

LEGE ARTIS

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. VIII. No 1 2023 (Special issue)

'LOVE' IS ALL YOU NEED: AN ATTEMPT AT CRITICAL CONCEPTUAL ACCOUNT

Iryna Pinich 

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Kyiv, Ukraine

Södertörn University, Stockholm, Sweden

Received: 20.02.2023 **Reviewed:** 25.02.2023 and 28.02.2023

Similarity Index: 2%

Bibliographic description: Pinich, I. (2023). 'Love' is all you need: An attempt at critical conceptual account. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, VIII (1), Special issue, p. 92-109. ISSN 2453-8035 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.23.8.1.07>

Abstract: The paper claims a cyclic evolvement of the multidimensional concept LOVE incurred by gradual changes in the degree of salience of critical parameters that the construal of love involves. A comprehensive account of modifications in the concept organization invites an alternative set of tools for emotion knowledge processing. Therefore, the aptness of configuration space as a tool for the analysis of concept elaborateness is tested with the purpose to establish a valid system of parameters profiling the cognized experience of various kinds of love.

Keywords: multidimensional concept, LOVE, configuration space, operational space, parameters.

*Peace among men, waveless calm at sea,
Rest from winds, slumber for our grief.
(Plato ca. 385–370 B.C.E.)*

1. Introduction

In the times of persistent displeasure, tension, and disdain, LOVE as discussed in Plato's Symposium (ca. 385–370 B.C.E./1991) stands out as a vulnerable and antiquated phenomenon long-awaiting for its recognition, praise, and glory. The contextual evolvement of the concept displayed in Diotima's ladder of love (ibid.) delivers an abstraction over the development of one's individual feelings from a sensual desire to revelation, wisdom, and contemplation of sublime beauty. In the view of Modern Epistemology, though, the interconnections between individual and collective emotional forces, both self-serving and self-giving, enable social and political processes on a global scale (Athanasidou et al. 2008). Therefore, among 'affective disruptions' mobilizing changes in the society (See further Schutze et al. 2022), there is an urge for temperance and justice which epitomize love and cement 'affective milieus' to secure stability, sustainable development, and flourishing.



The need for knowledge and practice in realizing the art of love (Fromm 1956) yields the revision of the concept and further cultivation of unity in the disintegrated society. The virtuous feeling put on the world's agenda by researchers must bring the forgotten emotional experience of respect, harmony, beauty, and truth to the fore of scholarly and overall international concerns to keep in check the contemptuous sway of malice and to broadcast the most humane feeling of love.

There is little denial that fundamental linguistic studies on the concept LOVE (Kövecses 1991a; 1991b; 2004: 26-29; Panasenko 2012; 2013a; 2013b; Wierzbicka 1992: 143-147; 2019) substantiate representative and formative value of emotional language in the concept construal and discourse coherence. Nevertheless, numerous incarnations of the experience find their elucidation predominantly in the study of romantic feelings, whereas other kinds of love are frequently an object of philosophical, psychological, theological, and sociological interdisciplinary research (see Enright et al. 2022; Koprowski 2014; Tan 2021: 89-105). That notwithstanding, the most recent historical account of agapeic LOVE by Wierzbicka (2019) unveils putative dynamics of the concept evolvement from a preferential to an all-embracing one fostered by the biblical discourse.

We would like to go further by assuming the cyclic nature of the concept evolvement attended by contextual changes defining the categories that hold the concept together within a particular period of history. The formative categories come to the fore and fade away or dissolve in the course of the concept existence. The far-reaching implications of the claim seek an in-depth analysis of multiple discourses at different stages of language development, an endeavor that by far exceeds the goal of the paper. The current aim therefore is to demonstrate the viability of the hypothesis and introduce an alternative tool for analyzing the rises and falls of concrete conceptual aspects of LOVE in all the grandeur of its all-consuming nature.

In what follows the study claims that 'love is essentially a matter of ideas' (Solomon 2016: 6) and the essence of love although has experiential and libidinal roots is shaped and defined discursively, conceived of and cultivated through the ideas. The ideas, which get reified in the realms both perceptible by senses and transmitted in language signs, build up the structures of the conceptual system, manifest themselves and get sedimented in conventional language means.

Thus, the paper's core objectives involve: 1) establishing regularities in metaphorical conceptualization of LOVE via a simultaneous analysis of critical literature and a corpus-based study; 2) elaborating on an alternative comprehensive approach for the concept analysis that applies to different kinds of love and transcends the linear perspective of cognitive modelling; 3) introducing the tools of configuration and operational space for a higher-level abstraction over the nature of LOVE; 4) setting a preliminary inventory of parameters for construing an operational space of a particular case of emotional experience. The material under analysis is retrieved from the Corpus of Early Modern English Texts (CLMET 3.1) and covers the period between the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 20th century. A random choice of nine fictional texts, three printed at the end of the 18th century, three in the middle of the 19th, and three at the beginning of the 20th century is called to provide objective results of the analysis. All texts are in the electronic format suitable for further computer analysis of concordances containing the term *love*.

The theoretical point of departure in unveiling the archeology of the concept is the Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory (see Kövecses 2020), which claims a connection between the influential contextual factors and the schematicity of the concept. According to the theory, a "contextualist view" (ibid., 116) involves four relevant types of context that shape the concept in discourse: (i) the situational context, including the physical environment, the social situation, and the cultural situation; (ii) the discourse context, including the surrounding discourse, and the knowledge of the conceptualizers; (iii) the conceptual-cognitive context which encompasses the metaphorical conceptual system, the ideology, knowledge about past events, and interests and concerns; and (iv) the bodily context, which assumes the influence of bodily conditions.

The paper argues the power of metaphorical and metonymic roots of the concept LOVE which aid the process of cognizing the abstract notion. Thus, like many other notions regarded as non-figurative, and despite the literal meanings of love, the understanding of true love, self-giving love, maternal love, or patriotic love is primarily facilitated by metaphorical correspondences. These correspondences highlight mappings between the source and target domains, similar to those observed in the psychological literature, such as the connection between passionate love and drugs, or companionate love and growing vines (see Haidt 2006: 125).

Nevertheless, the extensive power of LOVE positioning it as an 'axial' ideologeme (see Pinich 2020: 22) strands out from source domains inputs which themselves pertain to abstract categories and establish their own conceptual systems with both abstract and non-abstract source domains. This intrinsic feature

of the concept calls for a qualitative analysis of the metaphorical range of LOVE to come up with an alternative, holistic view of emotion construal encompassing every possible manifestation of love.

2. An overarching understanding of love

Integrative properties of LOVE derive in the multitude of relations the concept manages to embrace. A lexicological account of the term evinces that the very range of meanings the word possesses extends from adoration towards God and affection arising out of kinship or friendship to sexual attraction or desire, strong predilection, and intense emotional attachment to something (*American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language; Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary; Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus; Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online*). The semantics equally regards the lover and the object of affection or emotional attachment, thus expanding the focus of experience from intrasubjective to interobjective (see Sammut et al. 2010) metonymically.

From a psychological perspective, most theories of emotions: cognitive (Scherer 1999), biological (Damasio & Carvalho 2013), and social-constructionist (Russell & Barret 1999) agree on a number of key ontological characteristics of emotions that involve three major scopes: objectivity, experientiality, and purposiveness/consequentiality. A componential profile of romantic love, though, as suggested in Sternberg's triangular theory of love (1986) in the view of the author himself only narrows down the understanding of the feeling. Originally, intimacy, passion, and commitment which form the metaphorical vertices of the tripartite model, even with a significant componential extension by behavioural systems of attachment, caregiving, and sex (Mikulincer & Shaver 2019) still leave the model biased.

An attempt at compensating for the deficiency of the triangular structure that is undertaken in the duplex theory of love (Sternberg 2006) aims at espousing the discursive aspects of the concept construction. The dynamism of the concept evolution is also aided by the modifying potency of wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized (WICS) which are argued to favour the trajectories of the components of the feeling over time. Thus, the multidimensional view of the phenomenon produces a comprehensive model of love that takes the shape of a prism, but metaphorically secludes the feeling within itself as a purely internalistic experience measured according to its intrinsic properties and a degree of compatibility with other triangles, stories, and styles of thinking.

In philosophy, nonetheless, despite the recognition of extensive individualization of love severed from authority, sciences, techniques, arts (Barthes 1977: 2) and a large-scale commodification of the feeling

(Fromm 1956: 87) which metaphorically undergoes the procedures of investment, accounting, and receipt of dividends; an ever-growing cleavage between the romantic feeling and unmeasurable parental, compassionate or agapeic love is being bridged by novel approaches to the phenomenon. The declaration of the motivational force of love driving evolutionary changes (Burunat 2016), boosting individual cognitive skills and knowledge production in communal epistemic practices (Candiotto 2018), and cultivating cultural evolution (Pape 1997) forefronts the definitive nature of love in sense production and social construction.

Similarly, a cognitive account of LOVE evinces an integral view of the concept. Thus, a finite number of inherent concepts central to the conceptual structure of ROMANTIC LOVE such as, AFFECTION, ENTHUSIASM, INTEREST, INTIMACY, and LONGING, is believed to be complemented by other related concepts extending beyond the core of the network (Kövecses 1986: 74). Among the latter are not only LIKING and SEXUAL DESIRE but also RESPECT, ADMIRATION, DEVOTION, KINDNESS, CARING, ATTACHMENT, and FRIENDSHIP. Each of the related concepts is linked to LOVE to a different extent highlighting different facets of emotional experience associated with love. Furthermore, when causal emotions (HAPPINESS or ANGUISH) are admitted in the network, it becomes even more wide-spread exhibiting a pre-wired nature of love and its ubiquitous character.

In the view of contemporary revision of the concept LOVE, and heading beyond solely in-body experiential understanding of the metaphorical interpretation of reality, a conceptual network matrix of LOVE should provide an all-pervasive account of the matter that permeates the space in three relative dimensions: *directionality*, *perceptuality*, and *intentionality* (See Table 1).

Table 1. Configuration space parameters for the conceptual matrix of LOVE
Source: Own processing (Pinich 2020)

CONCEPT DIMENSIONS								
DIRECTIONALITY			PERCEPTUALITY			INTENTIONALITY		
PROFILES & PARAMETERS								
DYNAMISM	AGENTIVITY	SELECTIVITY	AFFECTABILITY	BENEFICIALITY	ACTIONALITY	PROCESSUALITY	CAUSALITY	EVENTUALITY
<i>inwardness</i> ∴ <i>outwardness</i>	<i>person</i> ∴ <i>community</i>	<i>electiveness</i> ∴ <i>inclusiveness</i>	<i>enjoyment</i> ∴ <i>distress</i>	<i>egotism</i> ∴ <i>altruism</i>	<i>everyday occurrence</i> ∴ <i>remarkable occasion</i>	<i>activity</i> ∴ <i>passivity</i>	<i>romanticism</i> ∴ <i>pragmatism</i>	<i>imagination</i> ∴ <i>reality</i>
<i>closeness</i> ∴ <i>distance</i>	<i>antagonism</i> ∴ <i>unity</i>	<i>reciprocity</i> ∴ <i>alienation</i>	<i>happiness</i> ∴ <i>un-happiness</i>	<i>advantage</i> ∴ <i>mercy</i>	<i>perturbability</i> ∴ <i>imperturbability</i>	<i>goal pursuit</i> ∴ <i>succumbence to Providence</i>	<i>benevolence</i> ∴ <i>care</i>	<i>worldliness</i> ∴ <i>divinity</i>
<i>self-∴ multi-directionality</i>	<i>complementarity</i> ∴ <i>entirety</i>	<i>equality</i> ∴ <i>inequality</i>	<i>gradation</i> ∴ <i>moderation</i>	<i>conditionality</i> ∴ <i>unconditionality</i>	<i>manifestation</i> ∴ <i>disguise</i>		<i>construction</i> ∴ <i>destruction</i>	<i>existence</i> ∴ <i>expectation</i>

Each of the dimensions is a dynamic complex framework that provides for generating and arranging the knowledge of perceptual experience towards the object of affection accompanied by infatuation of constructive/destructive nature.

Directionality of love makes one of the major profiles of the concept and assumes *dynamism* of self-transcendent experience, *agentivity*, and *selectivity* (conscious or subconscious). *Perceptuality* yields a physiological response of emotional experience through which the emotion is felt while concurrently discovered through its associated thoughts, beliefs, desires, and / or actions. And *intentionality* anchors teleologicalness of relation between love, the elements of the system (an individual's body and their behaviour), and affairs in the world in their concurrent concept construction and modification.

The system of parameters for each of the dimensions is complex and is schematically presented in the form of oppositions that indicate the span of possible meanings the concept can be construed through. Case specific combinations of relevant parameters outline an operational space of a particular experience of love or a different kind of love. Every dimension is consistently expounded on in the following sections through the analysis of defining categories within the scope of love.

3. The abundant generosity of love: The category of directionality

The expansion of LOVE in its metaphorical manifestations within a complex conceptual system is argued to arise from the lack of its specific source domains and the source input obtained in other domains similarly to the concept FRIENDSHIP or LIFE (Kövecses 1995). Consequently, the fluidity of the system engenders an embrace of or overlaps with other domains providing for the fuzziness of the concept boundaries. Consider such source domains as UNITY, CLOSENESS/INTIMACY, BOND, INVESTMENT or NUTRIENT (Kövecses 2004: 27-28), which make metaphorical systems themselves, to further encompass domains of ATTRIBUTED STATE, EVENT, COMPLEX STRUCTURE, and POSITIVE/NEGATIVE EVALUATION as well as OBJECT, VALUABLE COMMODITY, PLANT, MACHINE, BUILDING, HEAT, and LIVING ORGANISM (ibid.).

Findings of a prototypical approach to the folk concept of LOVE also claim the fuzziness within the subcategories of love, such as romantic love, maternal love, affection or friendship, each of which carrying the likeness to the overall pattern but observing no clear-cut boundaries separating them from each other or even from non-members (Fehr & Russel 1991: 427). What adds to the complexity of cognizing the phenomenon is the lack of borderline between the features of love, the object of love, and other related experiences. Such syncretism could be tentatively attributed to the chain structure of

conceptual complexes (Vygotsky 2012: 23-125) with changeable organizing principles in their evolution.

An alternative to the "definitional" view of concepts (Saeed 2016: 34) is the idea of conceptual archetypes which are positioned as "anchors in constructing our mental world" (see Langacker 2009: 12) and make the experientially grounded gestalt-like formations, fundamental and multifarious in their nature. LOVE, among others, makes a hardwired system which arises as a natural occurrence in both the physical and spiritual interconnection with the world. Yet, it is also a pre-wired system shaped and modified in the course of socialization and defined discursively with value and attitude dissemination across different texts.

The fluidity of the system can be traced in the dynamics of its salient aspects (type of love, object of love, features of love, relative concepts, etc.) in their tangible interplay with mental, biological, environmental, and social factors. The metaphorical construal of love as a system, therefore, assumes that it can be viewed as an environment that fills and penetrates dimensions and objects inhabiting it.

An efficient tool for the study of love's penetrating power, volatility, and fluidity is its inherent property of *directionality*. The category establishes the entirety of the configuration space of LOVE, its objects/subjects in their interconnection (for the nature of directionality see Cooper 2021). A close study of metaphorical expressions for LOVE in the corpus enables the identification of physical characteristics of the space, such as *dynamism*, *agentivity*, and *selectivity*. Each of which is displayed in the respective frameworks.

The dynamic properties of the experience crystallized in the emotion concept are analyzable within the system of spatial correlations that include: *inwardness* :: *outwardness*, *closeness* :: *distance*, and *selfdirectionality* :: *multidirectionality*. The affordances of the dimensional account permit for the conceptual location of the lived experiences as regards close or distant/unattainable objects and in terms of internalistic or self-transcendent, self- or other-directed movements of the soul. These highly schematic correspondences manage to encompass the knowledge about the feeling that doesn't assume direct and / or constant physical proximity to the love object such as, divine love or romantic long-distance love. The salient conceptual aspects therefore do not include the proximity principle as a critical or even assume questioning the genuineness of love which is defined by the object accessibility principle.

The spatial perspective equally involves temporal factors. For instance, the dynamism of romantic love experience is evidenced in the metaphoric display of the process when desires growing on a daily basis arise from affection and further undergo a decline with the increase of distance between lovers.

(1) "*But in what light soever her desires appeared to me, as they manifestly arose from an affection of which I had daily the most endearing proofs, I resolved to comply with her, and accordingly removed to a distant part of the town; for it is my opinion that we can have but little love for the person whom we will never indulge in an unreasonable demand*" (H. Fielding (1751) "Amelia").

A social context for metaphor construction proves critical in shaping the knowledge about distance and love intensity correlation. Closeness to the love object in the spontaneously arising feelings becomes subject to social regulatory mechanisms that shape the experience by physical distancing. Subsequently, the individuality of experience is subsumed under the social norms of constructing emotions, exhibiting yet another profile for the conceptual space – *intentionality*. The social conformity betrays also the experiential basis of the concept observed in the deliberately inflicted suffering which is triggered by the perspective of long-distance relationships. Therefore, the operational dimension of the experience as manifested in the fragment (1) is shaped by the most salient categorial spaces of:

Closeness :: Distance (*Directionality*)

Individuality :: Conformity (*Intentionality*)

Enjoyment :: Distress (*Perceptuality*)

Directedness of love that manifests itself in either self- or other-directionality may equally extend into multiple directions, as in an all-embracing love of nature, life, and humanity. Consequently, the agent(s) of the experience as well as the object is conceptually placed in the dimensional space of *agentivity* within the categories of *person :: community*, *antagonism :: unity*, and *complementarity :: entirety*. Interestingly enough, romantic feelings can likewise spread onto numerous objects at a time, conceptually locating the feeling between the extremities of *person :: community*.

Socially predetermined preferences that mark the operational space of agentivity prove decisive for the profile of *selectivity*. Its parameters encompass *electiveness :: inclusiveness*, *reciprocity :: alienation*, and *equality :: inequality*. The idea of selectivity of love that assumes the choice of the object among other alternatives is opposed to the concept of replaceability which entails the all-embracing and non-preferential love directed at everyone or everything with no exclusion whatsoever (for selectivity and (ir)replaceability aspects of love see Naar 2021). Love selectivity also prompts and maintains the feeling

of in- or outgroupishness observed in the reciprocity or alienation from the other, as in the classic example of star-crossed love between the exponents of the Montagues and Capulets. Similarly, the social perspective of *inequality* :: *equality* procures the organizing principle of social hierarchy by applying restrictions on the selection pool of the potential mate.

The uniting power of love rests with a perceptual tenderness and delicacy that the affection can assume. The choice of the object of love, though, can be accompanied by other factors conceptualized as (super)natural, mystical, or psychic force. Linkage to other conceptual networks of MARRIAGE, MORALITY, and / or SOCIAL STATUS is secured by the shared dimension of *intentionality* as is substantiated in the figurative emotion description of the excerpt below.

(2) "*Sir Charles, more charmed with her than ever, was ready in his present flow of tender sentiments for her, to offer her his hand with an unreservedness that would have satisfied all her delicate scruples; but carried away by the force of habit, an insurmountable aversion to marriage, and the false but strongly impressed notion of refinements in an union of hearts, where love was the only tie, he could not resolve to give her a proof of his affection, which in his opinion was the likeliest way to destroy all the ardor of it; but careful not to alarm her, and apprehending no great severity of morals from the gay interested mother, he politely thanked her for the liberty she gave him to make his passion known to Mrs. Darnley, and to solicit her consent to his happiness*" (Ch. Lennox (1762) "Sophia").

In the search of a perfect match the desire to meet the partner's expectations entails a symmetrical pursue of self-satisfaction. Therefore, the abstraction over the operational space of the experience that is defined by electiveness evinces also a conspicuous bias to self-directionality and profiles expectations about the fulfilment of love as a self-propelled action strategy.

Electiveness :: Inclusiveness (*Selectivity: Directionality*)

Self-directionality :: Multidirectionality (*Dynamism: Directionality*)

Goal Pursuit :: Succumbence to Providence (*Processuality: Intentionality*)

Since the dimension of *directionality* features the idea of the relational principles between and among the elements of the conceptual system of LOVE, the *perceptuality* profile helps apprehend the way the lived experiences are conceptualized. And even though infatuation is classically among the outstanding features of love, it is yet arguable whether it is separated from other concomitant experiences, deliberation inclusively.

4. Infatuation, awe, and temperance: The perceptual facets of LOVE

Whenever the experiential aspect of love is considered, it is normally a linear perspective of the feeling unfolding in time that counts (Panasenko 2012: 1070), and rightly so. Nevertheless, heterogeneity of love is not so easily represented in schema-like models, which do not apply across multiple kinds of the feeling as a ROMANTIC LOVE model suggests (see Kövecses 1986: 95-96). The mappings of EMOTION IS FORCE in the figurative mind do not equally well represent the dynamics of emotional experience for different types of love and do not always involve the change from the neutral state through the (un)controlled disturbance, the satisfaction of the desire in emotion, and subsequent subsidence by regaining a neutral emotional state.

For this purpose, the dimension of *perceptuality* is suggested as a tool for an abstraction over one of the vital properties of love. The dimensional capacity of *perceptuality* permits not only the exciting romantic part, the infatuation with an object or the ardent affection and devotion for the one, but the ensuing and somewhat "disguised working out of the "(un)happily ever after" (Solomon 2016: 8), maintenance and continuity of the feelings (for sensorimotor dependencies and social practices see Arango 2019). The experiential orientation of LOVE covers the configuration space based on the parameters of *affectability*, *beneficiality*, and *actionality*.

Biological capacities of the individual imply susceptibility of the latter to undergo bodily-felt experiences, frequently interpreted as unique affordances of abstract knowledge construal. Subsequently, physical characteristics linked to the experiences are capable of forming metonymic motivation for metaphorical emotion representation. The embodied account of emotion existence provides for regularities of correspondences between the domain of LOVE and other concepts gaining their tangible perspective in the cues of recognizable psycho-physiological response. Therefore, LOVE IS A NUTRIENT, AN APPETIZING FOOD, A NATURAL FORCE, A CAPTIVE ANIMAL, AN OPPONENT, A SOCIAL SUPERIOR, A SMALL CHILD, WAR, A GAME, A VALUABLE OBJECT or ECONOMIC EXCHANGE (for more see Kövecses 2004: 26-27).

Affectability perspective secures the property of felt experiences rather broadly and ranges between *enjoyment* :: *distress*, *happiness* :: *unhappiness*, and *gradation* :: *moderation*. A multitude of feelings, including rapture, affection, devotion or temperance, and tolerance are regarded as lived experiences of diverse types of love on equal terms. Thus, the multidimensional approach seeks an integrative view on attraction-love, attachment-love, advantage-love, friendship-love, benevolence-love, and agape-love as indivisible facets of the unifying concept (see Wolterstorff 2011: 37-40).

The benefactor of love is yet another criterion that before long served as a disintegrating factor for differentiation of agapic love from erotic love and friendship (Kierkegaard 1949; Nygren 1953). Nonetheless, an idea for the unity of ordinary human love with pure non-preferential love is passed on in contemporary philosophy revising the legacy of agapism (see Watts 2022). The *beneficiality* parameter is meant to cover both the benevolent promotion of the other and the self-praising eudaimonic practices that are observed in the oppositions of *egotism :: altruism, advantage :: mercy, and conditionality :: unconditionality*.

(3) "It was during this time that his little son, the apple of his eye, the cynosure of all his strong power of love, fell ill of the scarlet fever. They dragged him through the crisis, but his life hung on a gossamer thread. Everything, the doctor said, depended on good nourishment, on generous living, to keep up the little fellow's strength, in the prostration in which the fever had left him. Mocking words! when the commonest food in the house would not furnish one little meal" (E. Gaskell (1848) "Mary Barton").

The other-directedness and electiveness of parental love segues into an altruistic experience in an attempt to enhance the good of the child. The outmost anxiety about his health brings love to the brink of sadness and suffering leaving ecstatic feelings behind. Schematically, the parametrical characteristics of the experience fit into the following operational space:

Electiveness :: Inclusiveness (*Selectivity: Directionality*)

Satisfaction :: Distress (*Affectability: Perceptuality*)

Advantage :: Mercy (*Beneficiality: Perceptuality*)

Goal Pursuit :: Succumbence to Providence (*Processuality: Intentionality*)

The obsession with the child's life renders the *intentionality* of parental care as active and self-propelled rather than submissive and providential, meanwhile a self-sacrificial orientation of devotion warrants the divinity of the feeling over the worldly pleasures.

Actionality of love space assumes both the intraindividual, covert excitement of mind and the manifested acts of love conceived of through the parameters of *manifestation :: disguise, everyday occurrence :: extraordinary occasion*. Concurrently, the continuity of feelings is characterized by *perturbability:: imperturbability* where (grand)parental love is observably committed to permanence very much as the very phenomenon of love, taking different forms but claiming the "great evolutionary agency of the universe" (Pierce 1892–1893: 176).

5. The imbuelement of love: Care and benevolence

The conception of motivational power of LOVE as regards human agency invites an image of a person committed to a notable achievement in the name of love (Panasenko et al. 2023: 1551). Though, the might of the power might prove fatal, for love can make wonders and glorify people but it can also lead to unjust sacrifices and losses. Therefore, the concept of love must equally involve its constructive and destructive potency, the latter conceived of as a defect of love yet not in the least beyond its scope (Pierce 1892–1993: 177).

The *intentionality* dimension implies an abstraction over multifarious and at times unfathomable workings of love, an agency transcending the human mind and body and having a formative value within any given system. In this vein, the evolutionary drive of love was always conceptualized both as a physiological motivation for immortality (Plato 1991: 151) and the exuberant life force bestowed on the agents, deployed in the eye of a cherishing beholder and disseminated in the consecutive thought production in the love of wisdom (ibid., 155).

The inclusion of the supernatural and metaphysical in the dimension of teleologicalness captures a holistic view of the experience from the perspectives of its *processuality*, *causality*, and *eventuality*. The dualistic sets of parameters impart the continuity of human beings' natural loving and Divine Providence. *Processuality* lends itself to the parameters of *activity* :: *passivity* and *goal pursuit* :: *succumbence to Providence*. The apparent reduplication of parameters derives in the lack of unanimity about the concepts of activity and passivity which are largely defined discursively and are shaped contextually.

Volition is but the main aspect of love's motivational force viewed as a deliberate commitment to affection, devotion, respect, and tenderness. Nonetheless, there is a common misconception that anyone is aware of the essence of love, and even though the very word is commonly on everybody's tongue, "still hardly anyone knows what love actually is" (Swedenborg 2009: 3), let alone conceives of the origin of the desire. Subsequently, in Christianity, the Providential design and the metaphysical force of love prove definitive tools for conceptualizing the feeling. The benevolent activity of such agapeic love is consequently and consecutively substantiated in language by the use of preeminently active verbs for love, as, for instance, in the Scriptures (for more see O'Collins 2019).

In psychology, the infatuation with something or somebody that hits us unawares and the ensuing effort of a decisive action shape the indispensable facets of love's activity and passivity, respectively (Solomon 2006: 18). And yet, unlike in the worldly capitalist interpretation of the concept ACTIVITY, the externally

directed actions can testify to the passivity of a "slave in passion", whereas quiet contemplating can be indicative of love's inherent activity which empowers the agent with the force readily shared with others (Fromm 1956: 21-23). Along with that, habituation of an action that is construed as jeopardizing for romantic relationships ensures the depth of self-enriching state of love.

The *intentionality* cues for love operational space in the fragment below help identify the feeling as passive in its worldly interpretation yet active in terms of self-constructiveness and an individuality approach.

(4) "*Maria's passions were unknown. Though suspected of being universal, since she manifested no deliberate likes or dislikes, approving all things with a kind of majestic and indifferent omnipotence, they remained quiescent and undeclared. She probably just loved the universe. She felt at home in it. To Maria the entire universe belonged, because she sat still and with absolute conviction – claimed it*" (A. Blackwood 1915, "The extra day").

LOVE is profiled as a multidirectional, real and divine feeling simultaneously, which engulfs the whole universe in all its boundedness (4). The abstractness of the universe akin to that of love debunks its unattainable and inconceivable nature but projects an intuitively known and even perceptible homely feeling. Other parameters for setting the operational space of the experience are happiness, imperturbability, and mercy, but the most conspicuous of them are as follows:

Self-directionality :: Multi-directionality (*Dynamism: Directionality*)

Happiness :: Unhappiness (*Affectability: Perceptuality*)

Goal pursuit :: Succumbence to Providence (*Processuality: Intentionality*)

Existence :: Expectation (*Eventuality: Intentionality*)

The degree of actionality correlates with the conception of love's *eventuality* which consists in the possibilities for love reification. And while love of the ultimate abstraction of God and of material subjects/objects is represented within the framework of *worldliness* :: *divinity*, the realness of the worldly experience is profiled by *imagination* :: *reality*, and *existence* :: *expectation*. The construal of love realness is scaffolded by a strong belief that any intense pleasant feeling towards someone or something that fits the experience of the true-self must be love (Earp et al. 2017). Such an affective logic may bring to a disillusionment as the evidence collection for the realness of the feeling is biased and is governed mainly by imagination which can ingeniously trump up the actual state of things in favour of a ready-made belief (Kroeker 2019: 285).

Reason-responsiveness of the feeling stipulates yet another aspect of love which is the degree of rationality involved. This abstract property is profiled by the dimensions of *intentionality* and *perceptuality* combined, outlining the operational space of love by its *existence :: expectation* and *conditionality :: unconditionality*.

A *causality* profile is an efficient tool for the concept analysis as it helps to make sense of how actions LOVE implies are cognized. The scope of configuration space covers the span between *romanticism :: pragmatism*, *benevolence :: care*, and *construction :: destruction*. The parameters enable abstractions over conceptualizing the unity of LOVE and MORALITY as inherent reasons of actions of love (Schaubroeck 2019: 298). *Romanticism* makes the extreme point of the dimension profiling an all-consuming love of an idolized object or an unrequited love as opposed to *pragmatism* that outlines an active commitment towards the object and a utilitarian approach in the goal pursuit.

Forgiveness as a category associated with the workings of love manifests itself in the form of reaction to unwanted consequences of one's deeds in two possible ways or their consistent combination. One may demonstrate a benevolent attitude embracing the shortcomings of the cherished wrong doer or, otherwise, a just and retributive practice that does not exclude a biased and partial manner of doing so. Accordingly, love (a)rationality and the ensuing (ab)normality of behaviour feature the intrinsic unity of benevolence-love and care-love within the dimension defined by the respective parameters of their operational space. Therefore, the opposition unity of BENEVOLENCE and JUSTICE in the configuration space substantiates the claim of no conflict whatsoever between justice-imperative and love-imperative (Lippitt 2020: 105-140).

The farthest to virtuous reasons of love comes *destruction* with either an implication of deliberate damage in the name of fanatic love or as an instance of inconceivable divine providence interpreted as such by repining subjects.

6. Conclusions

Sophistication and omnipresence of love in every sphere of life implies the outmost figurativeness of its conceptualization. Multiple aspects of the phenomenon produce an immense cognitive network of the concept LOVE which frequently incorporates or overlaps with other fundamental concepts. A positivist account of the concept, though, risks leaving different kinds of love beyond the scope of the conceptual framework and yield further fragmentation of knowledge about love.

A strong premise about the embodied emotion experience and an indispensable metonymic grounding of conceptual metaphors substantiates the claim about a cyclic nature of concept evolvement shaped by contextual changes. For a comprehensive understanding of the concept organization, a multidimensional perspective of LOVE can prove beneficial to observe the tentative shifts in the salience of critical parameters driven and cultivated by the matter of dominant ideology.

Configuration space is an alternative theoretical tool for profiling the concept of LOVE in the relevant hyperdimensions of *directionality*, *perceptuality*, and *teleologicalness/intentionality* which involve another three specific dimensions each. Concrete instances of love manifestation are claimed to unfold themselves in the system of thought within respective operational spaces shaped by the experiential parameters that are schematically represented in the form of oppositional unities. Combinations of parametric indicators bring about the understanding of critical features of the concept at a particular point in its existence.

The set of defining parameters for shaping the operational spaces of the concept are preliminary and assume further consideration, but a qualitative analysis of the corpus data confirmed the liability of the approach in the study of the concept from a multidimensional perspective. Subsequently, configuration class parameters of different kinds of love could be identified in the future research endeavours.


References

1. Arango, A. (2019). From sensorimotor dependencies to perceptual practices: Making enactivism social. In *Adaptive behavior*, 27 (1), p. 31-45. DOI: [10.1177/1059712318811897](https://doi.org/10.1177/1059712318811897)
2. Athanasiou, A., Hantzaroula, P. & Yannakopoulos, K. (2008). Towards a new epistemology: The "affective turn". In *Historein*, 8, p. 5-16. DOI: [10.12681/historein.33](https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.33)
3. Barthes, R. (1977). *A lover's discourse: Fragments*. London: Penguin Group.
4. Burunat, E. (2016). Love is not an emotion. In *Psychology*, 7, p. 1883-1910. DOI: [10.4236/psych.2016.714173](https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2016.714173)
5. Candiotta, L. (2018). Boosting cooperation. The beneficial function of positive emotions in dialogical inquiry. In *Humana Mente. Journal of philosophical studies*, 11 (33), p. 59-82.
6. Cooper, M. (2021). Directionality: Unifying psychological and social understandings of well-being and distress through an existential ontology. In *The journal of humanistic counseling*, 60 (1), p. 6-25. DOI: [10.1002/johc.12148](https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12148)
7. Damasio, A. & Carvalho, G.B. (2013). The nature of feelings: Evolutionary and neurobiological origins. In *Nature reviews neuroscience*, 14 (2), p. 143-152. DOI: [10.1038/nrn3403](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3403)
8. De Smet, H., Flach, S., Tyrkkö, J. & Diller, H.-J. (2015). *The corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET), version 3.1: Improved tokenization and linguistic annotation*. Leuven – Berlin – Tampere – Bochum: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Freie Universität Berlin, Tampere University, Ruhr-Universität Bochum.
9. Earp, B.D., Do, D. & Knobe, J. (2017). The ordinary concept of true love. In *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of love*. Grau, Ch. & Smuts, A. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10. Enright, R.D., Wang Xu, J., Rapp, H., Evans, M. & Song, J.Y. (2022). The philosophy and social science of agape love. In *Journal of theoretical and philosophical psychology*, 42 (4), 220-237. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000202>
11. Fehr, B. & Russel, J.A. (1991). The concept of love viewed from a prototype perspective. In *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 60 (3), p. 425-438.
12. Fromm, E. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York: Harper & Row.
13. Kierkegaard, S. (1949). *Works of love*. Swenson, D.F. & Swenson, L.M. (trans.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
14. Koprowski, E. (2014). Freud, psychoanalysis, and the therapeutic effect of agapic love. In *Issues in mental health nursing*, 35 (4), p. 314-315. DOI: [10.3109/01612840.2013.842621](https://doi.org/10.3109/01612840.2013.842621)
15. Kövecses, Z. (1991a). A linguist's quest for love. In *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 8 (1), p. 87-97.
16. Kövecses, Z. (1995). American friendship and the scope of metaphor. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 6 (4), p. 315-346. DOI: [10.1515/cogl.1995.6.4.315](https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1995.6.4.315)
17. Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended conceptual metaphor theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Kövecses, Z. (1991b). Happiness: A definitional effort. In *Metaphor and symbolic activity*, 6, p. 29-46.
19. Kövecses, Z. (2004). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
20. Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the structure of concepts*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
21. Kroeker, E.E. (2019). Reasons for love. In *The Routledge handbook of love in philosophy*. Martin, A.M. (ed.). New York – London: Routledge, p. 277-287.
22. Langacker, R.W. (2009). Reflections on the functional characterization of spatial prepositions. In *Belgrade English language and literature studies (Belgrade BELLS)*, 1 (1), p. 9-34. DOI: [10.18485/bells.2009.1.1](https://doi.org/10.18485/bells.2009.1.1)
23. Lippitt, J. (2020). *Love's forgiveness: Kierkegaard, resentment, humility, and hope*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. Love. *American heritage dictionary of the English language*. Available at: <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/love>
25. Love. *Cambridge academic content dictionary*. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/love>
26. Love. *Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary & thesaurus*. Available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/love>
27. Love. *Longman dictionary of Contemporary English online*. Available at: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/love>
28. Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P.R. (2019). A behavioural systems approach to romantic love relationships: Attachment, caregiving, and sex. In *The new psychology of love*. Sternberg, R.J. & Sternberg, K. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 259-279.
29. Naar, H. (2021). The possibility of fitting love: Irreplaceability and selectivity. In *Synthese*, 198 (2), p. 985-1010. DOI: [10.1007/S11229-018-02079-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/S11229-018-02079-4)
30. Nygren, A. (1953). *Agape and eros*. Watson, P.S. (trans.). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
31. O'Collins, G. (2019). Love as a verb (1 Cor 13:4–8a). In *The expository times*, 131 (5), p. 205-208.
32. Panasenکو, N. (2012). Linguistic markers of emotional concept LOVE in literary texts. In *US-China foreign language*, 10 (4), p. 1067-1084.
33. Panasenکو, N. (2013a). Melodic component as the means of expressing emotions and feelings in American and Ukrainian folk love songs. In *International journal of arts and commerce*, 2 (7), p. 142-154.
34. Panasenکو, N. (2013b). The role of syntactic stylistic means in expressing the emotion term LOVE. In *Research in language*, 11 (3), p. 277-293. DOI: [10.2478/v10015-012-0016-6](https://doi.org/10.2478/v10015-012-0016-6)

35. Panasenکو, N., Stashko, H. & Zabuzhanska, I. (2023). Love and rhythm in poetry and music. In *Language and emotion. An international handbook. Handbooks of linguistics and communication*. Schiewer, G.I., Altarriba, J. & Ng, B.Ch. (eds.). Vol. 3. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, p. 1529-1557. DOI <https://doi.org.10.1515/9783110795486-009>
36. Pape, H. (1997). Love's power and the causality of mind: C. S. Peirce on the place of mind and culture in evolution. In *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce society*, 33 (1), p. 59-90.
37. Pierce, Ch. (1892–1893). Evolutionary love. In *Monist*, 3, p.176-200.
38. Pinich, I. (2020). Emotions in metamental organization of ideologies. In *Logos*, 103, p.18-29. DOI: [10.24101/logos.2020.23](https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2020.23)
39. Plato. (1991). *The Symposium. Dialogues of Plato*. Vol. II. Allen, R.E. (trans.). New Heaven – London: Yale University Press. (Original work published c. 385–370 BC)
40. Russell, J. & Barrett, L. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. In *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 76 (5), p. 805-819. DOI: [10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.805](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.805)
41. Saeed, J.I. (2016). *Semantics*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
42. Sammut, G., Daanen, P. & Sartawi, M. (2010). Interobjectivity: Representations and artefacts in cultural psychology. In *Culture & psychology*, 16 (4), p. 451-463. DOI: [10.1177/1354067X10380158](https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X10380158)
43. Schaubroeck, K. (2019). Reasons of love. In *The Routledge handbook of love in philosophy*. Martin, A.M. (ed.). New York – London: Routledge, p. 288-299.
44. Scherer, K.R. (1999). Appraisal theory. In *Handbook of cognition and emotion*. Dalgleish, T. & Power, M.J. (eds.). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons p. 637-663. DOI: [10.1002/0470013494.ch30](https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013494.ch30)
45. Schütze, P., Jörg, K., von Maur, I. & Slaby, J. (2022). Affect as disruption: Affective experimentation, automobility, and the ecological crisis. In *Methodologies of affective experimentation*. Knudsen, B.T., Krogh, M. & Stage, C. (eds.). Switzerland: Springer Nature, p. 27-45.
46. Solomon, R. (2006). *About love: Reinventing romance for our time*. Indianapolis – Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
47. Sternberg, R.J. (2006). A duplex theory of love. In *The new psychology of love*. Sternberg, R.J. & Weis, K. (eds.). New Haven: Yale University Press, p. 184-199.
48. Sternberg, R.J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. In *Psychological review*, 93 (2), p. 119-135. DOI: [10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.119](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.119)
49. Swedenborg, E. (2009). *Divine love and wisdom*. Dole, G.F. (trans.). West Chester: Swedenborg Foundation.
50. Tan, C. (2021). *Mindful education: insights from Confucian and Christian traditions*. New York: Springer.
51. Vygotsky, L. (2012). *Thought and language*. Hanfmann, E., Vakar, G. & Kozulin, A. (transl. and eds.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
52. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
53. Wierzbicka, A. (2019). The biblical roots of English 'love': The concept of 'love' in a historical and cross-linguistic perspective. In *International journal of language and culture*, 6 (2), p. 225-254. DOI: [10.1075/ijoc.18006.wie](https://doi.org/10.1075/ijoc.18006.wie)
54. Watts, D. (2022). Love's telos: Kierkegaard's critique of preferential love. In *Philosophy of love in the past, present, and future*. Grahle, A., McKeever, N. & Saunders, J. (eds.). New York: Routledge, p. 54-72.
55. Wolterstorff, N. (2011). *Justice in love*. Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Contact data

	<p><i>name:</i> <i>academic title</i> <i>/ rank:</i> <i>department:</i> <i>institution:</i></p> <p><i>e-mail:</i></p> <p><i>fields of interest:</i></p>	<p>Iryna Pinich CSc. (Philology) Associate Professor Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology Kyiv National Linguistic University 73, Velyka Vasylkivska St., Kyiv, 03680, Ukraine Visiting Researcher English Department, School of Culture and Education Södertörn University Alfred Nobels Alle 7, Flemingsberg 141 89 Huddinge, Stockholm, Sweden</p> <p>iryna.pinich@knlu.edu.ua iryna.pinich@sh.se</p> <p>Discourse studies, pragmatics, emotionology, language and ideology, philosophy of language.</p>
---	---	---