



## TURKISH METAPHORS OF ANGER

### TÜRKÇE ÖFKE METAFORLARI

**Elif ARICA AKKÖK**

Yrd. Doç. Dr., Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi,  
Dilbilim Bölümü, elifarica@gmail.com

#### Abstract

Studies in Cognitive Linguistics have established that metaphors have an important role in the conceptualization of feelings, and that these conceptualizations present clues about the properties unique to the nature of languages. (Lakoff, 405; Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 15; Kövecses, *Metaphor in Culture* 34). The concept of anger, which is one of the most frequently studied feeling concepts examined with a cognitive view, has a significantly important role in determining the cultural differences of the languages (Lakoff and Kövecses 200; Yu 60; Soriano 110; Kövecses, *Handbook of Anger* 164; Kövecses et al. 350). There have been prominent studies in Turkish as well which aim to put forward the general and culture specific conceptualizations of anger metaphors (Aksan, *Metaphors of Anger* 31; Aksan, *The Container Metaphor* 103). The aim of this study is to analyze Turkish anger metaphors and to describe their culture specific views. To reach this aim, the distribution and metaphorical mappings of anger metaphors in a database, which has been built from news articles and newspaper columns, have been determined. The findings of the study show that the metaphors of container, natural force and opponent have significant role in the cognitive model specific to Turkish; and that the Turkish specific model displays common properties with the model developed by Lakoff and Kövecses (200) for American English, aside from having some culture specific differences.

#### Öz

Bilişsel dilbilim alanındaki çalışmalar metaforların duyguların kavramlaştırılmasında önemli bir rolü olduğunu, söz konusu kavramlaştırmaların dillerin doğasına özgü özelliklere yönelik ipuçları sunduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Lakoff 405; Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 15; Kövecses, *Metaphor in Culture* 34). Bilişsel bakış açısıyla en sık çalışılan duygu kavramlarından birisi olan öfke kavramı, dillere özgü kültürel farklılıkları belirlemede oldukça önemli bir role sahiptir (Lakoff ve Kövecses 200; Yu 60; Soriano 110; Kövecses, *Handbook of Anger*, 164; Kövecses ve diğerleri 350). Türkçe'de de öfke metaforlarının genel ve kültüre özgü kavramlaştırmalarını ortaya koymayı amaçlayan öncü çalışmalar bulunmaktadır (Aksan, *Metaphors of Anger* 31; Aksan, *The Container Metaphor* 103). Bu çalışmanın temel amacı Türkçe öfke metaforlarını bilişsel dilbilim bakış açısıyla ele almak ve kültüre özgü görünümelerini betimlemektir. Söz konusu amaca ulaşmak için gazete haber metinlerinden ve köşe yazılarından oluşturulan bir veri tabanında yer alan öfke metaforlarının dağılımları ve metaforik eşlemeleri belirlenmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları Türkçeye özgü bilişsel modelde kap, doğal güç ve rakip metaforlarının belirgin rolü olduğunu; Türkçeye özgü modelin Lakoff ve Kövecses (200) tarafından Amerikan İngilizcesi için geliştirilen bilişsel modelle ortak özellikler sergilediğini, ancak kültüre özgü kimi farklılıklar gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur.

#### Makale Bilgisi

Gönderildiği tarih: 16 Mart 2017

Kabul edildiği tarih: 20 Nisan 2017

Yayınlanma tarihi: 21 Haziran 2017

#### Article Info

Date submitted: 16 March 2017

Date accepted: 20 April 2017

Date published: 21 June 2017

#### Anahtar sözcükler

Kavramsal Metafor; Öfke Metaforları;  
Bilişsel Dilbilim; Metaforik Eşleme;  
Duygu Kavramları

#### Keywords

Conceptual Metaphor; Anger  
Metaphors; Cognitive Linguistics;  
Metaphorical Mappings; Emotion  
Concepts

DOI: 10.1501/Dtcfder\_0000001516

## I. Introduction

Recent studies in the field of linguistics concentrate on the figurative uses of language. This study investigates the metaphoric uses of anger in Turkish within a cognitive semantic perspective. According to cognitive semantics, metaphor is not regarded as a characteristic of language but a characteristic of thought. One of the most prominent theories of cognitive semantics, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) proposed by Lakoff and Johnson, (8) states that metaphor is the way we conceptualize our world. Lakoff and Johnson (5) also suggest that concepts that structure the world we perceive constitute an important part in our lives. According to CMT the nature of language is metaphoric. We think, conceptualize, and speak by metaphors (Lakoff and

Johnson 57; Lakoff 381). As a result of this CMT suggests that conceptual metaphors are mostly based on bodily experiences. Human beings conceive the world in the way they experience, that is we speak by what we perceive or experience. So this theory asserts that we have conceptual metaphors in our minds and we reflect our thoughts through language by using linguistic metaphors.

A conceptual metaphor is a correspondence or mapping process between two conceptual domains. Regarding this, a conceptual metaphor is constituted by two domains: a source domain and a target domain. The source domain is the more concrete domain by which we select metaphorical expressions (*container, fire, object*) in order to understand another conceptual domain. The target domain is the more abstract (*emotions, life, time*) domain which is understood by source domain (Kövecses, *Metaphor: Practical Introduction* 3-15). Accordingly EMOTION IS A CONTAINER is a conceptual metaphor where “*I am full of anger*” is a linguistic metaphor exemplifying this conceptual metaphor. The best and also inevitable way to express an abstract concept such as an emotion through language is expressing it through a metaphor. Since the scope of this study is the emotion concept ANGER, it will be appropriate to give some information about the nature of emotions.

Emotions are very important parts of our lives, thus emotions and the way emotions are expressed in languages are studied by many researchers in different fields of study such as psychology, philosophy, ethnology, sociology and linguistics (Foolen 16). Linguists focus on the conceptualization of emotions. While doing this they try to answer the question of whether emotions are universal or culture specific. Wierzbicka (*Emotions Across Languages* 4) proposes that “while the concept of “feeling” is universal and can be safely used in the investigation of human experience and human nature, the concept of “emotion” is culture-bound and cannot be similarly relied on”. Thus she asserts that emotion concepts do not have universal characteristics, but have culture-specific characteristics. She proposes that the best way to show the universal and culture specific features of emotion terms is showing them by semantic primitives (Wierzbicka, *Defining Emotion Concepts*; Wierzbicka, *Semantics, Culture, Cognition*). These semantic primitives show conceptual content of emotion concepts and differences in the conceptualization of emotions show culture specific differences. On the other hand Kövecses (*Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* 14) with a metaphor depended point of view asserts that emotion concepts do have some universal characteristics since they are motivated by the human body, however it is also necessary to

acknowledge that they are also produced by a particular social and cultural environment. In a previous study focusing on anger, Lakoff and Kövecses (195) emphasized the role of embodiment and bodily experiences in conceptualization of anger. However as stated above, anger is both motivated by the human body and by experiences the source of which is a particular social and cultural environment (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 20; Kövecses, *Metaphor A Practical Introduction* 196). So a study to be conducted on emotion metaphors should not ignore the social and cultural environment motivating that emotion.

Kövecses (*Metaphor and Emotion* 215) suggests that metaphorical and metonymical understanding play a role in the conceptualization of emotions. Moreover he claims that prototypical scenarios emerging by metaphors show cultural models of languages. Apart from this, studies on conceptualization of emotion concepts emphasize the role of embodiment and these studies suggest that emotions which are common experiences coming up by sensory experience can exhibit some common or universal features according to languages or cultures. Supporting this view, the current study will try to show the potential of metaphors in linguistic expressions used for an emotion concept which is ANGER.

In their study Lakoff and Kövecses (210) propose a five stage prototypical scenario for the conceptualization of anger in American English:

1. Offending event
  - Wrongdoer offends self.
  - Wrongdoer is at fault.
  - The offending event displeases self.
  - The intensity of the offense outweighs the intensity of the retribution (which equals zero at this point), thus creating an imbalance.
  - The offense causes anger to come into existence.
2. Anger
  - Anger exists.
  - Self experiences physiological effects (heat, pressure, agitation).
  - Anger exerts force on the self to attempt an act of retribution.
3. Attempt to control anger
  - Self exerts a counterforce in an attempt to control anger.
4. Loss of control
  - The intensity of anger goes above the limit.
  - Anger takes control of self.
  - S exhibits angry behavior (loss of judgment, aggressive actions).

There is damage to self.

There is danger to the target of anger, in this case, the wrongdoer.

#### 5. Retribution

Self performs retributive act against wrongdoer (this is usually angry behavior).

The intensity of retribution balances the intensity of offense.

The intensity of anger drops to zero.

Anger ceases to exist.

According to this prototypical model, metaphors and metonymies used in the language can be mapped on different stages of the anger scenario. In this model there are five basic stages:

(1) cause → (2) existence of anger, or its counterpart (in the form of a force) → (3) attempt at control → (4) loss of control → (5) expression.

Several studies have been conducted in view of Lakoff and Kövecses's (195) study, in which metaphors of emotions are analyzed and compared in different languages in order to put forward the similarities and differences. For instance Yu (59) proposes the cultural model for Chinese in the view of CMT by analyzing metaphors of HAPPINESS and ANGER in Chinese. Mikolajczuk (153) outlines the conceptualization of metaphors of anger in Polish, Maalej (51) illustrates figurative expressions conceptualizing anger in Tunisian Arabic, Soriano (107) exemplifies Spanish cultural model by comparing Spanish metaphorical expressions of anger with English expressions. Aksan (*Metaphors of Anger* 31) and Aksan (*The Container Metaphor* 103) analyses Turkish emotion concept anger exemplifying the container metaphor and portrays an outline of Turkish cultural model. Apart from these, comparative studies trying to find out similarities and differences in cultural models of anger in different languages are conducted (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 115; Kövecses et al., 341). These studies show that languages share some universal characteristics, although there are some culture-specific differences among different languages. In other words, it can be seen that conceptual metaphors are largely common in these studies, and sometimes the exact same scenario works except for some cultural specific differences. In some languages like Chinese and Japanese, some differences among various steps of the scenario were observed.

Some group members do have more basic or prototypical roles in conceptualization of concepts in a category (Rosch 27). The same condition is in use in emotion categories. Thus some emotions play a more central or prototypical

role where some play a more peripheral role in conceptualization of emotions. For instance, emotions such as ANGER, LOVE, HAPPINESS, SADNESS play a more prototypical role than emotions such as PRIDE, SHAME or LUST. Besides this, some lexical units have a more representative role for an emotion category. In English, for example *rage* or *fury* are not the prototypical words, but *anger* is the prototypical word for the emotion concept ANGER. Similar to this in Turkish *öfke* is more prototypical than other words used while expressing anger such as *kızmak* and *sinirlenmek*. Thus in this study while searching for the concept “anger” in the database the most common and prototypical word for anger “öfke” is used.

The aims of the study basing on the above conceptual framework are given in the next part.

### 1.1. Aim of the study

Previous studies (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*; Kövecses, *Handbook of Anger*; Lakoff and Kövecses) focusing on cross-cultural experience of emotions argue that in languages abstract concepts such as emotions are conceptualized by metaphors. Hence metaphors play a crucial role in conceptualization of anger.

This study aims to investigate Turkish metaphors of anger in the light of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 60) with an attempt to provide an outline of the cultural model of the language. The following questions are going to be answered in order to reach this aim:

1. What are the conceptual metaphors of coming forth in the conceptualization of Turkish emotion concept ANGER?
  - a. What are the entailments and mappings motivating Turkish metaphors of ANGER?
  - b. How are the frequencies of linguistic expressions and linguistic examples exemplifying Turkish conceptual metaphors conceptualizing Turkish metaphors of ANGER?
2. What is the cultural model for Turkish?
3. What are culture-specific characteristics of the cultural model?

The study first introduces the method for data collection and analysis, and then presents the findings. After that findings are discussed and results regarding the metaphors collected from the database of the study are given.

## 2. Method

The document analysis method is used in this study while investigating Turkish metaphors of anger. Since a Turkish corpus on which to perform the study did not exist during the time the study was conducted, the study was performed by manually searching the internet archives of newspapers.

For the study, five Turkish newspapers were selected: *Hürriyet*, *Milliyet*, *Cumhuriyet*, *Zaman* and *Sabah*. These newspapers are national mainstream newspapers with a large circulation, and have different political and cultural biases, where *Hürriyet*, *Milliyet* and *Sabah* can be considered liberal/central right, *Cumhuriyet* secular and *Zaman* conservative.

The analysis was carried out as follows:

- The internet archives of the mentioned newspapers returned usage results from 1999 up to 2011.
- Thus the database is limited with newspaper archives, between the years 1990 and 2011.
- While constituting the database news reports, columns, sports and magazine news are all included.
- The word “öfke” (anger) and its inflected forms were searched in each newspaper.
- The paragraph containing each occurrence was copied to an excel file. The distribution of uses of “öfke” in each newspaper were as shown in Table 1 as follows:

**Table 1: The uses of “öfke” (anger) in newspapers**

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Uses of “öfke”</b>
Hürriyet	1766
Sabah	2486
Milliyet	3044
Zaman	2800
Cumhuriyet	1238
<b>Total</b>	<b>11334</b>

- These numbers also covered some derived forms, since it was impossible to make an internet search excluding the derived forms. So, as a next step, each context was examined and derived forms such as “öfkeli” (angry) and “öfkelenmek” (to get angry), as well as literal uses were deleted.
- The numbers also covered some repetitions. The next step was eliminating the repeated sentences or uses.



- Lastly, a detailed analysis was made on the remaining 1930 metaphorical expressions. The analyzed expressions were classified according to metaphorical source domains.
  - First the conceptual metaphors, entailments and mappings were determined
  - Second, the stage of the metaphoric expression according to anger scenario is determined:  
Existence → cause → (attempt and loss of) control → expression
  - Lastly, the findings and results were discussed

Findings obtained by using the method are presented in the next part of the study.

### 3. Findings

When the metaphoric expressions in our database is analyzed, 1930 metaphoric and metonymic expressions were found out. Among these 47 expressions were idioms or proverbs and these were eliminated from the data. 1827 expressions from the remaining 1883 examples were metaphoric where 56 were metonymic. The distribution of figurative expressions in the database are shown in Table 2:

**Table 2: The distribution of figurative expressions**

<b>Type of figurative expressions</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Metaphors	1827	94,66
Metonymies	56	2,90
Proverbs	47	2,44
<b>Total</b>	<b>1930</b>	<b>100</b>

#### *Conceptual metaphors*

In the study 19 metaphorical source domains were found out. In this part the top 10 metaphorical source domain and their mappings will be discussed.

A conceptual metaphor can have different numbers or types of conceptual correspondences i.e. entailments or mappings. In other words conceptual metaphors can be more or less elaborated in terms of number of entailments, mappings, number of linguistic examples or types of linguistic expressions. (Kövecses, *Handbook of Anger* 166). The richness of a conceptual metaphor depends

on these variables. It is also the best way to show the culture specific differences in a language. For this reason the number and percentages of metaphorical mappings, token of linguistic expressions and types of expressions are calculated for each metaphor in the database. The distribution of these variables are given in Table 3:

**Table 3: Metaphors of Anger in Turkish**

<b>Metaphorical Source Domain</b>	<b>Token of linguistic expressions</b>	<b>% of all expressions</b>	<b>Type of linguistic examples</b>	<b>% of all examples</b>	<b>Type of mappings</b>	<b>% of all mappings</b>
CONTAINER	667	36,51	75	26,13	12	19,35
NATURAL FORCE	353	19,32	36	12,54	5	8,06
OPPONENT	229	12,53	28	9,76	5	8,06
LOCATION	90	4,93	1	0,35	1	1,61
OBJECT/ ENTITY	81	4,43	16	5,57	6	9,68
LIVING ORGANISM	71	3,89	13	4,53	7	11,29
FIRE	65	3,56	30	10,45	5	8,06
DISEASE	48	2,63	9	3,14	3	4,84
INSANITY	41	2,24	3	1,05	1	1,61
WAR	33	1,81	9	3,14	2	3,23
SUPERIOR	27	1,48	6	2,09	2	3,23
INTENSITY	19	1,04	13	4,53	2	3,23
PERSON	22	1,20	16	5,57	1	1,61
WILD ANIMAL	19	1,04	5	1,74	2	3,23
CAPTIVE ANIMAL	17	0,93	6	2,09	2	3,23
NUTRIENT	16	0,88	8	2,79	2	3,23
BURDEN	14	0,77	6	2,09	1	1,61
TRIGGERING FORCE	8	0,44	1	0,35	1	1,61
MOVING ENGINE	7	0,38	6	2,09	2	3,23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1827</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100</b>

As can be clearly seen in Table (3) the most frequent three metaphorical source domains in the database are CONTAINER, NATURAL FORCE and OPPONENT.

The metaphors are also classified in terms of the stages that they map on the five stage prototypical model (Existence → cause → “attempt and loss of” control → expression) proposed by Lakoff and Kövecses (195) as shown in Table (4).



**Table 4: Distribution of metaphorical source domains in terms of stages in the prototypical model**

Metaphorical source domain	STAGE 1	STAGE 2	STAGE 3	STAGE 4	STAGE 5
	Cause	Intensity	Attempt to control	Loss of control	Expression
BURDEN		12			2
CAPTIVE ANIMAL			13	4	
CONTAINER	6	310	40	304	7
DISEASE			1	47	
FIRE		3		54	8
INSANITY				41	
INTENSITY	10	6			3
LIVING ORGANISM	71				
LOCATION		90			
MOVING ENGINE		2		4	1
NATURAL FORCE	7	7		206	133
NUTRIENT		6	4	4	2
OBJECT/ENTITY	6	60	9	6	
OPPONENT			54	172	3
PERSON		22			
SUPERIOR				27	
TRIGGERING FORCE				8	
WAR				33	
WILD ANIMAL			15	4	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>159</b>

As it is shown in Table (4) Turkish metaphorical expressions map on *loss of control* (stage 4) and *intensity* (stage 2) stages of the prototypical cognitive model.

Thus the findings of the top 10 metaphorical source domains will be discussed by referring to the metaphorical mappings, number and type of linguistic examples. Apart from these, since each metaphorical expression is classified in terms of the stage that it maps on, the five stage prototypical model the source domain emphasizes will also be discussed.

The metaphorical source domains yielded intensity on ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER metaphor. This metaphor comes up with 4 entailments, 12 mappings and 649 linguistic expressions and 75 types. The linguistic examples of this metaphor mostly map on intensity (304) and loss of control (310) stages of the cognitive model.

In the examples anger is conceptualized as a substance in a container and the substance in the container is usually a fluid under some sort of pressure. Thus the mappings of the metaphor focus on the *intensity* and *control* parts of the fluid. Here we can group the container into two groups. The first group of containers is a container apart from human body such as an object. For instance *öfke küpü* (jar of anger), *öfke çanağı* (bowl of anger) or *öfke tenceresi* (pot of anger). These examples are limited with five expressions.

#### ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER

- ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE THE CONTAINER WHICH CAN BE SOMETHING OTHER THAN BODY (*öfke tenceresi* “pot of anger”, *öfke küpü* “jar of anger”)

The second group and dominating metaphors in conceptualization of Turkish metaphors of anger is BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR ANGER.

- HUMAN BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR ANGER (*kalbi öfke dolu* “one’s heart full of anger”)

Different parts of human body can serve as a container for anger such as eyes: *gözleri öfke dolu* (one’s eyes to be full of anger); face: *yüzü/surati öfke dolu* (one’s face to be full of anger); heart: *yüreği/kalbi öfkeyle dolu* (one’s heart to be full of anger) and look: *öfke dolu bakış* (a stare full of anger). Another sub-container for anger is the *iç* “the insides” of the person which is very common in Turkish.

Metaphors gathered from the data reflect almost all of the entailments of ANGER IS A FLUID IN A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER metaphor (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*148). The entailments figured out in Turkish database for this metaphor are presented below:

#### WHEN THE INTENSITY OF ANGER INCREASES, THE FLUID RISES

- INCREASE IN INTENSITY OF ANGER IS THE LEVEL GOING UP (e.g. *öfke yükseliyor* “rising anger”)
- DECREASE IN INTENSITY OF ANGER IS THE LEVEL GOING DOWN (e.g. *öfkenin azalması* “decrease of anger”)
- INCREASE IN INTENSITY OF ANGER FILLS IN THE CONTAINER WITH A SUBSTANCE (e.g. *öfke dolu* “full of anger”)

#### INTENSE ANGER PRODUCES PRESSURE ON THE CONTAINER

- INTENSITY OF ANGER PRODUCES PRESSURE ON THE CONTAINER (e.g. *öfkeyle gerilmek* “to be tensed with anger”)

- ATTEMPT TO CONTROL ANGER IS TRYING TO SUPPRESS THE ENTITY IN A CONTAINER (*öfkelerini bastırmaya çalışmak*, “try to suppress anger”)
- CONTROLLING ANGER IS SUPPRESSING THE ENTITY IN A CONTAINER (e.g. *öfkelerini tutmak* “suppress anger”, *öfkelerini bastırmak* “suppress anger”)

WHEN ANGER BECOMES TOO INTENSE, THE PERSON LOSES CONTROL

- LOSING CONTROL CAUSES THE CONTAINER TO EXPLODE (*öfkesi patlamak* “anger explodes”)
- LOSING CONTROL IS SUBSTANCE PARTS OF WHICH GOING UP IN THE AIR (*öfke kafasının tasını attırdı* “anger flipped X’s head lid”)
- LOSING CONTROL IS THE SUBSTANCE FLOWING OUT OF THE CONTAINER (*öfke akmak* “anger flows”)
- LOSING CONTROL IS EMPTYING THE CONTAINER (*öfkeyi atmak* “throw out X’s anger”; *öfkeyi boşaltmak* “empty X’s anger”)

The second most common conceptual metaphor observed in the data is ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE. NATURAL FORCE is also the most elaborated metaphorical source domain. There are numerous metaphorical examples of a natural event affecting the person. In these examples the person responds the force in a passive way and undergoes the effects of a natural force (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 72). In the last stage the force *calms down* (*yatışmak*) or *dies down* (*dinmek*).

Natural forces show a range from milder natural events to stronger ones. In other words, as the intensity of anger increases, the effect of the natural force the person undergoes increases as well.

For instance, there are several examples related with rain: *öfke yağmuru* (rain of anger); *öfke yağmak* (to rain anger); *öfke seli* (flood of anger); *öfke sağanağı* (shower of anger); *öfke şimşekleri* (lightnings of anger).

The examples where the force is much stronger are: *öfke rüzgarı* (wind of anger); *öfkesi çığ gibi* (one’s anger to be like an avalanche); *öfke tsunamisi* (tsunami of anger); *öfke fırtınası* (storm of anger); *öfke dalgası* (waves of anger).

In some cases the natural force becomes almost a natural disaster: *öfkeyle duvarları sarsılmak* (for walls to shake because of anger - like an earthquake); *öfke selinde sürüklenmek* (drift in an anger flood); *öfke denizinde boğulmak* (drawn in an anger sea); *öfke seline kapılmak* (get caught in anger flood).

At the last stage; the natural force begins to calm down. There are expressions which show how the intensity of anger falls down as in: *Öfkesi yatışmak* (one's anger to die down) or *öfkesi dinmek* (one's anger to calm down - like wind or rain).

This conceptual metaphor reveals 353 examples, 36 types, 2 entailments and 5 mappings. The linguistic examples of mostly map on loss of control (206) and expression (133) stages of the cognitive model.

The first mapping shows the natural events or nature the angry person is associated with.

#### ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE

- ANGER IS A NATURAL EVENT (e.g. *öfke bulutu* (clouds of anger); *öfke iklimi* (climate of anger); *öfke çağlayanı* (waterfall of anger); *öfke denizi* (sea of anger).
- THE CAUSE OF ANGER IS A NATURAL SOURCE (e.g. *öfkenin kaynağı* “source of anger”)

The second mapping focuses on damaging force component of natural events.

#### ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE TAKING HOLD OF THE SELF/MAKING THE PERSON LOSE HER CONTROL

- ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE CAUSING A DEVASTATING EFFECT (*öfke tsunamisi* “tsunami of anger”, *öfke depremi* “earthquake of anger”)
- ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE DIVERTING THE SELF (e.g. *öfke selinde sürüklenmek* (drift in an anger flood), *öfkeye kapılmak* “drifting with anger”)
- LOSING CONTROL IS A NATURAL FORCE THAT CAN NOT PREVENTED FROM (*yatıştırılmayan öfke* “one's anger that can not be calmed down”)
- ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE CALMING DOWN (*öfkesi yatışmak* “one's anger to die down”, *öfkesi dinmek* “one's anger to calm down”)

The third most common conceptual metaphor is the ANGER IS AN OPPONENT metaphor. Thus, anger is also conceptualized as an OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE. In this conceptualization, the opponent causes the person to respond. The person tries to control his anger and either loses or maintains control over the opponent (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 69). The data also serves many examples to this metaphor where the expressions map on various parts of a struggle scene.

During the struggle the person attacks with anger (*öfkeyle saldırmak*); tries to struggle or cope with anger (*öfkesiyle mücadele etmek, öfkesiyle başa çıkmak*); can control/keep anger under control or lose control (*kontrol altında tutmak, kontrol etmek, kontrolünü kaybetmek*); in the end he/she can be beaten (*öfkesine mağlup olmak*) / defeated (*öfkesine yenilmek*) by anger or defeats anger (*öfkesini yenmek*). At the end of the struggle, the person can restrain or control (*yönetmek, hükmetmek*); conquer his/her opponent, which is anger (*zaptedilen öfke, zaptedilemeyen öfke*).

Anger can be an enemy (*öfke düşmandır*); at the end of the struggle he can choke his enemy (*düşmanını öfkesiyle boğmak*) with his anger.

This metaphor yields 229 linguistic expressions, 28 types of examples, 2 entailments and 5 mappings. The examples mostly map on loss of control (172) and attempt to control (54) stages of the cognitive model.

#### ANGER IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE

- ATTEMPT AT CONTROLLING ANGER IS STRUGGLING WITH AN OPPONENT (*öfkesiyle mücadele etmek* “struggle with anger”, *öfkesiyle başa çıkmak* “overcome anger”)
- CONTROLLING ANGER IS OVERCOMING AN OPPONENT (*öfkesini yenmek* “defeat anger”)
- CONTROLLING ANGER IS CONTROLLING AN OPPONENT (*öfkeyi kontrol etmek* “control anger”, *öfkesini yönetmek* “govern one’s anger”)
- LOSS OF CONTROL OF ANGER IS LOSS OF CONTROL OVER AN OPPONENT (*öfkesine yenilmek* “to be defeated by anger”, *öfkesine mağlup olmak* “to be beaten by anger”)

OPPONENT metaphor can also be conceptualized with OPPONENT IS A PHYSICAL TARGET entailment. In this entailment the angry person sees the opponent as a physical target.

#### OPPONENT IS A PHYSICAL TARGET

- THE TARGET OF ANGER IS A PHYSICAL TARGET (*öfkenin okları* “the arrows of anger”; *öfkeyi yöneltmek/yönlendirmek* “to direct one’s anger”)

The fifth frequent metaphor in the database is ANGER IS LOCATION metaphor with 90 linguistic expressions. However this metaphor has only one mapping and

one type of expression that is *öfke içinde* “in anger”. Thus it is not a salient metaphor.

The next most common metaphor is ANGER IS AN OBJECT/ENTITY metaphor. This metaphor comes up with 81 linguistic expressions, 16 types, 4 entailments and 6 mappings. The linguistic examples of this metaphor mostly map on intensity (60) stage of the cognitive model. Anger is conceptualized as an object/entity that is hidden (*gizli öfke*), an object the size of which is big (*büyük öfke*, *kocaman öfke*), an object which is sharp (*öfkesini törpülemek*) and an object which is shown by a sign (*öfke işareti*). The mappings forming this metaphor are given below:

#### ANGER IS A HIDDEN OBJECT/ENTITY

- ANGER IS AN OBJECT/ENTITY HIDDEN BY ANOTHER PERSON (*gizlenmiş öfke* “hidden anger”)
- ANGER IS AN OBJECT/ENTITY HIDDEN INTENTIONALLY (*öfkesini gizlemek* “hide one’s anger”)

#### ANGER IS AN OBJECT/ENTITY THE AMOUNT OF WHICH IS BIG

- ANGER IS BIG (*büyük öfke* “big anger”)

#### ANGER IS A SHARP OBJECT

- ANGER IS AN OBJECT SHARPENED (*öfkesini bilemek* “hone one’s anger”, *öfkesini keskinleştirmek* “sharpen one’s anger”)
- ANGER IS AN OBJECT BLUNTED (*öfkesini törpülemek* “file one’s anger”, *öfkesini köreltmek* “blunt one’s anger”)

#### ANGER IS A SIGN

- ANGER IS A SIGN (*öfke işareti* “sign of anger”, *öfke izi* “trace of anger”)

The sixth most frequent metaphor in the database is ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM metaphor with 71 linguistic expressions and 13 types. The linguistic examples of this metaphor mostly map on cause (71) stage of the cognitive model.

Anger is conceptualized as a sleeping organism: arouse anger/awake anger (*öfke uyandırmak*, *öfkesi uyanmak*); anger is sleeping (*öfke yatıyor*); can be an organism which is born, alive or growing up: anger is born (*öfke doğdu*); to give birth to anger (*öfke doğurmak*); to keep anger alive (*diri tuttuğu bir öfke*); make anger alive (*öfkeyi canlandırmak*); grow up anger (*öfkeyi büyütmek*) or as a plant: to breed

anger (*öfke ekmek*); the roots of anger (*öfkenin kökleri*); seeds of anger (*öfke tohumları*); sprouts of anger (*öfke tomurcukları*).

This metaphor has 2 entailments and 7 mappings as shown:

#### ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM

- ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM THAT GIVES BIRTH (*öfke doğuyor* “anger is born”)
- ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM WHICH SURVIVES TO STAYS ALIVE (*canlanan öfke* “anger coming to life”, *diri tuttuğu öfke* “anger kept alive”)
- ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM THAT SLEEPS AND WAKES UP (*öfke uyandırmak* “wake up anger”, *öfke yatıyor* “sleeping anger”, *öfkesi uyanmak* “awaking anger”)
- ANGER IS A LIVING ORGANISM THAT GROWS (*büyüyen öfke* “growing anger”)

#### ANGER IS A PLANT

- ANGER IS A PLANT WHICH HAS ROOTS (*öfkenin kökü* “roots of anger”)
- ANGER IS A PLANT WHICH IS PLANTED (*öfke ekmek* “planting anger”)
- ANGER IS A PLANT WHICH BLOSSOMS (*öfke tomurcukları* “blossoms of anger”)

The seventh common metaphor is ANGER IS FIRE with 65 linguistic expressions and 30 types. FIRE source domain is also one of the most elaborated ones. In these examples, anger causes the person to undergo the effects of this emotion. Here, angry person can be conceptualized as a person in fire, as a person breathing fire, as a person burning in fire or as a person burning someone with fire.

In the examples from the data; at the beginning fire is generally slow which also shows the cause: It can be a flame (*öfke kıvılcımı*); a blaze (*alevlenen öfke*) or a sparkle (*öfke halesi, parlayan öfke*). Then, it becomes more effective and anger is kindled (*öfkenin parlaması*).

As anger is kindled, the intensity of fire increases and shows variations such as anger burning with its fire (*ateşiyle yakan öfke*); catching fire with anger (*öfke ile yanıp tutuşmak*); burning with anger (*öfkeyle yanan*); the intensity of anger can increase more and more as in fan one’s anger (*öfkenin körüklenmesi, öfke ateşinin üzerine körükle gitmek*).



Anger can cover whole body and the person can become a ball of fire (*öfke topu, öfke topu haline gelmek*) or a gunpowder barrel with anger (*öfkeden barut fıçısına dönmek*).

When the intensity goes to a lower level, anger turns to ashes as in: I was watching his anger which was beginning to turn to ashes (*küllenmeye başlayan öfkesini seyrediyordum*) or extinguishes (*öfkesi sönmek, öfkesi tükenmek*); or its fire cools down (*öfke ateşi soğuduğunda*).

The result of fire causes damage to others as in spit fire (*ateş püskürtmek*); spit flames (*alev püskürtmek*); breathe flames (*ağzından alevler fişkırtmak*); to light the fuse (*öfkenin fitilini ateşledi*).

The examples of *saman alevi* (hay flame) are also observed in the data which is a special use in Turkish when the person gets angry suddenly and his anger lowers down very quickly.

Thus fire metaphor has 3 entailments and 5 mappings. The mappings corresponds to cause (3), intensity (8) and control (54) stages of the prototypical model.

#### CAUSE OF ANGER IS FIRE

- CAUSE OF ANGER IS THE SPARKLE OF A FLAME (*öfke kıvılcımı* “the sparkle of anger”)

#### INTENSE ANGER IS FIRE

- AS THE INTENSITY OF ANGER INCREASES THE INTENSITY OF FIRE INCREASES (*öfkeyle yanıp tutuşmak* “catch fire with anger”)
- AS THE INTENSITY OF ANGER DECREASES THE INTENSITY OF FIRE DECREASES (*öfkesi sönmek* “one’s anger to extinguish”)

#### TRYING TO CONTROL INTENSE ANGER IS TRYING TO CONTROL INTENSE FIRE

- ATTEMPT AT CONTROLLING ANGER IS TRYING TO TAKE FIRE UNDER CONTROL (*öfke ateşini söndürmeye çalışmak* “to try to extinguish the fire of anger”)
- LOSS OF CONTROL OF ANGER IS LOSS OF THE CONTROL OVER FIRE (*öfkeyle ateş püskürtmek* “spit fire with anger”)

The eighth most common conceptual metaphor is ANGER IS A DISEASE. This metaphor has 48 linguistic expressions, 9 types, 1 entailment and 3 mappings. The linguistic examples of this metaphor mostly map on loss of control (47) stage of the cognitive model.

Through this metaphor anger is conceptualized as a disease which comes with attacks or seizures (*öfke atağı, öfke nöbeti*), has the property of being contagious (*öfke salgını*) and can be cured (*öfke tedavisi*). The mappings of the metaphor are shown below:

#### ANGER IS A DISEASE

- ANGER IS AN ATTACK OF A DISEASE (*öfke atağı* “anger attack”, *öfke nöbeti* “anger seizure”, *öfke krizi* “anger spasm”)
- ANGER IS AN CONTAGIOUS ILLNESS (*öfke salgını* “anger epidemic”, *bulaşıcı öfke* “infectious anger”)
- ANGER IS A CURABLE DISEASE (*öfke tedavisi* “the cure of anger”)

The ninth common metaphor in the database is ANGER IS INSANITY metaphor. This metaphor comes up with 1 mapping and 41 linguistic expressions and 3 types. The linguistic examples of this metaphor mostly map on loss of control (41) stage of the cognitive model.

When an angry person loses all his control, he behaves in an irrational way. The person may become insane when he is very angry and go mad (*öfkeden delirmek*) or go crazy (*öfkeden çıldırmak*) with anger. A more intense example to insanity is to go raging with anger (*öfkesinden cinnet geçirmek*) where the person loses all rationality and behaves in a completely uncontrolled way. Many examples of going mad and going crazy are observed in the data, as expected from observations in many other languages as well (Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion* 74).

The tenth common metaphor is anger is a WAR metaphor which shows up with 33 linguistic expressions, 6 types, 2 entailments and 2 mappings. The linguistic examples of this metaphor only map on loss of control (33) stage of the cognitive model.

This metaphor seems to be related with OPPONENT metaphor. The examples map on different scenes of a war scenario as in *öfkenin kuşatması* (for anger to besiege someone); *öfke kampı* (anger camp); *öfkenin kurbanı* (victim of anger); *öfkenin menzili* (range of anger - as in a weapon); *ateşlenen öfke* (fire/shoot one's anger).

The mappings of anger is war metaphor are given below:

- ANGER IS BEING YIELDED OVER AN OPPONENT IN A WAR (*öfkenin kurbanı olmak* “victim of anger”)
- ANGER IS AN ENEMY SIEGING THE OPPONENT IN A WAR (*öfkenin kuşatması* “sieged by anger”)

#### *Conceptual metonymies*

The number of conceptual metonymic examples are 56. Conceptual metonymies are presented as behavioural and physiological responses. The two entailments of the conceptual metaphors are shown with their examples below:

#### PHYSICAL REACTIONS STANDING FOR ANGER

- AGITATION FOR ANGER

There are examples to physical agitation where the effects of emotional disturbance can be observed. These can be observed in the following ways:

*Öfkeden titremek* (to tremble with anger); *öfkeden sesi titremek* (one’s voice to tremble with anger); change in facial expression: *öfkeden yüzü kasılmak* (face muscles to contract with anger); *öfkeden dudaklarını ısırarak* (bite lips with anger); change in respiration: *öfkeyle burnundan solumak* (breathe through his nostrils in anger), *öfkeden göğüs kafesi inip kalkmak* (one’s chest to go up and down); inability to move: *öfkeden kaskatı kesilmek* (to stand still with anger); *öfkeden terlemek* (sweat with anger).

- CHANGE IN FACE COLOR FOR ANGER

Anger causes change in face colour. Usually as the result of the body heat, one’s face becomes red (*öfkeden kızarmak*) or becomes scarlet red (*öfkeden kıpkırmızı kesilmek/olmak*). Beside this, there are examples of a wider range of change in the face color in the data base. Apart from red, face color can turn into purple or even black. For example, *öfkeden yüzü simsiyah kesilmek* (one’s face to become black by anger); *öfkeden mosmor kesilmek* (one’s face to become purple by anger); *öfkeden yüzünün rengi değişmek* (one’s face to color to change).

- INACCURATE PERCEPTION

When angry person loses control, he/she has difficulty in perceiving things. The examples from the data are as follows:

The angry person loses his/her ability to see: not able to see straight with anger (*öfkeden gözü dönmek*); to go blind with anger (*öfkeden gözü kör olmak*); one's sight to be blackened by anger (*öfkeden gözü kararmak*).

The angry person loses consciousness with anger: to lose consciousness with anger (*öfkeden bilinci kilitlenmek*); to lose one's self with anger (*öfkeden kendini kaybetmek*).

- INTERNAL PRESSURE FOR ANGER

Internal pressure caused by anger results in various physiological responses. The examples obtained from the data are; to increase one's blood pressure with anger (*öfkeden tansiyonu çıkmak/yükselmek*); one's veins to swell (*damarları şişmek/kabarmak*).

#### BEHAVIORAL REACTIONS STANDING FOR ANGER

- FRUSTRATED BEHAVIOR

The angry person shows frustrated behavior in case of anger. Some examples from the data are; *öfkesinden kafasını duvara vurmak* (to hit one's head to walls), *öfkeyle ayağa fırlamak* (to stand up with anger) *öfkeyle duvarları tekmelemek* (to kick the walls with anger)

- ANIMAL BEHAVIOR

There are expressions which show animal behavior such as *öfkeden ağız salyalanmak* (one's mouth to salivate), *öfkeden kudurmak* (to have rabies by anger), *öfkeyle dişlerini gıcırdatmak* (to grind one's teeth with anger)

- INSANE BEHAVIOR

The angry person can also experience physiological effects of insanity. The example to this in the database are to foam with anger (*ağzından köpük çıkmak*).

The findings show that the cultural model of Turkish metaphors of anger is not determined by conceptual metonymies but by conceptual metaphors. All metaphors and metonymies in Turkish database map on different parts and stages of the "five stage" anger scenario. When we group all the metaphorical and metonymical expressions according to stages we come across a situation as shown in Table 5:

**Table 5: The number of metaphorical and metonymical expressions according to stages**

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Cause	100
Intensity	518
Attempt at control	136
Loss of control	970
Retribution	159
<b>Total</b>	<b>1883</b>

The table shows that the metaphorical expressions in Turkish map on several stages of the anger scenario in Turkish. The first stage cause of anger has the least number of metaphorical expressions with 100 examples. The second stage of the model intensity which is also the second prominent stage of the model has 518 examples. The control stage is the most salient stage in the model with 1106 examples. Besides the mappings show intensity in loss of anger component of the control stage. The last stage expression is limited with 159 examples. Hence the distribution of metaphorical mappings in the anger scenario in Turkish mostly seem to map on the control and intensity stages of the model.

In the next part the findings of the study are discussed and the culture-specific characteristics of Turkish cultural model of anger is tried to be argued.

#### **4. Discussion**

The results show that number of metaphorical linguistic expressions in the database is much more than metonymical expressions. So the cultural model in Turkish is mostly structured by conceptual metaphors.

The first research question of the study aimed to show the conceptual metaphors of anger coming to the fore in the conceptualization of Turkish emotion concept ANGER. The most frequent source metaphor in the database was the CONTAINER metaphor. This metaphor was followed by NATURAL FORCE, OPPONENT, LOCATION, OBJECT/ENTITY, LIVING ORGANISM, FIRE, DISEASE, INSANITY and WAR metaphors.

The LOCATION metaphor which is counted in the top ten metaphors is limited with only one mapping and one example which is *öfke içinde* (in anger). Thus this metaphor cannot be counted as a salient metaphor playing a role in the conceptualization of Turkish cultural model.

Apart from this, in Turkish examples the conceptualization of ANGER IS THE POSSESSED OBJECT METAPHOR are all in the structure of X's anger. Because of the structure of language, it's used with the possessive suffix and found as *öfkem* "my anger", *öfken* "your anger", *öfkesi* "his anger or X's anger" etc. and are mostly used with other metaphors. Possession metaphors, just like location metaphor, are limited with only one type and one mapping. Since this metaphor was mostly used with other metaphors and would not reflect the representative nature of the concept anger, possessed object metaphors are left out of analysis.

When the five stage cognitive model for American English is taken into consideration, mappings in conceptual metaphors in Turkish database become more intense in *loss of control* and *intensity* aspects of the prototypical anger scenario. Especially the enormous number of expressions mapping on the control stage of the model shows the culture specific characteristic of the language. The control stage has two sub stages: attempt to control and loss of control. The number of mappings in the control stage shows that the focus of Turkish metaphors is on the loss of control stage. This finding can be interpreted as "the angry person has a tendency to lose control when expressing his/her anger in Turkish culture".

Supporting Aksan (*Metaphors of Anger* 38) the prototypical cognitive model of Turkish is very similar to that of American English presented in the introduction part. However, again as stated in Aksan (*Metaphors of Anger* 58) differences occur at a specific level in the language as discussed below.

Although the first 10 metaphors are discussed in this study, the three metaphors having a role in shaping the prototypical model are CONTAINER, NATURAL FORCE and OPPONENT metaphors. The number of total metaphorical expressions exemplifying this metaphor is 1229 among 1883 metaphors.

The master metaphor seems to be the ANGER IS AN OBJECT/ENTITY IN A CONTAINER metaphor (667 examples) where the focus is mostly on the intensity (310 examples) and loss of control (304 examples) aspects of the prototypical model. This metaphor has universal aspects among many languages. Turkish also shares these

universal aspects. Among CONTAINER metaphors there are specific level differences. One of these is that the heat component is not included in the metaphorical expressions. The evidence for this is that there is no steam while expressing anger. The fluid gets higher because of the pressure applied not because of heat. So in Turkish examples of container metaphor the characteristic of being pressurized is more important. This finding is also stated in Aksan (*Metaphors of Anger* 45).

Another metaphor having a salient role in Turkish prototypical model is NATURAL FORCE metaphor (353 examples). As stated earlier, the abundance of natural force metaphors is probably due to the diverse climatic and geographic conditions in Turkey: it has four seasons and a variety of climates due to large geographical differences between the parts of the country. This variation in elaboration may be related with the climate of Turkish speaking countries, especially Turkey. Especially, elaboration of the rain component makes sense in that it rains a lot in most parts of Turkey. Many kinds of natural disasters are observed as well. As an interesting side note, a kind of natural disaster that is not seen in Turkey is hurricanes, which, although could be used as a metaphor, did not show up in the data, contrary to other disasters such as earthquakes and floods.

Another interesting point is that Turkish includes all stages in fighting with anger. All steps of a struggle can be witnessed in the examples through OPPONENT (229 examples), SOCIAL SUPERIOR (27 examples) and WAR (33 examples) metaphors: Anger is an enemy, angry person is aggressive, in case of anger the person attacks, overcomes or defeats; can be beaten, can be caught, can be dominated/ruled, saved/escaped. The person can yield anger; can be trapped, or be a slave. These examples coincide with the fact that the metaphorical expressions accumulate on Stage 4, loss of control, component of the prototypical model.

It can be clearly observed that anger is considered as a negative emotion in Turkish. However there are interesting points to be noted here:

In the prototypical scenario in (Lakoff & Kövecses, 210), self exerts a counterforce in an attempt to control anger, however in some cases self loses control of anger. When the self loses control; the intensity of anger goes above the limit and anger takes control of self. Thus, self exhibits angry behavior and gives damage to himself. There is danger to the target of anger. Though not so many in number, in some examples in Turkish, when the self loses control, he tries to increase the intensity of his anger deliberately. For instance the self sharpens, lashes, feeds his anger etc. These examples are not too many in number but it's an



interesting point to note. These may be another indication for the attractiveness of the relief after the fifth stage of the prototypical scenario. There is a proverb in Turkish *öfke baldan tatlıdır* which literally means “anger is more sweeter than honey” supporting this.

As a result, Turkish shares the same cultural model with that of American English. However there are some culture-specific differences in the conceptualization of metaphors which can be observed through metaphorical mappings. The high number of mappings in some conceptual metaphors such as CONTAINER, NATURAL FORCE, OPPONENT and FIRE show the specific-level differences in the language. Moreover high number of expressions mapping on the control stage of the model shows the importance of control component of anger.

## 5. Conclusion

This study attempted to provide an outline of the cultural model of Turkish metaphors of anger in the light of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. The overall results of the study show that the cognitive model for ANGER is similar to that of American English proposed by Lakoff and Kövecses (210). The master metaphor dominating the cognitive model in Turkish is ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER metaphor. Kövecses (*Handbook of Anger* 170) claims that this metaphor has near-universal characteristics by giving examples from several languages and argues that the differences occur at the specific level.

These differences in specific level can be shown by the entailments and elaborations of conceptual metaphors. The variety and number of mappings motivating the conceptual metaphors constitutes the cognitive model and shows aspects specific to Turkish.

Apart from the CONTAINER metaphor which seems to be the master metaphor, NATURAL FORCE and OPPONENT metaphors make the cognitive model for Turkish apparent. The culture-specific differences of the container arises by its mappings. The kind of the container, the kind of the substance, lack of heat in the container are some of these specific-level differences. The mappings of natural force metaphors show how environment and experiences are reflected in the language through metaphors. The mappings of the opponent metaphor denote the never ending fight with anger. Overall, when we look at these three metaphors, we can see that all three are FORCE metaphors in which the control component comes forward. So we can conclude that in Turkish anger is a force that either must be

controlled or as an equally likely alternative, not be controlled and left to flow freely. The large number of metaphorical expressions corresponding to the intensity and control stages support this conclusion.

Since this study is limited with newspaper articles and columns, the cognitive model is shaped regarding a single genre of text. A research on a bigger corpus comprising of different genres of texts is the next natural step to this study.

## WORKS CITED

- Aksan, Mustafa, "'Metaphors of Anger: An Outline of a Cultural Model'." *Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi/Journal of Linguistics and Literature* 3.1 (2006): 31-59.
- . "The Container Metaphor in Turkish Expressions of Anger'." *Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi/Journal of Linguistics and Literature* 3.2 (2006): 103-24.
- Foolen, Ad. "The Expressive Function of Language: Towards a Cognitive Semantic Approach." *The Language of Emotions: Conceptualization, Expressions, and the Theoretical Foundation*. By René Dirven and Susanne Niemeier. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ, 1997. 15-33.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. *Metaphor and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 2000.
- . *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: U Press, 2005.
- . *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . "Cross-Cultural Experience of Anger: A Psycholinguistic Analysis." *International Handbook of Anger: Constituent and Concomitant Biological, Psychological, and Social Processes*. By Michael Potegal, Gerhard Stemmler, and Charles Donald Spielberger. New York: Springer, 2010. 157-174.
- Kövecses, Zoltan, et al. "Anger Metaphors across Languages: A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective", *Bilingual Figurative Language Processing*. By Roberto Heredia and Anna Cieslicka, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 341-367.
- Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, I.: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, George, and Zoltán Kövecses. "The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English." *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. By Dorothy C. Holland and Naomi Quinn. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 1987. 195-221.

- Maalej, Zouhair. "Figurative Language in Anger Expressions in Tunisian Arabic: An Extended View of Embodiment." *Metaphor and Symbol* 19.1 (2004): 51-75. Web. 17 February 2015.
- Mikolajczuk, Agnieszka. "The metonymic and metaphorical conceptualisation of anger in Polish." *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression*. By Angeliki Athanasiadou and Elzbieta Tabakowska. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010. 153-191.
- Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorization." *Cognition and Categorization*. By Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1978. 27-48.
- Soriano, Cristina. "Some Anger Metaphors In Spanish And English. A Contrastive Review." *International Journal of English Studies* 3.2 (2003): 107-22. Web. 05 June 2016.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. "Defining Emotion Concepts." *Cognitive Science* 16.4 (1992): 539-81. Web. 22 February 2017.
- . *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York: Oxford U Press, 1992.
- . *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 2005.
- Yu, Ning. "Metaphorical Expressions of Anger and Happiness in English and Chinese." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10.2 (1995): 59-92. Web. 12 January 2017.