RIFL (2019) SFL: 42-54
DOI: 10.4396/SFL2019I7

# Emotion concepts in a new light

**Zoltán Kövecses**
Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
kovecses.zoltan@btk.elte.hu

**Abstract** This paper is an attempt to propose a new view of emotion concepts in cognitive linguistics (for the "old" view, see Kövecses 1986, 1990, 2000). The new view builds on two changes to "standard" conceptual metaphor theory (CMT): the idea of conceptual metaphors as multilevel structures and the addition of a reformulated view of context to CMT (see Kövecses 2020). With the help of these two changes to the theory, we can see emotion concepts as multilevel metaphorical structures that are embedded in a wealth of contextual information. The new view also enables us to explain the embodiment of emotion concepts better and allows us to account for the creativity of emotion metaphors.

**Keywords:** Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory; Emotion Concepts; Emotion Metaphor; Embodiment; Creativity; Context

**Invited paper.**

## 0. Introduction

In the paper, I wish to present an enriched view of the figurative (mainly metaphoric) conceptualization of the emotions from a cognitive linguistic perspective. The enrichment is necessary for a number of reasons. As it now stands, the theory cannot account for the actual use of metaphoric emotion terms, more specifically, for the specific meanings conveyed by the terms in natural discourse. Secondly, the theory is limited in its view of what we should mean by embodiment – it is exhausted by the "bodily basis" of metaphorical conceptualization. And, third, the theory cannot explain creativity in the use of emotion metaphors – conceptual metaphors are static mental patterns on which highly conventional linguistic metaphors are based (i.e., patterns that motivate conventional metaphorical expressions).

These issues in connection with the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions fall out of certain weaknesses of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) itself. One problem is that CMT relies on a generic level of mappings between source and target domains that is not capable of handling very rich and specific meanings that arise in actual usage. The other issue has to do with CMT's neglect of context as a significant factor both in embodiment and creativity. I suggest that an improved version of CMT that can take care of these problems can produce a better framework for the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions.

I will proceed as follows. In the first half of the paper, I provide a brief description of emotion concepts as based on my previous work on emotion concepts (see Kövecses, 1986, 1990, 2000). In the second half, I introduce the necessary changes to the theory on the basis of my more recent work on CMT (Kövecses, 2015, 2017, 2020) and present a new view of emotion concepts.

## 1. Metaphorical conceptualization of emotions in CMT

As I have shown in previous work, emotion concepts are largely metaphorically and metonymically constituted and defined. I suggested that emotion concepts are composed of four distinct conceptual ingredients: conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymies, related concepts, and cognitive models (see Kövecses, 1986, 1988, 1990, 2000/2003). Furthermore, the proposal was that conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymies, and related concepts converge on and constitute cognitive models. It is cognitive models, or conceptual frames, that we assume to be the mental representation of particular emotions, such as happiness, anger, love, fear, and many others.
By conceptual metaphor, I mean a set of correspondences between a more physical source domain and a more abstract target domain (e.g., Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002/2010). Some of the most typical generic-level conceptual metaphors that characterize emotions include the following:

- EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER (filled with emotion)
- EMOTION IS HEAT/FIRE (burn with emotion)
- EMOTION IS A NATURAL FORCE (be overwhelmed by an emotion)
- EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE (be struck by an emotion)
- EMOTION IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR (be governed/ruled by an emotion)
- EMOTION IS A OPPONENT (be overcome by an emotion)
- EMOTION IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL (let go of an emotion)
- EMOTION IS A FORCE DISLOCATING THE SELF (be beside oneself with an emotion)
- EMOTION IS BURDEN (be weighed down by an emotion)

The overall claim concerning such conceptual metaphors was that they are instantiations of a general force-dynamic pattern (see Kövecses, 2000), in the sense in which this was first discussed by Leonard Talmy (1988). In that pattern, a forceful entity (a cause or an emotion) affects another forceful entity (the rational self) with a certain outcome. Given the force-dynamic character of these conceptual metaphors and given that they can be said to make up a large part of the conceptual structure associated with emotions, it can be suggested that emotion concepts are largely force-dynamically constituted (Kövecses, 2000, 2008).
In the domain of emotions, conceptual metonymies can be of two general types: CAUSE OF EMOTION FOR THE EMOTIONS, and EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR THE EMOTION, with the latter being much more common than the former. (For a cognitive linguistic viewpoint on metonymy, see Kövecses and Radden, 1998; Barcelona, 2000). Below are some specific representative cases of the general metonymy EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR THE EMOTION:

- BODY HEAT FOR ANGER (being a hothead)
- DROP IN BODY TEMPERATURE FOR FEAR (getting cold feet)
- CHEST OUT FOR PRIDE (puffing one’s chest out with pride)
- RUNNING AWAY FOR FEAR (fleeing the scene)
- WAYS OF LOOKING FOR LOVE (looking at someone amorously)

- FACIAL EXPRESSION FOR SADNESS (having a sad face)

These specific types of conceptual metonymies correspond to physiological, behavioral, and expressive responses associated with particular emotions. Thus, BODY HEAT FOR ANGER and DROP IN BODY TEMPERATURE FOR FEAR are conceptual representations of physiological responses; CHEST OUT FOR PRIDE and RUNNING AWAY FOR FEAR are those of behavioral responses; and WAYS OF LOOKING FOR LOVE and FACIAL EXPRESSION FOR SADNESS are those of expressive responses.

What I call "related concepts" are emotions or attitudes that the subject of an emotion (i.e., the person feeling an emotion) has in relation to the object or cause of the emotion. For example, friendship is an emotion or emotional attitude (though, according to some studies, a nonprototypical one) that the subject of love prototypically has toward the beloved. If someone says that he or she is in love with someone, we can legitimately expect the subject of love to also exhibit the emotional attitude of friendship toward the beloved (at least in the prototypical cases of romantic love). Such related concepts can be claimed to function as conceptual metonymies. By mentioning one such related concept I may refer to the whole concept of which it is a part.

I pointed out in several publications (first with George Lakoff, see Lakoff and Kövecses, 1987) that there are important conceptual and bodily connections between some of the emotional responses that people produce and the emotion concepts they characterize. Consider the following responses and emotion concepts, as revealed by the early work:

- BODY HEAT and ANGER,
- LACK OF BODY HEAT and FEAR,
- PHYSICAL CLOSENESS and LOVE,
- UPWARD MOTION and HAPPINESS,
- CHEST OUT and PRIDE,
- BLUSHING and SHAME.

Moreover, I claimed that several conceptual metaphors of emotions are based on the metonymic connections between the elements above. Thus, for example, the metaphor ANGER IS HEAT is based on the BODY HEAT FOR ANGER metonymy, FEAR IS COLDNESS on the LACK OF BODY HEAT FOR FEAR metonymy, LOVE IS CLOSENESS on PHYSICAL (BODILY) CLOSENESS FOR LOVE, and so on. Essentially, we can think of such conceptual connections between the metonymies and metaphors as providing the bodily basis of the metaphors and the cognitive models that the metaphors help constitute. This is how we can capture the embodied nature of emotion concepts in the language-based folk theory of emotions. (For a recent general account of embodiment in general, see Gibbs, 2006.) A major advantage of this assumption is that it can explain why many emotion metaphors are shared by various languages and cultures. This is, briefly, because shared embodiment can lead to universality in metaphorical conceptualization (see Kövecses, 2005, for details).

Abstract concepts have very little ontological content, but a great deal of figurative construal (i.e., they are for the most part figuratively understood) (see Kövecses, 2020). But they do have some ontological content. This is what we call the bodily basis, the embodiment, of abstract concepts (such as the body heat of anger). It is interesting to note in this regard that several researchers consider emotion concepts as somewhat different from other abstract concepts (see, e.g., Borghi, et al., 2017; Altarriba, et al., 2004). They suggest that emotion concepts are more embodied than other abstract concepts. I believe, however, that this claim is too strong and needs to be qualified. It seems to me that it is only prototypical emotion concepts (such as anger, fear, sadness, joy) that are more embodied (that is, have a great deal of bodily basis). Nonprototypical ones often lack embodiment completely – at least if we limit embodiment to external signals of emotion states. (But as Anna Borghi remarked in personal communication, email message, February 26, 2019, we should consider not only exteroceptive signals of embodiment but also interoceptive ones, which would further refine the picture. This is a complex issue that I cannot go into here.) On the "cruder" view of the embodiment of emotions, hope, friendship, respect, contempt, and several others do not appear to be characterized by embodiment. Instead, they are entirely figuratively construed. The conceptual metaphors used for this purpose come from outside the typical metaphors that characterize prototypical emotion concepts (see Kövecses, 2000).

To remedy the felt contradiction between universality as based on embodiment and culture-specificity as based on context, I offered the notion of «differential experiential focus» (Kövecses, 2005). In brief, the idea was to not see embodiment as a homogeneous, monolithic factor that is conceived mechanically. This is made possible by the suggestion that embodiment consists of several components of bodily experience and that any of these can be singled out and emphasized by different cultures (or, as a matter of fact, even by individuals within cultures).

Following Lakoff (1987), we can think of a category as constituted by a large number of members, with some members being central. The mental representation of such central members can be given in the form of prototypical cognitive models. Emotions are conceptually represented in the mind as cognitive or, rather, cognitive-cultural models. A particular emotion can be represented by means of one or several cognitive-cultural models that are prototypical of that emotion. This emerges from the Roschean idea that categories have a large number of members, one or some of which being prototypical and many of which being nonprototypical (see, for example, Rosch, 1978). Prototypical members of emotion categories are represented by prototypical cognitive models, whereas nonprototypical members are represented as nonprototypical models; that is, as deviations from the prototypical model (or models). Prototypical cognitive-cultural models can be thought of as folk theories (as opposed to expert theories) of particular emotions (Kövecses, 1990). As I have suggested previously (Kövecses, 2000), the most schematic folk theory of emotions can be given as follows:

cause of emotion → emotion → (controlling emotion) → response

In other words, we have a very general idea of what emotions are like: There are certain causes that lead to emotions, and the emotions we have make us (i.e., the self) produce certain responses. Commonly, there are certain social constraints on which responses are socially acceptable. Societies may impose different sets of control mechanisms on emotions.

This general folk theory of emotions derives from the application of the generic-level conceptual metaphor CAUSES ARE FORCES. The metaphor applies to both the first part and the second part of the model above. In the model, whatever leads to an emotion is conceptualized as a cause that has enough "force" to effect a change of state in the self (i.e., to become emotional), and the emotion itself is also seen as a cause that has a "force" to effect some kind of response (physiological, behavioral, and/or expressive). As a matter of fact, it is the presence and double application of this generic-level metaphor that enables a force-dynamic interpretation of emotional experience. (On force dynamics in language, see Talmy, 1988.) In the prototypical cognitive-cultural model, a situation is conceptualized as a forceful entity that leads to the emotion and the

emotion itself is conceptualized as another forceful entity that produces some kind of action or set of actions. Thus, we conceptualize the emotions as one of our most fundamental image schemas: the FORCE schema, in which two forceful entities are in interaction. My claim has been that the most fundamental component of our understanding of emotion is this force-dynamic pattern that derives from our early preconceptual experience and that is constantly reinforced in our everyday living.
But this schema is much too general and it underlies many domains of experience, not only emotion. It therefore needs to be made more specific. This is exactly the function of the more specific EMOTION frame. Given the more specific frame, emotion can be defined as a set of feelings and responses caused by a particular situation or, alternatively, as a set of feelings and responses producing some actions by a person who is in a state characterized by such feelings and responses. In other words, the concept of EMOTION can only be defined relative to the frame and the other elements that the frame includes. Each and every element in the frame can be profiled (focused on) and defined in a similar way by making use of the other elements in the frame.
At the same time, the concept of EMOTION so defined evokes a large number of additional concepts in the conceptual system, constituting a "domain matrix" (see Langacker, 1987). Because emotions often arise in social situations, it evokes the notions of SOCIETY itself, SOCIAL RELATIONS, and SOCIAL NORMS. Because emotions are commonly displayed through bodily behavior, it evokes the HUMAN BODY and ITS FUNCTIONING. Because emotions are commonly based on moral ideas, it evokes notions of RIGHT or WRONG, APPROPRIATENESS OF RESPONSE and the APPROPRIATE MEASURE OF FEELING, and MUTUALITY or a lack of it. Because emotions can be pretended, it can evoke the concepts of TRUTH, SINCERITY (of feeling), and GENUINENESS. Some of these are more easily and commonly evoked, or activated, than others when people conceptualize and discuss their emotional experiences. For example, the body, including bodily responses, and the appropriateness of responses seem to be more closely tied with the concept of EMOTION than, say, issues of truth and sincerity in emotion. It thus appears that concepts in the domain matrix of emotion can be more or less central, but at the same time contextual influence may override any statistically valid association between emotion-related concepts, and can explain individual and broader differences in the use of emotion concepts.

## 2. A new view of emotion concepts

One of the major criticisms of conceptual CMT in general has been that it is not capable of accounting for meaning in actual occurrences of metaphorical language in real discourse (see, e.g., Deignan, 2005; Semino, 2008; Goatly, 1997; Cameron, 2003; Steen, 2008; and many others). In the "standard" view of CMT, researchers work on the levels of image schema, domain, or frame. These are conceptual structures that are decontextualized patterns in long-term memory that can account for metaphorical meaning in the most general ways. On the one hand, image schemas can explain why certain metaphors can be meaningful through embodiment and, on the other, the conceptual metaphors on these levels (image schema, domain, and frame levels) can account for metaphorical meaning through the mappings that constitute the conceptual metaphors and the inferences that can be made on the basis of such mappings. However, both of these conceptual mechanisms (providing meaningfulness and accounting for decontextualized meanings) are fairly general ones that cannot capture the contextually variable richness of metaphorical meaning in naturally occurring discourse.

How can we change this view of metaphorical meaning within CMT? I propose two major adjustments to the theory: introducing a multi-level view of metaphor and placing a lot more emphasis on context in metaphorical conceptualization than was done previously. These two changes, I contend, would produce important modifications not only to CMT in general but also to how we conceptualize the specific domain of emotions.
To show what these changes would involve, consider a part of Sonnet 18 by Shakespeare:

> Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
> Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
> Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
> And summer's lease hath all too short a date;
> Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
> And often is his gold complexion dimmed

I propose to analyze the metaphorical conceptualization of love here as occurring on four levels: the image schema, domain, frame, and mental spaces levels. This would amount to recognizing the following hierarchically linked conceptual metaphors:

Image schema:

> INTENSITY IS HEAT / COLD

Domain:

> EMOTION IS TEMPERATURE: INTENSITY OF EMOTION IS DEGREE OF HEAT / COLD

Frame:

> LOVE IS FIRE: LOVE'S INTENSITY IS THE DEGREE OF HEAT OF FIRE

Mental space:

> THE FLUCTUATION IN THE INTENSITY OF THE POET'S LOVE IS THE FLUCTUATION IN THE DEGREE OF A SUMMER DAY'S HEAT

The HEAT-COLD image schema is well-known in the cognitive linguistic literature in the conceptualization of emotions (see, e.g., Kövecses, 2000). It can be found in such conceptual metaphors as LOVE IS (HEAT OF) FIRE, ANGER IS (HEAT OF) FIRE, AFFECTION IS WARMTH, FRIENDLY IS WARM, UNFRIENDLY IS COLD, etc. In the sonnet, Shakespeare turns the HEAT OF FIRE metaphor into a very specific heat-related metaphor: the kind of heat we feel in a summer's day (but then he argues against it in the second half of the sonnet). The process goes from the most generic metaphorical level of HEAT through the less schematic domain level metaphor of EMOTION IS TEMPERATURE and the even less schematic frame level metaphor of LOVE IS FIRE to the least schematic mental space level metaphor that explicates the rich and specific meaning of the poem (at least on one interpretation and up to this point in the poem). This is called a "schematicity hierarchy" (see Kövecses, 2020).

In other words, if we wish to get at the richer and more specific aspect of metaphorical meaning, but at the same time preserve these general aspects of meaning (at the images schema, domain, and frame levels), we have to think of metaphor as a multi-level phenomenon that occurs also at the level of mental spaces. Online metaphorical activity necessarily makes use of the conceptual structure of mental spaces. This is the level where we produce and comprehend metaphors in natural discourse. Specifically, it is at this level that speakers

- use metaphors online (i.e., produce and comprehend metaphors)
- use them in a fully contextualized way
- use them with specific socio-pragmatic functions
- add emotional value to them
- create novel metaphors
- use metaphors deliberately
- create metaphors as a result of contextual priming
- use individual metaphors
- add lexical elaborations to frames
- perform conceptual integration
- mix metaphors in the same discourse

and possibly several others.

In addition to the multi-level view of metaphor, a second innovation I recommend for CMT is that it should take the notion of context seriously in how we account for metaphorical meaning (see Kövecses, 2015). In brief, the suggestion is that there are four types of context that can affect metaphorical meaning making: situational context, discourse context, bodily context, and conceptual-cognitive context. These four types of context subsume a number of contextual factors each. This can be show in Table 1 below:

| SITUATIONAL CONTEXT | DISCOURSE CONTEXT | BODILY CONTEXT | CONCEPTUAL-COGNITIVE CONTEXT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Physical environment | Surrounding discourse (co-text) | Correlations in experience | Metaphorical conceptual system |
| Cultural situation | Previous discourse | Bodily conditions | Ideology |
| Social situation | Knowledge about speaker, topic, hearer | Body specificities | Concerns and interests |
| | Dominant forms of discourse | | History |

Table 1: Four context types and their contextual factors

The main suggestion concerning these context types and contextual factors is that any one of them can prompt a speaker to use a particular linguistic metaphor that matches a contextual factor; that is, they all have a potential priming effect.

Given this new framework for CMT, now I briefly discuss and exemplify some of the uses of metaphors at the level of mental spaces. Most of the examples that I employ to demonstrate my points will be taken from the concept of anger, an experiential domain that has been well studied by cognitive linguists, and so sufficiently familiar to many readers.

RIFL (2019) SFL: 42-54
DOI: 10.4396/SFL2019I7

**2.1 Metaphors in natural discourse occur at the mental spaces level**
In online communication, speakers mobilize the static image schemas, domains, and frames at the mental spaces level. Consider the following example from Google: «Everything that I wanted to say I couldn't think how to say in French. I was bursting with anger, mostly at myself for my lack of French vocabulary»[1] (my bolding, ZK).

In the example, the metaphorical expression "burst with anger" assumes the metaphorical conceptualization of the speaker's anger as the high degree of physical pressure inside the person-container (speaker). We can put this in the conventionally used metaphor format (TARGET IS SOURCE): THE HIGH INTENSITY OF THE SPEAKER'S ANGER IS THE HIGH DEGREE OF THE PHYSICAL PRESSURE INSIDE THE SPEAKER-CONTAINER. This is a very specific conceptual metaphor at the mental space level, in that it fills the role of the angry person with a particular value (the speaker) and it is built on a specific aspect of anger; namely, its high intensity. This specific metaphor is based on THE ANGRY PERSON IS A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER metaphor and one of its mappings: THE INTENSITY OF A PERSON'S ANGER IS THE DEGREE OF PRESSURE INSIDE A PERSON. This, in turn, is an elaboration of the more schematic metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES; in particular, on its mapping EMOTIONAL INTENSITY IS DEGREE OF PRESSURE. The image-schematic metaphor that subsumes these metaphors is INTENSITY IS STRENGTH (OF EFFECT).
Thus, we get the following schematicity hierarchy:

Image schema level:

> INTENSITY IS STRENGTH (OF EFFECT)

Domain level:

> EMOTIONS ARE FORCEFUL INTERACTIONS: EMOTIONAL INTENSITY IS DEGREE OF PRESSURE

Frame level:

> THE ANGRY PERSON IS A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER: THE INTENSITY OF A PERSON'S ANGER IS THE DEGREE OF PHYSICAL PRESSURE INSIDE A PERSON-CONTAINER

Mental spaces level:

> THE HIGH INTENSITY OF THE SPEAKER'S ANGER IS THE HIGH DEGREE OF PHYSICAL PRESSURE INSIDE THE SPEAKER-CONTAINER

This example is simply meant to indicate that the metaphor burst is produced and comprehended in real discourse at the level of mental spaces, and the mental space that is most immediately used to produce and comprehend it is linked systematically to

[1] http://vagendamagazine.com/2014/10/harassment-on-the-streets-of-paris-why-is-it-worse-than-in-the-uk/

DOI: 10.4396/SFL2019I7

conceptual metaphors at higher levels that jointly serve the process of the production and comprehension of the metaphorical expression.

### 2.2 There is contextual priming at this level

We can suggest that in the previous example contextual priming is effected by the conceptual-cognitive context, an aspect of which is the metaphorical conceptual system, where the expression "burst with anger" can be found attached to a conventional conceptual metaphor. But, as was noted above, the priming effect can come from other context types as well, such as the discourse context, the situational context, and the bodily context. Let us look at an example for the first type, where a novel metaphor (hot stove) is introduced as a result of the contextual influence of discourse:

> Ryuuji couldn't help but shout at Taiga to ease his anger. Even though he was almost freezing, his anger was like a hot stove inside him. Looking at Taiga, Ryuuji breathed out large clouds of white mist as he rubbed his numb hands against his cheeks, slowly easing some blood into his hands[2] (my italics, ZK).

In the passage a person is described as very angry but also freezing. We can ask how the hot stove metaphor is (unconsciously) chosen in the discourse to metaphorically render the person's anger. It can probably be assumed that mention of the same person's freezing has a role to play in this. Freezing is the opposite of body heat that is associated with anger and that gives rise to heat-related anger metaphors. The image of a hot stove is evoked as a result of the mental-space level interaction of the BEING COLD frame and the BODY HEAT frame, in that a hot stove can be used to prevent someone from being cold. A hot stove is a device that can be a part of the BEING COLD frame but also of the BODY HEAT frame that serves as the basis for the ANGER IS HEAT conceptual metaphor. In addition, a stove is a container just like the angry person's body is a container. In sum, at the level of mental spaces an aspect of the discourse (literally freezing) can prime the speaker to introduce a nonconventional metaphorical expression that also matches an established conceptual metaphor (ANGER IS HEAT).

### 2.3 Blending occurs at this level

Fauconnier and Turner have repeatedly claimed (see, e.g., Fauconnier and Turner, 2002) that blending is a dynamic online process that makes use of mental spaces. One of their examples to demonstrate this is "He was so mad, smoke was coming out of his ears" (Turner and Fauconnier, 2000; Fauconnier and Turner, 2002). This metaphorical expression can be found in naturally occurring discourses of all kinds, including the one below: «He looked as if smoke was coming out of his ears, a vein about to pop, and his handsome face red from anger»[3].

Before the metaphorical expression became conventionalized in various forms (such as smoke / steam / fumes coming out), it must have emerged as a blend in some naturally occurring discourse, such as the above, when a speaker merged the image of an angry person's head with the image of a fire with smoke or a container with steam in it. Actually, it is also possible that the "original" blend was a cartoon or drawing, and it gave rise to the linguistic metaphor. But even if this was the case, the person who drew the blend must have created the blend by making use of mental spaces online as part of a dynamic process.

[2] https://www.baka-tsuki.org/project/index.php?title=Toradora!:Volume10_Chapter1

[3] (https://www.wattpad.com/336753058-the-luna%27s-alpha-meet-the-pmsing-alpha-and/page/2)

### 2.4 Pragmatic-narrative functions are given to metaphors at this level

At the image schema, domain, and frame levels, the linguistic metaphors express a particular aspect of the conceptual content of the source domain. The meaning of these metaphorical expressions is based the topology of the source domain and its mapping onto the target; their meaning is the expression of this conceptual content (such as the cause of the fire-heat being mapped onto the cause of one's anger). But at the mental space level (i.e., where the metaphorical linguistic expressions are used in actual discourse) a lot more can happen as regards meaning, as indicated by the following example: «1 Jimmy: Uh: I was (.) boiling at this stage and 2 I was real angry with Connie ( ). And 3 uh went up to bed 'n (.) I lay on the bed» (Edwards, 1999: 274).

Edwards makes the point that this particular use of "boiling" establishes accountability and provides justification for one's (the speaker's) actions. The passage is part of an interview in a counseling session, in which Jimmy talks about how his wife's "provocations" during an evening in a pub led him to leave her in the pub (with the man she was "messing" with) and to go home. The use of "boiling" shows that the intensity of his anger matches the intensity of the "provocations," thus making his wife accountable for his anger. At the same time, it also shows that the intensity of his anger provides justification for leaving the pub, go home, and, later, even assault his wife. "Boiling anger" presents him as being passive in relation to events in the sense that he appears to believe that such a high intensity of anger justifiably leads to those actions on his part. Clearly, the use of "boiling" here goes far beyond the expression of some metaphorical content. It fulfills extremely important narrative-discursive functions that constitute another and indispensable part of the expression's meaning in a particular context.

### 2.5 Elaboration for rhetorical purposes

Metaphors at higher levels can be elaborated at the level of mental spaces. The elaborations allow speakers to improvise and be creative. For this reason the process of elaboration is commonly employed in poetry. A well-known example in CMT is Adrienne Rich's poem "Phenomenology of Anger" (see Gibbs, 1994):

"white acetylene / ripples from my body / effortlessly released / perfectly trained / on the true enemy // raking his body down to the thread / of existence."

The poem is based on the ANGER IS A HOT FLUID metaphor. The poet elaborates the (hot) fluid as acetylene that can ripple from the body. Acetylene is a dangerous substance that can cause serious injury to the person who is targeted with it. The poet elaborates on an aspect of the conventional metaphorical source frame in an unpredictable and creative way. The process results in novel metaphors that serve the rhetorical purpose of the author.

## 3. Conclusions

I tried to demonstrate in the paper that certain changes to CMT, i.e., thinking of metaphors as occupying various levels of schematicity in a hierarchy and the hierarchies being embedded in context, result in changes to our view on how we conceptualize emotions. These changes have implications for how we make specific meanings in the use of emotion metaphors, for what we should mean by embodiment in the conceptualization of emotions, and for how we can account for creativity in the use of emotion metaphors.

As regards the specific emotional meanings that speakers produce in natural discourse, we saw that detailed emotional meaning emerges on the level of mental spaces. The mental spaces derive conceptual structures from the higher levels but make these

generic level metaphors specific and information-rich. They are conceptual structures that occur online in actual instances of natural discourse.
Second, and regarding embodiment, emotional meaning arises not only from bodily experience proper (or in a strict sense) but also from the situational and discourse context. Embodiment, in the sense of bodily experience proper, is conceived (and reconceptualized) here as a type of context. The conceptual-cognitive context can be thought of as the storehouse of conventional conceptual metaphors in long-term memory, which are evoked in "neutral" contexts.
Finally, the new approach to emotion concepts can account for metaphorical creativity in emotion language relying on both the multi-level and the contextual views. On the one hand, new emotion metaphors can be created as higher-level conceptual metaphors are elaborated on in novel ways (the "acetylene" example). And on the other, the variety of contexts types and contextual factors can prompt speakers to create new emotion metaphors (the "hot stove" example).

**References**

Altarriba, J., & Bauer, L. M. (2004), «The distinctiveness of emotion concepts: A comparison between emotion, abstract, and concrete words», in *The American Journal of Psychology*, 117, pp. 389-410. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4149007

Barcelona, Antonio (2000), *On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor*, in A. Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 32-58.

Borghi, A. M., Binkofski, F., Castelfranchi, C., Cimatti, F., Scorolli, C., & Tummolini, L. (2017), «The Challenge of Abstract Concepts», in *Psychological Bulletin*, Advance online publication, http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000089 (2017, January 16).

Cameron, L. (2003), *Metaphor in educational discourse*, Continuum, London.

Deignan, A. (2005), *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Edwards, D. (1999), «Emotion Discourse», in *Culture & Psychology*, Vol. 5(3), pp. 271-291.

Fauconnier, G. and M. Turner (2002), *The Way We Think*, Basic Books, New York.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994), *The poetics of mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gibbs, R. W. (2006), *Embodiment and cognitive Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Goatly, 1997; Goatly, Andrew (1997), *The language of metaphors*, Routledge, London.

Johnson, M. (1987), *The body in the mind*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Kövecses, Z. (1986), *Metaphors of anger, pride and love. A lexical approach to the structure of concepts*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Kövecses, Z. (1988), *The language of love. The semantics of passion in conversational English*, Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg PA, Associated University Presses, London and Toronto.

Kövecses, Z. (1990), *Emotion concepts*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York.

Kövecses, Z. (2000), *Metaphor and emotion*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kövecses, Z. (2002/2010), *Metaphor. A practical introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.

Kövecses, Z. (2005), *Metaphor in culture. Universality and variation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2008), *Metaphor and emotion*, in R. Gibbs (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 380-396.

Kövecses, Z. (2015), *Where metaphors come from*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.

Kövecses, Z. (2017), «Levels of metaphor», in *Cognitive Linguistics*, n. 28(2), pp. 321-347.

Kövecses, Z. and G. Radden (1998), «Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view», in *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9(7), pp. 37-77.

Kövecses, Z. (2020), *Extended conceptual metaphor theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lakoff, G. (1987), *Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980), *Metaphors we live by*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lakoff, G. and Z. Kövecses (1987), *The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English*, in D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds.) *Cultural models in language and thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, pp. 195-221.

Langacker, R. (1987), *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Radden, G. (2002), *How metonymic are metaphors?*, in Dirven, R. and R. Pörings (eds.). *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, pp. 407-433.

Rosch, E. (1978), *Principles of categorization*, in E. Rosch and B.B. Lloyd (eds.), *Cognition and categorization*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 27-48.

Semino, E. (2008), *Metaphor and discourse*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Steen, Gerard (2008), «The paradox of metaphor. Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor», in *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), pp. 213-241.

DOI: 10.4396/SFL2019I7

Talmy, L. (1988), «Force dynamics in language and cognition», in *Cognitive Science*, 12, pp. 49-100.

Turner, M. and G. Fauconnier (2000), *Metaphor, metonymy, and binding*, in Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 133-145.