RETHINKING EMOTIONS IN CONTEXT. CASE STUDY: *LOVE* FROM OLD TO EARLY MODERN ROMANIAN

GABRIELA STOICA[1]

Abstract. This paper examines the main recent theories in the conceptualization of emotions, proposing an integrative theoretical and methodological framework of analysis, from a cultural-anthropological and cognitive historical semantics point of view. Emotions represent complex cognitive and cultural phenomena, linguistically encoded, diachronically and diatopically variable. Following the undertaken theoretical and methodological premises, we put forward a case study: the analysis of the historical dynamics of a core emotional concept, *LOVE* in Romanian, focusing on the conceptual-semantic mutations undergone within the process of transition from the Old Medieval period (the 16th – the 18th centuries) towards the Early Modern time (end of the 18th century – first part of the 19th century).

Keywords: emotions, conceptualization, semantic parameters, cultural-affective pattern, love.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Emotions represent a fuzzy, polymorphic concept, which can be tackled from various complementary theoretical perspectives (psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, conceptual history, cultural history, language, literature, etc.). In the last few decades (starting with the ’60–’70s), the literature on emotions has brought forward various paradigms of research, all of them acknowledging the complex nature of their central topic of discussion. The debates and the differences of opinion in analyzing affectivity are triggered by the specific feature considered to be salient within each particular theoretical framework: the biological, the cognitive, the social, the anthropological/cultural, the

[1] Gabriela Stoica is lecturer at the Department of Linguistics of the Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, and researcher at the “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy. She is author of the books *Afect şi afectivitate. Conceptualizare şi lexicalizare în româna veche* (2012), and *Modele ale afectivităţii în cultura română premodernă (1780–1840)* (2015), co-author of the Romanian Academy projects *History of Romanian. I.* (2017), *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române* (2015), *Dicţionarul limbii române* (*Litera D*) (2007, 2009), *Micul dicţionar academic* (vol. II–IV, 2002–2003). She has also published several papers on topics in the history of Romanian, historical (cognitive) semantics, discourse analysis, and cultural linguistics. E-mail: gabrielastoica.litere@gmail.com.

RRL, **LXIII**, *1–2*, p. 183–202, Bucureşti, 2018

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

historical or the linguistic dimension. The answer to the classic question, *What is an emotion?* (James 1884), is thus variable: a biological impulse, inscribed in the individuals' genetic code; a mental-psychological process; a cultural marker; a factor of social cohesion; a conceptual, abstract reality, expressed using linguistic tools (specific words, syntactic-semantic structures) and enhancing communicative and discursive functions/strategies etc. Nevertheless, without being mutually exclusive, but, on the contrary, collateral and complementary, all these dimensions define and configure affectivity as an extremely kaleidoscopic reality.

In the light of the recent studies on emotions and emotional conceptualization, the present paper aims at rethinking and reformulating a possible way of understanding and analyzing the emotional concepts and categories, mainly from a historical and cultural linguistic point of view. In order to illustrate the undertaken theoretical perspective, we propose a case study: the diachronic conceptualization of *love* in Old and Early Modern Romanian, focusing on its specific salient conceptual-semantic mutations.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK. *WHAT IS AN EMOTION?*

2.1. Emotion – a Cultural/Anthropological/Social Reality

One basic standpoint in the literature on affectivity is that emotions represent a fundamental cultural marker for a particular cultural setting. From a cultural-anthropological perspective (see the social constructivism paradigm, developed in the '70s, Averill 1980, Harré (ed.) 1986, Lutz 1988, Oatley 1993, among others), emotions and their public display are social-cultural constructs, prescribed, shaped and expressed according to a set a social-cultural rules, active within a certain community/certain cultural context. Emotions are thus culture dependent, they are „made up" by each specific society, community and culture (see also Rosenwein 2002: 20). Different societies/cultures display different conceptual patterns of representing the (same) emotional phenomena, and, accordingly, different *cognitive models for emotions*, defined as "one's structure of beliefs concerning what brings each emotion about, what its mechanisms are, what to do about it, how to evaluate its occurrence, and so on" (Russell 1991: 428). In any culture there is a set of *core cultural ideas* (Markus and Kitayama 1997: 341–343, Mesquita *et al.* 1997: 257, Mesquita 2002), which vary according to the values and the concepts considered to be essential within the limits of that culture.

Another important distinction is the classic dichotomy (Hofstede 1984) between *individualistic cultures*, which are defined by a social-cultural frame of independence, and *collectivistic cultures*, whose characteristic is a cultural frame of interdependence. Following one of these two cultural patterns, affectivity may be brought forward in various forms of expression and instantiation (see also Triandis 1997).

2.2. Emotions – a Cognitive-Linguistic Reality

Within another paradigm of research, the cognitive psychology (and the cognitive linguistic perspective) (Arnold 1960, Frijda 1986, Lakoff and Kövecses 1987, among others), emotions represent complex cognitive phenomena. The conceptualization of

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

emotions involves inner cognitive mechanism/schemata (see Lutz and White 1986: 419, Rosenwein 2002: 29), a complex process of appraisal of a stimulus event. From this perspective, three major complementary perspectives in the emotion research can be mentioned:

(a) the prototype approach (particularly, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, see Kövecses 2004, 2010): emotions are conceptualized as *cognitive models*. A *cognitive model* is a conceptual frame, a mental representation of a particular emotion.

(b) the dimensional approach (see Russell 1983, 1991, Shaver *et al.* 1987, Russell *et al.* 1989, Shaver *et al.* 1992, Fontaine *et al.* 2002): the meaning of an emotion term is defined by a limited set of dimensions, including: ***valence*** (*/ evaluation / hedonic tone / pleasantness / pleasure*); ***power*** (*/ control / potency / dominance*); ***arousal*** (*/ activation*) (ibid.: 38) (cf. also *novelty, valence, certainty, control, consistency with social norms, agency tendencies*, etc., Ellsworth 1997: 45).

(c) the componential approach (the GRID paradigm) (Scherer 2013, Fontaine *et al.* (eds) 2013), related to the appraisal theories of emotions, stemming from psychology: an emotion is considered a multi componential phenomenon, including a set of patterned processes of appraisal of a stimulus event, along specific dimensions (*novelty, pleasantness / unpleasantness*; *goal / need relevance*; *causality*; *outcome probability*; *urgency*; *coping potential* (*control, power, adjustment*); *compatibility self-concept / standards – compatibility social norms / values* (see Scherer 2013, also Scherer 2001, 2005, Scherer and Ellsworth 2003, Frijda and Scherer 2009, cf. Russell 1991, Luhrmann 2006). These features of the emotional experience can be interpreted as dimensions of emotional meaning, making up a "component profile" for any specific emotion concept.

These cognitive patterns can be accessed by the analysis of the meanings of the emotional lexicon/words, hence using the methodological tools of another complementary discipline: cognitive semantics. From this perspective, "lexical meaning is conceptual representation" (Soriano 2013: 63), related to an entire system of world-knowledge and therefore illustrating the interdependent relationship between language and culture. The (semantic) corpus analysis of the emotional lexicon offers the access to the cognitive structures involved in the emotional conceptualization (Ogarkova 2013: 50, see also Lakoff and Kövecses 1987). Rather frequently, the cognitive mechanisms of emotional representation are metaphorical, indicating a certain type of inferential structure in the conceptualization of emotions (made in concrete terms) (Lakoff and Kövecses 1987, Kövecses 1990).

2.3. Emotions – a Cultural-Historical Reality

From another, rather recent perspective, emotions are perceived and analyzed as diachronic intra-cultural variables, following the mutations undergone within their specific broader cultural and historical background (see Reddy 2001, Rosenwein 2002, 2006, 2010, Nagy and Boquet 2008, Nagy and Boquet (eds) 2009, Boquet 2010, Frevert 2011, Frevert *et al.* 2014, Matt and Stearns (eds) 2014, Courbin *et al.* (eds) 2016). Diachronic changes in the cultural setting entail diachronic changes in the emotional conceptualization and lexicalization. This type of approach can delineate a diachronic cultural, conceptual and historical semantics of emotions.

2.4. Rethinking Emotional Concepts and Lexicon

All the above mentioned paradigms of research offer interesting and refined analyses of the emotional realities. Nevertheless, what is specific for a part of them is their atomistic

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

view, as they tend to grasp the content under consideration from a certain particular perspective and, therefore, emphasizing different facets of the same unique reality. Theoretically and methodologically, the complex nature of emotions imposes an interdisciplinary, integrative approach, in order to map and highlight in a more refined manner their conceptual-semantic features, as well as their cultural, anthropological, social and linguistic functioning across time and space.

It what follows, taking into account the current approaches on emotions, we propose a theoretical and methodological review on the diachronic conceptualization of emotions. The aim of this endeavor is the delineation of a historical semantics of emotions, resulting from the particular configuration of the cognitive-affective pattern specific to a certain community/cultural setting, by the analysis of the (contextual) meanings of the emotion lexicon.

The basic theoretical starting point is that *cognition* (universal) and *culture* (variable) are the two dimensions that define the emotional phenomena, as reflected by their specific *vocabulary*. Emotions represent complex cognitive phenomena, and, thus, emotional meaning is perceived as a conceptual representation. Emotions encompass, at the same time, a double, non-dichotomous, aspect: on one hand, they are *universal* human categories (given the prototypical conceptual/cognitive schemata); on the other hand, they are subjective, variable, *culturally* shaped phenomena (given the possible variation of the constitutive conceptual-semantic parameters), according to the broader historical context (see Stoica 2012: 92–111). All these features are pointed out by their lexicalization (see also Kövecses and Palmer 1999: 253–255). The overarching theoretical premise is, hence, the existence of complex constitutive links between *emotions*, *cognition*, *culture* and *language*.

For a historical and cultural inquiry of the emotional conceptualization and lexicalization, a multi levels analysis is required (see also Stoica 2015: 26–29), combining methods of linguistic analysis (mainly of the lexical and cognitive semantics) with certain key-concepts and theoretical and methodological principles of the anthropology of emotions (Harré (ed.) 1986, Lutz 1988, Oatley 1993, among others) or of the cultural history of emotions (Reddy 2001, Nagy and Boquet 2009, Boquet 2010, Rosenwein 2010, Frevert 2011, Frevert *et. al.* 2014):

(a) the demarcation of a corpus of texts, a set of "trustworthy" sources, relevant for the emotional experience and the cognitive-affective pattern of the period under consideration;
(b) based on the corpus analysis, the delineation of an inventory of affective words;
(c) resetting the identified emotional lexicon within the chronological context of the period under consideration, in order to understand the real conveyed meaning (standing apart from the modern frame of conceptualization): the correlation between the corpus data and the virtual existent theories of emotions of the time (lexicographic or (con)textual, empirical definitions of the emotion words, glosses, etc.).
(d) the contextual-semantic analysis of the emotion concepts/words, aimed at validating their meaning, and also their contextual affective functioning. In order to grasp the complexity of the emotional meaning, as well as its diachronic variation, we propose an integrative method of semantic analysis, by taking into account three of the above mentioned major paradigms in the emotion and semantics research: (a) the componential approach (the GRID paradigm, see

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

supra, **2.2.**), (b) the cognitive semantic approach (Scherer 2013, Fontaine *et al.* (eds) 2013), as well as (c) the textual semantics perspective (Rastier 1994, (coord) 1995).

Accordingly, the features of the emotional experience can be conceived as and converted into semantic parameters. We can delineate the following generic semantic grid/script (see Stoica 2012: 109), prototypically describing an emotion: **1.** *stimulus event / cause* (*external / internal*; *known / unknown*); **2.** *appraisal*: a. *novelty;* b. *pleasant / unpleasant / positive-negative*; c. *goal relevance;* d. *force – dominance / subordination*; e. *consequences: active-motivational / passive*; f. *control: of emotion / of the expressive behaviour*; g. *collective / self-norm compatibility*; **3.** *expressive*; **4.** *intensity* (*low, medium, high*); **5.** *aspect: long term / short term-momentary / inchoative*.

Nevertheless, the prototypical semantic features can undergo important contextual (cultural, historical) variation that can reconfigure the standard representation. Some dimensions can (diachronically and diatopically) become central/salient in the componential formula, whereas some others fade away.

Therefore, the next step of the analysis is the contextual examination of the terms designating a certain emotion concept in the corpus taken into account, at a micro-textual level: the lexical collocations, at a mezo-textual level: the affective isotopies, and at a macro-textual level (placing the emotional lexicon on the general background of the text and of the extra-linguistic context where they are recorded) (see Rastier 1994), which can point out the different instantiations of the standard dimensions of meaning. The data can invalidate, validate or refine the prototypical representation of the emotion under consideration, highlighting its possible conceptual-semantic facets. The different instances of contextualization of the affective words can represent markers of a particular cognitive-affective pattern (object of a specific diachronic dynamics, according to the more general mutations of the cultural background).

(e) The last level of analysis is the correlation of the linguistic (contextual lexical-semantic) data to certain key-concepts of the anthropology of emotions or of the cultural history of emotions, in order to identify the salient features of the cultural-affective pattern under scrutiny (such as *collectivism* / *individualism*; *extroversion of emotions* / *introverted emotional experience*, etc.) and their possible diachronic variation.

3. CASE STUDY: *LOVE* FROM OLD TO EARLY MODERN ROMANIAN

In what follows, we present the synthetic results of an analysis which followed the above mentioned methodology, a case study: the conceptual-semantic representation of *love* in Romanian, focusing on the main mutations that emerge within the period of transition from the Old Medieval epoch (the 16th – the 18th centuries) to the Early Modern period (end of the 18th century – first part of the 19th century). Based on a corpus of literary texts, representative for the period under consideration, we tackle the patterns of conceptualizing *love* and the semantic parameters that are variable or tend to become focused on during this period of time, as highlighted by its contextual lexicalization.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

3.1. *LOVE* – Definition and Typology

Prototypically, LOVE is a *relational feeling,* definable as "a subjective, cognitive-evaluative, polarized psychic force, involving intellect and will, weakly active-motivational, accompanied by somatic-behavioural manifestations, persistent in the absence of the triggering event / stimulus, of medium intensity and relative long term" (for the delineation of different categories of emotions and their definitions, see Stoica 2012: 346). According to the descriptive semantic features distinguished by the above mentioned multidisciplinary paradigms of research, LOVE can be conceptually described in terms of the following component-based semantic grid: /*psychic force*/, /*subjective – self-oriented*/, /*+awareness of the eliciting event*/, /*novelty*/, /*euphoric*/, /*goal relevance*/, /*force*/, /*-control*/, /*active-motivational*/, //*norm/self-concept compatibility*//, /*awareness of the consequences*/, /*+expressive-extroversion*/, /*medium-high intensity*/, /*relative long term*/.

In the prototypical definition of LOVE, the most important parameter seems to be the *cause/eliciting event*, culturally variable, pointing out the triggering emotional facts/the stimuli, which are salient within a particular cultural and temporal context. In the case of love, *cause* can be broadly identified as the *object* of love. Consequently, according to this parameter, we can demarcate a certain taxonomy of LOVE, instantiating particular relationships between the *emotion subject* and the *object*. Based on these criteria and considering also the various psychological and cultural-anthropological theories of love (see Kemper 1978, Kelley 1983, Hendrick and Hendrick 1986, Sternberg 1986, Lee 1988, among others), the following typology of LOVE can be outlined (Stoica 2012: 348–364):

(a) love as an individual (complementary), non-hierarchical feeling: *romantic love* (instantiated as *eros/mania/ludus/storgé*, see Lee 1988);
(b) love as an individual (mutual), non-hierarchical feeling: *brotherly love*;
(c) love as a collective (mutual-complementary), non-hierarchical feeling: *collective love* (*agapé love*);
(d) love as an individual, hierarchical feeling
– of laic subordination: *hierarchical-official love*; *filial-parental love*;
– of sacred subordination: *religious love*;
(e) love as an individual feeling
– with an inanimate, nonperson, abstract object/cause: *intellectual-aesthetic love*;
– with an inanimate, nonperson, concrete object/cause: *concrete-hedonic love.*

All these types of LOVE could be identified for the old Romanian affective pattern, having a counterpart lexicalization (see Stoica 2012: 342–381).

In what follows, considering the above mentioned typology, we shall highlight the main semantic mutations undergone by the concept of LOVE within the process of transition towards modernity. Few questions are to be answered: What changes in the conceptualization of love in the process of transition to a new cultural-(modern) historical period? Which types of love remain, become salient or disappear? Are there new types of love that are now distinguished? The corpus based analysis of the specific lexicon in context can clarify these ground issues.

3.2. *LOVE* – from Old to Early Modern Romanian

In Old Romanian, *love* is a polymorphic, hyper conceptualized prototypic affect, a central feeling of the cognitive-affective pattern, frequently lexicalized. Yet, the existent lexicon is not very refined (from a semantic point of view) in designating the various facets

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

of *love*. The basic lexemes recorded are *dragoste, liubov* [*love*], *a îndrăgi* [*to like, to fall in love, to love*], *a iubi* [*to love*], polysemous, conveying various and specific (contextual) meanings (for a detailed analysis, see Stoica 2012: 345–381).

In the period of transition towards modernity, according to the broader changes of the cultural context, the concept of *love* is rediscovered, revalued and reconfigured as an intense individual, hypercognated[2] feeling.

Important changes take place within the Romanian collective and affective mentality, as a consequence of the cultural and, implicitly, linguistic reorientation of the society to a new Western European cultural pattern, in which the affectivity and the individual feelings are focused on and predominantly exhibited. There is a shift from a traditionalist, hierarchic, collectivistic conceptualization of the reality to a modern, more introverted, individual-subjective manner of understanding and representing it. The 18th century is the age of sensibility, when individual feelings are rediscovered, refined, negotiated and expressed. A „crisis of sensibility" emerges also within the Romanian cultural space, as it adopts a new cultural model. All these mutations are brought forward by the conceptualization and the lexicalization of emotions, which undergo a salient process of refinement and diversification. In this context, *love* is the exponential case, as it tends to be the most displayed and debated emotion of the time. The sentimental literature emphasizes love, especially the *romantic, passionate love*, as an intense and transparently (even excessively) exhibited feeling. Besides the romantic dimension, *love* as a moral feeling is also discovered, love for others or love for moral and aesthetic values. This cultural dynamics also spread to the Romanian Principalities at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, through original literature (following a Western European model), intensive translation works (literature, philosophy, scientific writings) or newspapers.

Hence, *love* turns into the core emotion of the period, intensively and variously instantiated, becoming the object of an important conceptual and semantic renewal. The texts of the period put forward new salient facets of *love*, hyper conceptualized and hyper lexicalized, sometimes redundantly. From a conceptual-semantic point of view, previous existent dimensions of love tend to be highlighted (like *romantic love*) and, at the same time, new particular semantic facets of love are distinguished (like *patriotic love, self-oriented love, aesthetic love*). From a lexical-semantic point of view, the lexicon of love is enriched and renewed: old terms are semantically reinvested (*dragoste, iubire* – designating new dimensions of love), new words are borrowed from the languages of cultural contact (Neo-Greek, Neo-Latin, French, Italian): *amor* [*love*], *adorație* [*adoration*], *idolatrie* [*idolatry*], *mizantropie* [*misanthropy*], *tandrețe* [*tenderness*], *vanitate* [*vanity*], etc.

3.3. Pre-existing Conceptual-Semantic Dimensions of *LOVE*

3.3.1. *Romantic Love*

Romantic love is the basic, prototypical facet of LOVE, represented, in the period under consideration, as a highly intensive, personal, uncontrollable feeling, triggering other strong, divergent and distressful emotions: *anger, hatred, sadness, jealousy* etc. There are many contexts displaying large affective isotopies, in which *love* is intensively conceptualized and lexicalized as a state of "erotic alert". A new moral and behavioural

[2] For the distinction between *hypercognated* and *hypocognated affects,* see Levy 1984.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

model of *love* is gradually becoming salient: *love* gains in intensity and becomes a *passion* (*mania love*, see the typology of Lee 1988).

From the conceptual perspective, this entails an alteration of the prototypical *euphoric* dimension. *Romantic love* is conceptualized in a hybrid hedonic – both euphoric and dysphoric – tone, as a strong, incandescent feeling, in metaphorical terms of sufferance, disease, insanity, fire or hot fluid (see the conceptual metaphors for emotions, Kövecses 2004, 2010). The hybrid hedonic dimension, *euphoric-dysphoric*, of the *passionate romantic love* is the specific feature of the conceptualization of *love* during the period under consideration and it is highlighted by the various contexts from the literature of the time. The reorientation towards this extreme emotional category is, as well, pointed out by the alteration of some other standard semantic parameters, which are now focused on: /+*intensity* (maximal)/, /+*individual*/, /+*active-motivational* (+*aggressive*)/, /+*expressive-extroversion*/, /-*control*/.

The specific lexicon in context illustrates all these mutations of the prototypical semantic grid. Most of the time, *love* is dysphorically represented in the generic terms of (*psychical and physical*) *sufferance*, indicated by explicit words: *patimă* [*sufferance*], *a pătimi, a suferi* [*to suffer*], *pătimaş* [*in sufferance*], *durere* [*pain*], *a durea* [*to have a pain*], *chin, chinuire* [*torture, sufferance*], *urgie* [*intense sufferance*], or by nets of semantic recurrences associating various affective terms. In these contexts, the erotic feeling (unfulfilled or in alert of being fulfilled) dysphorically correlates, most frequently, to *sadness* and *fear*. An impressive (by their variation and frequency) inventory of affective words is brought forward by the texts of the time, also illustrating the associated emotional-expressive behaviour: *dragoste, amor* [*love*], *a iubi* [*to love*] – *ticălos* [*miserable*], *frică* [*fear*], *groază* [*horror*], *mâhnit* [*upset*], *jale* [*sorrow*], *trist* [*sad*], etc.; *a lăcrima* [*to drop tears*] – *lacrimă* [*tear*] – *a vărsa râuri de lacrimi* [*to shed rivers of tears*], *a suspina* [*to sob*] – *suspin* [*sobbing*], *a ofta* [*to sigh*] – *oftat* [*sigh*], *a plânge* [*to cry*] – *plâns* [*crying*], *a îmbrăţişa* [*to hug*], *a se cutremura* [*to tremble*], *a se boci* [*to wail*], *a striga* [*to shout*], *a văieta* [*to groan*], *a leşina* [*to faint*], etc. (see also Stoica 2016b).

Thus, *love* is *(euphoric) sufferance*, intensively (and excessively) exhibited by various markers of the expressive associated behaviour (tears, sighs, sobbing, fainting etc.), pointing out a very specific *emotionology* (Stearns and Stearns 1985). A strong extroverted dimension of the emotional feeling, specific to the period under consideration, can be noticed; emotions are felt and, at the same time, expressed, transparently and redundantly displayed, with all the details of the most intimate mechanisms of the subjective, individual emotional feeling. The texts frequently illustrate this saliency of the /*expressive*/ parameter, pinpointing a dynamic extroversion of *love,* which involves dramatic gestures and actions, sometimes aggressive, self-oriented, part of a stereotypical ritual, traditionally framed. The lexicalization reflects this stereotypical, ritualistic behaviour: *a se bate cu palmele peste obraz şi peste cap* [*to slap one's own face and head*], *a-şi rupe părul/veşmintele* [*to rip one's own hair/clothes*], *a-şi tunde părul* [*to cut one's own hair*], *a se clătina* [*to wobble*], *a-şi bate pieptul* [*to beat/punch one's own chest*], *a-şi frânge degetele* [*to twist one's own fingers*], etc.:

> (1) „îndată ***s-au aprins în inema ei*** ca un ***foc iute arzând,*** ca o ***dragoste*** cătră Erotocrit, cât şi zioa şi noaptea ***plângea*** şi ***ohta*** de ***dragostea*** lui Erotocrit" (EA 7)
> "a ***burning fire burst in her heart***, ***burning out of love*** for Erotocrit, so that she was ***crying***, ***sighing*** for Erotocrit's ***love***"

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

(2) „Îşi spune Erotocrit ***pătimile*** lui cu mari ***ohtături***, şi ***suspinând săruta*** fereastra, închipuind că ***sărută*** pre Aritusa. Dar Aritusa, auzind ***patimile*** lui, cu ***suspin plângea*** şi de la inemă ***ohta*** şi tăcea" (EA 73)
"Erotocrit told about his ***sufferance*** with deep ***sighs***, and ***weeping*** he was ***kissing*** the window, imagining he was ***kissing*** Aritusa. But Aritusa, hearing his ***sufferance***, was ***crying***, ***sobbing*** and ***sighing*** from the bottom of her heart and kept silent"

(3) „Când s-au înştiinţat fata craiului, Militina, că tată-său vre să o dea soţâie lui Ciubulaiu, ***inima*** ei ***s-au întunecat în sânge*** şi ***lacrămile curge pârău din ochii ei. Îş bate pieptul*** şi ***îş rumpe părul capului***. Vre mai bine să să omoare sângură decât să fie soţâie straşniculuişi scârnavului tătar" (PM 16r)
"When the king's daughter, Militina, heard that her father wanted to marry her to Ciubulaiu, her ***heart darkened in blood*** and ***her tears flowed like*** **a** ***river***. She ***punches*** her ***chest*** and ***rips*** her ***hair***. She prefers to kill herself than to be the horrible Tartar's wife"

(4) „Zori de ziuă să răvarsă / Şi ochi încă n-am închis, / Cum să-i închid când ei varsă / ***Părăie de foc aprins***./ Mă ***vaiet***, ***strig*** cu ***suspinuri***, / Dar nu găsesc agiutor, / Ce pot ***lacrămi***, ce pot ***chinuri***, / Când ***durerea***-i de ***amor***" (Conachi, 135)
"Daybreak is coming / And I can't close my eyes, / How can I, when they flow with / ***Rivers of burning fire/*** I'm ***sobbing***, I'm ***shouting*** in ***sighs***, / But I cannot find a help, / What can ***tears, tortures*** do / When the ***sufferance*** is out of ***love***".

Besides *sadness* and *fear*, rather frequently, *passionate romantic love* is ingenuously associated with *romantic jealousy*, a recently distinguished version of *jealousy/envy* (see also Stoica 2017a). In spite of the dysphoric dimension, the *romantic jealousy* is positively valued within the frame of the romantic model of passionate love. Its presence is a form of public acknowledgement, of affective legitimization of the erotic feeling; likewise, its absence is a marker of a less intensive form of *love*. In the following context, there is an empirical definition of *mania love* (metaphorically conceived as insanity), which implicitly associates *dysphoric love* to *jealousy* and *anger*, a highly intensive, active-motivational negative emotion:

(5) „***Adevăratul amor*** este acela care te face să uiţi toate celelalte pe lângă dânsul, care îţi sminteşte minţele, îţi amestecă ideile, îţi întunecă vederile, te face să sai cu amândouă picioarele peste toate convenenţile, să calci la pământ toate datoriile şi cele mai sfinte; în sfârşit, să te faci şi criminală, să-ţi otrăveşti rivala care ai, să-ţi înfigi pumnalul în inima amantului necredincios şi pe urmă să te arunci însuţi pe fereastră" (Bălăcescu, 101–102).
"***True love*** is the one that makes you forget about all the things around you, that takes away your mind, that dazes your thoughts, that blinds you, that makes you step over all the conventions, and put to the ground even the most sacred of the duties; finally, the one that makes you a murderer, makes you poison your rival, stab a dagger in your unfaithful lover's heart and, at the end, to throw yourself out of the window".

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

"True love" [*adevăratul amorul*] is contextually defined as a deeply intensive feeling, which dominates the individual's entire emotional universe, cancels rationality, affects the coherent thinking process and also the perception/senses, contradicts (or cancels) the rules of the socially accepted behaviour, ethical norms, and, accompanied by jealousy, triggers violent, drastic self-destructive actions (crime, suicide). This empirical definition ingenuously emphasizes some conceptual-semantic parameters, which are focused on within the frame of the *romantic love*: /+*dysphoric*/, /+*active-motivational*/ (instantiated as /*hostile-(self)aggressive*/), /+*high intensity*/, /-*control*/, /-*collective norm compatibility*/.

The dramatic isotopy of *mania love* from the above mentioned fragment points out a highly intensive form of conceptualizing romantic love, in the true spirit of the Romantic sensibility of the time.

3.3.2. *Brotherly Love*

Brotherly love is a fundamental conceptual dimension of LOVE, having as a salient supplementary semantic parameter the /*mutual*/ feature. This facet of love does not undergo important changes in the period under consideration, preserving its prominence within the cognitive affective pattern. Nevertheless, besides the old words, such as *prieten* [*friend*] – *prietenie* [*friendship*], the lexicon of *friendship* is diversified by new lexemes borrowed from French or Neo-Latin: *amic – amiciție.*

(6) „Toți patriciii aceştia era ***prietenii*** mei: îi ***iubeam***, răspundea cinstit la ***prieteşugul*** meu, am fost slujit, ne-am fost luptat împreună; ne-am fost amestecat lacrămile şi plăcerile noastre" (Heliade Rădulescu, 263)
"All these noblemen were my ***friends*****:** I ***loved*** them, they answered with honesty to my ***friendship***, we had served and fought together; we had shared our tears and pleasures".

3.3.3. *Collective Love* (*agapé*)

Collective love is a facet of LOVE highly valued and frequently lexicalized in the Old Romanian epoch. Closely connected to the religious feelings and beliefs, *agapé love* has the *other* as its object, the individuals as a collective being. It is the religious-Christian love, promoting the other's happiness and valuing the harmony of interpersonal relationships. This type of love is related to the collectivistic dimension of the (old) Romanian culture (see Stoica 2012, 2016a) that conceptualized the community as a large and complex macro-social structure, following a kinship pattern, in which the individual defines himself as a member of the group. In this context, *love* functions as an affective mechanism of social cohesion, consolidating the in-group interactions, towards cooperation, mutual understanding and support, solidarity and empathy.

In the process of transition towards modernity, this conceptual dimension of love remains active and lexicalized as such. Moreover, the traditional Christian ideal of altruistic love is being reinforced by the new modern, Western European philosophical concepts, like *philanthropy*, *solidarity*, *compassion*, etc. Consequently, new words and collocations appear: *filantrop / filantropie – iubitor de oameni, de om, de omenire* [*philanthropy*], together with its negative counterpart: *mizantrop – mizantropie* [*misanthropy*]:

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

(7) „N-aveați între voi ***unire***, / ***Unul p-altul să iubiți***, / Erați plini de ***pizmuire***/ Și de ***patimi*** stăpâniți" (Mumuleanu, 172)
"There was no ***solidarity*** between you, / To ***love each other***, / You were full of ***envy***/ And governed by ***passions***".

(8) „Îmi zic: ***urâtor de oameni*** și așa sunt. Dar, dacă eu ***urăsc*** oamenii, eu nu mă deosebesc dintr-această ***ură obștească***" (Negruzzi, II, 69)
"They call me a ***misanthrope*** and that's what I am. But, if I ***hate*** people, I am not apart of this ***collective***/***general hatred***".

3.3.4. *Hierarchical-Official Love*

Hierarchical-official love is a conceptual dimension frequently lexicalized in the Old Romanian times (see Stoica 2012: 357–360), referring to a specific type of affectively) marked interaction within the institutional hierarchy existent in the medieval period. It is a certain type of love that seems to frequently govern the relationship between the medieval ruler and the people/community; a hierarchical model of the emotional relationships can be thus noticed. This particular feature highlights the saliency of the collective dimension of the Romanian medieval cultural-anthropological pattern, the importance granted to the in-group solidarity, and also the public awareness and acknowledgement of the subordination to an authoritarian figure (the ruler). The community, perceived as a macro-social structure, is configured, in affective terms, similarly to the kinship micro-social structure (the family), governed, by default, by emotional mechanisms. Hence, the relationship between the ruler and his people is conceptualized following the pattern of a *father-son* relationship. Although less present in comparison with the old epoch, this facet of love is still active within the Early Modern period. A(n) (ideal) stratified-hierarchical model of social organization is preserved; the respect and the love for the ruler (the monarch) and, likewise, the monarch's respect and love for the people are perceived as traditional affective values, aimed at ensuring the social harmony and the good functioning of the community. Within this frame, *official-hierarchical love* becomes a form of *patriotism* (see, *infra*, **3.4.2.**).

(9) „s-au cunoscut la toți că domnul iaste înțelept, și blându, și bun, și ***iubeşte*** pă toți. Aşijderea și boiarii ***iubiia*** pe măriia-sa, văzând bunătatea și ***dragostea*** mării-sale" (RP 494)
"everybody knew that the ruler was wise, and kind, and good, and that he ***loved*** everyone. The boyards ***loved*** his highness as well, seeing his highness's kindness and ***love***"

(10) „Mihail, ce ni-i ***Părinte*** […] / Pe-a patriei tron s-așază în putere și *mărire*, / Cungiurat de-a sa lucoare și ***respectul umilit***,/ Dar mai mare ***slava***-i este a ***norodului iubire***!" (Asachi, 411)
"*Mihai* [the ruler], who is our ***Father*** […] / Sits on the country's thrown in greatness and *honour*, / Surrounded by his lightness and the ***humble respect***, / But the greatest ***honour*** is his ***people's love***".

3.3.5. *Filial-Parental Love*

Filial-parental love is another standard, "classical" facet of LOVE, diachronically constant, illustrating the specific kinship emotional relationship (father/mother – son/daughter). Related to the Old Medieval period, there is no conceptual and lexical innovation; the

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

conceptual frame is identical and also the counterpart lexemes: *iubi* [*to love*], *iubire, dragoste* [*love*]:

(11) „Sugetul piesei sunt sentimentele de respect, de evlavie, de ***iubire fiască***, de recunoştinţă şi de amor, care [...] sunt temeiul moralului" (Asachi, I, 481)
"The subject of the play is the feeling of respect, godliness, ***filial love***, gratefulness and love, which are the fundament of the morality"

(12) „Cât am fost cu voi în lume, / Aveam sfinte datorii / Cinstea mea către bărbatu-mi, / Şi ***dragostea către fii***" (Mumuleanu, 254)
"When I was with you in the world, / I used to have saint duties / The honour for my husband, / And the ***love for my sons***".

3.3.6. *Religious Love*

Religious love is a type of LOVE extremely important and intensively represented within the Old Romanian cultural setting. The sacred is a normal presence in individuals' everyday existence, as divinity is the supreme authority to which they refer. The relationship between the divine and the individual is, thus, subjectively evaluated and represented in affective terms (similarly, once again, to the relationships established within the family group: *father-son pattern*). The Love of God and for God is conceptualized as an euphoric, bidirectional feeling.

In the Early Modern Romanian epoch, this religious dimension remains salient. The new cultural ideas and values, promoted by the Enlightenment and the Romantic literature, fuse and overlap, in a particular coalescent symbiosis, with certain traditional principles deeply rooted in the collective mentality. Thus, the Romanian Enlightenment does not polemically oppose to the religious tradition, but, on the contrary, it leans on it. The religious feeling, the respect for the divinity (*frica de Dumnezeu – fear of God*), love for the others (*agapé*), and the Christian values, fundamental in the Old Medieval epoch, are still present, but associated with modern ideas of Western influence. Nevertheless, the texts of the time point out some new conceptual facets of religious love, beyond the Christian, traditional frame, illustrating a newer and broader conceptualization of the sacred; the designation is critically made in terms such as: *idololatrie* [*idolatry*], *idololatru* or *fanatism* [*fanaticism*]:

(13) „Am oarecare cuvânt că ***iubeşte*** pe altul [...] Cu Anah nu crez să fie tot aşa: ea ***iubeşte*** numai pe Dumnezeu" (Heliade Rădulescu, 159)
"I heard she ***loves*** someone else [...]. I don't think it is the same for Anah: she ***loves*** only God"

(14) „Omul nu este făcut dupe chipul lui Jehova? Dumnezeu ***n-a iubit*** pe acela ce l-a făcut? Noi îl imităm, şi împărtăşim ***dragostea***cu dânsul pentru aceea ce ***iubeşte*** el." (Heliade Rădulescu, 178)
"Isn't the man made by the Jehova's face and body? Did not God ***love*** the one He created? We imitate Him and we share the ***love*** with Him".

3.3.7. *Intellectual-Aesthetic Love*

Intellectual-aesthetic love is a conceptual facet of LOVE related to an inanimate, non-personal, abstract object/cause. The various instantiations of the *cause* parameter represent a factor of cultural and diachronic variation, shedding light on some elements of

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

the reality that could enhance forms of emotional attachment, intellectually or aesthetically justified. The aesthetic or intellectual appraisal remains secondary and subordinated to the primary, affective one. In the Early Modern period, new cultural and moral values become salient for the emotional appraisal and are promoted as such. On one hand there is love for the intellectual values: knowledge, science, culture (in more particular forms – love for poetry, music, books/reading, muses, learning, writing, etc.); on the other hand, there is love for moral values: truth, honesty, virtue, peace, (honest) work:

(15) „că nici un lucru nu este mai ***plăcut*** la un om decât ***muzica*** şi ***poezia***" (Mumuleanu, 82)
"there is nothing more ***pleasant*** for a man than ***music*** and ***poetry***"

(16) „Vie la noi ***iubirea*** de ***cinste***, ca să fim ***priiatini muzelor***" (Mumuleanu, 85)
"Let the ***love*** for ***honesty*** come to us, so we can be the ***muses' friends***".

3.3.8. *Concrete-Hedonic Love*

Concrete-hedonic love is the dimension of LOVE that focuses on the *hedonic* feature from its semantic script, having a *concrete* object-cause. The stimulus event is a concrete reality that triggers a basic concrete pleasure sensation. For the period under consideration, some particular variations of the *cause* parameter, culturally dependent, can be noticed, such as *entertainment, playing cards, social games, conversation*, or (rather frequent) *money*:

(17) „În ***cărți să se giaoge iubeşte*** / Şi că căştigă să făleşte" (PNP, 77-78)
"he ***loves to play cards*** / And he is proud of winning"

(18) „Al răului căpătâi […] Din ***iubirea de argint***" (Mumuleanu, 21)
"The head of the evil [..] / From the ***love of money***"

(19) „***Moneda*** e al lor ***amor***, / Şi alt nimic nu mai vor." (Mumuleanu, 156)
"The ***money*** is their ***love***/ And they don't want anything else".

Related to this new saliency of the emotional eliciting event, an associated emotion concept is focused on: *greed,* designated by new words, with a very precise meaning, such as: *avar – avariție* (glossed, in a text of the time, as: *avariție* (*iubire de argint*) "love for silver" 1818 FTM, 226), *cupid – cupiditate* [*greedy – greed*].

3.4. New Conceptual-Semantic Dimensions of *LOVE*

Besides the above mentioned conceptual dimensions of LOVE (with their diachronic variation of the prototypical semantic grid), the Early Modern texts record some new facets of LOVE, recently conceptualized and connected to the general dynamics of the historical and cultural context.

3.4.1. *Self-Love*

Prototypically, *love* is defined as a relational, hetero-oriented feeling, implying the compulsory relation to an exterior object/cause (see the definition in **3.1.**). The Early

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

Modern period brings forward the emphasis on the *individual-subjective* semantic parameter. The individuals' well-being and emotions and the personal subjectivity tend to be focused on, and, therefore, a new conceptualization of *love*, as a self-orientated feeling, is differentiated: *self-love.* Frequently this type of love is associated to another social moral emotion, *pride*, and from the overlapping of their specific semantic grids, new more refined and complex, secondary emotion concepts are conceptualized: *aroganță* [*arrogance*], *vanitate* [*vanity*], *orgoliu* [*self-esteem/pride*], *egoism* [*selfishness*]*, ambiție* [*ambition*] (for a detailed analysis, see Stoica 2017b). All these concepts refer to socially banished, criticized emotions, as opposed to *collective (agapé) love* or *patriotism.* Nevertheless, the salient conceptual feature of all these new emotions is the fact that the focus on the /*individual-subjective*/ (/*norm-self compatibility*/) parameter does not alter or cancel the complementary semantic /*social-collective*/ (/*norm-collective compatibility*/) dimension, prototypically specific to the moral emotions under consideration. The new facets of love point out a self-oriented feeling, but mandatory related to a social-moral collective entity (the community). This hybrid conceptual-semantic representation of love highlights a general characteristic of the Romanian cultural-anthropological pattern of the period of transition towards modernity: it remains rooted into the traditional values, still valuing an interdependent, collective construal of the self, as well as the respect for the social hierarchies and the religious norms. The emotional conceptualisation testifies a dynamic coalescent tension between a traditional, collectivistic cultural pattern and a modern, innovative, subjective-individual one:

(20) „***Ruşine*** pentru țara ce totul nu jertfeşte, / Când pacea-i, libertatea-i îi este la mijloc. / *Amar*, când ***egoismul***, ce-n inimi locuieşte, / Îi dictă laşitatea" (PNP, 25)
"***Shame*** for the country that do not sacrifice all, / When its peace, its freedom is at stake./ *Bitterness,* when ***selfishness*** that lives in the hearts, / Imposes its cowardice".

(21) „o damă groasă [...] ave ochii țântiți cu lăcomii la mine […]. Dar cu un tainic ***santiment de iubire de sine****,* făcându-mă să ieu lucrul în favorul meu, mi-am dizvălit grumazii cum am putut mai bine, sârguindu-mă a mă arăta cel mai bine ce să va putea" (Negruzzi, II, 92)
"a lady […] was greedily staring at me […] But with a ***feeling of self-love****,* making me think about it like a compliment, I uncovered my neck, trying to look as attractive as possible".

3.4.2. *Patriotic Love*

Patriotic love represents a particular dimension of LOVE (Stoica 2012: 342–345), which is present in the affective conceptualization of the Old Medieval period, but without representing a distinctive, clearly delineated and defined affective concept. The instantiation of this facet of *love* is not very frequent. When it does happen, *love of country* is represented rather as a *filial-parental love* or as an *official-hierarchical love*, the subject of emotion being, most of the times, the medieval ruler, whereas the object is *țara* [*country*], vaguely and non-discriminatorily perceived both as the community/people and the inhabited territory:

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

(22) „Mihai Racoviță-voevoda viind în scaon în Ieşi [...] să arăta ***cu mare dragoste*** şi blândeţe ***ţărâi***. *Ţara* încă să bucura, căci era moldovan"(IN 282)
"King Mihai Racoviță, taking the throne in Iaşi [...] showed ***a deep love*** and kindness to the ***country***. And the ***country*** rejoiced, because he was a Moldavian"

(23) „Vază dară fietecine şi cunoască chiverniseala şi bunătatea ***iubitorului*** acestuia ***dă a sa patrie domnu***"(CM II, 194);
"So let anyone know the organization skills and kindness of this *king,* ***who deeply loves his country***".

Love of country gains salience starting with the Early Modern period, as the new Western European cultural model of the Enlightenment is gradually inserted into the Romanian space and mentality. The importance granted to the so-called moral emotions (see Reddy 2009, Haidt 2002), promoted by the Enlightenment philosophy, represents a fundamental feature of the affectivity of the time. The positive moral emotions (among them: patriotism, sympathy, friendship, benevolence, gratitude, loyalty, faithfulness, etc.), indicating general human virtues and aimed at ensuring social cohesion and unity, are pointed out in the philosophical and literary writings of the time (Reddy 2009: 307–308); in this way, they become an instrument for educating and stimulating the collective sensibility.

This specific affectivity emerges also within the Romanian cultural space. *Patriotism* is conceptualized and lexicalized in intensive and specific terms (*patriotism, iubire de țară/ neam, naționalism* [*patriotism*], *patriot, naționalist* [*patriot*]), related to the idea of nation/nationality and subordinated to an ethical and cultural goal. The texts of the period record various fragments, where patriotism is connected to some new concepts, which now become salient and lexicalized: *patrie* [*country*]*, națiune* [*nation*]*, compatriot, patriot* [*compatriot*]*, societate* [*society*]*, limbă națională* [*national language*] (see also Drace-Francis 2006). Rather frequently, *patriotism* is contextually associated – in complex affective isotopies – to other emotional concepts, salient within the (Early) Modern Romanian period: *collective happiness*, *national pride*, *religious and collective love,* or, in a critical manner, the *shame* of acknowledging one's nationality (*ruşinea de a se numi român – the shame of calling oneself a Romanian* – ex. 25 below):

(24) „trebuie să ne împuternicim şi să judecăm care sunt ***datoriile unui bun patriot*** [...]; şi aşa, ***toți de obşte***, depărtând de la noi cele rele fapte şi îmbrățişând pe cele bune [...], să ridicăm ***mâini rugătoare*** către *milostivul părintele ceresc*, să ne înderepteze spre drumul ***fericilor***, şi să cerem tot chipul de ajutor de la preînălțatul nostru domn [...], ca *să putem urma cele mai nainte zisă foloase către nație*, căci, cum am mai zis: în ***fericirea obştii*** ne vom găsi fieşcare în parte şi pre a sa" (Golescu, 85).
"We must strengthen ourselves and judge which are the ***duties of a good patriot*** [...] And so, rejecting everything that is bad and embracing the good, let us ***all together*** [...] raise our ***praying hands*** to the *merciful divine father*, to guide us on the pursuit of ***happiness*** and to ask for his help [...] so we can achieve the *good things useful for the nation*, because, as I said: in the ***happiness of the community*** we shall find our own".

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

(25) „Toate neamurile au ***națională mândrie***. Englezii ***se mândresc*** întru înțelepciunea lor, franțezii în duhul lor şi nemții în filosofia lor, toți au ***iubirea de sineşi*** şi învăț limbile lor, iar noi, necunoscând această ***națională mândrie,*** am lăsat de tot în nebăgare de seamă limba noastră [...]. Râvnă numai de ***patriotism*** şi ***mândrie națională*** să între între noi ş-atunci toate nevoirile ni să vor părea lesnicioase. Neamurile ***să mândresc*** şi ***are cinste*** a zice portogalezul că e portogal şi danimarchezul că e danimarc, iar noi, în starea care ne aflăm, ***să ne fie ruşine a ne mai numi români***? La această stare ajunge neamul cel ce pierde ***mândria națională*** şi ***râvna de patriotism***. Acest scump şi neprețuit lucru de tot s-au pierdut de la noi. Mult mai mult ***patriotism*** era întru moşii şi strămoşii noştri [...]. Mult mai bună era învățătura lor, căci era plini de ***râvnă către Dumnezeu*** şi ***entusiasiți de patriotism, simțirea ce mai sfântă. Preafericiți***, aceştia strămoşi ai noştri, pentru ***dragostea ce avea pentru Dumnezeu, către patrie şi către neam***" (Mumuleanu, 89–90).

"All the nations have ***national pride***. Englishmen are ***proud*** of their wisdom, Frenchmen of their spirit and Germans of their philosophy; all have their ***self-love*** and learn their languages, while we, unaware of this ***national pride***, we neglected our language [...]. Let the eagerness for ***patriotism*** and ***national pride*** come to us and then all the problems will seem easier to face. The nations are ***proud*** and it's an ***honour*** for a Portuguese to say he is Portuguese, for a Dane to say he is Dane, and we, in the state we are now, ***are ashamed to call ourselves Romanians***? This is what happens to the people that lose their ***national pride*** and eagerness to ***patriotism***. This precious and invaluable thing is completely lost for us. Our ancestors had more ***patriotism*** [...] because they were ***full of eagerness for God*** and moved by ***patriotism, the most sacred of all the feelings***. They were most ***happy,*** our ancestors, for they had ***love for God, for the country and for the nation***".

4. CONCLUSIONS

The undertaken case study confirmed the initial premise: emotions are complex cognitive and cultural phenomena, diachronically variable, according to the mutations of the general cultural and historical background. Their lexicalization and their meanings in context encode a specific conceptual grid, which can be accessed using the methodological tools of the linguistic analysis, correlated to certain key-concepts of some complementary disciplines: cultural anthropology, (cognitive) psychology, or cultural history.

Love is a polymorphic, hyper conceptualized feeling in the Old and Early Modern Romanian period, central within the cognitive-affective model of the time, as pointed out by the contextual analysis of its specific lexicon. *Love* represents an exponential case for the general changes that emerge in the social and cultural Romanian life and in the collective mentality and sensibility at the beginning of the modern age. There is a dynamic shift in the conceptualization of emotions from an old, traditional, less refined model to a new, modern, more complex and refined one; new concepts are valued and focused on. The modernity emphasizes the highly intensive individual-subjective sensibility, and, at the

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

same time, the moral, social-collective emotions. These complementary facets of the affectivity, contiguously overlapping within the period under consideration, are highlighted by the particular case of love. On the one hand, there is an arousal of the passionate romantic love, as a deeply individual and intense feeling – frequently associated with *romantic jealousy, anger, sadness* or *fear* –, and also the new conceptualization of the self-oriented love (hence, focusing the individual's emotional well-being). On the other hand, pre-existing collective-social, moral emotions (*religious love, agapé love, love of country*) – focusing the (in-)group emotional well-being – are reinforced and reshaped in the terms of the new ideas of the Enlightenment or of the modern history (*patriotism, philanthropy, sympathy, empathy, solidarity, collective happiness*), sometimes in opposition to the self-oriented love, socially banned (*selfishness, ambition, misanthropy*).

From a conceptual-semantic point of view, the saliency of a new cognitive-affective pattern triggers diachronic variation of the prototypical semantic parameters of LOVE. The standard representation of the conceptual frame is reconfigured, as certain semantic dimensions become salient or focal within the specific historical and cultural context. The particular facet of romantic love is relevant, as it tends to be conceptualized as *passion* (*mania love*), according to the general changes undergone within the sensibility of the period. This entails an alteration of the prototypical *euphoric* feature, *romantic love* conveying, at the same time, a highly *dysphoric* dimension. Also, other semantic parameters are emphasized, reshaping the prototypical schemata of LOVE: /+*intensity* (maximal)/, /-*control*/, /+*expressive-extroversion*/, /+ *active-motivational* (+*aggressive*)/.

Emotions are culture-dependent and diachronically dynamic; the emotional lexicon is the linguistic marker of these characteristics. By analysing the (contextualized) emotion words, specific to a particular historical and cultural setting and used as a communicative and expressive tool within a certain community, important mutations that occur in the conceptualization of emotional life (across culture and time) can be highlighted.

SOURCES

Asachi, Gheorghe, *Opere*, I–II, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1973, 1981.
Bălăcescu, Costache, *O bună educaţie*, in: *Primii noştri dramaturgi*, Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură şi artă, 1960, 91–144.
CM – *Cronicari munteni*, I–II, Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură, 1961.
Conachi, C., *Scrieri alese*, Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură, 1963.
Golescu, Dinicu, *Scrieri*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1990.
EA – *Istoria lui Erotocrit cu Aretusa*, in: *Cărţile populare în literatura românească*, II, Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură, 1963, 27–85.
FTM – Fénelon, *Întâmplările lui Telemah*, translation from Italian made by Petru Maior, Buda, 1818.
Heliade Rădulescu, Ion, *Traduceri: Teatru*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1985.
IN – Neculce, Ion, *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1982.
Mumuleanu, Barbu Paris, *Scrieri*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1972.
Negruzzi, Costache, *Opere*, I–III, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1974–1986.
PM – *Istoria lui Poliţion şi a Militinei*, Bucureşti, Fundaţia Naţională pentru Ştiinţă şi Artă, 2003.
PNP – *Primii noştri poeţi*, Bucureşti, Editura Tineretului, 1963.
RP – *Istoriile domnilor Tărîi Rumâneşti de Radu Popescu*, in: *Cronicari munteni*, I, Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură, 1961, 227–577.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

REFERENCES

Arnold, M. B., 1960, *Emotion and Personality*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Averill, J. R., 1980, "A constructivist view of emotion", in: R. Plutchik, H. Kellerman (eds), *Emotion: Theory, Research and Experience*, vol. I. New York, Academic Press, 305–339.

Boquet, D., 2010, "Faire l'histoire des émotions à l'âge des passions", online http://emma.hypotheses.org/1106

Courbin, A., J.-J. Courtine, G. Vigarello (eds), 2016, *Histoire des émotions*, I–II, Paris, Seuil.

Drace-Francis, Al., 2006, *The Making of Modern Romanian Culture. Literacy and the Development of National Identity*, Taurus Academic Studies, Londra, New York.

Ellsworth, Ph., 1997, "Sense, Culture, and Sensibility", in: Sh. Kitayama, H. R. Markus (eds), *Emotion and Culture. Empirical Studies of Mutual Influences,* Washington, American Psychological Association, 23–50.

Fontaine, J. R., Y. H. Poortinga, B. Setiadi, S. S. Markam, 2002, "Cognitive Structure of Emotion Terms in Indonesian and The Netherlands", *Cognition and Emotion,* 16, 1, 61–86.

Fontaine, J. F. R., K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano (eds), 2013, *Components of Emotional Meaning. A Sourcebook,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Frevert, U., 2011, *Emotions in History. Lost and Found*, Budapest, CEU Press.

Frevert, U., 2014, "Defining Emotions: Concepts and Debates over Three Centuries", in: U. Frevert *et al.*, *Emotional Lexicons. Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700–2000*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1–31.

Frevert, U. *et al.*, 2014, *Emotional Lexicons. Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700–2000*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Frijda, N., 1986, *The Emotions,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Frijda, N. H., K. R. Scherer, 2009, "Emotion Definition (Psychological Perspectives)", in: D. Sander, K. R. Scherer (eds), *Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 142–143.

Haidt, J., 2002, "The Moral Emotions", in: R. J. Davidson, H. H. Goldsmith, K. R. Scherer (eds), *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 852–870.

Harré, R. (ed), 1986, *The Social Construction of Emotions*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Hendrick, C., S. A. Hendrick, 1986, "A Theory and Method of Love", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392–402.

Hofstede, G., 1984, *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage, Beverly Hills.

James, W., 1884, "What is an Emotion?", *Mind*, 9, 188–205.

Kelley, H. H., 1983, "Love and Commitment", in: H. H. Kelley *et al.* (eds), *Close Relationships*, San Francisco, Freeman, 265–316.

Keltner, D., K. Oatley, J. M. Jenkins, 2014, *Understanding Emotions,* New York, Wiley.

Kemper, Th. D., 1978, *A Social Interaction Theory of Emotions,* New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, John-Wiley and Sons.

Kövecses, Z., 1990, *Emotion Concepts,* Berlin, Springer-Verlag.

Kövecses, Z., 2004, *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambdridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z., 2010, "Metaphor and Emotion", in: Jr. Gibbs, W. Raymond (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, 380–396.

Kövecses, Z., G. B. Palmer, 1999, "Language and Emotion Concepts: What Experientialists and Social Constructivists have in common", in: G. B. Palmer, D. J. Occhi (eds), *Language of Sentiment: Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 237–262.

Lakoff, G., Z. Kövecses, 1987, "The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English", in: N. Quinn, D. Holland (eds), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 195–221.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

Lee, A. J., 1988, "Love-Styles", in: R. J. Sternberg, M. L. Barnes (eds), *The Psychology of Love*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 38–67.
Levy, R.I., 1984, "The Emotions in Comparative Perspective", in: K. R. Scherer, P. Ekman (eds), *Approches to Emotion*, Hillsdale, New Jersey, Erlbaum, 397–412.
Luhrmann, T. M., 2006, "Subjectivity", *Anthropological Theory*, 6, 3, 16–18.
Lutz, C. A., 1988, *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and their Challenge to Western Theory*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
Lutz, C., G. M. White, 1986, "The Anthropology of Emotions", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, 405–436.
Markus, H. R., S. Kitayama, 1997, "The Cultural Shaping of Emotion: A Conceptual Framework", in: S. Kitayama, H. R. Markus (eds), *Emotion and Culture. Empirical Studies of Mutual Influences*, Washington, American Psychological Association, 339–351.
Matt, S. J., P. N. Stearns (eds), 2014, *Doing Emotion History*, Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, University of Illinois Press.
Mesquita, B., 2002, "Emotions as Dynamic Cultural Phenomena", in: R. J. Davidson, H. H. Goldsmith, K. R. Scherer (eds), *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 871–890.
Mesquita, B., N. H. Frijda, K. Scherer, 1997, "Culture and Emotion", in: *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, vol. 2., *Basic Processes and Developmental Psychology*, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 255–297.
Nagy, P., D. Boquet, 2008, "Émotions historiques, émotions historiennes", *Écrire l'histoire*, 2, 15–26.
Nagy, P., D. Boquet, 2009, "Pour une histoire des émotions. L'historien face aux questions contemporaines", in: P. Nagy, D. Boquet (eds), *Le sujet des émotions au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1–51.
Nagy, P., D. Boquet (eds), 2009, *Le sujet des émotions au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Beauchesne.
Oatley, K., 1993, "Social Construction in Emotions", in: M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland (eds), *Handbook of Emotions*, New York, Guilford, 341–352.
Ogarkova, A., 2013, "Folk Emotion Concepts: Lexicalization of Emotional Experiences across Languages and Cultures", in: J. F. R. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano (eds), *Components of Emotional Meaning. A Sourcebook*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 46–62.
Rastier, F., 1994, *Sémantique pour l'analyse*, Paris, Masson.
Rastier, F. (coord), 1995, *L'analyse thématique des données textuelles. L'exemple des sentiments*, Paris, Didier Éditions.
Reddy, W. M., 2001, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Reddy, W., 2009, "Historical Research on the Self and Emotions", *Emotion Review,* 1, 4, 302–315.
Rosenwein, B. H., 2002, "Worrying about Emotions in History", *American Historical Review*, 107, 821–845.
Rosenwein, B. H., 2006, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, New York, Cornell University Press.
Rosenwein, B. H., 2010, "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions", *Passions in Context: Journal of the History and Philosophy of the Emotion*, 1, on line: http://www.passionsincontext.de/index.php?id=557
Russell, J. A., 1983, "Pancultural Aspects of the Human Conceptual Organization of Emotions", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 6, 1281–1288.
Russell, J., 1991, "Culture and the Categorization of Emotion", *Psychological Bulletin,* 110, 3, 426–450.
Russell, J. A., M. Lewicka, T. Niit, 1989, "A Cross-Cultural Study of a Circumplex Model of Affect", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 848–856.
Scherer, K. R., 2001, "Appraisal Considered as a Process of Multilevel Sequential Checking", in: K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr, T. Johnstone (eds), *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*, New York, Oxford University Press, 92–120.
Scherer, K., 2005, "What are emotions and how can they be mesured?", *Social Science Information*, 44, 4, 695–729.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)

Scherer, K., 2013, "Measuring the Meaning of Emotion Words: a Domain-Specific Componential Approach", in: J. F. R. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano (eds), *Components of Emotional Meaning. A Sourcebook*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 7–30.

Scherer, K. R., P. C. Ellsworth, 2003, "Appraisal Processes in Emotion", in: R. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, H. H. Goldsmith (eds), *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, New York, Oxford University Press, 572–595.

Shaver, P., J. Schwartz, D. Kirson, C. O'Connor, 1987, "Emotion Knowledge: Further Explorations of a Prototype Approach", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1061–1086.

Shaver, P. R., S. Wu, J. C. Schwartz, 1992, "Cross-Cultural Similarities and Differences in Emotion and its Representation", in: M. S. Clark (ed), *Emotion: Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, Newbury Park, CA, Sage, 175–213.

Soriano, C., 2013, "Linguistic Theories of Lexical Meaning", in: J. F. R. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano (eds), *Components of Emotional Meaning. A Sourcebook*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 63–81.

Stearns, P. N, C. Z. Stearns, 1985, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards", *The American Historical Review*, 90, 4, 813–836.

Sternberg, R. J., 1986, "A Triangular Theory of Love", *Psychological Review*, 93, 119–135.

Stoica, G., 2012, *Afect şi afectivitate. Conceptualizare şi lexicalizare în româna veche*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Stoica, G., 2015, *Modele ale afectivităţii în cultura română premodernă (1780–1840)*, Bucureşti, Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române.

Stoica, G., 2016a, "The Romanian Cultural-Anthropological Pattern and the Expression of Emotions. Some Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects", *Finish Journal for Romanian Studies*, 2, 109–125.

Stoica 2016b, „Dragostea romantic-erotică în cultura română premodernă. Analiză contextual-semantică", *Analele Ştiinţifice ale Universităţii "Ovidius"*, 27, 2, *In honorem Petre Gheorghe Bârlea*, 519–536.

Stoica, G., 2017a, „Din istoria unui concept afectiv: *invidie/gelozie.* Analiză lexico-semantică", in: L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, M.-V. Constantinescu, G. Stoica (eds), *Limbaj – discurs – stil. Omagiu Mariei Cvasnîi Cătănescu*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 331–354.

Stoica, G., 2017b, „*Mândrie* şi *dragoste de sine*: ipostaze conceptuale noi în epoca română (pre)modernă. Analiză lexico-semantică", in: A. Dragomirescu, Al. Nicolae, C. Stan, R. Zafiu (eds), *Sintaxa ca mod de a fi. Omagiu doamnei profesoare Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, la aniversare*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 387–400.

Triandis, H.C., 1997, "Major Cultural Syndromes and Emotion", in: Sh. Kitayama, H. R. Markus (eds), *Emotion and Culture. Empirical Studies of Mutual Influences*, Washington, American Psychological Association, 285–306.

BDD-A27743 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-31 01:16:43 UTC)