vehicle.

The comparison theory positions the topic and the vehicle side-by-side and acknowledges that something is common between them. The substitution theory emphasizes the replacement of a word, e.g. the word *love* replaced by *treasure*, and gives the reader an impression of love

being superimposed by treasure. The property attribution theory focuses on the attachment of a quality from A to B, which is a gesture of labelling. The substitution and property attribution theories indicate that the topic does not possess the used attribute until the replacement or the attachment process takes place.

Despite these minor differences, the three theories may be used to analyse the same metaphors. For example, the comparison theory could interpret Wordsworth's metaphor '[h]er voice was like a gentle waterfall' as a comparison of the voice to a gentle waterfall (perhaps because they are both soft and pleasant in sound). The substitution theory would say that the noun phrase 'her voice' is substituted with 'a gentle waterfall'. Even though the shared feature of the topic and the vehicle is usually specified, it is not a necessity for the comparison and substitution theories to express it. However, the property attribution theory has to point out which attribute is transferred (Ritchie, 2013:28). Following this principle, this theory might explain that Wordsworth's metaphor is a transfer of the softness and pleasantness in a gentle water's sound onto a lady's voice.

Since comparison, substitution and property attribution theories are similar in nature and can be applied to the same metaphors, they will be grouped for the sake of convenience as a unit in the comparison with CMT and the analogical model in the next section.

2.4.2 A Comparison of CMT, Substitution, Comparison and Property Attribution Theories and The Analogical Model

Two key terms in CMT are particularly important: (1) 'conceptual metaphor', which is involved in the construction of concepts; and (2) 'metaphorical concept', which conversely categorises the metaphors that contribute to the description and understanding of the concept (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 106). For example, love, as a metaphorical concept, leads and is inclusive of the following conceptual metaphors:

- (1) LOVE IS A JOURNEY (we have *come a long way*; they have to *go their separate ways*)
(Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 44)

(2) LOVE IS A FORCE (they are attracted to each other; there is electricity between them)

(Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 49)

(3) LOVE IS SICKNESS (heartbroken; mad for the boy)

Therefore, a metaphorical concept such as love could be seen as a terminal for all of its conceptual metaphors (love is a journey/a force/sickness, etc.), which serve as connecting leads between the concept of love and the concepts of journey, force, sickness, etc. This radial structure of a central concept supported by other concepts is commonly seen in the examples illustrated by Lakoff and Johnson but is unique among other theories discussed in this section. Under the summarizing metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, there are literal metaphors ‘we have come a long way’ standing for a long-lasting love and ‘they have to go their separate ways’ denoting the end of love. Therefore, in CMT the concept of love consists of three layers in a pyramid shape: the very concept itself at the top, summarizing metaphors in the middle and literal metaphors at the bottom.

The two key terms and the structure of CMT distinguish it from the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories in form. The latter theories direct the reader’s attention to a metaphor’s topic and vehicle, which form a one-to-one structure. However, the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories do not organise metaphors, which means that the metaphors dealt with by these theories are random and scattered. They act as instant analytical tools that encourage the user to identify mutual or similar features between the topic and the vehicle. When such features can be found or explicitly expressed, these theories are feasible, otherwise they struggle to interpret the material. For instance, the sentences ‘their eyes met’ (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:50) or ‘he gave me an idea’ are hard for any of these three theories to grasp. This is because the three theories do not possess the perspective for deeming these sentences metaphors in the first place. Both the topics and the vehicles are very inexplicit. However, CMT can analyse these literal metaphors by concluding the underlying prerequisites of them. The example ‘their eyes *met*’ supposes that SEEING IS TOUCHING (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:50) and ‘he *gave* me an idea’ assumes that IDEAS ARE OBJECTS (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:10).

CMT is most useful for discovering and organizing literal metaphors that have been

blended into everyday language. As discussed toward the end of section 2.2, on page 17, it also divides figurative language into three categories, with the first two related to literal metaphors and the last being novel metaphors, unrelated to literal metaphors. CMT provides a method to study the literal-metaphor-related categories but does not explore the field of novel metaphors. However, the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories can attempt to analyse novel metaphors. It is also possible for the three theories to examine less-literal metaphors in the first two categories. Moreover, once a literal metaphor is identified by CMT, the three theories could also be applied to discuss the shared features between the topic and the vehicle.

As for the analogical model, it is to some extent similar to the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories. The defining terms of the analogical model are analogy and one-to-one mapping. The *Cambridge Dictionary* defines analogy as ‘a comparison between things that have similar features’. This definition seems to describe exactly the comparison theory’s view of metaphor. The analogical model resembles the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories in the sense that it also seeks shared characteristics between two things, hence its one-to-one mapping. However, the analogical model differs from the other three theories in that essentially it can analyse multiple pairs of topics and vehicles at a time by mapping the relations between the vehicles onto the topics.

The analogical model identifies metaphors from two comparable scenarios. From another perspective, the analogical model turns two linked scenarios into a folder that stores analogies. This method of organizing metaphors differs from those of CMT and the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories. In the men-wolves example, the scenario of men pursuing women is likened to that of wolves preying on vulnerable animals. Here the three matched pairs of topics and vehicles, men – wolves, pursuers – prey and women – vulnerable animals, form a multi-lined parallel structure.

Due to their different frameworks, the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories could analyse metaphors researched by the analogical model but not necessarily to the same effect. In the case of ‘men are wolves’, the former theories may conclude that both men and wolves are muscular and strong rather than that they have predatory behaviours in common. Here it is observed that the substitution, comparison and property attribution theories could lead to various readings of a metaphor when a restrictive context is missing, whereas the scenarios

of the analogical model place restraints on its interpretations of metaphors.

The analogical model is not an approach to literal metaphors and mainly deals with figurative language. It could work as a complementary tool to CMT and vice versa, but the two theories overlap in the way they organise metaphors. The summarizing metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY functions in the same way as the scenario title ‘re-election is a domestic dispute’, which is to identify a cluster of sub-metaphors.

In conclusion, CMT, the comparison, substitution and property attribution theories and the analogical model complement each other and can be used in combination to maximize the understanding of metaphor. CMT has a framework which proposes that metaphorical thinking pervades human language, mind and activity, whereas the other approaches discussed do not make such a claim. This distinguishes CMT as a more systematic and interdisciplinary theory than the others and makes it applicable to the study of how cultural changes are reflected in metaphor use. Moreover, CMT is advantageous for interpreting and categorising metaphors by concept, which suits this thesis’s purpose of understanding love and marriage. The analogical model is capable of connecting metaphors with events and scenarios, and accords with the analysis of metaphor against the contexts of the novel from which it has been extracted and against history. The comparison, substitution and property attribution theories can facilitate the discussion of shared features between two metaphorically-linked concepts within a metaphor. These theories will be used in combination in the presentation of metaphors in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

2.5 The Linguistic Prototype Theory

This section will, finally, introduce the linguistic prototype theory, which provides an additional theoretical basis for categorising metaphors. This theory was initially proposed by Eleanor Rosch in her book *Principles of Categorization* (1988). However, the content of this section is based on Tissari’s (2003) summary of the theory and will present the theory’s three aspects: the essential claim, the structure and the prerequisite.

In essence, the linguistic prototype theory proposes that, in the same category, some items

are more exemplary than others. This claim is supported by a survey led by Rosch in the 1970s. The results of the survey showed that Californians considered the robin as the best representative of a bird, a car as the best representative of a vehicle, and a gun as the best representative of weaponry. A canary is also a very typical bird, a hawk is intermediately typical, whereas a penguin is least typical. (Tissari 2003: 9)

Structurally, a category tends to have a central core and a peripheral region. The commonest features are found among the most-typical birds such as robins and canaries, and an intermediately-typical bird such as a hawk shares fewer common traits with a robin, while a least-typical bird like a penguin has the fewest characteristics in common with a robin. Meanwhile, the common features between a robin and a penguin are different from those shared by a robin and another atypical bird, for instance, an ostrich. These observations can be generalized into two points: first, the central core of a category comprises typical examples that are more closely similar to each other; second, the peripheral region of a category is scattered with atypical cases that are more different both from the typical examples and from each other. Sometimes, a peripheral example is at the fuzzy boundary between two categories (Tissari 2003: 9). A person might regard a tomato as a vegetable, but someone else may prefer to place it in the fruit section.

The linguistic prototype theory is based on categories at the basic level, at which ‘most of [the human] knowledge is organised’ (Lakoff 1987: 46; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 10). For example, if one requires a phone, then it is futile to visit a furniture store, and it can cause confusion if someone refers to a dining plate as a culinary item. The words ‘phone’ and ‘plate’ belong to the basic level and represent objects utilized in daily life. It is almost impossible to picture an electronic device or a culinary item without directing the mind to visualize a more specific item such as a phone or a plate. Besides, it is hard to specify what actions one could apply to an electronic device without knowing the device at the basic level, as a headset or a camera, for example. Although more advanced terms are used in technical discourses, it is through basic-level words that people can most effectively communicate, study and understand the interactions between human and the basic-level objects. (Tissari 2003: 10)

The categorization of conceptual metaphors follows the principles of the linguistic prototype theory. Within one category of conceptual metaphors, some examples are more

representative than others. Those metaphors that can better represent their category are the crucial examples for the category, whereas there are peripheral examples that are either weak in its representation of the category or belong to two different categories at the same time. It is noteworthy that an example can be organised into two hierarchical categories, where one is nested inside the other. For example, the phrase *fall in* love is both categorized under LOVE IS A CONTAINER and LOVE IS FALLING (see pages 55 and 71-72). The suffering due to unrequited love alluded to in LOVE IS A DISEASE (see pages 55-56) can also be regarded as a 'hazard' of love, and the relevant metaphors can be categorized under LOVE IS A RISKY THING (see pages 59-60).

3. Metaphors of Love and Marriage

Many metaphors portray the different aspects of romantic love, and they fall into various categories. This chapter presents some metaphors of love and marriage in previous studies. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) love metaphors mainly represent the status of love or the effect of love on a person. Conversely, they also demonstrate that humans can shape love. Tissari (2003) focuses on how the metaphorical senses of love have changed from the period of Early Modern English to that of Present Day English within the domains of space, time and sensory perception, whereas Kövecses (1986, 1988 and 2000) presents metaphors of love according to the stages of its development. Marriage metaphors vary according to the culture from which they emerge. Quinn's (1987) metaphor study on marriage shows eight basic marital beliefs in American culture. Despite many similarities between American and Japanese marriage metaphors, there is a slightly nuanced difference between the two, demonstrated by Dunn's (2004) analysis of metaphors in Japanese wedding receptions.

One of the metaphors that depict the status of love is LOVE IS A PATIENT, which uses the concept of health to describe the quality or status of a romantic relationship.

LOVE IS A PATIENT

The relationship is *sick*.

Her romantic love for him is *dead*, too late to be *revived*.

It's a *healthy* romance. (Johnson & Lakoff 1980: 49)

The effect of love on a person can present itself as a physical force, madness, magic or war. LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE harnesses natural forces such as electricity, magnetism and gravity to create an image of the atmosphere around lovers or express how two people change the physical or psychological distance between them because of love. LOVE IS MADNESS depicts the hyperactive mental state of a person who has fallen under someone's spell. LOVE IS MAGIC employs terms from the field of magic to refer to love itself or its mystical effect. LOVE IS WAR reveals that strategies or aggression are involved in the pursuit of love and that

the result could be either a success or a failure.

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE

There is *electricity* between them.

He *gravitated* to her at first sight.

They have lost their *momentum*.

LOVE IS MADNESS

He is *crazy* about her.

I was *driven out of my mind* by her.

She is *wild* for her boyfriend.

LOVE IS MAGIC

The *magic* has disappeared.

He cast *his spell* over her.

He is *bewitched* by her lovely personality.

LOVE IS WAR

She is just one of his many *conquests*.

She *fled from* the man's *advances*.

He *fought for* her, but her ex-boyfriend *won out*. (Johnson & Lakoff 1980: 49)

While love can greatly affect a person's mood and behaviour, humans can also influence and shape love. This is suggested by the metaphor LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART. Through the perspective of a collaborative work of art, it is comprehended that love requires cooperative work, consensus on goals and values, communication, creativity, funding, etc. This view can be traced to Fromm (1956: 2), who argues that love is not merely a matter of finding an object to love or to be loved, it is an art that requires 'knowledge and effort'. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 139-140) suggest that this metaphor unifies human experiences of love, making them logical, consistent and therefore understandable.

Tissari (2003: 326) researches how conceptual metaphors of love have changed from Early Modern English (EModE) (between 1500-1700) to Present-Day English (PDE) in her work: *LOVEscapes: Changes in Prototypical Senses and Cognitive Metaphors Since 1500* (2003), focusing on how love relates to the basic conceptual domains of ‘space, time and sensory perception’ in metaphorical expressions during these two periods.

Love can be seen as a certain type of ENTITY in space. This entity can be either a concrete object or a substance, able to contain or to be contained by other entities and capable of being measured or exchanged. This leads to the identification of three subcategories associated with the features of love as an entity: ‘containment’, ‘quantity’ and ‘exchange’ (Tissari 2003: 333).

Containment love metaphors appear slightly more frequently in PDE than in EModE. Metaphors from the late twentieth century associate love with *nest*, *vacuum*, *closet* and *boat*, which all fall into the category of LOVE IS AN OBJECT, whereas in the EModE period, love is only described as a *fountain*, which belongs to the category LOVE IS WATER (or FLUID). In PDE, the emotion of love can be positively depicted as *light* and *spacious*, or negatively portrayed as a *closet*. In EModE, it was considered best when love as a substance exceeds the volume of its container (e.g. when it overflows). The fundamental prepositional expressions of love remain unchanged from EModE to PDE and include *in love*, *out of love*, *fall in love*, etc. (Tissari 2003: 333-334).

More quantity metaphors of love are found in EModE than in PDE, but it is noteworthy that the word *love* itself appears more frequently in the Renaissance period. Both periods use words such as *little*, *much* and *more* to quantify love, while in PDE the phrase *a can of minnows* is occasionally used to add a poetic touch, and in EModE agricultural and merchant terms, such as *store love* and *stock of love*, are often employed. In EModE, it was common to use the metaphor LOVE IS A PLANT, indicating its increase and the process to maturity, especially through the verb *grow*. In PDE, *develop* seems to have partially replaced *grow*. (Tissari 2003: 336-338)

Metaphors of love as an EXCHANGE involve the assessment of value. The data from EModE imply that it was important to show the value of one’s love convincingly and to acknowledge love from others, whereas this is rare in the data from the 1990s. Tissari suggests that the value of love is no longer settled and it is now widely accepted that love can be either

accepted or rejected in modern society, where individualism is prevalent. In both periods, the verb *love* can collocate with *dearly*, which, for example, is related to money in a pun in the Early Modern novel *Penny Merriments*:

- (1) How, that pleases me well to be getting of Money, for I love it dearly. (qtd. in Tissari 2003: 339)

In EModE, love connotes a greater sense of duty in its metaphors of exchange than it does in PDE, as exemplified by the words *debt*, *obligation*, *inherit*, *owe* and *requite*. Love is also more connected to interests of commerce through the words *price*, *gain* and *offer* in EModE. In PDE, the expression (love) *affair* is often used, whereas it is missing from EModE. Basic words or expressions such as *get* and *have* appear in both periods, but the verb *share* is relatively new in the discussion of love. Love has also always been treated as a concrete object, as reflected in the phrase *send love to her*. (Tissari 2003: 338-341)

Love can also be discussed in terms of time. In EModE, it is sometimes described as *endless*, but it can also *cease* and *continue*. One can *keep*, *maintain* and *preserve* love. In PDE, love can appear to be *never ending*, *out of season*, or *overdue* because someone has *intercepted* it. The phrases *love-life* and *year of love* also exist. (Tissari 2003: 345)

Lakoff notes that ‘Time in English is conceptualized in terms of space’ (Lakoff 1990: 57; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 345), which explains why some metaphors of love cover the dimensions of both time and space. For example, the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY entails both a route and a period of time, while LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY indicates that love as a valuable object can be *kept*, *maintained* and *preserved* across time and space. The word *love-life* indicates that the metaphor LOVE IS (or HAS) A LIFE, implying that love can be *born* and *die*. (Tissari 2003: 346)

Love deploys all kinds of sensory organs. In EModE, one can find and seek love, suggesting that the physical existence of love might be detected by sight or hearing. The words *manifest* and *manifestation* also indicate the ‘audible, visible and tactile’ nature of love. Meanwhile, there are cases of personification, where love can be requested to speak for someone, be awakened, or present itself as violent, powerful and tough. (Tissari 2003: 346-347)

In PDE, love can also be searched for, discovered and found. Love can be obvious or a secret, as suggested by the phrase *openly displayed*. The metaphor **BODY IS A CONTAINER** considers love to be an emotion that can be either revealed or not, depending on whether the container is open or closed. The *light* and *spacious* image of love is also connected to sight. (Tissari 2003: 346-347)

Both similarities and differences exist in EModE and PDE in relation to love in sensory terms. In both periods, love can be *shown* and *seen*, like an object, or *blind*, like a person. In EModE, the *sweet taste* or *sweetening* function of love are expressed by the metaphor **LOVE IS FOOD**, which continues to exist in PDE but without the association of sweetness. As an exception, one's beloved can still be described as *sweet* today. There has been no change from EModE to PDE in love being experienced as a sense of touch or warmth, as conveyed by **LOVE IS HEAT**. Love may be *ardent*, *hot* and *warm*, and one can be *fervently* and *feverishly* in love. However, EModE refers to the *heat* of love while PDE regards love as a *fever*. (Tissari 2003: 347)

As well as being categorised under the domains of space, time and sensory perception, conceptual metaphors for romantic love can also be organised into various love scenarios. For example, Kövecses's **typical model of love** divides a romance into five major stages:

The Typical Model of Love

1. "I search and find true love."

I am strongly attracted by someone.

2. "I try to control my emotions."

3. "The effort is unsuccessful, and I lose control."

4. "I am in a state of lack of control."

Love maximizes in intensity.

I form a unity with my lover.

Mutual love is formed.

"I am happy."

5. "Love is fulfilled in marriage."

Afterwards, love declines in intensity and develop into affection. (Kövecses 1986: 103-104, 1988: 67-68; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 153)

The ways in which these scenarios may be reflected in the use of metaphor may be briefly illustrated. The first stage is a process of searching for true love and becoming intensely attracted by someone. The search for love implies that LOVE IS A HIDDEN OBJECT, which is exactly abstracted from phrases such as *find* love and *look for* a girlfriend. These two phrases differentiate the object one searches for, whether it is love itself or an object to love. However, this model misses one possibility in the initial stage of love, that is, love occurs to someone unprepared, in the absence of any intention to search for it. Kövecses places this scenario as the step one in his **ideal model of love**: One *falls in* love. This is a container metaphor stating that LOVE IS A CONTAINER into which a person could fall. As for attraction, it is represented by the above-mentioned metaphor LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE. (Tissari 2003: 154-155))

It is a human instinct to attempt to restore equilibrium when disasters or accidents happen. When romantic love starts to emerge, one common reaction of the experiencers might be *fighting it off* as if LOVE IS AN OPPONENT. Examples that treat love as an enemy include love *seized* her and *surrender* to love (Kövecses 1986: 98, 1998: 61; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 154-155), suggesting that love as an *opponent* is stronger than the person who experiences it. This strength and autonomy of love is also expressed in the metaphor LOVE IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL:

She cannot *hold back* her feelings any longer.

At that moment, his feelings of love *broke loose*.

She *lost grip* on her feelings of love for him.

Just as a person's own feelings can disturb their sense of order, love from another person can present itself as a problem as well. LOVE IS WAR concludes conflicts caused by asymmetric love, where one or more parties are trying to win another's affections, as exemplified by the phrase *besieged* by suitors. In contrast to the tension and seriousness inherent in LOVE IS WAR, LOVE IS SPORT / A GAME conveys a light-hearted, casual attitude. (Tissari 2003: 155)

She made a play for him (Kövecses 2000: 26; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 155)

He is *playing the field*.

The guy *played with* her feelings.

LOVE IS FISHING and LOVE IS HUNTING represent a more detailed classification in the realm of sports. A regular hunter or angler employs professional skills to target, capture and often kill the quarry in an unfeeling manner. (Tissari 2003: 155-156)

The *chick* has not noticed that a *wolf* is *following* her.

She really fell for the guy, *hook, line and sinker*. (Kövecses 1988:73)

The third stage showcases the process where one gives up resisting the increasing force of love. LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, especially water, existing in the body, which is a container with skin as its boundary: he is *filled with* love and feelings *welled up* inside her (Kövecses 1986:82, 1988:43; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 156). The growth of love resembles the rising water level. Furthermore, the maximization of love is expressed through the spillage of liquid, e.g. *overflowing with* love and affections *pouring out*. LOVE IS FIRE as well, since the two concepts resonate with heat, brightness and passion:

He is *burning with* love.

She *set his heart on fire*.

He *carries a torch for her*. (Kövecses 1986: 84, 1988:44-45; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 156))

When the needs and expectations created by love are unsatisfied, one can experience pain, which has the potential to develop into physical and mental health issues or cause aberrant behaviours. These two situations can be summarized as LOVE IS A DISEASE, e.g. *love-sick*, and LOVE IS MADNESS, e.g. *crazy for* love. Paradoxically, sometimes LOVE IS A DRUG, as demonstrated by phrases such as *addicted to* love and *cured by* love. LOVE IS A RAPTURE as one can become *high on* love or *euphoric with* love (Kövecses 1986: 92, 1988:54; qtd. in

Tissari 2003: 157).

Kövecses (1988: 18-26; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 158) views LOVE IS A UNIT OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS as the core of both his love model and the entire concept of romantic love. When two people are in love, their basic desire is to stay both psychologically close and physically together. Otherwise, they might experience negative emotions due to separation anxiety, lovesickness, change of heart, etc. Here are some examples of this metaphor:

The couple is *inseparable*.

They *belong to each other*.

She is my *other half*.

Couples strive to sustain romantic love because they believe it is a need. LOVE IS A NUTRIENT displays this need:

She *starves for* love.

They *thrive on* their mutual affections. (Kövecses 1988: 13-15)

He *cannot live without* his lover.

The key to sustainable love is reciprocity, in other words, both parties should to some extent have their needs satisfied. Especially when mutual love has been established, continuous one-sided input becomes less realistic. One inevitably expects the other to requite the love they receive. Either LOVE IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY or LOVE IS AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE shows the give-and-take aspect of love (Tissari 2003: 159):

He *rewarded her love* with a large legacy.

He *put more into* their romance than she did.

She *gave* him so much love.

(Kövecses 1986: 95, 1988:58, 2000: 26; qtd. in Tissari 2003: 159)

The typical succession of love scenarios, as suggested by Kövecses, is completed by marriage,

traditionally seen in modern Western culture as the ideal end result of love. Accordingly, when love is not presented as an emotion but a relationship, it overlaps with the concept of marriage. At the same time, as marriage is as much a legal as a personal bond, and not necessarily dependent on emotion, metaphors for marriage introduce very different concepts to those of love.

Quinn (1987) analysed some excerpts from the discourse of a series of interviews, where eleven married couples shared thoughts of their marriage, in the context of American culture. She identified eight fundamental notions, which are rooted in the interviewees' comprehension of marriage and revealed in the description of their marital experience. These notions are discussed in the context of the metaphorical language employed by the interviewees, with the first five given a greater focus than the last three.

1. Marriage is enduring.
2. Marriage is mutually beneficial.
3. Marriage is unknown at the outset.
4. Marriage is difficult.
5. Marriage is effortful.
6. Marriage is joint.
7. Marriage may succeed or fail.
8. Marriage is risky. (Quinn 1987: 179)

First of all, MARRIAGE IS A MANUFACTURED PRODUCT. The interviewees use the words 'strengths' and 'stay together' for marriage and emphasize that a 'strong' or 'good' marriage requires 'work'. This parallels the way in which a fine product also requires effort to produce and is typically durable. Marriage also entails other manufacturing aspects, including 'craftsmanship, durable material, good components' that are installed firmly together and form a solid structure as a whole. Furthermore, both marriage and a manufactured product can be 'weakened' or even 'ruined' under certain conditions. If the two are no longer 'working', they become broken. However, they might be 'shaky' and have inner 'strains' but still possess 'the facade of a good marriage' or manufactured product. (Quinn 1987: 175)

MARRIAGE IS AN ONGOING JOURNEY is another recurring metaphor, characterizing the enduring quality of marriage. One interviewee shares that she and her husband have gone ‘through the good and the bad’ and achieved progress. Such an experience makes her object to ‘stopping’ her current marital journey and restarting with a new person. She asks the rhetorical question, “Where would you go?” to confirm her choice. This question indicates a sense of destination, where one opts not to endure a marriage anymore. Another person reflects that her marriage ‘could have gone in so many different directions’, as one must make decisions when facing many tracks in a journey. Interviewees also describe how they fail to endure marriage through this journey metaphor: they might ‘stop’ or be ‘unable to continue’, enter into ‘a place where they don’t want to be’ or ‘split and start going in a different direction’. (Quinn 1987: 175-176)

MARRIAGE IS A DURABLE BOND BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE also contains the feature of durability. Interviewees use words such as ‘cemented together’, ‘bound together’, ‘tied to each other’ and even ‘gelled’ to emphasize the secure connection between a couple. When the bond ruptures due to an irresistible force, one wife phrases it as ‘to be driven apart by our own problems’ (Quinn 1987: 176).

Marriage is expected to be not only enduring but also beneficial. A SPOUSE IS A FITTING PART is one of the metaphors that express the latter expectation. One spouse remarks that her husband ‘fit[s]’ her ‘needs’. A husband comments: ‘I couldn’t find another woman to replace Beth’, stressing the irreplaceability and uniqueness of his partner. Additionally, this metaphor is reflected in these comments: “[H]e fits me so well” and “We’ve kind of meshed in a lot of ways”, suggesting a fitting couple are inseparable (Quinn 1987: 176).

MARRIAGE IS AN INVESTMENT is another metaphor that encapsulates how the interviewees perceive their input into marriages. An interviewee questions why one would quit instead of ‘[getting] the use out of all the years you’ve already spent together’. Here, time is conceptualized as a resource, such as money, that is spent in the marriage. Others have the similar attitude that marital benefit is a resource for both the wife and the husband, as demonstrated by these statements “[T]hat was really something that we got out of marriage”, “[T]hey must have something good in their marriage” and “[T]alking about what we did and didn’t want in our own marriage.” (Quinn 1987: 176-177).

As the phrase ‘through the good and the bad’ suggests, there are both positive and negative marital experiences, corresponding to the beneficial and costly sides of marriage. The interviewees claim to be ‘short-changed in this relationship’ and lament that divorce is likely ‘when the effort is more than the reward’. For a marriage to be sustained, it is very important that both parties experience more benefit from it than expense, as implied by this confession: “I’m scared it’s going to cost me too much and leave me without being able to stay in the relationship”. One interviewee discloses that she and her husband have not consciously examined whether they are able to fulfill each other’s needs. In their frequent remarks about realizing benefit and satisfying needs, each of the interviewees tend to choose the pronoun ‘we’ and emphasize mutuality (Quinn 1987: 177).

The notion ‘marriage is unknown at the outset’ is captured in one wife’s comment that some people ‘go into marriage with their eyes closed’. The connection between knowledge and sight is embodied by the conceptual metaphor UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 48; qtd. in Quinn 1987: 178), based on which, insufficient understanding of marriage is rendered as being unwatchful and sightless. Metaphors also exist that reflect entering into marriage impetuously, such as ‘We sailed right into marriage’, ‘[h]e jumped from one marriage into another’ and ‘falling into marriage like kingpins at the bowling alley’ (Quinn 1987: 178).

Marriage can be experienced as difficult, as directly conveyed by the comment ‘[T]hings have been difficult’. The interviewees also describe the difficulties encountered in their marriage as ‘problems’, ‘struggles’, ‘trials’ and ‘conflicts’. Meanwhile, marital challenges are often metaphorically expressed as the hardship one undergoes in a journey, as they speak of the ‘difficult passages that we had’, ‘the uphill [that] stretches’, or ‘the rocky road to be travelled’. One husband compares marriage to a ship, emphasizing that only a soundly-structured marriage or ship could survive stormy conditions (Quinn 1987: 178).

Because marriage is difficult, it requires effort to sustain it. A wife ascribes lack of effort in marriage to ‘laziness’ to some extent, or ‘unwillingness to put out effort for nothing’, while she considers the efforts required in her relationship as ‘working through’ what ‘you need to learn’ in order to ‘make the first marriage stick’. A husband also adds, “[W]e want to work hard at... making it better”. Here, the effort that sustains and nourishes marriage is metaphorically

constructed in terms of work. Some interviewees illustrate the more specific aspects or forms of the effort needed. For example, it can be ‘searching’ so as to locate ‘where each of us were’, returning to a state as alluded by the journey metaphor: ‘fight[ing] our way back to the beginning’, or ‘creating’, which characterises the manufacturing metaphor, as indicated by the phrase ‘redo the whole thing’. (Quinn 1987: 178-179)

Marriage is a joint state. This is demonstrated by metaphors that group two married people together; for example, they are a ‘pair’, a ‘unit’, a ‘united front’, ‘teaming up’ or ‘together in this’, and marriage itself is a ‘partnership’. This sense of jointness has already been reflected in the previous metaphors MARRIAGE IS A DURABLE BOND BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE and A SPOUSE IS A FITTING PART, with the former additionally featuring durability and the latter having the extra tone of being beneficial. (Quinn 1987: 179-180)

The idea that marriage can either succeed or fail is frequently expressed through the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A MANUFACTURED PRODUCT. As mentioned earlier, successful marriages are those that ‘work’, whereas failed ones are no longer working. The notion that marriage is an effortful activity provides another way of describing marital success. The resolution of difficult marital problems represents the success of marriage, as conveyed by ‘worked out’, whereas a failed marriage does not work out. The risk in marriage could be portrayed as chance, such as ‘odds’ that are ‘against marriage’, or as a threat to the survival of marriage, exemplified by ‘the marriage may be in trouble’. The metaphor MARRIAGE IS AN ONGOING JOURNEY captures the tenacity required and the obstacles that emerge on the way, which further necessitate efforts to conquer the difficulties and existential danger. (Quinn 1987: 180)

Marriage metaphors are culturally based. Despite Japanese and American marital metaphors having similarities, they exhibit differences in how the required ‘work’ of marriage is understood. According to Dunn (2004: 364), marital metaphors in American and Japanese cultures agree that, first, marriage should be long-lasting although it is difficult; second, that certain activities should be shared; and third, that work and effort are required in order to sustain a marriage.

Dunn (2004: 365) demonstrates that American marriage metaphors differ from Japanese ones in ‘the nature and direction’ of the work. Americans emphasize that a couple has to ‘work

on' their marriage, typically through communicating openly about each other's emotions and needs. In contrast, the Japanese stress that marriage partners need to 'work together', in the process of which they become emotionally united. In other words, within a marriage, Americans consider emotional satisfaction to be a goal in itself, but the Japanese regard it as a by-product of mutual work between the husband and the wife. It appears that the compatibility of a couple is more important for Americans than for the Japanese; an American couple tends to focus on their marriage inwardly, whereas a Japanese couple is more inclined to consider themselves as a unit outwardly in the context of the wider society.

4. Plot Summaries and Comparison of *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget*

Jones's Diary

4.1 Plot Summary of *Pride and Prejudice*

Pride and Prejudice is a romantic novel authored by Jane Austen and published in 1813. The novel's main theme explores various attitudes towards love and marriage and how social class, personality and expectations affect one's choice of a marriage partner. The story evolves around the Bennet family's concerns, mainly expressed by Mrs. Bennet, over the daughters' marital prospects, especially those of the two eldest ones, Jane and Elizabeth, who are at a marriageable age, while the other three daughters, Mary, Kitty and Lydia, are younger. Because Mr. Bennet's property, the Longbourn estate, is entailed to male-line descendants, the five daughters in the Bennet family have no right to inherit it. If unmarried upon his death, the Bennet girls will be either dependent on material assistance from their relatives or employed as a lady's companion or a governess (Walters 2005: 56). Both results would be degrading and distasteful in comparison to their previous state of life. Therefore, they consider themselves facing an impoverished future if they do not secure a reliable husband.

The story begins with the sensation caused by the news that a wealthy young bachelor, Mr. Bingley, has rented the Netherfield estate, in the neighborhood of the English village of Longbourn. Mrs. Bennet considers this an excellent opportunity for one of her five daughters to marry. At a ball, Bingley meets the eldest Bennet daughter, Jane, and soon feels admiration for her. Meanwhile, Mr. Darcy, Bingley's rich friend, earns himself the reputation of being proud and disagreeable, and offends Elizabeth by remarking that she is not beautiful enough for him to dance with. At subsequent social events, Jane and Bingley grow fonder of each other, while Darcy learns to appreciate Elizabeth's beauty and intelligence.

Jane goes to visit Bingley, but falls ill on her arrival as a result of riding there in the rain. Elizabeth then comes and spends a few days at Netherfield to look after her. Darcy now finds it difficult to resist Elizabeth's charms, whereas Elizabeth continues to dislike him. After Jane has recovered and returned home, Mr. Collins, the heir and distant cousin of Mr. Bennet, visits

the Bennet family in the hope of marrying one of the five daughters. He chooses Elizabeth and proposes to her, but is met only with rejection, because she is disgusted by his complacent and pompous manner. Elizabeth's close friend, Charlotte, successfully avails herself of the opportunity to approach Collins and becomes engaged to him.

During Collins's stay at Mr. Bennet's, the Bennet daughters meet a handsome and charming military officer named Wickham. Elizabeth is attracted to him and believes his accusation that Darcy has reduced him to poverty by dishonest means. Bingley suddenly leaves for London on business and later cancels his intention of returning to Jane, after being persuaded by Darcy that Jane's preference for him were motivated by financial considerations rather than genuine affection. Jane is dejected upon reading a letter from Bingley about his plans. To relieve her disappointment, she accepts an invitation from her aunt and uncle to visit them in London. However, her stay there is marred by the disinterested attitude of Bingley's sister and Bingley's failure to arrange a meeting with her.

Elizabeth resents Darcy further for his interference in both Wickham's career and Jane's happiness. During her visit to the newly-wedded couple Collins and Charlotte, Darcy arrives to pay his respects to his aunt, Lady Catherine, who is Collins' patron. Elizabeth is confused by Darcy's repeated visits and his desire to converse with her, until he proposes to her. She turns him down, explaining that his bad deeds and arrogant manner have made it impossible for her to love him. The next day, Darcy composes a letter to Elizabeth, revealing Wickham's deceitful nature and stating that he had persuaded Bingley to leave Jane because he had observed her lack of fervent affection towards his friend. After thorough reflection, Elizabeth recognises that Darcy's statements are credible.

Back home, Elizabeth discovers that Lydia harbours affection for Wickham, and she is relieved that the latter is leaving for Brighton. However, Lydia receives an invitation from the spouse of the colonel of Wickham's regiment to travel with her to Brighton. Elizabeth urges her father to forbid this journey, but her father opts for inaction. Soon after, Elizabeth joins her aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Gardiner, for a summer trip, during which she visits Pemberley, Darcy's estate, in his absence. At Pemberley, she changes her mind about Darcy upon hearing his elderly servant sincerely compliment his master's kindness and good temperament. Darcy appears unexpectedly when the party is about to leave. Much to Elizabeth's surprise, he is all politeness

and hospitality towards them. As Elizabeth grows closer to Darcy, Jane's letters are delivered with the distressing news that Lydia has eloped with Wickham.

To save the family's reputation, Mr. Bennet and Mr. Gardiner follow Lydia and Wickham's tracks to London, but the former soon abandons the search. Darcy secretly joins Mr. Gardiner to continue tracking the eloping couple, who are eventually found. Despite Wickham's initial reluctance to marry Lydia, he agrees to do so under the condition that Darcy settles his debts and secures him a job. Lydia divulges Darcy's intervention when she recounts her wedding details to Elizabeth, who becomes overjoyed with gratitude towards Darcy. Surprisingly, Bingley returns to Netherfield with Darcy and soon after proposes to Jane. Shortly after this, Elizabeth accepts Darcy's second proposal. Finally, both couples are happily married.

4.2 Plot Summary of *Bridget Jones's Diary*

Bridget Jones's Diary is a comic romantic novel, published in 1996. Its author, Helen Fielding, is a British novelist most famous for her Bridget Jones book series, which has been adapted into films. The protagonist, Bridget Jones, is an unmarried woman in her thirties, working initially as a publisher in London and trying to find love. Fielding (BBC, 2016) remarks that Bridget is quite 'decent', 'kind', 'resilient' and 'not judgemental' in nature. As most of her peers are already married, Bridget endures the pressure of being single, especially from her mother and in social situations where couples gather and express 'concern' over her love life. The book is written as her personal diary, in which she tracks her consumption of alcohol and cigarettes, her weight, and her calory intake, and records her life events throughout a year.

At a New Year's party, Bridget re-encounters her childhood playmate Mark Darcy, now a divorced, rich and accomplished human-rights lawyer. Her parents' friend Una Alconbury attempts to play matchmaker and pairs Bridget up with Mark. However, Mark seems to be uninterested in Bridget, while Bridget considers Mark dull. After the party, they separate without planning to meet again.

Back at work, Bridget starts to exchange flirty messages with her charming and humorous boss, Daniel Cleaver. During their first date, Daniel informs Bridget as they proceed to intimate

physical contact that he has no intention of starting a relationship or making a commitment. Bridget reproaches him and leaves. Meanwhile, Bridget's mother regrets having been a housewife for decades and decides to separate from her father. Afterwards, she acquires a new Portuguese boyfriend called Julio and becomes the host of the television programme *Suddenly Single*.

Unwilling to give up, Bridget pretends to be indifferent to Daniel as a strategy to attract him. They soon resume flirting by messaging, but after they become sexually involved, Daniel distances himself from Bridget. A few weeks later, Daniel comes to Bridget's flat and confesses that he loves her. They finally enter into a relationship. However, Bridget experiences disappointment in her romance with Daniel, as he often fails to meet her needs and fantasies, and they break up after Bridget finds out that Daniel has been unfaithful to her.

Bridget moves from her current job to another as a TV presenter. She meets Mark again at a party, and this time he invites her out for dinner. However, she is upset when Mark does not turn up for the date. Later, she learns that she had not heard Mark ringing her doorbell because she had been blow-drying her hair. They arrange to meet again, this time with some of Bridget's friends. After the group has gathered, Bridget receives a phone call revealing that her mother has committed a crime with Julio, swindling her friends out of their savings in the guise of purchasing (non-existent) timeshare apartments in Portugal.

On hearing this news, Mark promptly becomes involved in the investigation and helps to track down the main criminal, Julio. To Bridget, however, Mark seems to have disappeared. Julio turns up at Bridget's family's Christmas lunch out of jealousy that Bridget's mother is about to reunite with Bridget's father. Mark arrives with the police, and Julio is arrested. On Christmas Eve, Mark reveals his feelings toward Bridget, and the story ends with them spending the night together, officially in love.

4.3 A Comparison of *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*

The two novels were chosen for comparison in this thesis because they are similar in some aspects. Indeed, the author of *Bridget Jones's Diary* once admitted to the BBC that she had

borrowed inspiration from *Pride and Prejudice* (BBC 2013). Nevertheless, they are largely confined to their respective eras and are thus different from each other.

The novels are similar in theme, plot and characters. First, they all focus on the concerns of women of marriageable age over the choice of a husband or boyfriend. Second, the novels are generally similar in plot: each deals with the problems of a single woman with a somewhat difficult mother (a humorous character in both books) and a developing relationship with a rich man, named Darcy in both books. Both heroines make an arbitrary and false judgement of the heroes' personalities at their first meetings and therefore keep their distance from them. After experiencing romantic failures with unfaithful men, they gradually learn to admire the heroes' virtues. However, family scandals cast shadows onto the promising new romances. Both heroes disappear while secretly taking responsibility for resolving the scandals. The heroines find this out in surprise and gratitude, and each of the two couples reunites with a deeper love bond. Third, some characters in *Pride and Prejudice* correspond to those in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Mark Darcy corresponds to Darcy Fitzwilliam, as they are both rich, rank high in social class, and share the values of respectability and integrity. Daniel is modelled on Wickham in his flirtatious and unfaithful behaviour. Both Bridget's mother and Elizabeth's mother attempt to nag their daughters into marriage with a man of wealth and status.

However, as the social background and women's circumstances, and consequently the conditions and values of love and marriage, have changed from *Pride and Prejudice* to *Bridget Jones's Diary*, there are inevitably differences between the two novels in theme, plot and characters despite the similarities mentioned. There is a time gap of almost 200 years between the two authors, during which historical events such as the Industrial Revolution, feminist movements and two world wars transformed English society. During this period, women made substantial progress in their equality with men in social status and rights, and became active in all social activities. Sexuality became far more liberal than it was in the 19th century, and pre-marital romances and sex were normalised. These changes are reflected in the themes of the two novels, where *Pride and Prejudice* illustrates how social class influenced the character's choice of love and marriage, whereas *Bridget Jones's Diary* addresses issues of modern dating. The plot differences are revealed in the lifestyles of the two novels' protagonists; *Pride and Prejudice* depicts, within its clear thread of story development, the middle-class ladies' mainly

peaceful and uneventful countryside life, interspersed from time to time with exciting events such as balls, trips, visits, scandals, proposals or weddings. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, Bridget's urban life is rather hectic, and she is often on the brink of losing control. She is engaged with work, life, dating, social life with many friends, self-improvement, and troubles with her parents. Written as a diary, the narrative often contains the heroine's stream of consciousness, featuring emotions, worries, plans and fantasies, making the storyline less continuous than that of *Pride and Prejudice*. The most noticeable contrast in characters is between the heroines of the two books, Elizabeth and Bridget, as each of them embodies the social environment of their respective time. Elizabeth comes from and lives in a respectable and moderately rich middle-class family in a rural area of England. She is confident, educated and independent in mind, but relies on her father economically, as do the other female members of the family. In contrast, Bridget is a modern independent woman, holds a job and lives on her own in London. She often struggles with self-doubt and insecurity regarding her career challenges, interpersonal relationships, romance and marital prospects. Elizabeth's romances are largely influenced by the social class restrictions and proprieties of the early nineteenth century, while Bridget enjoys more freedom and openness in her dating. The two novels' language styles also differ, reflecting both changing literary conventions and the more humorous and parodic character of *Bridget Jones's Diary*. While *Pride and Prejudice* is formal, eloquent, burlesque and witty, *Bridget Jones's Diary* is much more informal and employs much oral style and slang.

These similarities and differences make *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* suitable for the comparison of romantic and marital values. On the one hand, the two novels both explore the challenges the protagonists face, in their experience of love and their choice of a husband or boyfriend. On the other hand, the different social environments of the novels provide different contexts for love and marriage.

5. Literary Metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice*

The present study focuses on love metaphors as a feature of language; that is, specific instances of metaphoric language referring to love or marriage in terms of other concepts. Most studies of *Pride and Prejudice* have dealt with metaphorical usage in a more general, literary sense; as such usage is relevant for the context of metaphoric language, some examples are discussed here.

Austen (1965: 6; qtd. in Schneider 1993: 5) notes in her novel *Northanger Abbey* (1818) that country dance is similar to marriage in many aspects. First, in both cases it is the man who has the privilege of selecting his partner, while the woman reserves the right to accept or refuse. If her answer is positive, the pair will engage in the subsequent steps in the hope that they both enjoy the process. During both a marriage and a dance, the two parties must remain exclusive to each other in accordance with the rules until the end of the relationship. It is therefore advantageous for them not to imagine the potential existence of a better partner or to think of the flaws of their current one.

As noted by Reynolds (2016), in *Pride and Prejudice*, dancing is a metaphor for courtship. This is observed in the relationships both of Jane and Bingley and of Darcy and Elizabeth. Jane and Bingley's mutual enjoyment of their dances signifies their fondness for each other. At first, Darcy has no interest in dancing with Elizabeth because she is 'not handsome enough to tempt' him (Austen 2019: 9). Then, when he begins to admire her charms, he takes the initiative and invites her to a dance, but is turned down by Elizabeth, who has lost interest in him after being mortified by his proud attitude. Mr. Collins's clumsiness in dancing hints at the metaphorical meaning of him being a clumsy lover. His continual stepping on Elizabeth's toes also presages his proposal of marriage annoying rather than pleasing her. Nafisi (qtd. in Reynolds 2016) adds that such dances happen under the observation of others at the ball, as does courtship (Reynolds 2016).

However, Schneider (1993: 6) argues that, in *Pride and Prejudice*, card-playing is a better metaphor for marriage and courtship than dancing, because it revolves around money and luck (two essential elements that lead to marriage), whereas dancing involves such elements to a

lesser extent. Card-playing is a game in which a certain amount of money is used as a stake and which depends on the skillful exploitation of luck, with the target of winning and profiting. Similarly, the novel weaves the association between marriage and money into its language and knits chance into plots that decide the heroines' happiness. Mr. Bennet entertains himself repeatedly by comparing the sojourn of Bingley and his friends at Netherfield to an investment chance for the neighborhood, only half-jokingly. Odds were at work when Mr. and Mrs. Bennet produced five daughters in a row and no male heir, making Mr. Collins (Mr. Bennet's distant cousin) the lucky heir of Mr. Bennet's estate. The Bennet girls are therefore forced to secure for themselves a means of financial support before their father dies (Schneider 1993: 6).

Mr. Collins's good fortune continues with his promotion by Lady Catherine de Bough and his marriage to Charlotte; the latter exemplifying that card-playing is an emblem of marriage. Charlotte describes marriage as 'the only honourable provision for well-educated women of small fortune' (Austen 2019: 93), clarifying that her incentive for choosing Mr. Collins is economic. She distinguishes herself in the gamble of marriage by being a sharp observer and skillful player. Early in the novel, she accurately predicts that no progress could be made if Jane continues to hold her passionate feelings for Bingley in reserve. Later, she painstakingly plays the part of a sympathetic listener to Mr. Collins, whose self-esteem has been damaged by Elizabeth's rejection the day before. By employing her social skills cleverly and grasping the right opportunity, Charlotte secures her marital target, Mr. Collins. (Schneider 1993: 12)

In contrast, Elizabeth is a disinterested player. When Collins says that he believes Elizabeth's first refusal of his proposal to be inconsistent with what she truly feels in her heart, she replies that she would not dare to endanger her happiness by expecting to be proposed to twice. She then carries on to misinterpret Darcy's gaze and attention to her entirely, resulting in her being utterly shocked upon receiving Darcy's proposal. Just as she never participates in card games, she refuses to play the game of courtship for material gain. (Schneider 1993: 13)

Schneider (1993: 10) also notes that a person's preference in card games reveals their personal traits. For example, Lady Catherine's fondness for quadrille, an old-fashioned game, presages her disapproval of Darcy becoming betrothed to Elizabeth, as she considers the bride-to-be inferior to the groom-to-be. Lydia's liking for blind-chance games is mirrored by her 'always unguarded and often uncivil' disposition (Austen 2019: 96), prefiguring her reckless

elopement, which barely avoids damaging her family's reputation. Jane and Bingley prefer vingt-un, a game in which chance outweighs skill, to the game called 'commerce', which requires more skill to play. This preference is consistent with Jane's inability to show her romantic feelings tacitly and Bingley's susceptibility to persuasion from his family and friends.

Houses and landscapes can indicate characters' features or state of mind. The Pemberley estate is 'comparable to Darcy, its owner' (Reynolds 2016). Pemberley is 'a large, handsome, stone building, standing well on rising ground' (Austen 2019: 181) and Darcy is tall, handsome, dignified and wealthy. It is during her visit to Pemberley that Elizabeth starts to appreciate Darcy's virtues, which also resemble the style of his furniture, 'neither gaudy nor uselessly fine; with less of splendor and more real elegance' (Austen 2019: 182). Bodenheimer (1981: 610) argues that the heroine's widening vision of the landscape serves as a metaphor for her expanding 'moral perspective' towards the hero. Indeed, after the visit, Darcy becomes a person of almost perfect character to Elizabeth, and her love for him blossoms.

The arrangement of Charlotte and Collins's house represents the emotional gap between the married couple; Charlotte chooses the room at the back of the house as the ladies' sitting room instead of the larger and pleasanter dining parlour, so as to keep herself at a distance from the library at the front, which Collins occupies regularly (Austen 2019: 126). The neatness and tidiness of their house represents the housewife's ability to organise her life (Reynolds, 2016).

Reynolds (2016) also notes the 'fine eyes' of Elizabeth as a metaphor of 'beauty, intelligence and liveliness', especially for Darcy, who is a regular admirer. He also identifies practising the piano as a metaphor for self-discipline in the novel. Elizabeth confesses that she lacks mastery of the piano because her practice is inadequate, as a retort to Darcy, who has excused himself for being unsociable with strangers. Here she points out that piano practice as an activity demands self-discipline, and she has the self-awareness to acknowledge that she is not diligent enough to master the art.

6. Methodology

This thesis is a qualitative study with that presents and compares conceptual metaphors of love and marriage in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*. The method applied to the data can be divided into four main stages: (1) collect, (2) categorise, (3) present and (4) compare.

The data-collection stage started with identifying conceptual metaphors related to love and marriage in the two novels, guided by the definitions of conceptual metaphors introduced in detail in section 2.2. The novels were read through, and all the utterances related to love and marriage were scrutinized. Sentences containing nouns such as ‘affection’, ‘inclination’, ‘feelings’, ‘admiration’, ‘sentiments’, ‘tenderness’, ‘passion’ and ‘attachment’ in the discussion of love were carefully examined for love metaphors. Similarly, sentences containing words such as ‘marriage’, ‘relationship’, ‘match’, ‘union’, ‘happiness’, ‘wife’ and ‘husband’ also received special attention. Studying the context is important in determining the topic discussed in a metaphor, whether it is relevant to love, marriage or both. The context includes aspects such as each character’s identity, circumstances, intention, relationships, and histories with other characters.

Every utterance identified as referring to love or marriage was then reflected upon to discover if any words or phrases describing a certain aspect of love also evoked a particular aspect of another concept. If so, such a sentence was copied into an Excel spreadsheet, with its page number recorded. A preliminary observation note was also added, stating which concept of love is constructed in the sentence. For example, in ‘Jane’s feelings...were little displayed’ (P&P, 156), ‘Jane’s feelings’ refers to her romantic affection for Bingley and can perform the static action of displaying, but the verb *display* typically collocates with nouns denoting physical objects. Therefore, this sentence was duplicated in the Excel data sheet alongside its reference and the simple note LOVE-OBJECT as a reminder. The same procedures were also followed for collecting marriage metaphors.

Once all the data had been collected, the data-categorization stage began. The classification of the data was also based on the definitions of conceptual metaphors, building on the systems used by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Quinn (1987), Kövecses (1986, 1988, 2000)

and Tissari (2003) to categorize the examples of love and marriage metaphors in their respective works. In line with the linguistic prototype theory, some conceptual metaphors may be seen as more representative of their category while others appear to be less so, and some metaphors may be seen as representative of two different categories. The metaphors were then organised according to category. Metaphors featuring love as an object were categorized under the subtitle LOVE IS AN OBJECT, those portraying love as a disease under LOVE IS A DISEASE, and so forth.

A further process of analysis was then carried out to adjust and fine-tune the categories. Under the category of LOVE IS AN OBJECT, for example, the metaphors needed further specification regarding which particular aspect of an object love was being depicted — whether it was producibility, physical existence, quantifiability, etc. In addition to possessing one of these qualities, the metaphor examined must also align with the image of an object. For instance, the metaphor ‘so much love...awaited her there (P&P, 93)’ characterises love as being quantifiable but uncountable, which does not agree with the countable attribute of objects. Instead, the metaphor can be categorized under LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, since a substance is both quantifiable and uncountable. The complete lists of categorized data are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B, which record the data from *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* respectively.

The data are presented in Chapter 6 along with the full analysis, which documents all the detailed thinking behind the entire metaphor-categorization process. Each section of Chapter 6 primarily analyses one category of metaphors, sometimes including metaphors from similar categories. Here the metaphors are also placed in their context within the novels, and are related to the social and cultural background, considering the ‘experiential bases’ which, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 19), may be explored in order to address the possible reasons behind specific conceptual metaphors.

The final step was to compare the metaphors from the two novels and identify those found in both, as well as those which uniquely appear in each. It is believed that the changes in the values of romantic love and marriage from 1813 to 1996 are reflected in Jane Austen and Helen Fielding’s metaphorical expression of the two topics. Based on this assumption, the comparison attempts to explain why some metaphors have survived from *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) to

Bridget Jones's Diary (1996) while some only appear in the former, and why new metaphors emerge in the latter.

7. Findings

In this chapter, the metaphors of love and marriage will be analysed and discussed. Section 7.1 presents the metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice* and Section 7.2 presents those in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Each subsection deals with one category of metaphors, which construct the concept of love or marriage in terms of another concept. Occasionally two or three related subcategories are included under the same heading. In addition to metaphors proper, two categories of metonyms are also included as being closely related to the metaphors and highly relevant to the discussion.

7.1 Analysis of Metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice*

7.1.1 Love Is an Object

Love is an abstract concept without a concrete physical form. However, in *Pride and Prejudice*, love is found to be conceptualized as an object, giving it access to many qualities characteristic of an object. First and foremost, it can be created and has a physical being. Examples (1) and (2) signify the creation of love:

- (1) *making love to* a girl (P&P, 116)
- (2) the *sentiments* which Mr. Wickham has *created* (P&P, 150)

In the context of example (1), *make love* means '[t]o pay amorous attention; to court, woo', (*Oxford English Dictionary*), so the whole phrase could be interpreted as a wooer attempting to cause the girl to produce responsive love. Examples (1) and (2) resonate the feature of love being creatable like an object. As an object can remain still, (3) signifies that love can stay firm in the same position. The following instances illustrate that love can be handled in many manners that are similar to how an object is dealt with:

- (3) his affection and wishes must still be *unshaken* (P&P, 248)

- (4) if a woman is partial to a man, and does not endeavour to *conceal it* (P&P, 17)
- (5) *obtain* the affection of their amiable neighbour (P&P, 98)
- (6) *gain* my affections (P&P, 116)
- (7) Jane's feelings...were little *displayed* (P&P, 156)
- (8) regret *what he had thrown away* (P&P, 113).
- (9) Mr. Darcy should have *delivered* his sentiments in a manner... (P&P, 166)
- (10) Mr. Darcy *sends* you all the love in the world, that he can *spare* from me (P&P, 286)
- (11) His affection for her soon *sunk* into indifference (P&P, 289)

Love is endowed with physical existence in examples (4) - (11). It can sink and it can be obtained or gained, displayed, concealed, delivered or sent, spared or thrown away, similar to how an object, such as an exhibit, a letter, a coin or a bag of rubbish, could be treated. Each of these actions indicates that love can be touched and moved. The example of sinking in (11) even suggests that love has weight and follows Newton's Law of Universal Gravitation. Analogous to the weight of a physical object being measured, the amount of love can also at least be quantitatively evaluated as shown in (12) and (13):

- (12) Wickham's affection for Lydia, was...*not equal to* Lydia's for him (P&P, 248).
- (13) so *much* love and eloquence awaited her there (P&P, 93).

While instance (12) shows love as something generally comparable as to quantity or size, example (13) uses the quantity indicator *much*, which modifies uncountable nouns and does not fit one's experience with and expectation of an object. Therefore, LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE is a more appropriate metaphor to interpret the phrase *so much love*. As a substance, love is usually depicted as a liquid, such as water. The liquidity of love is expressed by the word *overflow* in example (14).

- (14) the gentleman was *overflowing* with admiration (P&P, 193)
- (15) you would have laughed yourself *out of it* [love] sooner (P&P, 107)
- (16) I have never been much *in love* (P&P, 113)

(17) so easily *falls in love* with a pretty girl (P&P, 106)

The metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER gives an imaginable form that ‘the object of love’ could take. The phrase *fall in love* in example (17) especially captures the dynamic moment of descending into the realm of love. It also implies that love has depth. Being in love (16) and being out of love (15) are two static states, indicating respectively that one is inside the boundary of love or outside it. Example (17) also introduces another metaphor LOVE IS FALLING, which encapsulates the initial experience of love. The rationale behind this metaphor is that the onset of love is associated with a sense of losing control, which is commonly experienced when one falls over or off the edge of something.

7.1.2 Love Is a Disease

The concept of love is often constructed in terms of a sickness or wound especially when the characters in *Pride and Prejudice* encounter hardship pertinent to love.

- (1) I shall certainly try to *get the better* (P&P, 102)
- (2) it has *done no harm* to any one but myself (P&P, 102)
- (3) all that Jane had *suffered* (P&P, 140)
- (4) the *recovery of her spirits* (P&P, 141)
- (5) Could there be finer *symptoms* (P&P, 107)

Examples (1) – (4) are all extracted from the section in which Jane suffered pain due to her disillusionment with the romantic prospects between her and Mr. Bingley after his departure from Netherfield. The context of example (5) is the situation when Elizabeth listed to Mrs. Gardner some examples of Mr. Bingley’s behaviour towards Jane, which were evidently driven by admiration; here, she termed them symptoms of love. The following examples, on the other hand, relate to Elizabeth:

- (6) complimented her on *bearing it so well* (P&P, 115)

- (7) the *pain* he was to receive (P&P, 142)
- (8) involving them both in *misery of the acutest kind* (P&P, 143).
- (9) I have no such *injuries* to resent (P&P, 172)

Example (6) is Mrs. Gardiner's compliment to Elizabeth after Wickham withdrew his attention from her and redirected it to Mary King. Example (7) refers to Mr. Darcy's pain caused by Elizabeth's rejection, and example (8) is Elizabeth's comment that Mr. Darcy's interference in the romance between Jane and Mr. Bingley inflicted torture on both sides. Example (9), finally, is Elizabeth's reply to her father that she has not yet experienced misfortune in love affairs due to Lydia's imprudent behaviour in the public.

All these examples, except for (5), convey the message that unrequited love can bring pain, suffering and misery but that one may recover and heal over time. However, unlike a diagnosed disease or wound, this 'love sickness' is usually considered to be a mental discomfort rather than a physical one. Nevertheless, the painful experience of being rejected in love has a physiological basis. Research has proved that social rejection activates the same region of the brain that physical pain could awaken (Kross et al., 2011). This resonates with Johnson and Lakoff's theory (1980), that conceptual metaphors have an experiential foundation. Although two hundred years ago there was no scientific proof to validate the theory that affective sufferings were actual physical pains, the association between the two had long been learnt through experience and had become established in language.

Finally, it may be noted that, when a romance fails, the injured part of the body is usually identified as the heart, as illustrated by the extremely common metaphor, also found in *Pride and Prejudice*:

- (10) I thought I should have *broken my heart*. (P&P, 171)

7.1.3 Love Is a Force

Love is sometimes described as a force that is autonomous and not subject to control:

- (1) His apparent partiality *had subsided* (P&P, 113)
- (2) *so strong* an affection (P&P, 145)
- (3) for in Darcy's breast there was a tolerable *powerful* feeling towards her (P&P, 71)
- (4) *the strength of* that attachment which, in spite of all his endeavours, he had found impossible to *conquer* (P&P, 142)
- (5) In vain have I *struggled*. ...My feelings will not be *repressed* (P&P, 142)
- (6) pure and *elevating* passion (P&P, 113)
- (7) She *attracted* him more than he liked (P&P, 45)
- (8) the *violence* of my affection (P&P, 81)
- (9) how am I even to know that it would be wisdom to *resist* (P&P, 110).

The phrases *had subsided* in (1), *so strong* in (2), *powerful* in (3) and *the strength of* in (4) all elicit that love has its *strength*, which could be rated as strong or weak. The idea that love can *subside* suggests that the force of love is subject to change. As a force is a vector, which has a direction, love is also oriented and has its direction. For example, love has an upward direction as indicated by *will not be repressed* in (5) and *elevating* in (6), whereas in (7) the force of love draws Darcy towards his object of love as communicated by the word *attract*. Furthermore, the words *impossible to conquer* in (4) and *struggled* and *will not be repressed* in (5) present a picture of Darcy who battles with the autonomous force of his affection which is generated within him but not under his governance. The word *violence* in (8) illustrates that the force of love is both strong and difficult to control. In the context of example (9), Elizabeth explains to her aunt that if Wickham proposes, she is inclined not to turn him down because he lacks fortune. In her opinion, she should follow her heart and allow the force of love to guide her. In addition, the actions of *struggling with*, *repressing* and *resisting* love also imply the strength of love as a force.

7.1.4 Love Is a Catching Game

In *Pride and Prejudice*, the two main love affairs both go through phases of lacking or unclear reciprocity: either that one person remains indifferent (as with Darcy and Elizabeth) or that neither is certain of the other's feelings (as with Jane and Bingley). In both cases, one party ends up proactively taking measures to win the other person's affections, the process of which is expressed in the subsequent three examples:

- (1) to believe myself *his first object* (P&P, 110)
- (2) it was all in *pursuit* of Mr. Bingley (P&P, 24)
- (3) When she is *secure of him...* (P&P, 17).

These instances illustrate the three steps of a catching process, from (1) setting a target, through (2) chasing, to (3) capturing. Catching is always performed intentionally, whereas one can also submit oneself to voluntarily being caught, as shown by (4):

- (4) her manners were not those of the fashionable world, he was *caught* by their easy playfulness (P&P, 18).
- (5) Mrs. Collins's pretty friend had moreover *caught* his fancy very much. (P&P, 130)

In (4), Darcy first noticed the attractiveness of Elizabeth. The world *caught* identifies a subtle change of attitude in a fleeting moment, since Darcy did not consider Elizabeth as handsome earlier. The use of the word *caught* in (4) emphasizes how a person becomes interested in certain qualities. In contrast to (4), the same word in (5) is applied in a reserved way, stressing that fondness is generated when one's interest is well-responded by someone.

- (6) At last it *arrested* her—and she beheld a striking resemblance of Mr. Darcy (P&P, 185)
- (7) she is luckily too poor to be *an object of prey* to any body (P&P, 173)

The event in (6) is during Elizabeth's visit to Pemberley House, where she searches for Darcy's

portrait in the picture gallery. When she finds it, she is immediately *arrested* by it, signifying the change of her feeling for Darcy as her impression of him changes in the house. Therefore, this ‘arrest’ has the metaphorical meaning of Darcy winning Elizabeth’s heart.

Example (7) reflects the cruel and dangerous aspect of love as a catching game. It implies that someone might approach another in the name of love while secretly plotting to gain access to their fortune, turning the target of the approach into an object of prey.

Finally, in the ‘catching game’ of love, competition might exist when there are multiples parties competing for the same person’s interest:

(8) set up as a *rival* of Jane (P&P, 194)

(9) What a *triumph* for him (P&P, 231)

(10) she would have felt almost sure of *success* (P&P, 92)

(11) my proposals will not *fail* of being acceptable (P&P, 83)

This situation can be more precisely encapsulated by LOVE IS COMPETITION and is exemplified by (8). Both metaphors, LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME and LOVE IS COMPETITION, share the possible results of success and failure, as shown in examples (9)-(11).

7.1.5 Love Is a Risky Thing

The metaphor LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME displays danger as a facet of love, and this aspect can be extended to form a metaphor category in itself — LOVE IS A RISKY THING. The connection between the two metaphors is illustrated by (1), in which the phrase *falling an easy prey* demonstrates the overlap and illustrates that love can be utilized as a tool to benefit the wooer at the cost of the one being wooed. There are also other types of risks in love.

(1) neither her virtue nor her understanding would preserve her from *falling an easy prey* (P&P, 207)

- (2) *the danger of raising expectations which might only end in disappointment* (P&P, 136)
- (3) you cannot think me so weak, as to be *in danger* now. (P&P, 252)

The context of (2) is that Charlotte suspects that Darcy loves Elizabeth but the possibility is ridiculed by Elizabeth. Out of uncertainty and to spare her friend from disappointment, Charlotte decides to press the subject. This example indicates the risk that a mistaken perception of love can disappoint the person who hopes for it. Having experienced this disillusion, Jane indicates her attitude towards Bingley's return to Netherfield in (3). She plans to remain strong and civil, but indifferent to his presence so as to avoid the rekindling of her love and experiencing a probable second heartbreak. It should be noted that the whole section of 6.1.2 (Love Is a Disease) highlights the health risks of unrequited or failed love.

The above cases indicate that the risk of romantic love stems from how individuals can be influenced by their loved ones. This effect of emotional affinity is also demonstrated in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980: 128) metaphor, CLOSSNESS IS A STRENGTH OF EFFORT, denoting that the closer the bond between two individuals, the greater the impact one has on the other. This metaphor explains example (4), where Darcy's love toward Elizabeth is expressed as Darcy's being *in her power*. Relinquishing one's power can produce neutral and harmless consequences, but it still can cause someone to go on the alert or make them cautious about external influences, as in (5), where Darcy regards his feelings for Elizabeth as a sign of danger, and in (6), where Jane attempts to hide her affection for Bingley.

- (4) if she could suppose him to be *in her power*. (P&P, 136)
- (5) He began to feel the *danger* of paying Elizabeth too much attention (P&P, 44).
- (6) but it is sometimes a disadvantage to be so very *guarded* (P&P, 16)
- (7) My *watchfulness* has been effectual; and though I should certainly be a more interesting object to all my acquaintance, were I *distractedly* in love with him (P&P, 114)
- (8) ...advise him to marry as soon as he could, provided he chose with *discretion* (P&P, 50)

However, as (7) shows, Elizabeth's *watchfulness* has helped her to avoid deep involvement with Wickham, who soon switches his attention from her to Mary King. Her reservation is also apparent in that she did not love Wickham *distractedly*, noting the dangerous aspect of devoted love, especially toward a recent acquaintance. In (9), Mr. Collins is also advised by Lady Catherine to choose his marriage partner with *discretion*.

7.1.6 Love Is a Creature

Love can be depicted as a living creature having biological needs, specific types of behaviour and character.

- (1) a *fine, stout, healthy* love (P&P, 34)
- (2) poetry as *the food of* love (P&P, 34)
- (3) I am convinced that one good sonnet will *starve* it entirely away (P&P, 34)
- (4) I am *run away with* by my feelings (P&P, 80)
- (5) the influence of his friends successfully *combated* by the more natural influence of Jane's attractions (P&P, 108)
- (6) so much love and eloquence *awaited* her there (P&P, 93)

When love is vigorous, its vitality is expressed in example (1) as a *fine, stout* and *healthy* state, which is characteristic of a creature's strong physical health. It requires nourishment to sustain its life, as stated in (2); otherwise, it can *starve to death*, as (3) conveys. In example (4), the phrase *run away with* invests love with will and mobility, likening it to a creature that is capable of deciding its own course of action. In (5), love displays its aggressive dimension, and *combating* an opposing power to protect its existence. As well as being wild and ferocious, love can also exhibit a tame aspect as in (6), where it merely *await* someone. The latter three examples not only feature the possible actions which love can take, but also suggest that it may play either an active or passive role.

7.1.7 Love Is a Union

The idea of love as a concept of union may be seen to start from an *inclination*, as shown in (1), which is a tendency to draw closer physically or a preference indicating a close psychological distance. In example (2), the word *suit* implies the possible success of uniting two people. In (3) and (4), the words *attach* and *attachment* suggest an emotional connection between two parties which can either be one-sided or mutual.

- (1) I never saw a more promising *inclination*. (P&P, 107)
- (2) Lizzy does not lose much by not *suiting* his fancy (P&P, 11)
- (3) If they believed him *attached* to me... (P&P, 104)
- (4) I hope there is no strong *attachment* on either side (P&P, 164)

Similarly, when the end or stifling of love is described, this is often seen as the ending of a union:

- (5) she would not hear of *leaving* Wickham. (P&P, 239)
- (6) they would not try to *part* us (P&P, 104)
- (7) The pain of *separation* (P&P, 105)
- (8) Wickham's *desertion* (P&P, 115)
- (9) I had *detached* Mr. Bingley from your sister (P&P, 147)
- (10) and what is to *divide* them? (P&P, 265)

The words *leave*, *part* and *separation* respectively in (5), (6) and (7) signify that a couple is no longer in the state of being together, indicating the end of a union, at least in the physical sense, if not immediately followed by the termination of love. In (8), the noun *desertion* depicts both leaving someone physically and withdrawing love simultaneously, often in a cruel way. In (9), the verb *detach* emphasises the loss of mental connection, and *divide* in (10) implies the separation of a love union by force.

7.1.8 Metonym: Love and Marriage Are Happiness

In *Pride and Prejudice*, the emotion of happiness, engendered through activities relevant to love and marriage, is often employed as a metonym to refer to the whole affair of love and marriage. Evidently, love and marriage also involve other emotions, such as sadness, disappointment, jealousy or fear. However, happiness is certainly the most salient and desirable emotion one anticipates from a relationship, which renders it understandable that people tend to use it to symbolize love and marriage.

When Mr. Collins asks Charlotte about the date of their wedding, he describes it as the day on which he is to become ‘the happiest of men’ (P&P, 93). Here entering into marriage is represented by the concept of supreme happiness. When Elizabeth complains about Mr. Darcy’s interference in the romance between Jane and Mr. Bingley, she questions his right and judgement as to the determination and announcement of ‘what manner that friend [is] to be happy’ (P&P, 139). Jane and Mr. Bingley are in love with each other without having confessed to each other, and they would most probably have married if their love had freely developed. ‘Happiness’ certainly denotes love in Elizabeth’s statement, and it is reasonable to suppose that it is a metonym for marriage.

Another metonym appears in *Pride and Prejudice* solely for love. While Mr. Darcy is detailing his long-felt affection for Elizabeth, she mocks him in her heart, thinking that he is less articulate ‘on *the subject of tenderness* than of pride’ (Austen 2019: 142). Tenderness in Elizabeth’s words is equivalent to love in general, which is different from the usage in the phrase ‘a very *tender* affection’ (Austen 2019: 169). In the latter example, *tenderness* is used merely as a quality to modify the love Jane cherished for Mr. Bingley. This follows the principle of metonymy, using a part of something (in this case, ‘tenderness’) to denote the whole (love).

7.1.9 Metonym: A Person Is a Place

A person can be represented by a place that they own and are responsible for it. This association is expressed in example (1): Ms. Bennet wants one of her daughters to marry Bingley, imagining her then living happily as his wife at Netherfield. This stresses the association between Bingley

and Netherfield; Bingley rents and is in charge of the estate, so Netherfield is an appropriate metonym for him.

- (1) If I can but see one of my daughters happily settled at Netherfield (P&P, 7).
- (2) a man whose sisters and friends are all wishing him to marry elsewhere? (P&P, 91)
- (3) Younger sons cannot marry where they like. (P&P, 138)

Examples (2) and (3) show expressions referring more directly to a person as a place. Here, the choice of a marriage partner is phrased as *marry elsewhere* and *marry where they like*. Of course, one can never actually marry a place, which is merely used here as a metonym for one's bride or groom. As well as ownership and responsibility, the association between a person and a place also includes the fact of living in a place, which can be elaborated as a property, a village, town, city or country, characterised by a certain landscape or weather. Since a marriage can involve one of the couple leaving home and moving to where their spouse lives, it is reasonable to consider the choice of a marriage partner as also a choice of where one would like to live; however, this aspect would not have been relevant for the landowning men in *Pride and Prejudice*.

7.1.10 Marriage Is a Risky Thing

Between the Bennet sisters Lydia and Elizabeth, there is a dialogue which exemplifies the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING, as it remains uncertain whether there is really any true affection between the two characters discussed.

Lydia: "There is no danger of Wickham's marrying Mary King...Wickham is safe."

Elizabeth: "And Mary King is safe...safe from a connection imprudent as to fortune."

(P&P, 164)

Lydia points out that a marriage between Wickham and Mary King would be dangerous;

Elizabeth did not contest this, but she disagrees with Lydia as to who is in danger. Since Lydia admires Wickham and considers Mary King as her enemy of love, whom she describes as ‘a nasty little freckled thing’ (Austen 2019: 164), from Lydia’s perspective the real hazard of Wickham and Mary King marrying would be her failure to gain Wickham’s affection. There is no evidence available to Lydia, or in the entire novel, suggesting that Mary King could pose any harm to Wickham. As a result, Lydia’s concern for Wickham’s safety is at least ill-founded if not totally imaginary. It can be assumed that Lydia merely projected the danger she perceives of losing her love to Wickham’s marrying Mary King. Furthermore, she minimizes Mary King as an unworthy and undeserving woman for Wickham, since then she could conclude that Wickham is safe.

At the stage when this conversation takes place, Elizabeth has learnt about Wickham’s immorality from Darcy’s letter and has sufficient reason to suspect that his approaches to Mary King are motivated by pecuniary considerations rather than by genuine fondness. Darcy discloses two things to Elizabeth about Wickham; first, that he demanded compensation for renouncing the preferment given to him by Darcy’s late father (which is a valuable position in Darcy’s family church), and, second, that he plotted to secretly elope with Darcy’s sister in order to gain access to her fortune of thirty thousand pounds. Before Elizabeth receives this letter, Mrs. Gardner (Elizabeth’s aunt) once mentions critically that Wickham’s sudden enthusiasm of Mary King coincides with her receipt of a legacy from her grandfather. Some time after this letter, Wickham becomes so heavily indebted that he has to escape from the militia in Brighton. Then, to gain the benefit of having a female companion, he seduces Lydia into eloping with him by fraudulently promising to marry her while intending to abandon her as soon as a better prospect appears. According to these consistent accounts, Wickham is a profligate and dishonest opportunist who attempts to make his fortune through marriage. With the revelation of Wickham’s selfish, exploitative, extravagant and treacherous personality, it has become apparent that Wickham is indeed a danger that could exhaust Mary King’s fortune and ruin her happiness if they were married.

This dialogue between Lydia and Elizabeth demonstrates how the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING can be investigated entirely differently depending on the metaphor user’s information and standpoint, as well as the social context. Another example of this metaphor is

Darcy's perception of danger in his affection toward Elizabeth, which is derived from yet another distinct cause.

- (1) were it not for the inferiority of her connections, he should be *in some danger* (P&P, 39)
- (2) pointing out to my friend, the certain *evils* of such a choice. (P&P, 148)
- (3) [Bingley is] the kind of young man to get into *a scrape* of that sort (P&P, 139)

As example (1) indicates, Darcy regards Elizabeth's attractiveness as a threat. As an upper-class gentleman, Darcy considers it as demeaning to marry a woman with inferior relatives. In a conversation between Darcy and his friends, it is revealed that Elizabeth has one uncle working as an attorney and another uncle as a tradesman living near London's Cheapside. Miss Bingley reacts to this information with mockery and contempt, and Darcy asserts that it certainly reduces the Bennet sisters' opportunity to marry any men of significance (Austen 2019: 27). In this case, he is talking of himself. The danger he perceives is a metaphor for the degradation of social status that would be caused by marrying a woman who is associated with an inferior class.

The same applies to example (2), where Darcy dissuades Bingley from marrying Jane. By the word *evils*, he refers to the disadvantages of this potential marriage, which are on the one hand Bingley's suffering of social degradation and on the other hand Jane's suspect intentions. Darcy has observed that Jane does not treat Bingley any differently than others, and has concluded arbitrarily from this that Jane was approaching Bingley for material benefits. Based on these two reasons, Darcy intervenes in the matter to help his friend avoid an imprudent marriage. Apart from social degradation, the inauthenticity of one of the parties is presented as another possible risk of marriage.

In (3), Colonel Fitzwilliam also opines that Bingley would be 'getting himself into a scrape' if he married Jane. Since Colonel Fitzwilliam has not met Jane, it can be reasonably assumed that he has formed this opinion based on what his cousin, Darcy, has told him.

7.1.11 Marriage Is a Union

Marriage is a legally approved relationship between two people who are each other's life *companions*, as shown in (1); whereas union means the action or status of being joined together. The main feature common to both marriage and union is the state of joining, as expressed by *united* in (2).

- (1) the *companion* of my future life (P&P, 80)
- (2) Miss Elizabeth Bennet, would...be soon afterwards *united* to my nephew (P&P, 263)
- (3) Is he married or *single*? (P&P, 3)
- (4) we planned the *union* (P&P, 264)
- (5) planning his happiness in such an *alliance* (P&P, 39)
- (6) the happy prospect of their nearer *connection* (P&P, 84)
- (7) the idea of so unsuitable a *match* (P&P, 96)

In (3), *single* refers to the unmarried state, but the most straightforward meaning of single is 'one only'. Since every person is a separate individual, it is of course not logical to refer to a married man as 'not single' and this use may therefore be considered metaphorical. It reflects the social convention of viewing marriage as the *union* of two people, which makes them a unit (a couple), as conveyed in (4). There are also other terms describing the action or state of two people entering into matrimony: some examples are synonyms of union, such as *alliance* as in example (5), *connection* exemplified in (6) and *match* in (7).

- (8) she will not have Mr. Collins (P&P, 85)
- (9) had my fair cousin honoured me with her hand (P&P, 87)

There are other instances which to some degree signify marriage as a union. In example (8), *have* Mr. Collins means accepting him as a husband. The word *have* connotes a sense of ownership and belongingness. The phrase *have someone* deftly articulates the inclusion of a person into a marital relationship. In (9), the expression *honour me with her hand* pictures two

lovers holding hands, which is both a symbol and physical form of union.

7.1.12 Marriage Is a Preservative

As an economically dependent but well-educated woman, Charlotte calls her marriage her pleasantest desired *preservative*, as shown in example (1). MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE is an appropriate metaphor to represent marriage's typical function as a living for women in early 19th century. A preservative is originally an additive used in foodstuffs or applied to wood to prevent decay, while marriage was a method of keeping women from falling into poverty, although it does not guarantee happiness.

- (1) however uncertain of giving happiness, [it] must be their pleasantest *preservative* from want. (P&P, 93)

In *Pride and Prejudice*, women have this material and realistic motivation for marriage because they depend on their husbands to provide for them. Charlotte's marital choice is a typical example of this situation. Mr. Collins is Mr. Bennet's distant cousin and heir and a clergyman. After he fails in his proposal to Elizabeth, Charlotte plots to secure him and succeeds by being attentive and encouraging to him in conversation. In Charlotte's evaluation, her future husband is 'neither sensible nor agreeable', serves an irritating patroness and merely has imaginary and non-existent love for her (Austen 1813: 93). However, she feels fortunate about and satisfied with her forthcoming marriage because Mr. Collins's income and status as a middle-classed man can afford her a comfortable life.

7.1.13 Marriage Is a Business

Similar to a business, there are positions to fill (husband and wife) and a livelihood to earn within a marriage. The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS is found in several examples from *Pride and Prejudice*, which draw similarities between the making of a marriage and some

aspects of a business.

In example (1), Mr. Bennet calls his making the acquaintance of Mr. Bingley as a *venture* and indicates that he must help his daughters to *stand their chance*. This instance reflects that it is necessary to take risk and seize the opportunity on the appearance of a marriage candidate. The process is very similar to the search for a business partner.

Both examples (2) and (3) discuss the selection of a husband and a wife in a way that corresponds to the hiring of employees. In (2), Mr. Collins considers that Elizabeth is *qualified* to become his wife because of her suitable personal traits and status, while in (3), Elizabeth refuses Mr. Collins's offer with the excuse that she is *ill-qualified*. In these two instances, the roles of husband and wife are to be occupied by 'qualified' candidates, which is similar to job positions being assigned to qualified personnel.

- (1) But if we do not *venture*, somebody else will; and after all, Mrs. Long and her neices must stand their *chance*; (P&P, 6)
- (2) I shall speak in the highest terms of your modesty, economy, and other amiable *qualifications*. (P&P, 82)
- (3) she would find me in every respect *ill qualified* for the situation. (P&P, 82)
- (4) I know it to be the established custom of your sex to reject a man on the first *application* (P&P, 82)
- (5) She...does not know her own *interest* (P&P, 84)
- (6) It seems an hopeless *business* (P&P, 85)
- (7) Miss Lucas, who accepted him solely from the pure and disinterested desire of an *establishment* (P&P, 93)

In example (4), Mr. Collins refers to his marriage proposal as an *application*, which is characteristic of applying for a job. In (5), Mrs. Bennet judges that Elizabeth's refusal as an ignorance of self-interest and warns her of poverty after her father's death. This reflects Mrs. Bennet's business mindset concerning marriage. where she places financial considerations over other factors in marriage.

In the last two examples, marriage is directly referred to with the terms *business* and

establishment. Especially in the case of (6), Charlotte chooses to become Mr. Collins's spouse, for the sake of her livelihood rather than love, making the role of Mr Collins's wife more of an occupation for her.

7.2.14 Discussion

The metaphors analysed in 7.1 show that CMT is a useful tool for understanding the concept of love and marriage in *Pride and Prejudice*. Conversely, *Pride and Prejudice* is a rich linguistic source for the application of CMT, as it contains an abundance of conceptual metaphors for love and marriage. This is partially due to the figurative narrative style of this novel. At the same time, most of these metaphors are particularly common in everyday language, with a few distinguishing themselves as novel and noteworthy, such as MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE. Those metaphors that relate marriage to business reflect the social context in *Pride and Prejudice*, where there are certain marriageable criteria for each class.

In most metaphors in this section, multiple features are attributed to the concepts of love and marriage by means of various other concepts, as illustrated by the cited examples. This confirms CMT's claim that a conceptual metaphor is systematic and highlights some features while hiding the others. Being 'systematic' means that a metaphorical concept has its own range of language. Highlighting and hiding features denotes that, within a metaphor, certain aspects of a concept are placed in the foreground highlighted while others are relegated to the background. For example, when the metaphor LOVE IS A CREATURE is examined, living features attributed to the concept love are active in mind, while the hazards of imprudent love represented by LOVE IS A RISKY THING are temporarily forgotten.

7.2 Analysis of Metaphors in Bridget Jones's Diary

7.2.1 Love Is an Object

As in *Pride and Prejudice*, the concept of love is commonly conceptualized as an object in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. First of all, it has physical existence and therefore can be found, as in (1).

Second, it can be gathered and accumulated, as in (2). Third, it can be demolished, as in (3). Here the examples demonstrate three different phases of love, described in terms of how an object can be treated. In the initial stage, love comes into existence through the action of finding; in the developing stage, love expands by gathering; and in the final stage, love disappears because it is destroyed.

(1) *finding* a relationship (BJD, 144)

(2) to *gather* emotions (BJD, 69)

(3) *wreck* my relationship by sowing suspicions in my mind (BJD, 177)

Love is typically depicted as a container, which has a boundary. As examples (4) and (5) respectively demonstrate, the state of loving someone is being *in* love and the state of not loving anyone is being *not in* love. The proposition *in* indicates the borderline of love, as it means inside an enclosed area. The sense that LOVE IS A CONTAINER is further emphasized by the word *free*, which has the connotation of leaving an enclosed space.

(4) I'm *in* love. (BJD, 111)

(5) I'm *not in* love with Daniel any more. I am *free*. (BJD, 105)

(6) *how much* he truly loved me (BJD, 185)

Example (6) contains the metaphor LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, which is similar to LOVE IS AN OBJECT. The phrase *how much* attempts to quantify love and therefore attributes physical existence to love, as LOVE IS AN OBJECT does. However, the unaccountable nature of this phrase makes the concept of love in (6) resemble more of a substance rather than an object.

7.2.2 Love Is Falling

As in *Pride and Prejudice*, the metaphor of falling is used in *Bridget Jones Diary*, not only in the commonly used phrase *fall in love* but in other phrases which convey the blossoming of

love: *fall for someone*, and, more dramatically, *to be swept off one's feet*.

- (1) Maybe I should *have fallen for* someone younger and mindless. (BJD, 59)
- (2) *to be swept off our feet* (BJD, 196)

These two expressions suggest an association between loving and falling, because these two events are both unpredictable. When one falls over or falls off the edge of something, it usually happens surprisingly and unexpectedly. This metaphoric usage is generally limited to the description of the starting point of romantic love.

7.2.3 Love Is a Disease

The metaphor LOVE IS A DISEASE is also found in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In Example (1), the word *love-sick* directly treats love as a disease. Meanwhile, example (2) attributes the condition of heartbreak to failed love. In other words, romantic failure is not a disease in itself but the trigger for the health issue. Failed love becomes a health threat which develops into a sickness.

However, the statement made in (2) also extends the cause of a heartbreak beyond the realm of love to self-ego and pride. Bridget comes to this reflection after her ex-boyfriend Peter informs her of his marriage, crushing her illusion that that he might still be waiting for her. The example indicates that a heartbreak can be caused by disillusion in love and damage to our self-esteem.

- (1) Probably overwhelmed by too many Tiffany's boxes from *love-sick* suitors (BJD, 120)
- (2) how much romantic *heartbreak* is to do with ego and miffed pride rather than actual loss (BJD, 191)
- (3) Only Women *Bleed*. (BJD, 133)

The context of example (3) is that Bridget's female friend Magda becomes miserable and hurt

because her husband, Jeremy, has been flirting with another woman. Subsequently, Bridget receives the warning that ‘only women bleed’ from one of her male friends, suggesting that women are more prone to hurt in love. The word *bleed* vividly evokes the image of a bleeding wound caused by love trauma.

7.2.4 Love Is a Force

In *Bridget Jones’s Diary*, the metaphor LOVE IS A FORCE emphasizes love only as an attractive or magnetic force.

- (1) wishing Daniel wasn't quite so *attractive*. (BJD, 103)
- (2) he'd been very *attracted to* this girl. (BJD, 132)
- (3) There we were, just him and me, *caught in a massive electrical-charge field, pulled together irresistibly, like a pair of magnets*. (BJD, 58)

Both (1) and (2) portray the object of love as attractive characters in the eyes of the beholders, who desire to draw closer to their love. Example (3) develops the force metaphor much further with a more detailed description of an electrical field, mixing the metaphor with a final simile *like a pair of magnets*. It may be noted that the more violent ideas of love as force to struggle against, which appear commonly in *Pride and Prejudice*, are entirely absent here.

7.2.5 Love Is a Catching game

Also in *Bridget Jones’s Diary*, love can be portrayed as a catching game, where one person chases the object of love, as shown in this example:

- (1) another who was *pursued* by a bloke for three months (BJD, 20)

The action of pursuing usually happens between two people when one person has already

developed feelings for the other whereas the other remains indifferent or is still uncertain about his or her own emotions. Similar to a game, the 'pursuit' of someone with whom one is in love typically ends with victory or failure.

7.2.6 Love Is a Negotiation

In the only example here, love is portrayed as a negotiation between a couple, requiring both parties to compromise. It suggests a connection between women's right to negotiate with men and their means of economy. Real negotiations can of course take place in a relationship when a couple discusses each other's interests and demands in order to reach agreements, but this section talks about negotiation in the metaphorical sense.

- (1) we are a pioneer generation daring to refuse to *compromise* in love and relying on our own economic power. (BJD, 21)

On the grand scale, the metaphor LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION can be applied to a romance as a whole. A sustainable romance resembles a successful negotiation, whereas a collapsed relationship is like a failed negotiation. On the minor scale, every conflict between a couple can be regarded as a negotiation. Example (1) is an encouragement from Sharon for Jude, who's boyfriend, Richard, has broken up with her. Jude has invited Richard to go on holiday with her, but this alarms him. He has interpreted the invitation as a proposal to advance their relationship, so he decides to reject the idea and leave her as a to prevent their relationship from developing any further. Going on holiday together would clearly have exceeded what he expects from the relationship and what he could contribute to it. The romance was broken by the mismatch between the two parties' expectations of the relationship and a lack of communication and compromise between them. This breakup story illustrates the fact that love is a negotiating process both on the grand scale (the relationship is ended), and the minor scale (it starts with a conflict).

7.2.7 Love Is a Union

In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, the metaphor LOVE IS A UNION is frequently manifested through various expressions that inform the union of two people. The examples below showcase nuanced aspects of togetherness, which is the fundamental state of a couple. Both (1) and (2) describe the state that romantic love or a marriage brings two people into: they become each other's companions. (3) is professed by Daniel Cleaver to Bridget before sexual conduct, to disclaim responsibility and commitment. The word *involved* indicates that romantic love requires both parties to pay attention to each other and make efforts to cultivate their romance.

- (1) to discuss *living together* (BJD, 20)
- (2) they *got back together* (BJD, 22)
- (3) I don't think we should start *getting involved*. (BJD, 33)

As for (4), in the *Cambridge Dictionary*, *fit* as a verb has the sense 'be [of] the right size or shape' which may, as here, be extended to a general, metaphorical sense. The expression *mentally fitting* someone conveys the sense that the two lovers' mentalities have matching shapes. Example (5) demonstrates that love-generated curiosity and attraction makes one desire to merge *into* the loved one. Finally, Example (6) indicates an attempt of matchmaking — to fix Mark and Bridget up, in an almost brutal way, because the phrase *fix up* connotes physically tying two people together.

- (4) I could see her *mentally fitting* Mark Darcy. (BJD, 101)
- (5) He's really, like, *into you*. (BJD, 193)
- (6) The minute I decide I like Mark Darcy, everyone immediately stops trying to *fix me up with him*. (BJD, 282)

Again, the separation of a couple demonstrates the destruction of their togetherness and the end of their union. A different choice of words engenders a difference in the attitude and emotion of the breakup. The expressions *chuck* or *get rid of* someone in examples (7) and (8)

communicate a lack of attachment on the part of one of the two lovers, signifying an easy and remorseless removal of the partner by the deserter. However, the phrasal verb *split up* in (11) indicates mutuality, with potential force and pain involved in the rupture of an emotional bond.

(7) Vile Richard...had *chucked* her (BJD, 19)

(8) ...for not advising Jude simply to *get rid of* Vile Richard (BJD, 22)

(9) she is currently *split up*. (BJD, 125)

(10) I'm a singleton. (BJD, 42)

(11) one must not live one's life through men but be complete in oneself as a woman of substance. (BJD, 31)

In (10), the word *singleton* points to someone's status as a single person, stressing their being alone and having no romantic relationship with another. Example (11), finally, can be regarded as a response to Plato's myth of humans' desire to unite with their lovers and achieve completeness. This statement does not reject the idea of a couple forming a unity, but it stresses the importance of an individual being independent and complete in themselves and contradicts the notion that a woman's life can only be meaningful and fulfilled through obtaining a male partner.

7.2.8 Marriage Is a Union

Since a marriage is often considered as the fruit of love in modern English society, marriage is naturally also a form of union.

(1) we're bringing *other halves* (BJD, 80)

(2) Mum might be planning their *reunion* (BJD, 91)

The noun phrase *other halves* in (1), referring to a couple, can be traced back to Plato's *Symposium*, which narrates that humans originally had a circular body, dual heads, four arms and four legs, but were split in two by gods for their insolence. According to this myth, the split halves of human beings yearn to find their other halves and achieve reunion, ideally returning

to their original state by merging into one (Plato 2008: 25). It has become a custom to call one's partner one's other half despite individualism being greatly emphasized nowadays.

(3) she is *leaving* Dad for it (BJD, 47)

Example (3) is extracted from the part of BJD that takes place during Christmas in which, after a period of estrangement, Bridget's mother appears to plan to restore her relationship with her husband. This scenario resembles Plato's myth in the parts of separation and reunion. The expression *leave someone* reveals a calm and neutral attitude towards the breakup.

7.2.9 Marriage Is a Trap

In Bridget Jones's Diary, marriage is conceptualized as a trap for some male characters. The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRAP to men is explicitly expressed in the first example below, in which the word *them* refers to men. Marriages and traps share the similarity that once one enters into them it is difficult to come out and one is no longer totally free. The fear of being trapped is then transferred to a fear of getting married. This is revealed in the following three examples, where the men *wriggle out* or *duck out* of 'the trap'.

(1) all women are trying to *trap them* into marriage (BJD, 213)

(2) Feel he thinks I am trying to *trap him into a mini-break; as if it were not a mini-break but marriage* (BJD, 144)

(3) and men like Richard...play on the chink in the armour to *wriggle out of* commitment, maturity, honour, and the natural progression of things between a man and a woman. (BJD, 20)

(4) only to find him *ducking out* (BJD, 20)

(5) I think *I've made my bed, I'll just lie in it now* (BJD, 133).

In (2), Bridget complains about her boyfriend Daniel's unwillingness to take a mini-break with

her. She interprets his evasiveness about the subject as reluctance to progress their relationship into marriage. Example (3) exemplifies a similar plot, in which Bridget's friend Jude is abandoned by her boyfriend Richard after they have been dating for eighteen months, because he is frightened by her holiday invitation and is worried that she will use it as an opportunity to accelerate the development of their relationship. This behaviour is criticized by Sharon, another friend of Bridget, who considers him immature and dishonorable. The story behind example (4) is that a man suddenly retreats when his loved woman accepts his proposal, after he has spent three months pursuing her passionately. These three examples suggest a pattern of men fearing commitment.

In the novel, only Daniel's reluctant attitude is explained. On the one hand, he is a flirtatious, habitual womaniser. On the other, although he finds Bridget interesting and fun, she is not beautiful enough for him to devote himself to her. He confirms this by first cheating on her and then deciding to marry a physically more attractive woman. Marriage with Bridget appears to him to be a trap because this relationship does not fulfill his requirements and expectations.

In contrast, Bridget's friend Magda is indeed trapped in her marriage, but she chooses not to break up because of her circumstances, as she metaphorically remarks in (5). She finds out that her husband has been flirting with another woman. Though heartbroken, she opts to stay in the marriage for the sake of her two children, who are both under three years old. In her remark, she employs the idiom 'I've made my bed, I'll just lie in it' to refer to her situation of being trapped in her marriage. In her case, what has really ensnared her in the marriage is her responsibility for bringing up her young children.

7.2.10 Marriage Is a Trade

The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRADE compares women to products that have a sell-by date and must be purchased by men before their reproductive function expires. This idea is conveyed by example (1), which suggests that women must find husbands and give birth to children while they are still biologically capable. This is contrasted at the end of the example with men, who,

as ‘customers’, do not have such a concern. In the novel, Bridget frequently suffers from the stress she feels about aging and finding a partner.

- (1) how difficult it is being a woman and *having a sell-by date* for reproduction unlike men' (BJD, 195)

As a woman over thirty, Bridget has to deal politely with the eagerness demonstrated by her mother and her mother’s friends to introduce her to potential partners. One of them even directly expresses apprehension over Bridget’s age and puts pressure on her by saying, ‘[T]ick-tock-tick-tock’, imitating the sound of her biological clock (BJD, 11). Bridget also has appearance anxiety, which makes her fear wrinkles and the inability to control her weight due to aging (BJD, 78). Occasionally, she feels paranoid about her age, seeing it as something vicious that makes it less likely she will find a partner the older she becomes. (BJD, 143). Ultimately, she also fears dying alone with her body lying unfound for weeks (BJD, 20).

If women are reproductive products in the trade called marriage, their fertility deadline is indeed their sell-by date, while their appearance is their selling point. The closer they approach menopause, the less likely they are to find a ‘purchaser’, since both their function and appearance decline due to aging. This general idea, and an implicit criticism of it, lies behind much of the plot in *Bridget Jones’s Diary*.

7.2.11 Marriage Is a Place

The phrase *settle down* primarily means to familiarize oneself with a place and become satisfied with it. It could also mean that one starts to inhabit a place with one’s partner and plans to live there over the long term; in this sense, it is employed as a common metaphor of marriage:

- (1) to *settle down* in the first bloom of youth (BJD, 144)

In the case of example (1), Bridget’s use of the phrase is close to the latter meaning, but more

specifically she is referring to entering into marriage. In the context of example (1), she recounts the disadvantages of a woman staying single into her thirties, causing her to regret that she had not married in the best age of her youth. In this way, Bridget talks about settling down in a marriage instead of a place. This replacement in the collocation creates a link and comparison between a marriage and a place, to the extent that a marriage takes on the metaphorical meaning of place.

7.2.12 Marriage Is a Machine

In modern society, many machines, such as cars, computers and microwaves have been integrated into everyday life. The profound impact of machines is also visible in the language of intimate relationships.

- (1) form *functional* relationship with adult man (BJD, 189)
- (2) *dysfunctional* relationships (BJD, 78)

The two examples here embody the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE by indicating that a relationship can be either *functional* or *dysfunctional*. A cooperative and sustainable relationship is comparable to a functional machine which works smoothly and continuously, whereas a destructive and incompatible relationship is similar to a dysfunctional machine which requires maintenance or must be scrapped.

7.2.13 Discussion

Bridget Jones's Diary shows a fairly small number of conceptual metaphors, which limits the application of CMT. For a few metaphors, there is only one example, but CMT can still be applied to such isolated examples to reveal the hidden metaphor; for instance, LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION is produced from a single example in the book and can still be analysed by CMT in relation to the plot. Another metaphor, LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME, also has only

one example, with the keyword 'pursue' in it.

CMT is naturally better applied to metaphors that have more examples. The metaphor LOVE IS A UNION, for instance, has eleven examples demonstrating the relationship between the concept of love and the concept of union, which allows for a much fuller and more complex discussion of this metaphor.

8. Comparison

8.1 General Overview

Figure 1 displays all the conceptual metaphors extracted from *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*. The figure is divided vertically into two main parts. Part 1 lists the metaphors shared by both novels, while Part 2 contains those metaphors unique to either novel. In Part 2, the metaphors that only appear in *Pride and Prejudice* are organised on the left-hand side, while those exclusive to *Bridget Jones's Diary* are shown on the right-hand side.

Figure 1: An Overview of Conceptual Metaphors of Love and Marriage in P&P and BJD

	No	P&P	BJD
Part 1: Metaphors shared by both novels	1.	LOVE IS AN OBJECT	
	2.	LOVE IS A CONTAINER	
	3.	LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE	
	4.	LOVE IS FALLING	
	5.	LOVE IS A DISEASE	
	6.	LOVE IS A FORCE	
	7.	LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME	
	8.	A PERSON IS A PLACE (metonym) or MARRIAGE IS A PLACE	
	9.	LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A UNION	
Part 2: Metaphors unique to either novel	10.	LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING	MARRIAGE IS A TRAP
	11.	MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE	LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION
	12.	MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS	MARRIAGE IS A TRADE
	13.	LOVE IS A CREATURE	
	14.		MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE
	15.	LOVE & MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS (metonym)	

The following two sections deal with the metaphors in Part 1 and Part 2 respectively. Section 8.2 addresses the metaphors in Part 1 in terms of how much each metaphor in *Pride and*

Pride and Prejudice resembles its equivalent in *Bridget Jones's Diary* by comparing their specific examples in both books. Section 8.3 analyses reasons why the metaphors in Part 2 are unique by drawing connections between each metaphor and its relevant historical background.

8.2 Metaphors that are Used in Both Novels

In both novels, the concept of love is constructed in terms of the concepts of object, container, substance, falling, disease, force, catching game and union. The concept of marriage is formed with resemblance to a place and a union.

Figure 2: The List of Metaphors That Appear in Both Novels

1.	LOVE IS AN OBJECT
2.	LOVE IS A CONTAINER
3.	LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE
4.	LOVE IS FALLING
5.	LOVE IS A DISEASE
6.	LOVE IS A FORCE
7.	LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME
8.	A PERSON IS A PLACE or MARRIAGE IS A PLACE
9.	LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A UNION

In both novels, love is depicted as an object. The metaphor LOVE IS AN OBJECT is an ontological metaphor in CMT. An ontological metaphor is an analogy between the experiences of objects and substances and another set of experiences. In terms of the metaphor LOVE IS AN OBJECT, the experiences of love are mapped onto the experiences of an object. To be more specific, by mapping the existence of love to the existence of a physical object, one can to a large extent treat the concept of love the same way as one handles an object. Therefore, in *Pride and Prejudice*, love can be ‘created’ (P&P, 150), ‘[obtained]’ (P&P, 98), ‘displayed’ (P&P, 156), ‘delivered’ (P&P, 166), ‘[sent]’ (P&P, 286), ‘unshaken’ (P&P, 248), ‘[concealed]’ (P&P, 17),

'spared' (P&P, 286) and 'thrown away' (P&P, 113), like an object. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, love can be 'found' (BJD, 144), 'gathered' (BJD, 69) and 'wrecked' (BJD, 177). These references to an object allow the experiences of love to be categorized and reasoned about (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 25). Although love appear as an object in both novels, this conceptual metaphor is given a wider usage and multiple facets in *Pride and Prejudice* while it has merely a simple definitional application in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

The metaphorical expression of love as a container and a substance has not changed over time. The metaphor LOVE IS A CONTAINER appears in both novels, as indicated by the expressions 'in love' (P&P, 113) (BJD, 111) and 'out of [love]' (P&P, 107) or 'not in love' (BJD, 105). The boundary of love emerges from the contrast of being either *inside* or *outside* of it. The metaphor LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE is represented by the phrases 'so much love' (P&P, 93) and '[overflow] with admiration' (P&P, 193) in *Pride and Prejudice*. A liquid substance, such as water, possesses the properties of being quantifiable and fluid, and the above two phrases attribute these physical qualities to the concept of love. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, there is a similar expression: 'how much he truly loved me' (BJD, 185), which conforms to the notion of love as a substance. The ontological metaphors LOVE IS A CONTAINER and LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE serve the purpose of marking one's 'love status' and quantifying love. They play a fundamental role in the discussion of love, which is an important reason why the relevant expressions have withstood the passage of time.

The onset of love is connected with the experience of falling in both novels. This idea can be concisely represented by the metaphor LOVE IS FALLING, as signified by the phrases '[fall] in love' (P&P, 106), 'to be swept off our feet' (BJD, 196) and '[fall] for someone' (BJD, 59). The metaphor LOVE IS FALLING can be classified as an orientational metaphor. An orientational metaphor gives a concept a spatial orientation, such as up or down. Spatial orientations are generated because of the human ability 'to identify the position or direction of objects or points in space' (Benton & Tranel 1993, qtd. in van den Berg & Ruis 2017). Falling involves detecting a rapid change in one's position in the downward direction, and LOVE IS FALLING is an orientational metaphor because falling is downward. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 16) propose the metaphor GOOD IS UP, since the indicators of personal well-being such as life, happiness and control all have an upward tendency. While CONTROL IS UP, falling is in the

opposite direction and is a sign of being out of control. The onset of love being represented by falling is based on the shared uncontrollable feeling of loss of control imparted by the two experiences.

The metaphors LOVE IS A DISEASE, LOVE IS A FORCE and LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME are all structural metaphors. A structural metaphor constructs a concept in terms of another concept. In the three metaphors, the concept of love is constructed in terms of the concepts of disease, force and catching game.

The metaphor LOVE IS A DISEASE appears more often in *Pride and Prejudice* than in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, one can exhibit unusual behaviours as the 'symptoms' (P&P, 107) of love. Unrequited love results in 'pain' (P&P, 142), '[suffering]' (P&P, 140), 'injuries' (P&P, 172) and 'misery of the acutest kind' (P&P, 143). A patient suffering from lovesickness needs to '[bear] it' (P&P, 115) to 'get the better' (P&P, 102) or do something to '[recover] her spirits' (P&P, 141). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, suitors are described as 'love-sick' (BJD, 120). In both books, unrequited love causes heartbreak (BJD, 191; P&P, 171). When love disappears, one recovers from the symptoms and discomfort, similar to recuperating after a disease. In terms of this metaphor, the two books both have metaphors that deal with love-driven acts — *symptoms* (P&P) versus being *love-sick* (BJD), and hopeless love — a *heartbreak* (P&P and BJD). In *Pride and Prejudice*, the metaphor has a broader range of manifestations, describing various types of pain and covering the suffering and recovery process, which is absent from *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

The concept of love depicted in *Pride and Prejudice* has three dimensions, one more than *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the metaphor LOVE IS A FORCE demonstrates that love as a force has 'strength' (P&P, 142) and can be 'strong' (P&P, 145) or '[subside]' (P&P, 113). Love as a force also has a direction, either toward the object of love, revealed by the word 'attracted' (P&P, 45), or upward, as indicated by 'elevating' (P&P, 113) and 'will not be repressed' (P&P, 113). Love as a force is autonomous, as well as strong, since one may '[struggle]' (P&P, 142) to 'resist' (P&P, 110) it, but it is impossible to 'conquer' (P&P, 142) or to be 'repressed' (P&P, 142). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, love is characterised as a force by describing being in love as being 'attracted' to someone (BJD, 132) or by describing a love object as 'attractive' (BJD, 103). The attraction between lovers is compared to the force of

magnets (BJD, 58).

Attraction remains a crucial feature in the metaphor LOVE IS A FORCE. This is because the experience of romantic love always accompanies the desire to become close to the beloved. It is a fundamental impulse and basic human behavioral pattern motivated by love.

Pride and Prejudice uses richer language than *Bridget Jones's Diary* to portray love as a catching game. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the 'catching process' is not only communicated by the word 'pursuit' (P&P, 24) but also by the noun phrases 'his first object' (P&P, 110) and 'an object of prey' (P&P, 173). Meanwhile, there could be a 'rival' (P&P, 194) competing for the same person. The result of 'the catching game' is indicated by 'secure of him' (P&P, 17), 'triumph' (P&P, 231), 'success' (P&P, 92) and 'fail' (P&P, 83). However, in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, this metaphor is only instanced with the verb '[pursue]' (BJD, 20). The metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice* address more aspects of love as a catching game, which can be described as consisting of three main steps: target, pursuit and result. In contrast, there is only one metaphor presenting the essential 'pursuing' step in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

The metonym A PERSON IS A PLACE in *Pride and Prejudice* corresponds to the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A PLACE in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, a person becomes a metonym of a place. This is implied by the phrase 'settled at Netherfield' (P&P, 7), which imagines married life in the estate rented by Bingley, but the expressions 'marry elsewhere' (P&P, 91) and 'marry where they like' (P&P, 138) directly substitute a person for a place. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, to marry is termed 'to settle down' (BJD, 144), as if marriage is a place where one lives. Both the metonym and the metaphor convey the idea that to marry a person is to settle down with this person, showing that *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* agree on this.

The metaphor LOVE IS A UNION appears both in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the union of love starts with an 'inclination' (P&P, 107). If two people 'suit' (P&P, 11) each other, they might become 'attached' (P&P, 104). Such an 'attachment' hampers any attempts to 'divide' (P&P, 265) or 'part' (P&P, 104) the lovers, as neither of them wants to '[leave]' (P&P, 239) the other. If 'separation' (P&P, 105) does occur, because one party is 'detached' (P&P, 104), the other party may be subject to 'desertion' (P&P, 115). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, the uniting of a pair in love is termed 'getting involved' (BJD,

33) or 'living together' (BJD, 20) because they are 'into' (BJD, 193) or 'mentally [fit]' (BJD, 101) each other. The union of love may be restored through '[getting] back together' (BJD, 20) or created by '[fixing someone] up with' another (BJD, 282). The status of the union can be breached when a couple 'split up' (BJD, 125), sometimes in the manner that one party '[chucks]' (BJD, 19) or '[gets] rid of' (BJD, 22) the other. In any case, one may become a 'singleton' (BJD, 42) and decide to 'be complete in oneself' (BJD, 31) instead of relying on another.

Some of the words or phrases demonstrate the similarities of the two novels in terms of the metaphor LOVE IS A UNION. The belief that a couple should suit each other remains unchanged, as shown by *suit* and *mentally fit*. *Attached* is closest in meaning to *getting involved* and *being into someone*, all of which suggest an emotional bond. The word *desertion* corresponds to the phrases *get rid of* and *chuck* someone, all indicating a ruthless way to break up. *Separation* equalises *split up*. These four groups of similar examples from *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* reveal some basic features of the union and dissolution of love.

Meanwhile, there are differences surrounding the metaphor LOVE IS A UNION in the novels. It can be deduced from the word *inclination* that the expression of love is more implicit and veiled in *Pride and Prejudice* than in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, where it is expressed more explicitly and openly. The most obvious example is that in *Bridget Jones's Diary* the union of love can be formed at the level of cohabitation during a romance. In *Pride and Prejudice*, Lydia and Wickham cohabit scandalously during their elopement, and the latter is bribed to marry Lydia in order to save the reputation of Lydia's family and herself. In *Pride and Prejudice*, to break up a union of two people is uniquely described as to *divide* or *part* a couple. However, although not expressed through metaphors, there is friendly advice in *Bridget Jones's Diary* to discard an unpromising relationship (BJD, 22). The expression *be complete in oneself* is a new notion in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, reflecting the fact that most women were capable of being economically independent by the time that novel was written. The phrase *fix someone up with another* only appears in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, but there are plots in *Pride and Prejudice* in which occasions are exploited to increase the probability of love (P&P, 24, 92).

The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A UNION exists in both novels but with quite different connotations. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the 'union' (P&P, 264) is expressed as a 'connection'

(P&P, 84), ‘match’ (P&P, 96) and ‘alliance’ (P&P, 39). The gesture ‘[honor] someone with her hand’ (P&P, 87) is consent for one to ‘have’ (P&P, 85) another, and the two are ‘united’ (P&P, 263) through marriage. Then one is no longer ‘single’ (P&P, 3) but instead has a life ‘companion’ (P&P, 80). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, one’s marriage partner is the person’s ‘other [half]’ (BJD, 80). One may ‘leave’ (BJD, 47) the other and break the union. Naturally, to remarry is a ‘reunion’ (BJD, 47). It is noticeable that the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A UNION is used more frequently in *Pride and Prejudice* than in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

Marriage as a union has a stronger legal binding force in *Pride and Prejudice* than in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In the early nineteenth century, upon marriage ‘the husband and wife [were] one person in law’. In other words, the ‘legal existence’ of the married woman was ‘suspended’ or integrated into that of her husband (qtd. in Grossi 2014: 18). Furthermore, divorce was very rare, as it had to be processed by the Parliament, a procedure that was both inconvenient and extremely expensive (R. Adkins & L. Adkins, 2013: 16). In contrast, by the end of the twentieth century, married women could not only represent themselves but were also entitled to the same rights as men, and the legal procedure for ending a marriage had become totally accessible and affordable to every couple. This fundamental difference in the possibility of divorce is apparent from a comparison of the two novels. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, the topic of divorce appears in several sub-plots, whereas it is not even mentioned in *Pride and Prejudice*. Consequently, while a divorced couple remarries in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, this does not happen in *Pride and Prejudice*.

Three main points were derived from examining the shared conceptual metaphors. First, *Pride and Prejudice* contains a significantly higher number of examples of the following metaphors: LOVE IS AN OBJECT, LOVE IS A DISEASE, LOVE IS A FORCE, LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME and MARRIAGE IS A UNION. As a result, among these metaphors, the concepts of love and marriage in *Pride and Prejudice* tend to display more metaphorical dimensions of their respective associated concepts than in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. However, although these metaphors are more vividly rendered in *Pride and Prejudice*, they are consistent in nature in both novels. Second, both books have only a few examples of the metaphors LOVE IS A CONTAINER, LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, LOVE IS FALLING and MARRIAGE IS A PLACE, illustrating mostly the same features. Third, the metaphors LOVE IS A UNION and

MARRIAGE IS A UNION are presented both similarly and differently in *Pride and Prejudice* and in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

8.3 Metaphors That Only Appear in Either Novel

Figure 3 compares the conceptual metaphors of love and marriage which differ in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*. It consists of two columns, with the left one displaying conceptual metaphors that only appear in *Pride and Prejudice* and the right one showcasing those that are unique in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Rows 2, 3 and 4 each compare a metaphor from *Pride and Prejudice* and a corresponding one from *Bridget Jones's Diary* that are different but share some features or associations. Rows 1 and 5 have only one metaphor each, one in the *Pride and Prejudice* column and the other in the *Bridget Jones's Diary* column, because neither of them has a corresponding comparable metaphor. Row 6 is a metonym from *Pride and Prejudice*, which is also without an equivalent in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

Figure 3: A Comparison of Metaphors of Love and Marriage from P&P and BJD

	Metaphors Only Appearing in P&P	Metaphors Only Appearing in BJD
1.	LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING	MARRIAGE IS A TRAP
2.	MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE	LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION
3.	MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS	MARRIAGE IS A TRADE
4.	LOVE IS A CREATURE	
5.		MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE
6.	LOVE & MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS (metonym)	

Row 1 juxtaposes the metaphors LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING from *Pride and Prejudice* and MARRIAGE IS A TRAP from *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the risk of love and marriage is repeatedly expressed through the word *danger*. The danger of love affairs ranges from partial loss of self-control as indicated by phrases such as ‘to be in her

power' (P&P, 44), through several references to disappointment and pain caused by unfulfilled romantic expectations, to being exploited in love as registered by the phrase 'falling an easy prey' (P&P, 93). Meanwhile, the danger of marriage involves being scorned for marrying someone from an inferior class or for marrying an ill-natured person. Such risks occasion a general cautious attitude to love and marriage. For example, Jane is 'guarded' (P&P, 16) toward Bingley and concealed her affection in the beginning, Elizabeth favours Wickham but with 'watchfulness' (P&P, 114) and Mr. Collins is advised to choose his wife with 'discretion' (P&P, 50). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, marriage is perceived as a 'trap' (BJD, 231) that women lure men into and which some men '[duck] out' (BJD, 20) or 'wriggle out of' (BJD, 20).

The external 'danger' of love and marriage presented in *Pride and Prejudice* is due to the following circumstances. First, in the early 18th century, it was customary to marry within the same social class. If an upper-class man married a lower-class woman, he would be distained owing to the snobbery that was prevalent (Adkin R. & Adkin L. 2013: 4). Second, because of married women's precarious legal standing, parents usually advised their daughters to choose their husband with great vigilance. Lady Sarah Pennington wrote a popular book of conduct called *An Unfortunate Mother's Advice to Her Absent Daughters*; in a Letter to Miss Pennington (1761). In it, she advised her daughters to find a truly virtuous husband instead of depending on transient love, especially distinguished between 'ill-humored' and 'ill-natured' men and warned them of the hazards of being in a marriage where one was not esteemed (Teachman 1997: 65-66). She spoke from her own experience, as she had been mistreated and abandoned by her husband. After the separation, Lady Pennington's husband forbade his daughters to have any contact with their mother, which was supported by the law that estranged women did not have the custody to their children.

This cautious attitude towards love was also documented in Dr John Gregory's best-selling conduct book *A Father's Legacy to His Daughters* (1774). Gregory gave marital suggestions to his daughters and other female readers, warning them not to develop affection for men easily and not to misapprehend fleeting infatuation as enduring love. He also advised his daughters to evaluate a man based on his disposition and financial ability instead of on temporary romantic feelings. In his opinion, 'genuine love' might be engendered through 'virtue, honor, similar tastes, and sympathetic love', however, 'passion' was not reliable (Teachman 1997: 60).

Gregory's most controversial suggestion was that, in order to retain respect from her husband, a wife should not tell him how much she loved him (Teachman 1997: 61).

As for why men perceive marriage as a trap in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, a study shows that men are notably more dismissing than women in their style of romantic attachment in over 50 cultures, including the UK, out of the 62 countries investigated. It has been proposed that a dismissing romantic attachment pattern and a short-term mating tendency are connected and their psychological mechanisms are similar. Evolutionary psychology suggests that men's dismissive trait is an evolved function in intimate relationships to withhold affection and protect them against probing for commitments (Buss 1994; qtd. in Schmitt et al. 2003). From the evolutionary perspective, it is speculated that the short-term mating tendency is the reason why men near-universally have a higher level of dismissiveness in romance than women (Schmitt et al. 2003).

However, marriage could also be a trap for women in the early nineteenth century, although no metaphor expresses this in *Pride and Prejudice*. As noted already, in Austen's time, a divorce was possible if one party of the married couple became ill-tempered or committed adultery, but it was extremely difficult and costly (R. Adkins & L. Adkins, 2013: 16; Grossi 2014: 18). Moreover, such attempts could only be initiated by husbands, as they legally represented their wives and commanded the household finances. As a result, marriage was indeed a trap for women, since there was no way out for unhappily married women (Walters 2005: 54).

Row 2 contrasts the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE from *Pride and Prejudice* with LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION from *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte considers marriage as her 'preservative' (P&P, 93) in the sense that it provides her with a comfortable life. However, no such metaphor or statement appears in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Instead, working women have the confidence to refuse to 'compromise' in love (BJD, 21) because of their financial power.

The reason for this contrast is rooted in the change in gender roles that took place from the early nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. In the early nineteenth century, there were moral concerns over both genders participating in the labour process due to repressed sexuality. Possible consequences included familiarity and promiscuity between random male and female workers, which were considered scandalous (Humphries 1987: 937). It became unrespectable

for women to do waged work, which was typically undertaken alongside unrelated workmates and without family supervision, and families consequently started to keep their female members at home if their economy allowed it (Humphries 1987: 947). Within this social context, marriage was a decent means of securing a livelihood in which women became housewives and relied on their husband to earn money, even though wedlock deprived them of their rights as single women. The marriage laws granted men legal authority to represent their wives, which included possession of the latter's assets and control over the freedom of the latter's actions (Walters 2005: 45). This historical background provides further explanation as to why Charlotte regarded marriage as the sole proper preservative for an educated woman of little fortune.

British women's situation has undergone dramatic changes since the early nineteenth century; Emily Davies was a pioneering advocate for the higher education of women, and, through her work from the 1850s on, British universities began to allow female students to attempt the same examinations as male students and gradually started to award degrees to women (Walters 2005: 62-63). Mill first petitioned for women's suffrage in 1866 (Walters 2005: 47). After five more decades of painstaking campaigning, in 1918 women over thirty were allowed to vote and in 1928 they won voting rights equal to those of men (Walters 2005: 85). The First World War served as a catalyst of female suffrage, pushing women to participate widely in employment and raising their social status (Walters 2005: 86). Women's engagement in politics in turn became a powerful weapon in the lengthy battle of equality. Through successive feminist movements, women gained not only economic power, but also confidence in their intelligence and ability, together with extensive feminist awareness (Walters 2005). Based on this tremendous progress of feminism, it is clear that in *Bridget Jones's Diary* women were in a position to negotiate rather than compromise in love.

Row 3 compares the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS and MARRIAGE IS A TRADE. In *Pride and Prejudice*, marriage is directly referred to as a 'business' (P&P, 85) or an 'establishment' (P&P, 93). The roles of wife and husband require 'qualifications' (P&P, 82), so naturally, 'ill-qualified' (P&P, 82) candidates fail their '[applications]' (P&P, 82). Nevertheless, one needs to 'venture' (P&P, 6) in order to 'stand [a] chance' (P&P, 6) in the competition for the position of someone's wife or husband. Those who do not prioritize finance in the consideration of marriage do not know their 'interest' (P&P, 84). In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, it is

commented that women have ‘a sell-by date’, up to which they are able to perform their function of ‘reproduction’ (BJD, 195). This remark compares marriage to the action of purchasing products, meaning fertile women.

In the early nineteenth century, the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS represented a decreasing yet still large part of people’s values. It was the traditional view that marriage, through the union of a couple, was an alliance between two families to sustain power and fortune on both sides (Teachman 1997: 51). Finance has remained an important factor in the evaluation of a romantic prospect, although love has become the major reason for marriage (Grossi 2014: 63). In *Bridget Jones’s Diary*, Mark’s wealth is emphasized when Bridget’s mother recommends him as a potential partner to Bridget. Although the mainstream value of marital culture has changed from marriage as a business venture to an institution of love, finance is a matter of survival and still affects the choice of a marriage partner.

The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRADE is extracted from a different context from MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS. It stems from Bridget’s shame, anxiety and loneliness for still being single in her 30s and her concern that her fertility was declining. In England, the average age of first marriage had been increasing steadily since the 1970s and was 33.6 for men and 31.1 for women in 1996. Meanwhile, the yearly number of opposite-sex couples who embark on marriage has been decreasing over the long term since 1972 (Office for National Statistics 2016). The statistics show that Bridget’s case was becoming a common phenomenon. Her mocking statement that women have to marry while they can still reproduce is based on the idea that the ideal marriage age overlaps with the ideal childbearing age. Her stress is to some extent caused by the social expectation for women to marry and produce offspring. Being privileged with a longer fertility span, men seem to Bridget to be free from anxiety about marriage and reproduction. Therefore, in this context, MARRIAGE IS A TRADE does not involve financial considerations as in MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS, but instead conveys an exchange of functions. Meanwhile, these two metaphors coincide in indicating that women can become wives only if they are able to perform certain duties.

Row 4 contains only the metaphor LOVE IS A CREATURE from *Pride and Prejudice*, with no equivalent in the *Bridget Jones’s Diary* column. Through this metaphor, which is common in *Pride and Prejudice*, love is imbued with the features and functions of a living

creature. Love as a creature can be ‘fine, stout, [and] healthy’ (P&P, 34). It requires ‘food’ (P&P, 34) to survive otherwise it will ‘starve’ (P&P, 34). It can ‘[combat]’ (P&P, 108) repression, ‘[await]’ (P&P, 93) the beloved and ‘run away with’ (P&P, 80) its experiencer. In contrast, *Bridget Jones's Diary* does not contain any similar love metaphors. There are a few rare constructions hinting at such a metaphor, such as ‘love has eradicated [the] need to pig out’ (BJD, 22) and ‘it was getting too serious’ (BJD, 20), but none of them is adequate to form a conceptual metaphor. The reason for this difference could be that *Pride and Prejudice* uses richer and more figurative language to describe love. This is not only reflected in the amount of love metaphors it contains but also in the variety of vocabulary that refers to love. While in *Pride and Prejudice*, the vocabulary of love includes words such as affection, feelings, captivation, partiality, inclination, attachment and happiness; in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, words indicating love are restricted to those such as affection and emotions.

Row 5, finally, has a unique metaphor from *Bridget Jones's Diary* - MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE. A relationship can be in a ‘functional’ (BJD, 189) or ‘dysfunctional’ (BJD, 78) state, evoking a machine that is working or not. However, these two adjectives are entirely absent from *Pride and Prejudice*. One reason for this is that the word ‘functional’ was generally rarely used and the word ‘dysfunctional’ did not even exist in Austen’s time, with the first reference in the *Oxford English Dictionary Online* being from 1936. Another reason is that it had become more complicated to sustain a relationship as men and women became more equal, and that starting and ending relationships was much easier, so whether they functioned or not had become an important point. The divorce rate increased from close to zero in the early nineteenth century to 13-14% in the 1990s (Office for National Statistics, 2012). The words ‘functional’ and ‘dysfunctional’ reflect the thinking around and expectations of sustainable relationships, especially in the modern era, in which divorce has become normalized.

Row 6 is a metonym, LOVE AND MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS, and is exclusively used in *Pride and Prejudice*. In this novel, becoming a groom makes the husband-to-be ‘the happiest of men’ (P&P, 93), and choosing a lover and a potential marriage partner is to decide in what ‘manner’ ‘to be happy’ (P&P, 139). However, this characterisation is disputed in the novel itself, as Charlotte considers that marriage is ‘uncertain of giving happiness’ (P&P, 93). The beliefs expressed by this metonym were not unanimously agreed or disagreed with in actual

eighteenth-century society either. For example, Gregory thought that his daughters' choice of a husband was what had the greatest bearing on their happiness (Teachman 1997: 62), while Lady Pennington held a more nuanced opinion, believing that being married was not the essence of happiness but that a good marriage could increase one's respectability and value for society (Teachman 1997: 64). Both Gregory and Lady Pennington considered blind romantic love to be capricious and unhelpful in selecting a proper husband. In contrast, Defoe asserted that marrying without love was non-rational and caused unhappiness (Teachman 1997: 58).

In modern times, people probably agree with the belief 'love and marriage are happiness' even less. Bridget refers to research which asserts that happiness is engendered from sustainable goals, not from love (BJD,18). Meanwhile, statistics show that the number of people living alone in the UK has increased by about 1.7 million from 1996 to 2022 (Statista, 2023). It can be reasonably deduced that this trend started at least in the 1970s, since when the age of first marriage has continued to rise and the marriage rate has decreased. In addition, the divorce rate increased from 1932 until 1993 (Office for National Statistics, 2019). This means that the average length of time modern people spend in marriage has shortened compared to those who lived two hundred years ago. This could be one of the reasons why it is not as natural for 'happiness' to be a metonym for love and marriage in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

In general, the metaphors unique to one or other of the novels arise from various literary, linguistic, social, economic, historical and legal reasons. LOVE IS A CREATURE is only present in *Pride and Prejudice* because Austen's novel is more poetic and figurative in narrative style than *Bridget Jones's Diary*. LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING does not appear in *Bridget Jones's Diary* because the underlying romantic and marital risks in *Pride and Prejudice* had lessened by the time *Bridget Jones's Diary* was written. The majority do not now consider it a disgrace to marry between different social classes. The two parties are now legally equal within a marriage, and if a person is unhappily married, divorce is an accessible solution. The disappearance of MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE and the emergence of LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION may also be related to the social changes that have taken place, as a result of which most women are now capable of achieving independence in personal finance and mind through education. This change is also connected to the disappearance of the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS, which is common in *Pride and Prejudice* but not found in

Bridget Jones's Diary. The more women can rely on themselves, the less they need to prioritize the wealth of their marriageable candidates.

The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRAP appeared at the same time as the privileges of men over women diminished, reflecting some men's dismissive attachment style. Gender equality and liberty of divorce have posed challenges to the sustainability of a relationship, as mirrored in MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE. However, in the late twentieth century, the social expectation remains that women should marry and reproduce, still causing shame and anxiety for women who fail to marry at an ideal age. It explains why Bridget devalues herself as an expirable fertile product through the metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRADE. Finally, there were clearly mixed attitudes in real life in the eighteenth century toward the metonym LOVE & MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS, the belief of which appears repeatedly in *Pride and Prejudice* but it is not found in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In the late twentieth century, the increasing trend in first marriage age and divorce rate has presumably made the metonym unconvincing.

9. Discussion and Conclusions

Altogether, twenty-one conceptual metaphors have been identified in the two novels. The metaphors that are found in both novels are (1) LOVE IS AN OBJECT, (2) LOVE IS A CONTAINER, (3) LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, (4) LOVE IS FALLING, (5) LOVE IS A DISEASE, (6) LOVE IS A FORCE, (7) LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME, (8) A PERSON IS A PLACE (metonym) or A MARRIAGE IS A PLACE, and (9) LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A UNION. The metaphors solely appearing in *Pride and Prejudice* include (10) LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING, (11) MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE, (12) MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS, (13) LOVE IS A CREATURE and (14) LOVE AND MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS (metonym). The metaphors unique to *Bridget Jones's Diary* consist of (15) MARRIAGE IS A TRAP, (16) LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION, (17) MARRIAGE IS A TRADE and (18) MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE. (8), (9) and (10) each consists of two metaphors.

The shared metaphors can be divided into three groups based on the degree of similarity in the way they are used in the two novels. Group one includes LOVE IS AN OBJECT, LOVE IS A DISEASE, LOVE IS A FORCE and LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME. All of these have the same nature in both novels, although *Pride and Prejudice* elaborates them with more details than *Bridget Jones's Diary* does. LOVE IS AN OBJECT illustrates how love can be treated like an object. In *Pride and Prejudice*, this metaphor mainly attributes to the concept of love the qualities of being creatable, having weight and existing in a tangible and movable physical form. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, the same metaphor focuses on love as existing physically. In *Pride and Prejudice*, LOVE IS A DISEASE highlights two ‘symptoms’ of love, namely love-driven behaviours and suffering from unrequited love. The latter ‘symptom’ involves various pains and is followed by recovery. *Bridget Jones's Diary* has three examples of this metaphor, demonstrating the symptom of wooing and two types of wounds in love, without referring to the recovery. LOVE IS A FORCE depicts the impulse to approach the beloved. In *Pride and Prejudice*, the force of love has a variable strength, directions, and autonomy. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, it is simplified as a force between two people, leaving out the dimension of autonomy. LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME portrays the pursuit of love. In *Pride and Prejudice*, this

pursuit comprises three steps, which are to target, to pursue, and to succeed or fail. The metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice* also imply that love as a catching game is dangerous and competitive. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, only the action of pursuing is mentioned.

Group two comprises LOVE IS A CONTAINER, LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE, LOVE IS FALLING and A PERSON IS A PLACE (or MARRIAGE IS A PLACE). The few phrases used to describe these metaphors are largely identical in both novels. LOVE IS A CONTAINER marks one's 'love status', indicating whether one is *in* or *out* of love. LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE quantifies love, which is implied by such phrases like *how much* love and *so much* love. In this case, *Pride and Prejudice* has an extra example: love *overflows*. LOVE IS FALLING describes how the onset of love is experienced, as in *fall* in love. The metaphor A PERSON IS A PLACE appears in *Pride and Prejudice*, in which marrying another person is termed 'marry elsewhere' (P&P, 91). A MARRIAGE IS A PLACE appears in *Bridget Jones's Diary* with same meaning as its corresponding metaphor in *Pride and Prejudice*; that to marry a person is to 'settle down' with this person (BJD, 144).

Group three contains LOVE IS A UNION and MARRIAGE IS A UNION, metaphors that show both similarities and differences in their representations in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*. The similarity lies in that both novels describe love and marriage as uniting two people into a single unit. However, in *Pride and Prejudice*, this union appears to be purely emotional for love, because no intimate contact is described between two decent unmarried people; but in *Bridget Jones's Diary* it is also physical, as pre-marital sex between lovers is permissible there. For marriage, P&P does not mention the separation of a married couple. For marriage, *Pride and Prejudice* does not mention the separation of a married couple but in *Bridget Jones's Diary* the topic of divorce appears several times.

The metaphors unique to either novel can be sorted into three comparable pairs and three individual cases. The first pair contrasts LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING with MARRIAGE IS A TRAP. In *Pride and Prejudice*, LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING delineates a cautious attitude towards love and marriage for fear of the possible hazards of a bad romantic or marital relationship. In Austen's time, the unfair marriage laws gave husbands great control over their wives' circumstances. For this reason, parental advice cautioned unwed daughters that love was transient and unreliable and that they should choose their husband based

on his virtue and ability of a man. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, MARRIAGE IS A TRAP is derived from (typically men's) fear of being trapped in marriage. Research has shown that men are usually more dismissive than women in romance (Schmitt et al. 2003).

The second pair compares MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE with LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION. In *Pride and Prejudice*, MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE characterises marriage as a livelihood for women. It was usually inappropriate for women from a decent and capable household to work in the early nineteenth century. As a result, marriage became a respectable means for them to survive. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION emphasizes that women no longer solely compromise in love but have the power to negotiate with their partners. It is pointed out that this is the result of women's economic independence (BJD, 21), which is ascribed to the succession of feminist movements that have taken place within the last two hundred years.

The third pair is MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS and MARRIAGE IS A TRADE. In *Pride and Prejudice*, MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS points to the similarities between the operations of a marriage and a business and reflects the traditional value that one's finance and status are prioritized in the consideration of a marriage. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, MARRIAGE IS A TRADE reflects women's concern about having to find a man to marry before they become 'out of date' for reproduction.

In *Pride and Prejudice*, LOVE IS A CREATURE depicts features of love that resemble to those of a living creature and derives from Austen's more poetic style. Written as a personal diary, *Bridget Jones's Diary* is more colloquial, which might account for the absence of such metaphors in the novel. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE characterises a marriage as functional or dysfunctional. This metaphor does not exist in *Pride and Prejudice*, as in the early nineteenth century the word functional was rarely used and dysfunctional did not exist.

In *Pride and Prejudice*, LOVE AND MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS is a metonym in which the word happiness is used to refer to love and marriage. The belief behind this metonym was only partially agreed with, or was even disagreed with, in the eighteenth century. Similarly, the opinion that love is happiness is rejected in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. Since the 1970s, more people have chosen to stay out of marriage (Office for National Statistics, 2019), which

accounts for this metonym not appearing in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

Overall, the metaphors may be said to survive from *Pride and Prejudice* into *Bridget Jones's Diary* for two reasons. First, they are fundamental to the discourse of love and marriage. This is especially true for the metaphors LOVE IS A CONTAINER and LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE. It is difficult to replace expressions such as *in love* and *how much love* with other words. Other metaphors also contain phrases or words that are crucial for the communication of love. For example, *attract* in LOVE IS A FORCE, *pursue* in LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME and *settle down* for MARRIAGE IS A PLACE. Although there are no such particularly important keywords for LOVE IS AN OBJECT, the concept of love as an object is indispensable for expressing what is done to love. Second, they reflect the fundamental experience and nature of love and marriage. Romantic love can be experienced as uncontrollable and unexpected (like falling), ample or scarce, or an attraction, pain or a pursuit. Love brings two people together and marriage is a legal binding of a couple. These experiences have not changed over time. Therefore, the relevant expressions also remain unchanged from *Pride and Prejudice* to *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

The metaphor LOVE IS A CREATURE exists in *Pride and Prejudice* but not in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, because the two novels' language styles are different. However, it would not have been anachronistic to employ metaphors such as 'love grows' or 'love never dies' in the 1990s, and they are still appropriate for use now.

LOVE/MARRIAGE IS A UNION is a complicated case. As mentioned earlier, although the metaphor's general sense of *uniting* is unaltered, the content and extent of the union is not the same from *Pride and Prejudice* to *Bridget Jones's Diary*. These differences exist, because since Austen's time, attitudes towards sexuality have become more open and the marriage laws have been amended to make divorce much easier in the modern era, as it is in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

Gender equality has brought changes to romantic and marital cultures, which could account for why some metaphors only appear in *Pride and Prejudice* and new metaphors emerge in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. In the early nineteenth century, love and marriage were A RISKY THING. For a man, marrying into an inferior class was risky as it could cause him to be scorned. At the same time, women were greatly disadvantaged compared to men, and

marriage was their livelihood, A PRESERVATIVE and A BUSINESS under their unfavorable surviving conditions of education, work opportunity, personal economy and political rights. LOVE & MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS was only true for some lucky couples.

By the end of the twentieth century, women had made so much progress in gender equality that love had become A NEGOTIATION. The metaphor MARRIAGE IS A TRAP suggests a correlation between men's loss of dominance in marriage and their dismissive intimate attachment style. As marriage became more fragile in *Bridget Jones's Diary* than in *Pride and Prejudice* owing to the freedom of intimate relationships and divorce, MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE indicates the problem of evaluating and sustaining a relationship. However, MARRIAGE IS A TRADE reflects the fact that the English society still largely expected women to fulfill their traditional role of becoming a wife and mother in the 1990s.

References

- Bodenheimer, Rosemarie. 1981. 'Looking at the Landscape in Jane Austen.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 21(4): 605-623.
- Cambridge English Dictionary Online*. dictionary.cambridge.org. Accessed 8 Apr. 2024.
- Dunn, Cynthia Dickel. 2004. 'Cultural Models and Metaphors for Marriage: An Analysis of Discourse at Japanese Wedding Receptions.' *Ethos* 32(3): 348-373.
- Fielding, Helen. 1996. *Bridget Jones's Diary*. London: Picador.
- Fromm, Erich. 1956. *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Adkin, Roy and Lesley Adkin. 2013. *Jane Austen's England*. New York: The Penguin Group.
- Austen, Jane. 2019. *Pride and Prejudice*. Rev. edn. New York: Oxford University Press. [first published 1813]
- Gentner, Dedre and Brian F. Bowdle. 2001. 'Convention, Form, and Figurative Language Processing.' *Metaphor and Symbol*, 16: 223-247.
- Grossi, Renata. 2014. *Looking for Love in the Legal Discourse of Marriage*. Canberra: ANU Press.
- Humphries, Jane. 1987. "'...The Most Free From Objection...'" The Sexual Division of Labor and Women's Work in Nineteenth Century England.' *The Journal of Economic History* 47(4): 929-949.
- Johnson, Mark. 1981. 'Introduction: Metaphor in the Philosophical Tradition.' In Johnson, Mark (ed.), *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 3-48.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Leezenberg, Michiel. 2014. 'From Cognitive Linguistics to Social Science: Thirty Years after Metaphors We Live By.' *Cognitive Semiotics* 5(1-2): 140-152.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. www.oed.com. Accessed 5 May 2024.
- Plato. 2008. *The Symposium*. Rev. edn. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Quinn, Naomi. 1987. 'Convergent Evidence for a Cultural Model of American Marriage'. In Holland, Dorothy and Naomi Quinn (eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 173-192.
- Ritchie, David L. 2013. *Metaphor*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, Matthew. 1993. 'Card-playing and the Marriage Gamble in *Pride and Prejudice*.' *Dalhousie Review* 73(1): 5-17.
- Schmitt, David P. et al. 2003. 'Are Men Universally More Dismissing Than Women? Gender Differences in Romantic Attachment Across 62 Cultural Regions.' *Personal Relationships*, 10: 307-33.
- Searle, John R. 1993. 'Metaphor'. In Ortony, Andrew (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. Rev. edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 83-111. [first published 1979]
- Teachman, Debra. 1997. *Understanding Pride and Prejudice: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources, and Historical Documents*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Tissari, Heli. 2003. *LOVEscapes Changes in Prototypical Senses and Cognitive Metaphors Since 1500*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- van den Berg, Esther and Ruis, Carla. 2017. 'Space in Neuropsychological Assessment.' *Neuropsychology of Space*, 361-378.
- Walters, Margaret. 2005. *Feminism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Websites

- BBC. 2016. 'Margaret Thatcher tops Woman's Hour Power List.' 14 Dec. 2016. Accessed 22 Feb. 2024. <<https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-38303886>>
- BBC. 2013. 'Bridget Jones vs *Pride and Prejudice*.' 28 Jan. 2013. Accessed 22 Feb. 2024. <<https://www.bbc.com/news/av/entertainment-arts-21204956>>
- 'Divorces in England and Wales: 2012.' *Office for National Statistics*. 6 Feb. 2014. Accessed 16 Apr. 2024. <<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/divorce/bulletins/divorcesinenglandandwales/2014-02-06>>
- Hardy, James. 'Who Invented Time? The Human Odyssey of Measuring Eternity.' *History Cooperative*. 11 Mar. 2024. Accessed 20 Mar. 2024. <<https://historycooperative.org/who->

Appendix A: The metaphors in *Pride and Prejudice*

LOVE IS AN OBJECT

- (1) *making love to* a girl (P&P, 116)
- (2) the *sentiments* which Mr. Wickham has *created* (P&P, 150)
- (3) his affection and wishes must still be *unshaken* (P&P, 248)
- (4) if a woman is partial to a man, and does not endeavour to *conceal it* (P&P, 17)
- (5) *obtain* the affection of their amiable neighbour (P&P, 98)
- (6) *gain* my affections (P&P, 116)
- (7) Jane's feelings...were little *displayed* (P&P, 156)
- (8) regret *what he had thrown away* (P&P, 113).
- (9) Mr. Darcy should have *delivered* his sentiments in a manner... (P&P, 166)
- (10) Mr. Darcy *sends* you all the love in the world, that he can *spare* from me (P&P, 286)
- (11) His affection for her soon *sunk* into indifference (P&P, 289)
- (12) Wickham's affection for Lydia, was...*not equal to* Lydia's for him (P&P, 248).

LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE

- (1) so *much* love and eloquence awaited her there (P&P, 93).
- (2) the gentleman was *overflowing* with admiration (P&P, 193)

LOVE IS A CONTAINER

- (1) you would have laughed yourself *out of it* [love] sooner (P&P, 107)
- (2) I have never been much *in love* (P&P, 113)
- (3) so easily *falls in love* with a pretty girl (P&P, 106)

LOVE IS FALLING

- (1) so easily *falls* in love with a pretty girl (P&P, 106)

LOVE IS A DISEASE

- (1) I shall certainly try to *get the better* (P&P, 102)
- (2) it has done no *harm* to any one but myself (P&P, 102)
- (3) all that Jane had *suffered* (P&P, 140)
- (4) the *recovery* of her spirits (P&P, 141)
- (5) Could there be finer *symptoms* (P&P, 107)
- (6) complimented her on *bearing it so well* (P&P, 115)
- (7) the *pain* he was to receive (P&P, 142)
- (8) involving them both in *misery of the acutest kind* (P&P, 143).
- (9) I have no such *injuries* to resent (P&P, 172)

LOVE IS A FORCE

- (1) I thought I should have *broken my heart*. (P&P, 171)
- (2) His apparent partiality *had subsided* (P&P, 113)
- (3) *so strong* an affection (P&P, 145)
- (4) for in Darcy's breast there was a tolerable *powerful* feeling towards her (P&P, 71)
- (5) *the strength of* that attachment which, in spite of all his endeavours, he had found impossible to *conquer* (P&P, 142)
- (6) In vain have I *struggled*. ...My feelings will not be *repressed* (P&P, 142)
- (7) pure and *elevating* passion (P&P, 113)
- (8) She *attracted* him more than he liked (P&P, 45)
- (9) the *violence* of my affection (P&P, 81)
- (10) how am I even to know that it would be wisdom to *resist* (P&P, 110).

LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME

- (1) to believe myself his *first object* (P&P, 110)
- (2) it was all in *pursuit* of Mr. Bingley (P&P, 24)
- (3) When she is *secure* of him... (P&P, 17).
- (4) her manners were not those of the fashionable world, he was *caught* by their easy playfulness (P&P, 18).
- (5) Mrs. Collins's pretty friend had moreover *caught* his fancy very much. (P&P, 130)

- (6) At last it *arrested* her—and she beheld a striking resemblance of Mr. Darcy (P&P, 185)
- (7) she is luckily too poor to be *an object of prey* to any body (P&P, 173)
- (8) set up as a *rival* of Jane (P&P, 194)
- (9) What a *triumph* for him (P&P, 231)
- (10) she would have felt almost sure of *success* (P&P, 92)
- (11) my proposals will not *fail* of being acceptable (P&P, 83)

LOVE IS A RISKY THING

- (1) neither her virtue nor her understanding would preserve her from *falling an easy prey* (P&P, 207)
- (2) *the danger of raising expectations which might only end in disappointment* (P&P, 136)
- (3) you cannot think me so weak, as to be *in danger* now. (P&P, 252)
- (4) if she could suppose him to be *in her power*. (P&P, 136)
- (5) He began to feel the *danger* of paying Elizabeth too much attention (P&P, 44).
- (6) but it is sometimes a disadvantage to be so very *guarded* (P&P, 16)
- (7) My *watchfulness* has been effectual; and though I should certainly be a more interesting object to all my acquaintance, were I *distractedly* in love with him (P&P, 114)
- (8) ...advise him to marry as soon as he could, provided he chose with *discretion* (P&P, 50)

LOVE IS A CREATURE

- (1) a *fine, stout, healthy* love (P&P, 34)
- (2) poetry as *the food of love* (P&P, 34)
- (3) I am convinced that one good sonnet will *starve* it entirely away (P&P, 34)
- (4) I am *run away with* by my feelings (P&P, 80)
- (5) the influence of his friends successfully *combated* by the more natural influence of Jane's attractions (P&P, 108)

- (6) so much love and eloquence *awaited* her there (P&P, 93)

A PERSON IS A PLACE

- (1) If I can but see one of my daughters happily *settled* at Netherfield (P&P, 7).
 (2) a man whose sisters and friends are all wishing him to marry *elsewhere*? (P&P, 91)
 (3) Younger sons cannot marry *where* they like. (P&P, 138)

LOVE & MARRIAGE ARE HAPPINESS

- (1) the *happiest* of men (for becoming a groom) (P&P, 93).
 (2) what manner that friend was to be *happy* (P&P, 139).

LOVE IS A UNION

- (1) I never saw a more promising *inclination*. (P&P, 107)
 (2) Lizzy does not lose much by not *suiting* his fancy (P&P, 11)
 (3) If they believed him *attached* to me... (P&P, 104)
 (4) I hope there is no strong *attachment* on either side (P&P, 164)
 (5) she would not hear of *leaving* Wickham. (P&P, 239)
 (6) they would not try to *part* us (P&P, 104)
 (7) The pain of *separation* (P&P, 105)
 (8) Wickham's *desertion* (P&P, 115)
 (9) I had *detached* Mr. Bingley from your sister (P&P, 147)
 (10) and what is to *divide* them? (P&P, 265)

MARRIAGE IS A RISKY THING

- (1) There is no danger of Wickham's marrying Mary King... Wickham is safe. (P&P, 164)
 (2) And Mary King is safe...safe from a connection imprudent as to fortune. (P&P, 164)
 (3) were it not for the inferiority of her connections, he should be *in some danger* (P&P, 39)
 (4) pointing out to my friend, the certain *evils* of such a choice. (P&P, 148)
 (5) [Bingley is] the kind of young man to get into *a scrape* of that sort (P&P, 139)

MARRIAGE IS A UNION

- (1) Is he married or *single*? (P&P, 3)
- (2) the idea of so unsuitable a *match* (P&P, 96)
- (3) planning his happiness in such an *alliance* (P&P, 39)
- (4) the happy prospect of their nearer *connection* (P&P, 84)
- (5) the *companion* of my future life (P&P, 80)
- (6) Miss Elizabeth Bennet, would...be soon afterwards *united* to my nephew (P&P, 263)
- (7) we planned the *union* (P&P, 264)

MARRIAGE IS A PRESERVATIVE

- (1) their pleasantest *preservative* from want (P&P, 93)

MARRIAGE IS A BUSINESS

- (1) But if we do not *venture*, somebody else will; and after all, Mrs. Long and her neices must *stand their chance*; (P&P, 6)
- (2) I shall speak in the highest terms of your modesty, economy, and other amiable *qualifications*. (P&P, 82)
- (3) she would find me in every respect *ill qualified* for the situation. (P&P, 82)
- (4) I know it to be the established custom of your sex to reject a man on the first *application* (P&P, 82)
- (5) She...does not know her own *interest* (P&P, 84)
- (6) It seems an hopeless *business* (P&P, 85)
- (7) Miss Lucas, who accepted him solely from the pure and disinterested desire of an *establishment* (P&P, 93)

Appendix B: The metaphors in *Bridget Jones's Diary*

LOVE IS AN OBJECT

- (1) *finding* a relationship (BJD, 144)
- (2) to *gather* emotions (BJD, 69)
- (3) *wreck* my relationship by sowing suspicions in my mind' (BJD, 177)

LOVE IS A CONTAINER

- (1) I'm *in* love. (BJD, 111)
- (2) I'm *not in* love with Daniel any more. I am *free*. (BJD, 105)

LOVE IS A SUBSTANCE

- (1) *how much* he truly loved me (BJD, 185)

LOVE IS FALLING

- (1) Maybe I should *have fallen* for someone younger and mindless. (BJD, 59)
- (2) *to be swept off our feet* (BJD, 196)

LOVE IS A DISEASE

- (1) Probably overwhelmed by too many Tiffany's boxes from *love-sick* suitors (BJD, 120)
- (2) how much romantic *heartbreak* is to do with ego and miffed pride rather than actual loss (BJD, 191)

LOVE IS A FORCE

- (1) wishing Daniel wasn't quite so *attractive* (BJD, 103)
- (2) 'he'd been very *attracted to* this girl'. (BJD, 132)
- (3) There we were, just him and me, *caught in a massive electrical-charge field, pulled together irresistibly, like a pair of magnets*. (BJD, 58)

LOVE IS A CATCHING GAME

- (1) another who was *pursued* by a bloke for three months (BJD, 20)

LOVE IS A NEGOTIATION

- (1) we are a pioneer generation daring to refuse to *compromise* in love and relying on our own economic power. (BJD, 21)

LOVE IS A UNION

- (1) to discuss *living together* (BJD, 20)
- (2) they *got back together* (BJD, 22)
- (3) I don't think we should start *getting involved*. (BJD, 33)
- (4) 'I could see her *mentally fitting* Mark Darcy' (BJD, 101)
- (5) 'He's really, like, *into you*.' (BJD, 193)
- (6) 'The minute I decide I like Mark Darcy, everyone immediately stops trying to *fix me up with him*'. (BJD, 282)
- (7) Vile Richard...had *chucked* her (BJD, 19)
- (8) ...for not advising Jude simply to *get rid of* Vile Richard (BJD, 22)
- (9) she is currently *split up*. (BJD, 125)
- (10) I'm a *singleton*. (BJD, 42)
- (11) one must not live one's life through men but be *complete in oneself* as a woman of substance. (BJD, 31)

MARRIAGE IS A UNION

- (1) we're bringing *other halves* (BJD, 80)
- (2) Mum might be planning their *reunion* (BJD, 91)
- (3) she is *leaving* Dad for it (BJD, 47)

MARRIAGE IS A TRAP

- (1) all women are trying to *trap* them into marriage (BJD, 213)

- (2) Feel he thinks I am trying to *trap* him into a mini-break; as if it were not a mini-break but marriage (BJD, 144)
- (3) and men like Richard...play on the chink in the armour to *wriggle out* of commitment, maturity, honour, and the natural progression of things between a man and a woman. (BJD, 20)
- (4) only to find him *ducking out* (BJD, 20)

MARRIAGE IS A TRADE

- (1) how difficult it is being a woman and *having a sell-by date* for reproduction unlike men' (BJD, 195)

MARRIAGE IS A PLACE

- (1) to *settle down* in the first bloom of youth (BJD, 144)

MARRIAGE IS A MACHINE

- (1) form *functional* relationship with adult man (BJD, 189)
- (2) *dysfunctional* relationships (BJD, 78)