

# Comparing the Greek metaphors for fear and romantic love

Maria Theodoropoulou & Theodoros Xioufis

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
mtheod@lit.auth.gr, txioufis@lit.auth.gr

## Περίληψη

Στην μελέτη αυτή συγκρίνονται οι μεταφορές του φόβου και του έρωτα με βάση ένα σώμα κειμένων το οποίο δημιουργήθηκε από τις απαντήσεις 100 υποκειμένων σε σχετικό ερωτηματολόγιο. Διερευνάται ειδικότερα η ύπαρξη κοινών και ιδιοσυγκρασιακών μεταφορών των δύο συναισθημάτων καθώς και οι παράγοντες που καθορίζουν την εμφάνισή τους.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: θεωρία εννοιολογικής μεταφοράς, φόβος, ρομαντικός έρωτας

## 1 Emotion and intra-linguistic comparison

The close connection between metaphor and emotion – for which the Conceptual Metaphor Theory has already made a case since its inception (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, Kövecses 1990, 2000) – gave rise to various studies that explored the metaphors used in the expression of particular emotions (e.g., Kövecses 1990); in due course, it also provided the ground for questioning the conceptualizing role of metaphor in the language of emotions (e.g., Foolen 2012, Crawford 2009, Theodoropoulou 2004, 2012). Moreover, the connection between metaphor and emotion sparked a series of studies of inter-linguistic comparison (the language of comparison being the highly studied English; e.g., Türker 2013), which aimed at exploring the intertwining of universal and cultural factors in the metaphorization of emotions (e.g., Kövecses 2005). However, studies that compare two or more emotions intra-linguistically are not frequent enough. These aim at pinpointing differences in the metaphors either of the same emotion in different genres/discourses (e.g., Beger 2011) or in the cognitive models of two contrasting emotions (e.g., pain/happiness, Kövecses 2008; pride/shame, Bročić 2020). It could be argued that Kövecses' (2000) *Metaphor and Emotion* might discourage any attempt to an intra-linguistic comparison of emotions. Based on the examination of eight emotions, this study attempts to highlight the systematicities that rule the conceptualization of emotions. However, the intra-linguistic comparison of emotions is not the primary concern of this study; the analysis of metaphors is used as evidence to support Kövecses' argument for a Body-Based Constructionism in the conceptualization of emotions. Additionally, this study highlights the metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE as the 'master metaphor' of emotion concepts, a generic-level metaphor that gives coherence to the specific-level ones. However, Kövecses' analysis could be used as a basis of reference in an attempt to compare emotion metaphors intra-linguistically, as his project presupposes the charting of both the common and the different features of the metaphors used.

In this paper, we present the results of a study conducted through a written questionnaire and aim at comparing the metaphors for fear and romantic love. It constitutes part of a broader project purposing to compare the figurative language (metaphors, metonymies, and their interaction) of both romantic love and fear. We have chosen to examine two radically different emotions (and not contrasting ones, as it is used in the literature). On the one hand, fear, an unanimously basic-level emotion connected to survival (e.g.,

LeDoux 1998) thus deemed an ‘individual-oriented’ emotion. On the other hand, romantic love, an emotion de facto implicating another person as the object of desire, yet controversy surrounds its listing as a basic emotion. Moreover, romantic love has been considered as the most metaphorized emotion (Ungerer & Schmidt 1996, Kövecses 2000), fear being the most metonymized one (Kövecses 1990: 70, Theodoropoulou 2004). Despite the obvious differences between these emotions, both of them register bodily and behavioral reactions linguistically (which is not exclusive for all emotions). This bodily basis is the lever of the comparison we attempt, as it is the necessary element of the embodiment of these concepts.

Specifically, we seek to answer these questions:

a. Are the metaphors of these emotion concepts completely different, as a result of the idiosyncratic character of each emotion, or do they share some metaphors due to their identity as emotions?

b. Are there any differences as a result of the kind of question posed (Theodoropoulou & Xioufis 2018)? For example, the first question targets answers that focus on the conceptualization of the emotion, while the second one its expression (see below).

## 2 Method

The data we analyze in this study derives from a corpus of 7.353 words compiled from the written answers of 50 subjects (25 men and 25 women, aged from 20 to 35) to two questionnaires about fear and romantic love. We used the same subjects for both questionnaires to avoid individual differences. Since our aim was to elicit spontaneous discourse, subjects were asked to fill out the questionnaires in the same free manner as they would in their own journal.

The questionnaires comprised two questions: the first question, *What is fear/romantic love according to you?*, focused on the conceptualization of the emotion, as has been stated, and the second one, *Have you ever experienced fear/ Have you ever fallen in love? Can you tell how you felt?*, on the expression of the experience. We opted for a questionnaire rather than an interview as a tool for eliciting this data because of the advantages it offers compared to other methods. Compared with the interview, one can avoid the “observer’s paradox” (Labov 1972). Compared with general corpora, one can elicit more extensive texts focusing on the targeted aspects of the emotions under examination and contrast this data with the one taken from a general corpus. Finally, one can draw and work on novel metaphors, which would otherwise not be possible if one adopted Kövecses’ (1990) “lexical approach” that works with fixed expressions.

The processing of the data was done as follows: Firstly, we did a manual search of both figurative and non-figurative expressions of fear and romantic love. Expressions that had to do with other emotions were excluded. We then categorized the figurative expressions into three groups: metaphors, metonymies, and their interactions (with further categorizations; Theodoropoulou & Xioufis 2018). In this study, we present only the metaphors of the two emotions and not metaphorizations of their metonymic manifestations: for example, we do not include in our examination expressions like *Πολλές φορές έχω υποκύψει και έχω αρκεστεί στην απραξία* ‘I have given in and settled for idleness many times,’ where the idleness, a metonymy of fear, is metaphorized as SUPERIOR.<sup>1</sup> The metaphoricity of these expressions was checked by using MIPVU

---

<sup>1</sup> See the category ‘irrelevant’ in Table 1 below.

(Steen et al. 2010). Subsequently, these metaphors were categorized according to their conceptual mappings, and this categorization was checked by a PhD and MA students group working on metaphor. Finally, a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data was conducted.

### 3 Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of metaphors compared with the other figurative mechanisms in the corpus. The last columns, in light gray, show the percentages per question and emotion of the total production; the last row, in dark gray, shows the percentage per figurative mechanism.

	Metaphors		Interaction	Metonymy	TOTAL	
		Irrelevant				
Fear 1	34.43%		5.26%	16.88%	16.82%	21.09%
Fear 2	13.47%	47.90%	22.80%	26.82%	28.59%	23.75%
Romantic Love 1	30.83%		26.31%	24.83%	26.35%	27.19%
Romantic Love 2	21.25%	52.08%	45.61%	31.45%	28.22%	27.93%
TOTAL	27.19%		4.65%			100%
	31.84%			24.59%	43.56%	100%

**Table 1 | Figurativity in the expressions of fear and romantic love**

As Table 1 shows, 27.19% of the figurative language in this corpus is metaphors. This finding, by itself, when compared to the other two basic categories – metonymies and their interaction with metaphor – questions the prominent role assigned to metaphor in the language of emotions (e.g., Kövecses 2000): based on our data *it is metonymy that is more prominent than metaphor*. Furthermore, what the findings of Table 1 suggest is that the role of metaphor and metonymy should be co-examined, thus highlighting their dialectic relationship, and should not be explored separately (Theodoropoulou in preparation). For example, the ‘low’ percentage of metaphor in the second question about fear (13.47%/ 15.41% in total) should be co-examined with the percentages of the other figurative mechanisms (in total): 52.39% is metonymies, 27.73% is cases of interaction and 4.45% is irrelevant.

Moreover, considering the percentage of the metaphors used *per emotion*, it is evident that the production of metaphors in the answers about romantic love is about 4% higher than those about fear. This seems to confirm the high metaphorization of romantic love argued in the literature (Ungerer & Schmidt 1996; Kövecses 2000). Interestingly, the higher percentage spotted in the ‘micro-scale’ of metaphors has its equivalent to the broader picture of the whole figurative language. The results in Table 1 show that the percentage of the entire figurative language of romantic love is about 10% higher than that of fear (53.08 % *Vs.* 43.38%). Consequently, based on this data, the argument that romantic love is the most metaphorized emotion (Ungerer & Schmidt 1996; Kövecses 2000) is not precise. Indeed, romantic love is *the emotion that most figuratively manifestd emotion*.

Finally, if one compares the answers elicited by the first question with those of the second one, one gets the following results: the first question, which focuses on the conceptualization of the emotion, shows a much higher percentage (65.26%; fear 1: 34.43%, romantic love 1: 30.83%) than that of the second question (34.72%; fear 2:

13.47%, romantic love 2: 21.25%), which focuses on the expression of the emotion. This finding seems to confirm the viewpoints that argue in favor of the conceptualizing role of metaphor in the case of emotions (e.g., Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Kövecses 1990, 2000). Further, these results suggest that, when compared *per emotion*, fear licenses more metaphors than romantic love (34.43% as opposed to 30.83% in the first question), whereas the reverse applies to the second question (21.25% as opposed to 13.47% for fear).

Concerning the first question of our study, i.e., if both emotions share some metaphors due to their commonplace nature as emotions, the answer is that they share metaphors in a percentage about 60%. Still, they manifest their unique individual metaphoricity, as shown in Table 2.

Common metaphors in all four answers	34.73%		59.58%	
Common metaphors in the three out of the four answers	20.65%			
Common metaphors in the two out of the four answers	4.19%			
Common metaphors in both answers of fear	8.98%		19.74%	40.38%
Metaphors of fear in the first or second question answers	A. 10.17%	B. 0.59%		
Common metaphors in both answers of romantic love	7.78%		20.64%	
Metaphors of romantic love in the first or second question answers	A. 6.28%	B. 6.58%		

**Table 2 | Common and unique metaphors of both emotions**

Tables 3, 4, and 5 show the shared metaphors of both emotions elaborating on the conceptual mappings. For reasons of space, we shall not comment on these findings.

Conceptual mappings	Fear 1	Fear 2	Romantic Love 1	Romantic Love 2
Personifications	<b>17.39%</b>	11.11%	10.67%	7.04%
Objectifications	8.69%	<b>28.88%</b>	8.73%	4.22%
X IS SUPERIOR	5.21%	13.33%	4.85%	5.63%
X IS SPACE	4.34%	6.66%	0.97%	2.81%
X IS A MOVING ENTITY	3.47%	2.22%	1.94%	1.40%

**Table 3 | Common metaphors in all four answers (34.73%)**

As shown in Table 3, this category comprises about 1/3 of the sum of metaphors (34.73%) and is preferred in the answers about fear. The fact that this category includes the almost ‘ubiquitous’ metaphors confirms Kövecses’ (2000: 51) thesis that there are no specific emotion metaphors and that we “build up an abstract domain from ‘conceptual materials’ that we make use of in other parts of our conceptual system as well.”

Conceptual mapping	Fear 1	Fear 2	Romantic Love 1	Romantic Love 2
X IS FORCE	2.60%	–	<b>21.35%</b>	12.67%
THE INTENSITY OF X IS PHYSICAL FORCE	0.86%	–	2.91%	2.81%
ENTITY	2.60%	–	0.97%	1.40%
X IS CONSTRUCT	1.73%	–	0.97%	1.40%

X IS COLOUR/ LACK OF COLOUR	0.86%	2.22%	–	1.40%
X IS ANIMAL	0.86%	2.22%	0.97%	–
X IS TORMENTOR/ TORTURE-	0.86%	2.22%	0.97%	–
X IS PHYSICAL DAMAGE	–	2.22%	4.85%	1.40%
X IS FIRE	–	2.22%	0.97%	2.81%

**Table 4 | Common metaphors in the three out of the four answers (20.65%)**

Conceptual mapping	Fear 1	Fear 2	Romantic Love 1	Romantic Love 2
X IS A LIVING ORGANISM	0.86%	–	–	1.40%
X IS A NATURAL PHENOMENON	0,86%	–	–	1.40%
X IS JOURNEY	–	2.22%	5.82%	–
X IS BUILDING	0.86%	–	1.94%	–

**Table 5 | Common metaphors in the two out of the four answers (4.19%)**

The subsequent Tables (6-9) show the unique metaphorical mappings per emotion.

Conceptual mapping	Fear 1	Fear 2
FEAR IS ENEMY	14.78%	13.33%
FEAR IS DARKNESS	2.60%	2.22%
FEAR IS CONTAINER/ CONTENT	0.86%	4.44%

**Table 6 | Common metaphors in both answers of fear (8.98%)**

Conceptual mapping	Fear 1	Fear 2
FEAR IS A MONSTER	9.56%	–
THE CAUSE OF FEAR IS SPRING	2.60%	–
FEAR IS THE END	1.73%	–
IS BURDEN	1,73%	–
IS OBSTACLE	1,73%	–
IS LACK OF BRIGHTNESS	0.86%	–
IS MIRROR	0.86%	–
IS SIGNALLING	0.86%	–
IS IDEA	0.86%	–
IS MENTAL CHAINS	0.86%	–
IS BOUNDARY	0.86%	–
IS CONFINEMENT	0.86%	–
IS TRAP	0.86%	–
IS CAGE	0.86%	–
IS HERCULES' DILEMMA	0.86%	–
IS THE PUSHING OF A BUTTON	0.86%	–
IS SWITCHING OFF POWER	0.86%	–
ACTING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF FEAR IS BEING AT CROSSROADS	0.86%	–
THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEAR INTO PANIC IS COURSE	0.86%	–
FEAR IS SEASON	–	2.22%
IS PLUNGING WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO REACT	–	2.22%

**Table 7 | Metaphors of fear in the answers in the first or second question answers (10.76%)**

Conceptual mapping	Romantic Love 1	Romantic Love 2
ROMANTIC LOVE IS UNITY	0.97%	<b>8.45%</b>
IS HEAVEN AND HELL	1.94%	2.81%
IS GAS	2.91%	1.40%
THE OBJECT OF LOVE IS DEITY	0.97%	2.81%
ROMANTIC LOVE IS CHAOS	0.97%	1.40%
IS ILLNESS	0.97%	1.40%
IS VEIL	0.97%	1.40%
IS MADNESS	0.97%	1.40%

**Table 8 | Common metaphors in both answers of romantic love (7.78%)**

Conceptual mapping	Romantic Love 1	Romantic Love 2
ROMANTIC LOVE IS SPRING	4.85%	–
IS FREEDOM	1.94%	–
IS STROLL TO AN AMUSEMENT PARK	0.97%	–
IS A COURSE TOWARDS A CLIFF	0.97%	–
IS A MIXTURE OF LOVE AND PASSION	0.97%	–
IS IMAGE	0.97%	–
IS LIQUID IN A CONTAINER	0.97%	–
IS THE LABYRINTH OF THE MIND	0.97%	–
IS CONNECTION	0.97%	–
IS MAGIC	0.97%	–
IS DECEPTION	0.97%	–
IS STARTING POINT OF LOVE	0.97%	–
IS DOWN	0.97%	–
ROMANTIC LOVE [and LOVE] ARE A MATHEMATICAL SET	0.97%	–
THE OBJECT OF LOVE IS SUPERNATURAL BEING	0.97%	–
IS CASTLE	0.97%	–
ROMANTIC LOVE IS THE MEANING OF LIFE	–	2.81%
IS SWEET	–	2.81%
IS TIMETRAP	–	1.40%
IS LIGHT	–	1.40%
IS EXCLAMATION POINT	–	1.40%
IS FAIRYTALE	–	1.40%
IS MARKING	–	1.40%
IS PERSPECTIVE LENS	–	1.40%
IS RAPTURE	–	1.40%
IS PREDATION	–	1.40%
IS MAKER OF EMOTIONS	–	1.40%
THE ONSET OF ROMANTIC LOVE IS BOMB		1.40%
ROMANTIC EXPERIENCE IS MASSAGE	–	1.40%
IS DEPILATION	–	1.40%
IS ENTERING A LABYRINTH	–	1.40%
IS THE MAXIMUM EXPERIENCE OF ONESELF		1.40%
THE OBJECT OF LOVE IS TROJAN HORSE	–	1.40%
IS MYTH	–	1.40%
ROMANTIC REJECTION <sup>66</sup> IS DRAMA	–	1.40%

THE END OF THE ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP IS THE COURSE OF A FALLING STAR	–	1.40%
--	---	-------

**Table 9 | Metaphors of romantic love in the first or second question answers (12.86%)**

#### 4 Discussion

As stated above, both emotions display metaphors that are both commonplace and unique, thus evidencing their shared identity as emotions as well as their specificity. If this is the answer to the first question of our study, the answer to the second one has proved to be more complicated due to the interweaving of the idiosyncratic nature of each emotion with the kind of question asked. So, how could the higher frequency of metaphors in the first question that focuses on conceptualization be explained? It should be noted that, for the prevention of encyclopedic responses, the adoption of “*according to you*” in the first question (*What is fear/romantic love according to you?*) was essential. This motivated answers that display intensively experiential elements. For example, in

*ο έρωτας είναι μια βόλτα στο λούνα παρκ*  
‘romantic love is a stroll to an amusement park’

the metaphor highlights, through the ride alternations in the amusement park, the intensive emotional changes one experiences while being in a romantic relationship. Likewise, in

*ο φόβος είναι παγίδα, κλουβί*  
‘fear is trap, cage’

the metaphor highlights the feeling of entrapment and/or confinement. In this sense, these answers instantiate a metaphorical construal imbued with subjective, emotional experience. Dancygier & Sweetser (2014: 216) argue that metaphors are inherently viewpointed and that “many of them rely on experiential viewpoint – usually of some participant in one of the scenes.”<sup>2</sup> By adopting the questionnaire as our methodological tool, this enabled us to capture the personal thoughts and experiences of the subjects, thus providing fertile ground for highlighting their experiential viewpoint.

Furthermore, there are clues in the subjects’ answers that evidence the experiential nature of the so-called question of conceptualization. Firstly, the large number of novel metaphors – the majority of direct metaphors (Steen et al. 2010: 774) being novel should be included here. For example,

*Ο έρωτας είναι πορεία κατευθείαν προς το γκρεμό πιστεύοντας ακράδαντα ότι υπάρχει αόρατη γέφυρα να σε πάει απέναντι... Μόνο που δεν υπάρχει.*  
‘Romantic love is one’s direct course to the edge of a cliff all the while being convinced that there is an invisible bridge to take him/her to the other side... only this bridge does not exist.’

*Ο πραγματικός φόβος είναι σαν να κατεβάζεις τον γενικό στο μυαλό σου.*  
‘Real fear is like switching off the power supply in your mind.’

Raffaelli & Katunar (2016: 141, 143) argue that it is typical of novel metaphors (and to a certain extent, of the semi-conventionalized ones, to display low frequency but high affective markedness.

<sup>2</sup> For reasons of space, we cannot discuss here possible connections of this thesis with the points of view which argue that metaphor serves expressivity in the case of emotions.

Yet, another kind of evidence derives from the function of personifications and objectifications. It is generally considered that personification “allows us to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 32). Additionally, Dancygier & Sweetser (2014: 63) argue that personification “allows speakers to attribute volitional behavior to abstractions, and also to represent how the speaker is affected by them.” Our data also confirms this but other functions of personifications are noticeable as well: for example, the (active) interaction with the particular emotion, e.g.

...αν αντικρίσεις κατάματα [τους φόβους σου]

‘...if you look [at your fears] straight in the eye’;

yet, mainly the attribution of character traits to the emotion metaphorized as a person, indicating the subject’s attitude towards it:

*ο έρωτας είναι διπρόσωπος, ο φόβος είναι ύπουλος, ένας επιπόλαιος, υγιής, ώριμος έρωτας...*

‘romantic love is two-faced’; ‘fear is devious’; ‘a frivolous, healthy, mature love’ ...

Moreover, neither the objectifications do display the function argued by Dancygier & Sweetser (2014: 63), i.e., that “they offer a construal of our (often agentive) interaction with something.” Most objectifications profile aspects of the emotion-as-object, like its quantity, its substance, some of its dimensions, etc., thus highlighting aspects of the emotional experience (i.e., intensity) or attitudes towards it: *μεγάλος φόβος της απέλασης* ‘great fear of deportation’, *καθαρός φόβος* ‘a clear fear,’ *μονόπλευρος έρωτας* ‘one-sided love,’ *επιφανειακός έρωτας* ‘a superficial love’ etc.

Although the above observations suggest that metaphorical conceptualization is mingled with (emotional) experience, the question “how could the higher frequency of metaphors in the first question that focuses on conceptualization be explained?” remains unanswered. We argue that this question could be answered by taking into account the – also – high percentage of literality in the subjects’ responses. Table 10 shows the whole ‘picture’ of emotion language in our data.

	Metaphor		Interaction	Metonymy	Literality
		Irrelevant			
Fear 1	<b>34.43%</b>	5.26%	16.88%	16.82%	<b>33.56%</b>
Fear 2	13.47%	22.80%	26.82%	28.59%	20.97%
Romantic Love 1	<b>30.83%</b>	26.31%	24.83%	26.35%	<b>28.67%</b>
Romantic Love 2	21.25%	45.61%	31.45%	28.22%	16.78%

**Table 10 | Figurativity and literality in the expressions of fear and romantic love**

In other words, it might be the case that the phrase “*according to you*” prompts subjectivity and experientially viewpointed metaphors. Nonetheless, the first question is still a question targeting conceptualization. Importantly, this question could be answered equally well by using literality: for example, “fear is the emotion you experience when you feel that you are in some kind of threat.” If we contrast this utterance with *ο φόβος είναι... απώλεια του φωτός* ‘fear is the loss of light’, we can argue that during the meaning-making process metaphor is chosen as the subjective, embodied, and experience-highlighting version of literality (Christidis 2007, Theodoropoulou 2004; see also Radden et al. 2007 for the viewpoint that language underspecifies meaning).



This dialectic relationship between metaphor and literality could also explain the higher percentage of metaphor, especially in the conceptualization of fear as opposed to that of romantic love. This fact could be connected with an issue discussed in the literature (Averill 1975, 1980, Theodoropoulou 2005) concerning the quantitative prevailing of negative emotional terms (i.e., literality) over the positive ones. We argue that the same need that motivates this phenomenon, i.e., the need to talk about the negative (and not the positive) emotion one experiences (a kind of discharge; Theodoropoulou 2005), is also at work here. Even if one objects that romantic love can also have negative aspects, one must consider that fear has to do with survival, which is superior and more crucial than any rejection from the object of desire.

The last question posed by the results of this study is how the higher percentage of metaphors – and generally of figurative language – could be explained in the case of romantic love. The answer to this question should take into consideration the high value attributed to romantic love (much needed for one's completion) and mostly the idiosyncratic features of this emotion, its *dual* nature being the most important: Romantic love involves a person as the object of the subject's desire. Its duality is determined by the fulfillment or not of this desire.

The metaphorical construals in our corpus highlight this duality. Firstly, there are personifications like *ο έρωτας είναι διπρόσωπος* 'romantic love is two-faced'. Secondly, there are metaphors showcasing a positive and a negative experience like *Ο έρωτας είναι το νόημα της ζωής* 'romantic love is the meaning of life'; *είναι οξυγόνο*, 'it is oxygen'; *πολλά θαυμαστικά στο τέλος της πρότασης* 'it is many exclamation points at the end of the sentence'; but also *αρρώστια* 'it is illness'; *χάος* 'chaos'; *πορεία κατευθείαν προς τον γκρεμό* 'a direct course to the edge of a cliff (see also Ungerer & Schmidt 1996). Above all, there is co-occurrence simultaneously or consecutively of the opposites: *Παράδεισος και Κόλαση* 'Heaven and Hell', (how you felt?) *στην αρχή σαν μασάζ και μετά σαν αποτρίχωση* 'In the first place like massage and then like depilation'. The increased metaphoricity/figurativity of romantic love, then, could be explained on the basis of the subject's attempt to manage the dual nature of this emotion. This very attempt could also illustrate the increased use of metaphors in the second – clearly experiential and expressive – answer about romantic love.

## 5 Conclusion

The data of this study, elicited from spontaneous speech, showed the fuzziness of metaphors considered to be unique (Kövecses 2000). For example, the metaphor X IS JOURNEY, considered to be a typical metaphor of romantic love, has also been spotted in the metaphors of fear. This data also questions the status of this most cited metaphor in the literature, as this unexpectedly showed a low frequency being pinpointed in the answer of only one subject. Above all, what this study showed is the intertwining of multiple factors in the emergence of emotion metaphors: the idiosyncratic elements of each emotion in parallel with their common features as well as the role of the broader context imposed by the particularities of the question asked. This multiplicity of factors can also explain why the processing of the data brought to the fore additional issues not been predicted while formulating the research questions of this study.

## References

- Averill, James. 1975. "A semantic atlas of emotional concepts." *ISAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology* 5:330 (Ms. No. 421).
- Averill, James. 1980. "On the paucity of positive emotions." In *Assessment and Modification of Emotional Behavior*, edited by Kirk Blankstein, Patricia Pliner, and Janet Polivy, 7–45. New York, London: Plenum Press.
- Beger, Anke. 2011. "Differences in the use of emotion metaphors in expert-lay communication." In *Converging Evidence: Methodological and Theoretical Issues for Linguistic Research*, edited by Doris Schönefeld, 319–348. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bročić, Andrijana. 2020. "On the metaphorical conceptualization of contrasting emotional experiences: The case of *pride* and *shame* in English and Serbian." *English Language and Literature Studies* 1:33–49.
- Christidis, Anastassios-Fivos. 2007. "The nature of language." In *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, edited by Anastassios-Fivos Christidis, 27–64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford, Elizabeth, 2009. "Conceptual metaphors of affect." *Emotion Review* 1(2):129-139.
- Foolen, Ad. 2012. "The relevance of emotion for language and linguistics." In *Moving Others, Moving Ourselves: Motion and Emotion in Intersubjectivity, Consciousness, and Language*, edited by Ad Foolen, Ulrike Lüdtke, Timothy Racine, and Jordan Zlatev, 349–368. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dancygier, Barbara, and Eve Sweetser. 2014. *Figurative Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 1990. *Emotion Concepts*. New York: Springer & Verlag.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2008. "The conceptual structure of happiness and pain." In *Reconstructing Pain and Joy: Linguistic, Literary and Cultural Perspectives*, edited by Chyssoula Laskaratou, Anna Despotopoulou, and Elly Ifantidou, 17–33. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- LeDoux, Joseph. 1998. *The Emotional Brain*. London: Phoenix.
- Radden, Günter, Köpcke, Klaus-Michael, Berg, Thomas, and Peter Siemund. 2007. "The construction of meaning in language". In *Aspects of Meaning Construction*, edited by Günter Radden, Klaus-Michael Köpcke, Thomas Berg and Peter Siemund, 1-15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Steen, Gerard, Dorst, Aletta, Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal and Tina Krennmayr. 2010. "Metaphor in usage." *Cognitive Linguistics* 21(4):757–88.
- Raffaelli, Ida, and Daniela Katunar. 2016. "A Discourse Approach to conceptual metaphors: A corpus-based analysis of sports discourse in Croatian." *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 133:125–47.

- Theodoropoulou, Maria. 2004. *Treading the Linguistic Paths of Fear* (in Greek). Athens: Nissos.
- Theodoropoulou, Maria. 2005. "Language and emotion: Positive and negative terms" (in Greek). In *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 25: 230–240
- Theodoropoulou, Maria. 2012. "Metaphor: a flexible mechanism?" (in Greek). In *Language and Cognition: Discussing about language in Aeginition*, edited by Ioannis Evdokimidis and Costas Potagas, 172–183. Athens: Sinapsis.
- Theodoropoulou, Maria. in preparation. *Body, Emotion and Language*.
- Theodoropoulou, Maria, and Theodoros Xioufis. 2018. "The interplay of metaphor and metonymy in the Greek language of fear and romantic love: The role of personification." Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Figurative Thought and Language, Braga, Portugal, October 23–28.
- Türker, Ebru. 2013. "A corpus-based approach to emotion metaphors in Korean: A case study of anger, happiness, and sadness." *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 11(1):73–144.
- Ungerer, Friedrich, and Hans-Jörg Schmidt. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Addison-Wesley: Boston.