

Infected affiances: **Metaphors of the word JEALOUSY in Shakespeare's plays**

Javier E. Díaz Vera, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

(JavierEnrique.Diaz@uclm.es)

Abstract

In this paper I propose an analysis of the metaphoric conceptualizations of JEALOUSY used in the bulk of Shakespeare's plays. Following *the metaphorical pattern analysis* methodology, I have identified up to 53 figurative expressions for *jealousy* in Shakespeare's English, which I have classified into broad conceptual areas (such as DISEASE/INSANITY, ENEMY/OPPONENT, NATURAL FORCE, WILD ANIMAL and POISON). Broadly speaking, these conceptual mappings illustrate Renaissance beliefs and ideas on *jealousy*, and are highly congruent with parallel studies on jealousy in Present-Day English. The most striking differences between both historical periods have to do with the lower frequency of somatic-related conceptualizations in Shakespeare's English, where *jealousy* is frequently conceived of as an external force that attacks the experiencer's body and mind. Finally, I propose a discussion of the distribution of these conceptual mappings among masculine and feminine characters in Shakespeare's plays, where I tentatively affirm that feminine characters show a stronger tendency towards the use of embodied mappings for *jealousy*.

In diesem Beitrag versuche ich eine Analyse der im umfangreichen Shakespeare'schen Werk zu ermittelnden metaphorischen Konzeptualisierungen von Eifersucht. Mit Hilfe der *metaphorical pattern*-Analyse konnte ich bis zu 53 bildliche Ausdrücke für Eifersucht im Shakespeare-Englisch identifizieren. Diese habe ich anhand breiter konzeptueller Bereiche (wie etwa Krankheit, Feindschaft, Naturgewalt, wildes Tier und Gift) klassifiziert. Diese konzeptuellen Übertragungen illustrieren renaissancetypische Auffassungen zur Eifersucht und zeigen darüber hinaus starke Parallelen zu Untersuchungen der englischen Gegenwartssprache. Die auffälligsten Unterschiede bestehen in der geringeren Häufigkeit körperbezogener Konzeptualisierungen bei Shakespeare, bei dem Eifersucht häufig als eine äußere Gewalt beschrieben wird, die Körper und Geist des Betroffenen angreift. Abschließend diskutiere ich die Verteilung der verschiedenen Konzepte auf weibliche und männliche Charaktere. Erste Resultate zeigen, dass körperbezogene Konzepte stärker bei weiblichen Charakteren ausgeprägt sind.

1. Aims and objectives

The study of how metaphor and metonymy mediate our conceptualization of sentiments is not new; it has been extensively approached by Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT; Fesmire 1994; Kövecses 1986, 1988, 1990; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff/Johnson 1980; Lakoff/Kövecses 1987). A central claim by CMT scholars is that human feelings and emotions are largely understood and expressed in metaphorical terms. Research into the linguistic expression of

emotions and their metaphors has, for the most part, fallen into two positions: metaphorical universality and cultural relativity (cf. Quinn/Holland 1987; Kövecses 2005; Núñez/Sweetser 2006; Geeraerts/Gevaert 2008). Broadly speaking, whereas universalist approaches to metaphorical conceptualizations of emotions tend to focus on purely biological and physiological factors (such as changes in body temperature or rate of heartbeat), the relativist perspective maintains that variation in the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions is sensitive to social, cultural and historical influences.

In this paper I propose a study of the metaphoric conceptualizations of JEALOUSY in Shakespeare's plays, based on the analysis of a textual corpus (*Shakespeare Corpus*, hence SC, compiled by Mike Scott) consisting of 37 plays plus all the speeches of all characters. The digital texts, distributed in three different folders (comedies, historical and tragedies), are based on the standard Oxford University Press edition (Craig 1914). I have used *Wordsmith Tools* version 5.0 (Scott 2008), although manual searches have also been performed at times.

In order to extract the relevant metaphorical data from the textual corpus, I have followed the *metaphorical pattern analysis* (hence MPA) methodology proposed by Stefanowitsch (2004, 2006). This proposal consists in choosing one or more lexical items referring to the target domain under scrutiny (i.e. JEALOUSY) and extracting a sample of their occurrences in the corpus. Thereafter, the metaphorical expressions of which the search word is a part are identified and grouped into coherent sets representing general mappings. Metaphorical patterns provide a basis for target-domain oriented studies of metaphorical mappings, analogous to source-domain oriented methods. In fact, using this method we can retrieve a large number of illustrations of our target domain items (i.e. early Modern English¹ *jealousy* and its synonyms and derivatives) and exhaustively identify the metaphorical patterns they occur with.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines some particularities related to the conceptualization of JEALOUSY in Modern English. Section 3 outlines the data and methodology used for this research. This is followed by a

¹ Henceforth eModE.

discussion of the conceptualizations of JEALOUSY encoded in linguistic expression in sections 4 and 5.

2. EModE conceptualizations of JEALOUSY

Within the general field of strong emotions, the domain of JEALOUSY and its conceptualizations show a series of interesting peculiarities. To start with, jealousy is often seen as a secondary emotion that requires a conceptualization of the self.² Jealousy is also described as a learnt emotion, that is, an emotional association that is acquired with repeated experience (Damasio 1994: 134-138). In fact, a previous knowledge of the values of a romantic relationship is necessary for jealousy to be elicited: the motive for being jealous, the target of the jealousy, who expresses it, when to express it, the manner of expressing it, etc (Hupka 1991). Jealousy can thus be considered a social construction (Averill 1980; Harré 1986) that may differ from culture to culture (Bryson 1991).

Numerous research studies have showed the existence of strong differences in the way men and women respond to *jealousy*. These intra-cultural differences have been analysed by, among others, Symons (1979), Daly/Wilson/Weghorst (1982) and Wiederman/Allgeier (1993). Broadly speaking, these studies show that whereas a wife's experience of jealousy is determined by the degree of threat that she perceives in her husband's adultery, a husband's experience of jealousy is relatively invariant (Symons 1979: 232). In their analysis of 55 American undergraduate students (32 males and 23 females), Buss/Larsen/Westen/Semmelroth (1992) predicted that men and women would differ in their responses to emotional and sexual infidelity, with women being relatively responsive to the former and men to the latter. According to their study, whereas men appear to be more likely than women to become upset over threats to sexual exclusivity, women are more likely than men to react negatively to potential loss of partner time and attention. These sex differences have been explained on purely evolutionary grounds, so that:

² From this perspective, jealousy would not be possible in animals or in young infants. Jealousy-related behaviours in animals and infants are referred to by Lewis (2010) as proto-jealousy, and described as reactions of protest at lost of desired resources.

ancestral women's challenge of ensuring paternal investment exerted selective pressures that increased women's jealousy in response to emotional infidelity, whereas ancestral men's challenge of paternal uncertainty exerted selective pressures that increased men's jealousy in response to sexual infidelity (Edlund et al. 2006: 462).

Given these peculiarities, relative degrees of variation in the linguistic conceptualization of jealousy should be expected not only from culture to culture, but also intra-culturally from individual to individual. However, in spite of the strong cultural and social constraints on the conceptualization of *jealousy*, cognitive linguistics literature has not paid much attention to the different ways this emotion can be expressed linguistically.

In a recent study of the conceptualization of *jealousy* in Present-Day English, Ogarkova (2007) proposes a list of up to 22 different mappings³. According to her analysis, these are the most frequent metaphorical mappings for *jealousy* found in the British National Corpus, in decreasing order of their frequencies in her sample:

JEALOUSY IS DISEASE/PAIN: *He felt a pang of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE/ENEMY: *The wounds of jealousy reopen.*

JEALOUSY IS A MIXED/PURE SUBSTANCE: *The murky waters of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A (HOT) LIQUID (IN A CONTAINER UNDER PRESSURE): *He seethed with jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER: *Her life is full of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS AN ANIMAL/INSECT: *Jealousy is a shark seeking its supper.*

JEALOUSY IS A SHARP OBJECT/WEAPON: *A stab of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS FIRE: *She was inflamed with jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A HUMAN BEING/(SLEEPING) ORGANISM: *Jealousy is a bedfellow.*

JEALOUSY IS INSANITY/FOOLISHNESS: *He went mad with jealousy.*

³ These 22 metaphorical mappings listed by Ogarkova (2007) are instantiated by 399 individual metaphoric expressions (72.15% of the total) found in the corpus. The remainder 27.85% is constituted by EVENT STRUCTURE metaphors (i.e. general metaphorical systems for verbalizing „notions like states, changes, processes, actions, causes, purposes, and means“; Lakoff 1993:220).

JEALOUSY IS A (DESTRUCTIVE) PHYSICAL FORCE: *She was moved by jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS AN UNPLEASANT TASTE/GORGE: *A taste of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS HIGH/LOW INTENSITY: *She gave rise to jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS AN (UN)MASKED OBJECT: *A display of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS AN OBSTACLE/BARRIER: *Jealousy got in the way.*

JEALOUSY IS A WRONGDOING: *He confessed his jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A WEATHER PHENOMENON: *Their lives were clouded by jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A PLANT: *He planted seeds of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A SPY: *Prying jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS LIGHT: *A spark of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A SUPERNATURAL BEING: *The demons of jealousy.*

JEALOUSY IS A MECHANISM: *Jealousy is at work.*

These metaphorical source domains address various aspects of the concept of *jealousy*. For example, the ENEMY, WEAPON and DESTRUCTIVE FORCE metaphors focus on the negative effects of jealousy on the experiencer, WRONGDOING on the negative social perception of jealousy, and so forth. Now the conceptual metaphors that seem to be the central ones for *jealousy* are:

- DISEASE/PAIN (which also accounts for INSANITY/FOOLISHNESS);
- OPPONENT/ENEMY (which also accounts for sharp OBJECT/WEAPON and for DESTRUCTIVE NATURAL FORCE); and
- MIXED/PURE SUBSTANCE and (HOT) FLUID IN A CONTAINER.

Taken together, these mappings account for nearly 49.30% of all metaphors in the whole sample. In sum, Ogarkova's analysis clearly shows that *jealousy* is predominantly viewed by speakers of Modern English as a painful experience, located outside the experiencer (lack of control), but with very strong mental and physical effects.

Taking all this into account, I will propose here a study of the conceptual metaphors for *jealousy* used in Shakespeare's plays. My selection of this textual corpus is based on a variety of factors. To start with, with up to 37 different plays illustrating three different sub-gender (comedies, historical and tragedies), William Shakespeare is one of the most prolific English writers ever. Furthermore, jealousy is a central topic on most of his works, and some

of his characters have become universal icons. Finally, Shakespeare corpus has proved a fundamental tool for the analysis of linguistic variation in early Modern English (see, for example, Cyr 1983; Busse 2001, 2002; Dieter 2003; Tissari 2006; among others). In spite of the very limited size of my corpus (with around 820 000 words) and the relatively low number of occurrences of *jealousy*-nouns in it (97 in all), I will use this data in order to address the following questions:

1. What are the central conceptual metaphors for *jealousy* used in Shakespeare's English?
2. To what extent do these data point to masculine and feminine psychological differences related to the conceptualization of *jealousy* in the linguistic expressions used by his characters?

The first question is discussed in Section 4, where I present and discuss conceptual source domains mapped on the target domain of *jealousy*. Finally, in Section 5 I try to determine Shakespeare's degree of awareness of gender differences related to the conceptualization of *jealousy*, and how these differences are reflected in the linguistic characterization of his masculine and feminine characters.

3. Data and methodology

Using the online version of the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (hence HTOED), I have made a full list of all the words for JEALOUSY in usage between 1500 and 1700. The list consists of the following 10 early Modern English (henceforth eModE) nouns and their adjectival derivatives (Table 1).

Thereafter, I have searched all the occurrences of each *jealousy*-word used in the Shakespeare Corpus (97 occurrences in all). My search focuses on nouns for two main reasons. Nouns, and especially abstract nouns, are not normally used to make metaphors (Hanks 2006: 20), which guarantees that most, if not all, the *jealousy*-nouns found in the corpus are being used non-metaphorically and consequently refer to the concept *jealousy*. Furthermore, recent corpora-based studies of metaphor have shown that, when used metaphorically, a large number of nouns tend to become a different part of speech (such as, for example, a verb, an adjective or an adverb; Deignan 2005: 148). By combining

both principles, I will argue that most of the metaphorical patterns for JEALOUSY included in the Shakespeare Corpus are composed of (1) a noun from this domain (i.e. a *jealousy*-noun, as in Table 1), and (2) an adjective, verb or adverb from a different domain (i.e. the metaphor's source domain).

ENTRY	FIRST OCCURRENCE	LAST OCCURRENCE
<i>jealousness</i>	c1380	a1626
<i>jealousy</i>	c1425	
<i>heartburning</i>	1513	
<i>zealousy</i>	1542	1598
<i>yellowness</i>	1598	1621
<i>zelotypia</i>	1601	
<i>yellowes</i>	1601	1638
<i>heartburn</i>	1621	
<i>zelotypie</i>	1623	
<i>jealows-hood</i>	1685	1486

Table 1: EModE lexemes for JEALOUSY

I have then grouped all these sentences into figurative (44 instances out of 97, corresponding to 45.36%) and literal (53 instances, corresponding to 54.64%) expressions. The distribution of figurative and literal uses of *jealousy*-words in the three sub-corpora is represented in Table 2:

	FIGURATIVE	LITERAL	TOTAL
TRAGEDY	13	25	38
COMEDY	27	25	52
HISTORY	4	3	7
TOTAL	44	53	97

Table 2: Figurative and literal uses of *jealousy*-words in Shakespeare's Corpus

Finally, I have analysed the resulting set of metaphorical patterns and classified them into source domains, trying to determine the specific paradigmatic relations between „lexical items from the target domain and the source domain items that would be expected in their place in a non-metaphorical use” (Stefanowitsch 2006: 67).

4. Shakespeare’s metaphors of JEALOUSY

In the present study I have paid more attention to the qualitative analysis of the data in that, given the limited size of my corpus, a quantitative analysis could not be considered sufficiently representative. However, it is important to note that the conceptual metaphors for *jealousy* described as central in Ogarkova’s (2007) analysis of the BNC also show the highest frequencies in my study of Shakespeare’s metaphors. This is clearly the case of the DISEASE/INSANITY metaphor, with five occurrences in the whole corpus (see [1] to [5]):

- (1) Come hither, Mistress Ford, the honest woman, the modest wife, the virtuous creature, **that hath the jealous fool to her husband!** I suspect without cause, mistress, do I? (Ford/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 4.2.129-132)
- (2) Help to search my house this one time: if I find not what I seek, show no colour for my extremity; let me for ever be your table-sport; let them say of me, **As jealous as Ford**, that searched a hollow walnut for his wife’s leman.’ (Ford/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 4.2.160-164)
- (3) In food, in sport, and life-preserving rest to be disturb’d, would mad or man or beast: the consequence is then, **thy jealous fits** have scar’d thy husband from the use of wits. (Abbess/*The Comedy of Errors*, 5.1.83-86)
- (4) As man and wife, being two, are one in love, so be there **twixt your kingdoms such a spousal that never may ill office, or fell jealousy, which troubles** oft the bed of blessed marriage, thrust in between the paction of these kingdoms, to make divorce of their incorporate league; (Queen Isabel/*The Second Part of Henry IV*, 5.2.3343-3348)
- (5) For that I do suspect the lusty Moor hath leap’d into my seat; the thought whereof doth, like a poisonous mineral, gnaw my inwards; and nothing can or shall content my soul till I am even’d with him, wife for wife, or failing so, yet that I put the Moor at least into **a jealousy so strong that judgment cannot cure.** (Iago/*Othello*, 2.1.295-302)

Similarly, jealousy is described in the corpus as a dangerous opponent in a struggle, as in the following examples:

- (6) Why should I not, had I the heart to do it, like to the Egyptian thief at point of death, kill what I love? **A savage jealousy that sometimes savours nobly.** (Orsino/*Twelfth Night*, 5.1.120-23)
- (7) For Hector in his blaze of wrath subscribes to tender objects, but **he in heat of action is more vindicative than jealous love.** (Ulysses/*Troilus and Cressida*, 4.5.105-7)
- (8) No, Master Brook; but the peaking cornuto her husband, Master Brook, **dwelling in a continual 'larum of jealousy,** comes me in the instant of our encounter, after we had embraced, kissed, protested, and, as it were, spoke the prologue of our comedy; (Falstaff/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 3.5.73-77)
- (9) Poor and content is rich, and rich enough, but riches fineless is as poor as winter to him that ever fears he shall be poor. Good heaven, **the souls of all my tribe defend from jealousy!** (Iago/*Othello*, 3.3.172-176)
- (10) *O, beware, my lord, of jealousy; it is the green-eyed monster which doth mock the meat it feeds on; that cuckold lives in bliss who, certain of his fate, loves not his wronger.* (Iago/*Othello*, 3.3.165-168)

The OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE metaphor is a specification of the general metaphor JEALOUSY IS A LIVING BEING, normally a human or an anthropomorphic entity, where jealousy is presented with human physical and psychological features (such as eyes, sleep or hunger):

- (11) But for mine honour, which I would free, if I shall be condemn'd upon surmises, all proofs sleeping else but **what your jealousies awake,** I tell you 'tis rigour and not law. (Hermione/*Troilus and Cressida*, 3.2.109-13)
- (12) Nay, I will consent to act any villany against him, that may not sully the chariness of our honesty. O, that my husband saw this letter! **it would give eternal food to his jealousy.** (Mistress Ford/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 2.1.658-661)
- (13) As doubtful thoughts, and rash-embraced despair, and shuddering fear, **and green-eyed jealousy!** (Portia/*The Merchant of Venice*, 3.2.115-16)
- (14) How many fond fools **serve mad jealousy!** (Luciana/*The Comedy of Errors*, 2.1.116)
- (15) **Self-harming jealousy!** Fie! Beat it hence. (Luciana/*The Comedy of Errors*, 2.1.376)

- (16) These are the **forgeries of jealousy**: and never, since the middle summer's spring, met we on hill, in dale, forest, or mead, by paved fountain, or by rushy brook, or in the beached margent of the sea, to dance our ringlets to the whistling wind, but with thy brawls thou hast disturb'd our sport. (Titania/*A Midsummer's Night Dream*, 4.1.129-132)
- (17) As he shall smile, Othello shall go mad; and **his unbookish jealousy must construe** poor Cassio's smiles, gestures, and light behavior. (Iago/*Othello*, 4.1.100-102)
- (18) But jealous souls will not be answer'd so; they are not ever jealous for the cause, but **jealous for they are jealous; 'tis a monster begot upon itself, born on itself**. (Emilia/*Othello*, 3.4.159-162)
- (19) But I do think it is their husbands' faults if wives do fall. Say that they slack their duties, and pour our treasures into foreign laps, or else **break out in peevish jealousies**, throwing restraint upon us; or, say they strike us, or scant our former having in despite. (Emilia/*Othello*, 4.3.86-91)
- (20) Believe me, I had rather have lost my purse full of cruzadoes; and, but my noble Moor is true of mind, and **made of no such baseness as jealous creatures are**, it were enough to put him to ill thinking. (Desdemona/*Othello*, 3.4.25-29)

As can be seen in example (14), jealousy can be conceptualized as a SOCIAL SUPERIOR, whereas the person who experiences jealousies becomes his servant. A different version of the mapping JEALOUSY IS A RULER can be found in examples (21) and (22), where jealousy is conceptualized as a god and a devil, respectively:

- (21) How novelty may move, and parts with person, alas, **a kind of godly jealousy** – which, I beseech you, call a virtuous sin – makes me afeard. (Troilus/*Troilus and Cressida*, 4.4.2513-16)
- (22) That same knave Ford, her husband, hath the **finest mad devil of jealousy in him**, Master Brook, that ever governed frenzy. (Falstaff/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 5.1.16-18)

Less frequently, jealousy is mapped as a wild animal or even a monster, as can be seen here and in examples (10) and (18) above:

- (23) **I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen**; more clamorous than a parrot against rain; more new-fangled than an ape; more giddy in my desires than a monkey. (Rosalind/*As You Like It*, 4.1.149-153)
- (24) To both these sisters have I sworn my love; **each jealous of the other, as the stung are of the adder**. (Edmund/*King Lear*, 5.1.57-59)

A final specification of the jealousy is a LIVING BEING can be found in the following examples, where jealousy is described as an entity, probably a plant, that grows or makes the person who experiences jealousy grow:

- (25) **I shall grow jealous of you shortly**, Launcelot, if you thus get my wife into corners. (Lorenzo/*The Merchant of Venice*, 3.5.31-32)
- (26) By this marriage, **all little jealousies which now seem great**, and all great fears which now import their dangers, would then be nothing; truths would be but tales where now half tales be truths; (Agrippa/*Anthony and Cleopatra*, 2.2.841-845)

The (DESTRUCTIVE) NATURAL FORCE scheme (with 3 occurrences in the corpus), focuses on the same idea of *jealousy* as an external agent of movement, growth or mistrust that cannot be controlled at all by the experiencer:

- (27) For, **being transported by my jealousies** to bloody thoughts and to revenge, I chose Camillo for the minister to poison my friend Polixenes: (Leontes/*The Winter's Tale*, 3.2.1390-93)
- (28) **Rumour is a pipe blown by surmises, jealousies**, conjectures, and of so easy and so plain a stop that the blunt monster with uncounted heads, the still-discordant wavering multitude, can play upon it. (Rumour/*The Second Part of Henry IV*, 2.1.15-20)
- (29) O! **How hast thou with jealousy infected the sweetness of affiance**. Show men dutiful? (King Henry/*The Second Part of Henry IV*, 2.2.130-131)

The SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER metaphor occupies however a much more peripheral position here than in the BNC (Ogarkova 2007:104). With four single occurrences, this pattern is only weakly present in the Shakespeare's Corpus.

- (30) My foolish rival, that her father likes only for his possessions are so huge, is gone with her along, and I must after, **for love, thou know'st, is full of jealousy**. (Valentine/*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 2.4.175-8)
- (31) I think my husband hath some special suspicion of Falstaff's being here; for **I never saw him so gross in his jealousy till now**. (Mistress Ford/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 3.3.187-189)
- (32) To my sick soul, as sin's true nature is, each toy seems prologue to some great amiss: **So full of artless jealousy is guilt**, it spills itself in fearing to be spilt. (Queen Gertrude/*Hamlet*, 4.5.20-24)
- (33) Think'st thou **I'd make a life of jealousy**, to follow still the changes of the moon with fresh suspicions? (Othello/*Othello*, 3.3.177-179)

This is in clear contrast with modern theories on the embodiment of emotions (Prinz 2004), according to which emotions occur when the perception of an exciting fact causes a number of bodily changes. In Shakespeare's plays, there is a strong preference for non-somatic conceptualizations of *jealousy*, which is presented as an external factor of emotional distress, as in the OPPONENT, ANIMAL and NATURAL FORCE metaphors described above. Furthermore, if we assume that the very low salience of this somatic pattern in Shakespeare's English is to some extent representative of literary early Modern English usage, one could tentatively propose the existence of a general diachronic pattern from non-somatic conceptualizations of emotions in early English to more physiological associations and embodiment in Present-Day English. This claim is supported by the fact that a similar tendency has been described related to the expression of *anger* (Geeraerts/Gevaert 2008) and *fear* (Díaz-Vera 2011) in literary varieties of Old and Middle English. However, the limited nature of my corpus implies that further research into the figurative and non-figurative expressions of *jealousy* in early Englishes is needed before this hypothesis can be confirmed.

Of special relevance in Shakespeare's plays is the use of colour metaphors for *jealousy*. This emotion is referred to as a destructive 'green-eyed' being on two different occasions (see examples [10] and [13] above). This association of jealousy with the colour green is not new. As indicated by Gundersheimer (1993:323-324), sixteenth-century philosophers and writers equated jealousy with coldness. Interestingly, since women were presumed to have less body heat than men, it followed that jealousy should come more easily to them:

According to the medical theories of the time, women have colder bodies; thus, the jealousy natural to them serves to quench the fires of love. For this reason, too, jealousy is associated with the colour green, whose opposite signifies the passion of love (Gundersheimer 1993:324).

In the following example, jealousy is associated with the colour of an orange skin:

- (34) The count is neither sad, nor sick, nor merry, nor well; but civil count, civil as an orange, and **something of that jealous complexion.**
(Beatrice/*Much Ado About Nothing*, 2.1.275-277)

According to most interpretations of this paragraph, rather than the orange colour, this is a reference to yellow, a colour traditionally related to jealousy in

early English (as in the noun *yellowness*). According to Williams (1994), the homonymic factor „presumably eased the association between yellow melancholia and jaundice” (p. 1557). However, as stated by Hulme (1891), the origins of this association are deeply rooted in Christian traditions:

In France, during the sixteenth century, the doors of felons and traitors were painted yellow; and in some countries the Jews were required to wear yellow, because they denied the Messiah. It is the colour of jealousy and treason, and Judas is often represented in old glass painting in a yellow robe (p. 20).

Similarly, in (35) jealousy is mapped as a tainting substance, which can change the colour of someone's heart and brain:

- (35) Why did you suffer Iachimo, slight thing of Italy, **to taint his nobler heart and brain with needless jealousy**; (Sicilius/*Cymbeline*, 5.4.63-66)

The mapping JEALOUSY IS A MECHANISM is relatively frequent in Shakespeare's plays, as in:

- (36) Thy tyranny, together **working with thy jealousies**, fancies too weak for boys, too green and idle for girls of nine, O! Think what they have done, and then run mad indeed, stark mad; (Paulina/*The Winter's Tale*, 3.2.192-195)
- (37) *As, I confess, it is my nature's plague to spy into abuses, and oft my jealousy shapes faults that are not, – that your wisdom yet, from one that so imperfectly conceits, would take no notice, nor build yourself a trouble out of his scattering and unsure observance.* (Iago/*Othello*, 3.3.146-151)

Finally, I will discuss briefly three metaphoric mappings that are not listed in Ogarkova's (2007) study of *jealousy* in the BNC: POISON (as in [38]), UNITY OF TWO PARTS (as in [39]) and LOCATION (as in [40-41]).

- (38) And thereof came it that the man was mad: **The venom clamours of a jealous woman poison more deadly than a mad dog's tooth.** (Abbess/*The Comedy of Errors*, 5.1.68-70)
- (39) Lord Cardinal, will your Grace persuade the queen to send the Duke of York unto his princely brother presently? If she deny, Lord Hastings, go with him, and from **her jealous arms pluck him perforce.** (Duke of Buckingham/*The Tragedy of King Richard III*, 2.4.32-36)
- (40) Why, look, where he comes; and my good man too: **he's as far from jealousy, as I am from giving him cause**; and that, I hope, is an unmeasurable distance. (Mistress Page/*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 2.1.104-106)

- (41) I know you two are rival enemies: How comes this gentle concord in the world, that **hatred is so far from jealousy**, to sleep by hate, and fear no enmity? (Theseus/*A Midsummer's Night Dream*, 4.1.129-132)

The image of *jealousy* as a poison has a long literary tradition in Europe (Wagschal 2006: 79-80). This pattern, which can be related to the UNPLEASANT TASTE/SMELL metaphor illustrated by examples (42) and (43) below, is highly consistent with some of the physiological effects of jealousy, which are similar to well-known specific responses to most drugs (including alcohol): they include, among other things, increased heart rate, increased systolic and diastolic blood pressure, palm sweating and frowning (Pietrzak/Laird/Stevens/Thompson 2002: 83).

- (42) Why should I not, had I the heart to do it, like to the Egyptian thief at point of death, kill what I love?--**a savage jealousy that sometimes savours nobly**. (Orsino/*Twelfth Night*, 5.1.120-23)
- (43) O! how **hast thou with jealousy infected the sweetness of affiance**. Show men dutiful? (King Henry/*The Second Part of Henry IV*, 2.2.130-131)

Example (43) illustrates the blending of the mappings JEALOUSY IS A BITTER TASTE and JEALOUSY IS A SHARP WEAPON.

As for the UNITY OF TWO PARTS metaphor, *jealousy* is conceived of as a physical force that keeps two lovers together, sometimes against the will of one of them. The same metaphor is used by Shakespeare in order to characterize both *friendship* and *romantic love* (Tissari 2006:155-156). Friends and lovers are in fact presented as Siamese twins who cannot be separated from each other.

Finally, the mapping JEALOUSY IS A PLACE is related to general EMOTIONS ARE LOCATIONS metaphor, according to which emotions are metaphorically viewed as locations which may be reached, occupied and left behind (Pérez Rull 2001).

5. Men's vs. women's jealousy metaphors

According to Kövecses (2005:91), „a language community may employ differential metaphorical conceptualizations along a social division that is relevant in that society”. As has been pointed earlier, this may be applicable to some of the intra-cultural differences between men and women, which are reflected in a variety of ways in our metaphorical language and thought. In this section, I will try to determine to what extent Shakespeare tried to use

different conceptualizations of *jealousy* in the stereotyped linguistic characterization of his male and female characters. Although my analysis does not necessarily represent gender distinctions in actual language usage or thinking, it can be illustrative of how conscious Renaissance speakers were of the existence of these differences.

As described above, my analysis has focused on 50 metaphorical mappings for jealousy. Of these, 29 correspond to male characters, whereas the other 22 correspond to female characters. Finally, two examples correspond to personified entities, such as Time and Rumour, and have not been included in this part of the study. The distribution of the metaphors of *jealousy* used by Shakespeare in his masculine characters is illustrated in Table 3.

	OCCURRENCES
OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE	5
INSANITY/DISEASE	3
ANIMAL/MONSTER	3
SUPERNATURAL ENTITY	2
PLANT	2
(DESTRUCTIVE) FORCE	2
SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER	2
COLOUR	2
MECHANISM	2
HUMAN (ANTHROPOMORPHIC) BEING	1
UNITY OF TWO PARTS	1
LOCATION	1
WEAPON	1
UNPLEASANT TASTE	1
TOTAL	28

Table 3: Man's metaphors for *jealousy* in SC

As can be seen here, there is a clear preference for the OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE mapping (5 occurrences), which is followed by the INSANITY/DISEASE and the ANIMAL/MONSTER mappings (3 instances each).

Violence, rivalry and loss of self-control are in fact typically masculine reactions to negative emotions in general, and to *jealousy* in particular (Salovey/Rodin 1984). *Jealousy* is presented here as an external entity that attacks and takes hold of the experiencer's body and mind (as can be seen in the mappings JEALOUSY IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE, JEALOUSY IS INSANITY/DISEASE and JEALOUSY IS AN ANIMAL/MONSTER). In the case of feminine characters, the preference is for the HUMAN BEING mapping (9 occurrences). Besides personification, there seems to be a relative preference in Shakespeare's female characters for mappings that imply embodiment of this emotion, as in the case of ANIMAL/MONSTER, COLOUR, SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER and COLOUR. *Jealousy* seems to have a corporeal existence, either as an external being or, metonymically, as a substance that invades the experiencer's body producing a series of psychological and physiological effects.

	OCCURRENCES
HUMAN BEING	9
DISEASE/INSANITY	2
ANIMAL/MONSTER	2
SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER	2
COLOUR	2
MECHANISM	2
RULER	1
POISON	1
LOCATION	1
TOTAL	22

Table 4: Women's metaphors for *jealousy* in SC

6. Conclusions

In this study I have presented an analysis of a series of metaphoric conceptualizations of *jealousy* used by Shakespeare in his 37 plays. Using the *metaphorical pattern analysis* methodology proposed by Stefanowitsch (2004, 2006), I have analysed all the sentences where the noun *jealousy* or any of its early Modern English synonyms and derivatives is used in a metaphorical pattern in the Shakespeare Corpus. Thereafter, these patterns have been classified into metaphorical mappings (50 mappings in all), which inform us on Renaissance conceptualizations of *jealousy*.

Broadly speaking, my analysis confirms and complements Ogarkova's (2007) assumptions on the conceptualization of jealousy in Present-Day English both in terms of conceptual mappings and of individual preferences. Only in the case of conceptualizations of *jealousy* based on its somatic effects (such as SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER), I have noted that their saliency is much lower in Shakespeare's English than in the BNC. Physiological associations and embodiment are relatively more frequent in the case of feminine characters, which could be illustrative of the different reactions to infidelity by women and men. I have also identified a series of mappings that are not listed in Ogarkova's study: this is the case of JEALOUSY IS A POISON, JEALOUSY IS UNION OF TWO PARTS and JEALOUSY IS A LOCATION, which illustrate characteristically Renaissance conceptualizations of jealousy (especially in the case of the poison metaphor, as indicated by Wagschal, 2006).

In any case, given the limited nature of the data used here, further research into the figurative and non-figurative expressions of *jealousy* in the early stages of the history of English is required in order to have a more comprehensive view of this field and its evolution.

References

A. Corpora and Dictionaries

MED = *Middle English Dictionary, The* (2001), online edition. McSparran, Frances (ed.): <http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/med/> (last accessed 10/10/2011).

OED = *Oxford English Dictionary, The* (2000-), second edition, online version. Simpson, John (ed.): <http://www.oed.com> (last accessed 10/10/2011).

SC = *Shakespeare Corpus* (2006), online edition. Scott, Mike (ed.): <http://www.lexically.net/wordsmith/support/shakespeare.html> (last accessed 10/10/2011).

B. Secondary References

- Averill, James R. (1980): „A Constructivist View of Emotion“, in: Plutchik, Robert/Kellerman, Henry (eds.): *Emotion: Theory, research and experience*, New York, 305-339.
- Bryson, Jeff B. (1991): „Modes of Response to Jealousy Evoking Situations“, in: Salovey, Peter (ed.): *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York, 178-210.
- Buss, David M./Larsen, Randy J./Westen, Drew/Semmelroth, Jennifer (1992): „Sex Differences in Jealousy: Evolution, Physiology, and Psychology“, in: *Psychological Science* 3, 251-255.
- Busse, Ulrich (2001): „The use of address pronouns in Shakespeare’s plays and sonnets“, in: Andersen, Henning (ed.): *Actualization: Linguistic Change in Progress*, Amsterdam, 119-142.
- Busse, Ulrich (2002): *Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus*, Amsterdam.
- Craig, William James (1914): *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, Oxford.
- Cyr, Helen W. (1983): *Lexical Choices and Morphological Variables in the Shakespeare and Oxford Corpora*, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Daly, Martin/Wilson, Margo/Weghorst, Suzanne J. (1982): „Male Sexual Jealousy“, in: *Ethology & Sociobiology* 3, 11-27.
- Damasio, Antonio (1994): *Descartes’ Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*, New York.
- Deignan, Alice (2005): *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*, Amsterdam.
- Díaz-Vera, Javier E. (2011): „Reconstructing the Old English Cultural Model for FEAR“, in: *Atlantis* 33(1), 85-103.
- Edlund, John E./Heider, Jeremy D./Scherer, Cory R./Farc, Maria-Magdalena/Sagarin, Brad J. (2006): „Sex Differences in Jealousy in Response to Actual Infidelity“, in: *Evolutionary Psychology* 4, 462-470.
- Fesmire, Steven. A. (1994): „Aerating the Mind: The Metaphor of Mental Functioning as Bodily Functioning“, in: *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 9, 31-44.
- Geeraerts, Dirk/Gevaert, Caroline (2008): „Hearts and (Angry) Minds in Old English“, in: Sharifian, Farzad/Dirven, René/Yu, Ning (eds.): *Culture, Body, and language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs Across Cultures and Languages*, Berlin, 319-347.

- Gundersheimer, Werner (1993): „The Green-Eyed Monster': Renaissance Conceptions of Jealousy", in: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 137(3), 321-331.
- Hanks, Patrick (2006): „Metaphoricity is Gradable", in: Stefanowitsch, Anatol/Gries, Stephan Th. (eds.): *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, Berlin/New York, 17-35.
- Harré, Rom (1986): „An Outline of the Social Constructionist Viewpoint", in: Harré, Rom (ed.): *The Social Construction of Emotions*, Oxford, 2-14.
- Hulme, Edward (1891): *The History, Principles and Practice of Symbolism in Christian Art*, London.
- Hupka, Ralph B. (1991): „The Motive for the Arousal of Romantic Jealousy: Its Cultural Origin", in: Salovey, Peter (ed.). *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York, 252-270.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (1986): „A Figure of Thought", in: *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 6, 29-46.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (1988): *The Language of Love: The Semantics of Passion in Conversational English*, Lewisburg, PA.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (1990): *Emotion Concepts*, New York.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2005): *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*, Cambridge.
- Lakoff, George (1987): *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, Chicago.
- Lakoff, George (1993): „A Contemporary Theory of Metaphor", in: Orton, Antony (ed.): *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge, 202-251.
- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago.
- Lakoff, George/Kövecses, Zoltan (1987): „The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English", in: Holland, Dorothy/Quinn, Naomi (eds.): *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Cambridge, 195-221.
- Lewis, Michael (2010): „Lost, protest and emotional development", in: Hart, Sybil L./Legerstee, Maria (eds.): *Handbook of Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Multidisciplinary Approaches*, Chichester, 27-39.
- Núñez, Rafael/Sweetser, Eve (2006): „With the Future Behind Them: Convergent Evidence From Aymara Language and Gesture in the Crosslinguistic Comparison of Spatial Construals of Time", in: *Cognitive Science* 30(3), 401-450.

- Ogarkova, Anna (2007): „Green-Eyed Monsters: a Corpus-Based Study of the Concepts of ENVY and JEALOUSY in Modern English”, in: *Metaphorik.de* 13, 87-147.
- Pérez Rull, Juan Carmelo (2001): „The conceptualization of emotions as locations in English”, in: *RESLA* 14, 353-363.
- Pietrzak, Robert H./Laird, James D./Stevens, David A./Thompson, Nicholas S. (2002): „Sex Differences in Human Jealousy: A Coordinated Study of Forced-Choice, Continuous Rating-Scale, and Physiological Responses on the Same Subjects”, in: *Evolution and Human Behaviour* 23, 83-94.
- Prinz, Jesse J. (2004): „Embodied Emotions”, in: Solomon, Robert (ed.): *Thinking about Feeling: Contemporary Philosophers on Emotion*, Oxford, 44-60.
- Quinn, Naomi/Holland, Dorothy (1987): „Culture and Cognition”, in: Quinn, Naomi/Holland, Dorothy (eds.): *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, Cambridge, 3-42.
- Salovey, Peter/Rodin, Judith (1984): „Some Antecedents and Consequences of Social Comparison Jealousy”, in: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47, 780-792.
- Scott, Mike (2008): *WordSmith Tools version 5*, Liverpool.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol (2004): „HAPPINESS in English and German: A Metaphorical-Pattern Analysis”, in: Kemmer, Achard/Kemmer, Susanne (eds.): *Language, Culture, and Mind*, Stanford, 137-149.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol (2006): „Words and their Metaphors: A Corpus-Based Approach”, in: Stefanowitsch, Anatol/Gries, Stephan Th. (eds.): *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, Berlin/New York, 63-105.
- Stein, Dieter (2003): „Pronominal usage in Shakespeare: Between sociolinguistics and conversation analysis”, in: Taavitsainen, Irma/Juker, Andreas (eds.): *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, Amsterdam, 251-307.
- Symons, Donald (1979): *The Evolution of Human Sexuality*, Oxford.
- Tissari, Helli (2006): „„Is Love a Tender Thing?’ Metaphors of the Word LOVE in Shakespeare’s Plays”, in: *Studi Linguistic e Filologici Online* 4.1., <http://www.humnet.unipi.it/slifo/vol4.1/Tissari4.1.pdf> (last accessed 15/10/2011).
- Wagschal, Stevens (2006): *The Literature of Jealousy in the Age of Cervantes*, Columbia/London.

Wiederman, Michael W./Allgeier, Elizabeth R. (1993): „Gender Differences in Sexual Jealousy: Adaptionist or Social Learning Explanation?“, in: *Ethology and Sociobiology* 14, 115–140.

Williams, Gordon (1994): *A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery in Shakespeare and Tudor Literature*, London/New Jersey.