

Metaphoric Conceptualisation of “LOVE IS A PLANT” in Gikūyū: A Cognitive-Semantics Perspective

Moses Gatambuki Gathigia

Lecturer in the Department of Humanities and Languages at Karatina University- Kenya
gatambukimoses@gmail.com

Joseph Nyehita Maitaria

senior lecturer in the Department of Humanities and Languages at Karatina University, Kenya

Abstract: Starting from the premise that a metaphor is a cognitive mechanism in which one experiential domain is partially mapped onto a different experiential domain, this paper examines the metaphoric conceptualisation of “LOVE IS A PLANT” in Gikūyū from a cognitive-semantics perspective. In order to achieve this objective, the study adopted the fundamental tenets of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). An interview schedule was administered to 48 speakers of Gikūyū by the researcher assisted by two research assistants of different gender. The data collected were subjected to the Metaphor Identification Procedure *Vrije Universiteit* (MIPVU) to find out whether the lexical items collected were metaphorical or not. Using four annotators, including the researcher, the study identified nine plantosemic metaphors which play a pivotal role in the understanding of love in Gikūyū. The study concludes that plantosemic metaphors are conceptual phenomena which are integral component of the Gikūyū cultural milieu expressed in language. Further, the study also notes that gender is an important variable through which males and females conceptualise love in Gikūyū.

Keywords: Metaphor, love, plant, Gikūyū, Gender



1. Introduction

Research on metaphor from the late 1990s and 2000 onwards has completely shifted focus from viewing metaphor as a primarily cognitive phenomenon, stressing "the importance of language use in understanding metaphor" (Cameron & Deignan, 2006, p.672). In this new "emergentist perspective" metaphor is viewed as a combination of linguistic, conceptual and socio-cultural aspects (Cameron & Deignan, 2006, p.674). Etymologically, the word “metaphor” comes from the Greek word ‘*meta*’ meaning “beyond” or “above” and the word ‘*pherein*’ meaning “carrying” or “bearing”. Glucksberg (2001, p.3) has pointed out that “[f]rom this deceptively simple root, metaphor¹ has come to mean different things to different people, so much so that specialists in the area are often temporarily confounded when asked for a definition of metaphor”. In contrast to the classical or Aristotelian view, which stigmatizes metaphor as a mere grammatical or rhetorical device, cognitive linguistics treats metaphor as a conceptual phenomenon which pervades both language and thought (Lakoff, 1987, 1993)². As Kövecses (2002) says, “metaphor plays a role in human thought, understanding, and reasoning and beyond that, in the creation of our social, cultural, and

¹ Metaphor has been extensively discussed in the cognitive literature. Among the most influential works are Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), which changed the entire view of metaphor. Other linguists who have discussed the phenomenon of metaphor include: Lakoff (1993); Lakoff and Turner (1989); Gibbs (1994); Clausner and Croft (1999); Grady (1997) and Glucksberg (2001).

² For more detailed discussions of cognitive linguistics see, for example, Talmy (2000), Langacker (1987) and Clausner and Croft (1999).

psychological reality (p. x-xi)³. However, Lakoff (1993) argues that metaphors have something to do with our abstract thinking and can help us conceptualize our thoughts in the concrete domain. Similarly, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) opine:

For most people, metaphors are a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish – a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Metaphors are pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (p.3).

The above quotation not only shows how important metaphors are, but also show how metaphors are “a way of thinking and a way of seeing” (Morgan, 2006, p. 4), as well as a cognitive process that helps people understand abstract phenomena. Thus, according to Hendricks, Demjén, Semino and Boroditsky (2018), an extensive body of work shows that the metaphors used to describe many complex concepts shape the way people think about them (as the concept of love in the present study).

According to Jankowiak and Fischer (1992), love is abstract phenomenon. Researchers have increasingly documented the existence of romantic love across many different cultures, giving credence to the belief that romantic love is a universal experience (Buss, 2006; Diamond, 2003). The existence of metaphors in the phenomenon of love is premised on the postulation of Kövecses (2010), who, working on the language and conceptualization of emotion, observes that “emotion concepts such as anger, fear, love, happiness, sadness, shame, pride, and so on are primarily understood by means of conceptual metaphors” (p. 23). However, the choice of love as a subject of study is because according to Kövecses (2010), love is the most highly ‘metaphorized’ emotion concept. Romantic love has also been identified as a human universal (Jankowiak & Fischer, 1992; Fisher, 1998; Hatfield & Rapson, 1996). The universality of romantic love is buttressed by Jankowiak and Fischer’s (1992) study in which 147 out of 166 sampled cultures described having an experience that fit into the rubric of romantic love.

According to Kövecses (2002), plants are sometimes used to conceptualize abstract phenomena. Kleparski (2008) argues that the process of transference of plant names to refer to various qualities of human beings and / or with reference to humans is known as plantosemy. In other words, plantosemy means that names of plants are employed to denote human qualities (Grząśko, 2015). Plantosemy is thus a form of metaphoric semantic change. Since metaphor has both universal and cultural specific conceptualizations (DeLamater, 1991), this study zeroes in on Gikūyū. This is because compared with the vast literature in English on metaphor; metaphor research in Gikūyū is just emerging and has not been extensively studied from such a cognitive-semantics perspective. In addition, DeLamater believes that “the disposition to fall in passionate love with another person is the result of socialization” and thus “heavily influenced by the culture” within which one lives (p. 57). This paper, therefore, discusses the metaphoric conceptualisation of “LOVE IS A PLANT” in Gikūyū from a cognitive-semantics perspective.

2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework on which the present study relies are derived from the cognitive model of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (hereafter CMT), initially developed by Lakoff and Johnson in their seminal work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Lakoff and Johnson claimed that we talk about things the way we conceive them, and this is grounded in our experience and culture. From this standpoint, metaphor is defined as “a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff, 1993, p.203); that is, a mapping or set of conceptual correspondences from a source domain (the

³ According to Lakoff (1993 p.203), metaphor is defined as “a cognitive mechanism whereby one experiential domain is partially ‘mapped’, that is, projected, onto a different experiential domain, so that the second domain is partially understood in terms of the first one”.

realm of the physical or more concrete reality) to a target domain (the more abstract entity, in our case, love)⁴. Thus, the source domain is used to understand and structure the target domain. In other words, the CMT is a theory of cognitive semantics which explains the motivation for particular mappings as grounded in experientialist connections between domains. These experiential domains are normally referred to as the *source domain* and *target domain* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p.45-49). These terminologies in cognitive semantics will be used to analyse the metaphors of love in this paper. In CMT, the term *domain* refers to “a body of knowledge that organizes related concepts” (Evans & Green, 2006, p.190), where “the source is a more physical, and the target a more abstract kind of domain” (Kövecses, 2006, p.117). This implies that metaphor facilitates the understanding of target domains that are normally more vague and abstract, via source domains that are more tangible and concrete.

3. Methodology

This study adopts the qualitative methodological approach because the objective is not to generalise but to understand how respondents perceive love in Gĩkũyũ within a Cognitive Linguistics perspective. Thus, the current study is a qualitative analysis of responses which a sample of 48 speakers of Gĩkũyũ (24 men and 24 women) gave to the following interview question: (i) “How is love conceptualized in Gĩkũyũ? (Give at least 5 such words / expressions / metaphors you would use to refer to Love). For example, “Love is.....” (ii) Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?”⁵ The 48 respondents were purposively sampled native speakers of Gĩkũyũ who could read and write in English and Gĩkũyũ. The study considered a sample of 48 Gĩkũyũ speakers representative because Ritchie, Lewis and Elam (2003) note that qualitatively inclined samples should often “lie under 50” (p.84). The dichotomy of gender was factored in since according to Gathigia and Ndũng’ũ (2011), gender is one of the variables that influences the usage of euphemisms. The respondents’ responses are arranged in several tables: Table 1 highlights the mappings of LOVE IS A PLANT in Gĩkũyũ as reported by 20 native speakers while Table 2 displays the metaphors of LOVE IS A PLANT in Gĩkũyũ.

The metaphors collected were subjected to inter-rater agreement reliability check in which four annotators including the researcher carried out the Metaphor Identification Procedure *Vrije Universiteit* (MIPVU). With the exception of the researcher, the three annotators were PhD students of English and Linguistics with experience in metaphor studies. Each lexical unit was annotated as a metaphor-related word if its contextual meaning contrasted with its basic meaning (Goatly, 1997). When the four annotators disagreed with the identification of a metaphor, they discussed its meaning and categorized it once there was an agreement (Steen et al., 2010). Although there are other procedures employed by cognitive linguists⁶, this simple procedure was employed by this study to measure the inter-rater agreement⁷.

⁴ The commonly used notation in CMT is a capitalized mnemonic for the set of correspondences, with the target domain stated first and linked to the source domain via the “copula” or “as” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

⁵ The full interview schedule is given in the appendix.

⁶ Other procedures include: the Fleiss' kappa which measures the inter-annotator agreement (Artstein & Poesio, 2008) and Cochran's Q (Dunn, 1989) which looks at analyst bias and checks whether one or more analysts are behaving significantly differently than the others.

⁷ The inter-rater agreement was on a case-by-case basis of the lexical units. According to Cameron (2003), the inter-coder reliability rate should only be considered to be acceptable if it is 75% or more. This implied that three annotators out of four in the study had to come to a consensus for a lexical unit to be considered a metaphor. Since there were four annotators, each annotator had to allocate 25% or 0.25 points to every lexical unit that was metaphorically related for unanimity on metaphoricity to be achieved. That is, the agreement between annotators was computed as follows: If 3 annotators agreed that a lexical unit is a metaphor; the study would multiply 3 with 0.25 in order to get 0.75. This was marked as not unanimous although acceptable since it is 75%. If all the four agreed that a lexical unit is a lexical unit, then this was marked as unanimous since when you multiply 4 with 0.25 you will get 1.00 or 100% (cf. Appendix B).

4. Research Findings / Results

4.1. LOVE IS A PLANT

Table 1 below displays the ontological mappings of LOVE IS A PLANT in Gĩkũyũ. Some of the ontological mappings highlighted below are adopted from the SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS (Kövecses, 2002). The stages of plant growth are systematically mapped onto the stages of love development as highlighted in Table 1 below:

Table (1): Mappings of LOVE IS A PLANT

NO	TARGET DOMAIN (LOVE)	SOURCE DOMAIN (PLANT)
1	Love	Plant
2	The early stages of a love relationship / nascent feelings of love starting to grow	The sprouting period
3	The blossoming of love	Growth of a plant / the budding of a plant
4	Death of love	Death of a plant / withering
5	Love requires attention for growth	A plant requires fertilizer, manure, water, et cetra
6	Love involves emotional growth.	Plants involve physical growth
7	The origin of love	The root of the plant
8	Reducing love	Removing a part of the plant
9	The most successful period of a love relationship	The flowering of a plant
10	Beneficial consequences of a love relationship, for example, children	The production of fruits
11	Wooring and enticing	Planting a seed, a seed undergoing a dormant period before germination
12	A relationship with a strong bond	A strong plant
13	A relationship with a weak bond	A weak plant

The conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A PLANT accounts for nine of the metaphors of love in Gĩkũyũ. Table 2 below displays the metaphors of LOVE IS A PLANT:

Table (2): Metaphors of LOVE IS A PLANT

NO	Gĩkũyũ	Gloss	Gender	
			M (lf)	F (lf)
1	Wendo nĩ mūmera	Love is a plant	9	9
2	Wendo nĩ mūtĩ ũrakūra	Love is a tree that is growing	6	9
3	Wendo nĩ ihũa	Love is a flower	15	16
4	Wendo nĩ ithangũ	Love is a leaf	4	2
5	Wendo nĩ mbembe ya gĩthigũ	Love is a maize variety that has big grains and is resistant to pests and diseases	5	4
6	Wendo nĩ mĩgua	Love is thorns	5	5
7	Wendo nĩ rwamba rwa kĩgunyũ kana mūtĩ	Love is like a plant's bristles / caterpillar's bristles	0	1
8	Wendo nĩta kĩgwa	Love is like a sugarcane	4	3
9	Wendo nĩta itunda	Love like a fruit	6	3
Total Lexical Frequency			54	52

Most metaphors in this conceptual equation have strong positive evaluations. Kövecses (2002) found that plants are one of the most common source domains for metaphorical mapping. Plants provide humans with shelter, food, medicine, clothing and so on. Since the Agĩkũyũ are mainly agriculturalists (Ishii, 1997) and plants are an important part of their ecosystem, this forms the basis of their conceptualization of love as below:

(1) “Wendo nĩ mūmera” - love is a plant,

(2) “Wendo nĩ mūtĩ ũrakūra” - love is a tree that is growing.

According to Esenova (2007), emotion metaphors like love are motivated by human experience of

plants. This is the basis of metaphors (1) and (2) above in relation to emotion. A plant growing bigger may be comparable to an intensifying emotion while a deeply rooted plant maps with a strongly felt emotion. In addition, the plant is mapped with the heart while the physical pain caused by thorns is the emotional pain experienced in a love relationship. Therefore, according to metaphors (1) and (2) above, a strong plant may be compared to a relationship that has a strong bond. Esenova argues that some emotions or states like acquaintance, friendship and love are seen as different points lying on the same continuum of a plant development.

Human beings have strong positive feelings associated with metaphor (3) below. A flower is a source of pleasure and it induces feelings of happiness. Evidence from data shows that in modern world, flowers are normally given out during the most important events of life like weddings and funerals in the Agĩkũyũ community. So, when the metaphor of a flower as a symbol of love is used, it implies that love is an important and valuable thing. For instance:

(3) “Wendo nĩ ihũa” -love is a flower.

A flower also has specific mappings like the fluorescence of the flower corresponding to the fast development of a love relationship; the flower’s full bloom or beauty corresponding to the love relationship reaching its pleasant stage, and the scent or fragrance of the flower corresponding to the sweetness of the love relationship. In addition, just like a flower opens up and then withers after sometime, the same case may happen to love. This implies that love can blossom and wither or die with time. The aspect of ephemerality of love is, therefore, implicit in the metaphor (3) above.

Metaphor (4) below is also used to conceptualize love despite its contradictory interpretations. Thus:

(4) “Wendo nĩ ithangũ” - love is a leaf.

First, unlike flowers (metaphor 3 above) whose blossoms are always so short-lived, leaves take a longer period of growth from the tender bud, to the small but rapidly growing leaflet to the mature and robust leaf. The metaphor also has the implicit meaning of ephemerality of love since most leaves do wither and die. Therefore, the metaphor above acquires a powerful message of both the fragility and the durability of life.

The metaphor of maize below may be said to be a novel imaginative metaphor representing a new way of thinking. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), a novel metaphor is a metaphor not used to structure part of our normal conceptual system but as a new way of thinking about something. Maize (*zea mays*) is one of the world’s most important crop plants (Iken & Amusa, 2004). Like many other grasses, maize is wind pollinated and is a natural cross-pollinator. However, maize is particularly amenable to genetic analysis owing to its monoecious floral development, wherein unisexual male and female flowers are borne on separate stems (Iken & Amusa, 2004). Among the Agĩkũyũ, maize is the staple food and which can be roasted or boiled on the cob when fresh, although usually the grains are removed from the cob boiled together with maize to make *gĩtheri*. Further, maize is also used to make porridge and *ugali*. Thus:

(5) “Wendo nĩ mbembe ya gĩthigũ” - love is a maize variety that has big grains and is resistant to pests and diseases.

Mbembe ya gĩthigũ is that type of maize that produces big and broad grains and is resistant to tough weather conditions, diseases and pests. Despite weed infestation, this maize variety, interestingly, does not reduce its yields or production. When one says that love is *mbembe ya gĩthigũ* the implication behind this metaphor is that this is love that continues to blossom despite disappointments, miseries, pain, calamities or other unpleasant challenges. It is a relationship that stands almost insurmountable problems to succeed.

Esenova (2007) notes that some plants, especially roses, bear sharp and woody thorns. The metaphor of thorns normally has strong negative connotations since we experience a sharp physical pain if the thorns prick us. This metaphorical conceptualization stems from a more general metaphor, EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN. This experience has been carried over to the domain of emotions and we speak of emotional pain in terms of physical pain caused by thorns. Therefore:

(6) “Wendo nĩ mĩgua” - love is thorns.

The metaphor of thorns may, therefore, also symbolize physical grief, bitterness, hurt and irritation in a relationship. The expression *wendo nĩĩrĩ mĩgua*, ‘love has thorns’, is a warning to people that there is misery, disappointment and disagreeable experiences of life occurring at every stage of a love relationship. That is, we need to be careful that love is not all about pleasure. The metaphor above has strong negative connotations unlike Charteris-Black’s (2004) argument that plant metaphors are normally associated with strong positive evaluations.

A caterpillar has spiny bristles or long fine hair-like setae (Soble, 1995). The bristles on a caterpillar are also called setae or urticating hairs (Malaque et al., 2006) and are a defence measure against predation. Some plants like napier grass too have bristles that lodge in the skin or mucous membranes and cause irritation. It is because of this discomfort caused by the bristles that people conceptualize love negatively as in the expression below:

(7) “Wendo nĩ rwamba rwa kĩgunyũ kana mĩtĩ” - love is a plant’s bristles / caterpillar’s bristles.

Contact with either a caterpillars’ bristles or a plant bristles causes local symptoms such as intense heat, pain, itching or a sharp stinging sensation. Skin rashes are the most common symptoms of the caterpillar’s or plant’s bristles. The skin reaction may cause a high degree of discomfort. The metaphor, therefore, warns lovers of the unpleasant consequences of being in love.

The sensory modality of gustatory (taste) is also instantiated when giving meaning to love in Gikũyũ. The word “kĩgwa” (sugarcane) alludes to food and the sense of taste and play an important role in the conceptualization of love. Consider the plant metaphor below:

(8) “Wendo nĩ kĩgwa” - love is sugarcane,

Metaphor (8) above is also relevantly mentioned in the context of love. Gathigia and Ndung’u (2011) note that “kũrĩa kĩgwa” (eating the sugarcane), is a euphemism for sexual intercourse among the Agikũyũ. Therefore, “kĩgwa” for ‘sugarcane’ may also be understood as a metaphor for love or sex.

The appropriateness of metaphor (9) below can be explained by the fact that fruits were considered an important source of food in human evolution (Esenova, 2007). For example, as in the metaphor:

(9) “Wendo nĩ itunda” - love is a fruit.

The plant metaphor above for love may be interpreted in two distinct ways. For example, less intimate forms of emotions are normally associated with an unripe fruit and more intimate forms with ripe fruit. That is, the initial stage of an emotion correlates with an unripe fruit and later stages of a relationship with a ripe one. Positive and negative emotions may, therefore, be associated with sweet and bitter fruits, respectively, and such associations may stem from our experiences in our evolutionary past. That is why the metaphor is germane to the discussion of this conceptualization.

5. Discussion

First, the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A PLANT accounts for nine metaphors of love in Gikũyũ. This shows that metaphor is a useful cognitive mechanism of conceptualizing love in Gikũyũ. The same view is shared by McGlone (2007, p.113) who notes that metaphor provides a way to “piggyback” our understanding of abstract concepts on the structure of concrete concepts. Past researches also corroborate the finding that metaphor is a basic and indispensable linguistic feature of human understanding (Cienki, 2005; Kövecses, 2002; Ramanathan, Hoon & Paramasivam, 2018). Specifically, Kövecses (2002) posits that the plant domain is a common source domain in the conceptualization of abstract phenomena. Thus, in the PLANT metaphor, the stages of plant growth are systematically mapped onto the stages of love.

Second, this study notes that that the MIPVU is an effective framework of identifying metaphors of love in Gikũyũ. This finding resonated with Krennmayr’s (2008) view that the MIPVU

not only provides explicit steps for researchers to follow when identifying metaphor, but also a reliable criterion of identification which coders used in reliability checking exercises. This study concurs with Steen et al. (2010) and Vierkant, (2008) conclusion that the MIPVU is effective for the identification of Metaphor Related Words.

Third, the study notes that the metaphors used to refer to love are well accounted for in terms of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) as propounded by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The CMT acted as a tool for the identification of the various conceptual mappings of metaphors of love. The presence of nine metaphors of love confirms the fact that a single idea can also be explained by a number of metaphorical expressions (Charteris-Black, 2004). As Cienki (2005, p. 1) notes, metaphor provides “a tool for reasoning about one thing in terms of the other”.

Fourth, the paper also notes that there is a triadic relationship between language (metaphor), culture and body which is congruent with most Cognitive Linguistics studies (Gibbs, 2006; Gibbs & Wilson, 2002; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). This interaction between language, culture and body which is the main statement of the embodiment theory in Cognitive Linguistics (Gibbs, 2006; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), as exemplified in metaphor (6), for example, which stems from the general metaphor, EMOTIONAL PAIN IS PHYSICAL PAIN is something worth noting. The study, therefore, notes that there are culture / language-specific metaphors that are grounded in Agīkūyū cultural salience or cultural embodiment.

Lastly, this study concludes that males have slightly higher lexical frequencies for LOVE IS PLANT than females. This is consistent with past studies which have shown that although the capacity for love is likely to be universal (Fischer, 1998), love manifests differently across individuals in an adaptively patterned fashion. Similarly, Galperin and Haselton (2010) posit that individual differences could be rooted in biological sex, culture and other variables. Gender, therefore, comes out as a dominant variable that provides people with lenses through which they view love (Galperin & Haselton, 2010; Oliver & Hyde, 1993).

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion above, this study concludes that metaphor is so pervasive in the expression of love that it appears to play an indispensable role in our understanding of it. Second, the study concludes that metaphors of love in Gīkūyū are well accounted for in terms of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Third, this study concludes that the MIPVU is an effective method of identifying metaphors of love in Gīkūyū. This finding is consonant with Shenkar, Luo and Yeheskel’s (2008) view that metaphors, theories, and methods can have a symbiotic existence. The plant metaphors identified have also been accounted for by the use the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. The study, therefore, concludes that it is a natural thing for human beings to find similarities between plants and themselves. Further, the study concludes that the gender variable is intertwined with love in Gīkūyū since males have 50.94% and females 49.06% of the lexical frequencies as far as the LOVE IS A PLANT metaphor is concerned. However, this is a slight differential that may not be considered significant.

References:

- [1] Artstein. R., & Poesio. M., Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics, *Computational Linguistics*, 34(4)(2008), 555–596, <https://doi.org/10.1162/coli.07-034-r2>
- [2] Buss. D. M., The evolution of love. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The new psychology of love* (pp. 65-86). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, (2006)
- [3] Cameron. L., *Metaphor in educational discourse*, London: Continuum, (2003)

- [4] Cameron. L., & Deignan. A., The emergence of metaphor in discourse, *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4) (2006), 671- 690, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml032>
- [5] Charteris-Black. J., *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, (2004)
- [6] Cienki. A., Metaphor in the “Strict Father” and “Nurturant Parent” cognitive models: A test case for two models of metaphors, *Journal of language and politics*, 3(2005), 409-440.
- [7] Clausner. T., & Croft. W., Domains and image schemas, *Cognitive linguistics*, 10(1)(1999), 1-31, <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1999.001>
- [8] DeLamater. J., The social control of human sexuality. In K. McKinney & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Human sexuality: The societal and interpersonal context* (pp. 30-62). Norwood, NJ: Ablex, (1989)
- [9] Diamond. L., What does sexual orientation orient? A bio-behavioral model distinguishing romantic love and sexual desire, *Psychological Review*, 110(1)(2003), 173-192, <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.110.1.173>
- [10] Dunn. G., *Design and analysis of reliability studies. The statistical evaluation of measurement errors*. New York: Oxford University Press, (1989)
- [11] Esenova. O., Plant metaphors for the expression of emotions in the English language, *Beyond Philology*, (2007), 7-21.
- [12] Evans. V., & Green. M., *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, (2006)
- [13] Fisher. H., Lust, attraction, and attachment in mammalian reproduction, *Human Nature*, 9(1)(1998), 23-52, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-998-1010-5>
- [14] Galperin. A., & Haselton. M., Predictors of how often and when people fall in love, *Evolutionary Psychology*, 8(1)(2010), 5-28, <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491000800102>
- [15] Gathigia. M., & Ndūng’ū. R., *A cognitive linguistics analysis of Gikūyū euphemisms*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Publishing House Ltd, (2011)
- [16] Gibbs. R.W., *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*, New York: Cambridge University Press, (1994)
- [17] Gibbs. R. W., *Embodiment and cognitive science*. New York: Cambridge University Press, (2006)
- [18] Gibbs. R., & Wilson. N., Bodily action and metaphor comprehension, *Style*, 36(2002), 524-540.
- [19] Glucksberg. S., *Understanding figurative language: From metaphors to idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2001)
- [20] Goatly. A., *The language of metaphors*, London: Routledge, (1997)
- [21] Grady. J., *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes* (Unpublished doctorate thesis), University of California, Berkeley, (1997)
- [22] Grzaśko. A., On the semantic history of selected terms of endearment, *Linguistics Beyond and Within*, 1(2015), 104-118.
- [23] Hatfield. E., & Rapson. R., *Love and sex: Cross-cultural perspectives*, New York: Allyn & Bacon, (1996)

- [24] Hendricks. R.K., Demjén. Z., Semino. E., & Boroditsky. L., Emotional implications of metaphor: Consequences of metaphor framing for mindset about cancer, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 33(4)(2018), 267-279, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2018.1549835>
- [25] Iken. J.E., & Amusa. N.A., Maize research and production in Nigeria, *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 3(6)(2004), 302-307, <https://doi.org/10.5897/ajb2004.000-2056>
- [26] Ishii. Y., Birth control and reproduction in the Kikuyu society: The case from Murang’a District in Kenya, *African Study Monographs*, 18(3, 4)(1997), 191-201.
- [27] Jankowiak. W.R., & Fisher. E.F., A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love, *Ethnology*, 31(2)(1992), 149-155, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3773618>
- [28] Kleparski. G.A., The joys and sorrows of metaphorical consumption: mozarellas, prostisciuttos, mutttons and yum-yum girls – foodsemy with a romance accent, *z e s z y t y n a u k o w e u n i w e r s y t e t u r z e s z o w s k i e g o , s e r i a f i l o l o g i c z n a s t u d i a a n g l i c a r e s o v i e n s i a* 5(2008), 45-59.
- [29] Kövecses. Z., *Metaphor: A practical introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2002)
- [30] Kövecses. Z., *Language, mind, and culture: A practical introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2006)
- [31] Kövecses. Z., A new look at metaphorical creativity in cognitive linguistics, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 21(4) (2010), 663-698, <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2010.021>
- [32] Krennmayr. T., Using dictionaries in linguistic metaphor identification. In N. L. Johannesson & D.C. Minugh (Eds.), *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals* (pp. 97–115). Stockholm: Department of English, Stockholm University, (2008)
- [33] Lakoff. G. (1987), *Women, fire and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [34] Lakoff. G., The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1993), <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139173865.013>
- [35] Lakoff. G., & Johnson. M., *Philosophy in the flesh. The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*, New York: Basic Books, (1999)
- [36] Lakoff. G., & Johnson. M., *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1980)
- [37] Lakoff. G., & Turner. M., *More than cool reason. A field guide to poetic metaphor*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1989), <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470986.001.0001>
- [38] Langacker. R.W., *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, (1987)
- [39] Malaque. C., Andrade. L., Madalosso. G., Tomy. S., Tavares. F.L., & Seguro. A.C., Short report: A case of hemolysis resulting from contact with a Lonomia caterpillar in southern Brazil, *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 74(5)(2006), 807-809, <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.74.807>
- [40] McGlone. M.S., What is the explanatory value of a conceptual metaphor?, *Language & Communication*, 27(2)(2007), 109–126, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2006.02.016>
- [41] Morgan. G., *Images of organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, (2006)

- [42] Oliver. M., & Hyde. J., Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(1)(1993), 29-51, <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.114.1.29>
- [43] Ramanathan. R., Hoon. T.B., & Paramasivam. S., Metaphors in political tweets during national elections, *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 26(2)(2018), 929 - 944.
- [44] Ritchie. J., Lewis. J., & Elam. G., Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice, A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp.77-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, (2003)
- [45] Shenkar. O., Luo. Y., & Yeheskel. O., From “distance” to “friction”: substituting metaphors and redirecting intercultural research, *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4)(2008), 905–923, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.34421999>
- [46] Soble, M., *The lepidoptera: Form, function and diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, (1995)
- [47] Steen. G., Dorst. A. G., Herrmann. J. B., Kaal. A. A., Krennmayr. T., & Pasma. T., *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.14>
- [48] Talmy. L., *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol. II: Typology and process in concept structuring*, Cambridge, MA and London, (2000)
- [49] Vierkant. S., Metaphor and live radio football commentary. In E. Lavric., P. Gerhard., S. Andrew & S. Wolfgang (Eds.), *The linguistics of football* (pp.121-132). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, (2008)

Appendix A: Interview Schedule

Introduction

The purpose of this interview schedule is to get your views on metaphors of love in Gĩkũyũ. Any information that you give will be treated with confidence and will only be used for the success of this academic research.

Section A

Your name (optional)

Your sex

(Tick the appropriate box)

Male

Female

Section B

1. How is love conceptualized in Gĩkũyũ? (Give at least 5 such words / expressions / metaphors you would use to refer to Love). For example, “Love is.....”

i. _____

Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?.....

.....

ii. _____

Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?.....

.....

iii. _____

Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?.....

.....

iv. _____

Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?.....

.....

v. _____

Why is the word /expression / metaphor used?.....

.....

(Is / are there other word (s) / expression (s) / metaphor(s) for love in Gĩkũyũ?) _____

Why is / are the word (s) / expression (s) /metaphor (s) used?.....

.....

Thank you for your participation

Appendix B: An Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Measurement Form

NO	Gĩkũyũ	Gloss	Reliability Measures				
			Coder 1	Coder2	Coder3	Coder4	Total
1	Wendo nĩ mũmera	Love is a plant	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
2	Wendo nĩ mĩtĩ ũrakūra	Love is a tree that is growing	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
3	Wendo nĩ ihũa	Love is a flower	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
4	Wendo nĩ ithangũ	Love is a leaf	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
5	Wendo nĩ mbembe ya gĩthigũ	Love is a maize variety that has big grains and is resistant to pests and diseases	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
6	Wendo nĩ mĩigua	Love is thorns	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
7	Wendo nĩ rwamba rwa kĩgunyũ kana mĩtĩ	Love is like a plant's bristles / caterpillar's bristles	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
8	Wendo nĩta kĩgwa	Love is like a sugarcane	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00
9	Wendo nĩta itunda	Love like a fruit	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1.00