

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ANGER IN ENGLISH POP FICTION STORIES

OLGA BLANCO CARRIÓN

UNIVERSIDAD DE CÓRDOBA

Abstract

The present paper studies the conceptualization of anger by native speakers of English. The conceptual study of emotions has a well known tradition among linguists (Kövecses 1986, 1995a, 1995b, 2000; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987; Geeraerts & Grondelaers, 1995; Gevaert 2005). When dealing with the study of emotions from a linguistic perspective it is important to differentiate, following Foolen (1997), between the spontaneous expression of an emotion and the description of it. This paper focuses on the latter. Following Kövecses (2000) I attempt at showing how some aspects of the folk concept of anger are illustrated in English pop fiction stories by the use of specific linguistic constructs.

This paper¹ aims at presenting a modest discussion of some aspects of the conceptual structure of anger in English from a folk model perspective. In the first section, in order to introduce the topic, I provide some definitions of anger as well as highlight the basic components of this emotion, which need to be taken into account to understand its conceptualization. The second section deals with how we talk about anger, that is, what linguistic resources are used to describe anger. As I follow a cognitive linguistic perspective, the relationship between language and conceptualization is taken for granted. Thus, the next section deals with how we conceptualize this emotion as well as the kinds of factors that play a role in this conceptualization. Finally, a selection of target texts will be analysed with regards to the cognitive-linguistic resources used to construe this

¹ This paper has been written in the framework of the research project “An empirical Investigation into the role of conceptual metonymy in grammar, discourse and sign language. Compilation of a metonymy database”, funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Spain (FFI2008-04585).

emotional reality in order to discuss some of the conceptual underpinnings of the structure of anger as understood on the folk model. Although, this paper is part of wider research into the folk conceptualization of anger in English and a variety of source texts (press articles, interviews, blogs, etc.) is to be annotated, the data presented here correspond to an initial stage of our work and only come from the description of anger in English pop fiction stories.

1. What is *anger*?

Anger is an emotional state that may range in intensity from mild irritation to intense fury and rage. Anger has physical effects including raising the heart rate and blood pressure and the levels of adrenaline and noradrenaline.

Anger is a (physiological and psychological) response to a perceived threat to self or important others, present, past or future. The threat may appear to be real, discussed, or imagined. Anger is often a response to the perception of threat due to a physical conflict, injustice, negligence, humiliation or betrayal among other contentions.

The expression of anger can be through active or passive behaviors. In the case of “active” emotion the angry person “lashes out” verbally or physically at an intended target. When anger is a “passive” emotion it is characterized by silent sulking, passive-aggressive behaviour (hostility) and tension.” (Clausen, 2007, p. vii)

In the quote above, Clausen neatly portrays the four most basic components of the concept *anger*. First, the *intensity scale* with mild irritation being somewhere at the bottom of the scale, and intense fury and rage being somewhere at the top. Secondly, *physical effects* such as raising the heart rate, the blood pressure, the levels of adrenaline and noradrenaline. Then, the *cause* of anger, be it a perceived threat to self or important others, and an acknowledgment that this threat may be real, imagined, discussed. Finally, two possible routes *emotion expression* may take, active (e.g. lashing out verbally or

physically at a target), or passive (e.g. passive-aggressive behaviour such as hostility and tension).

However, Hertenstein, Butts and Hile (2007, p. 7) propound that from an evolutionary perspective, emotions – including anger – are seen as adaptations to solve problems of social and physical survival, and as a tool to achieve one's goals, as Barret & Campos (1987) and Keltner & Gross (1999), as cited in Hertenstein, Butts and Hile (*ibid.*), claim. For example, after experiencing a perceived injustice one may display anger toward the transgressor to inform him of one's action tendency if he incurs again. Therefore, displays of anger regulate interpersonal behaviour and help problems related to social life.

Solomon (1984), defending what is known as a cognitive theory of emotions, argues that anger is not just a physiological reaction along with a sensation plus an interpretation, a cause and certain forms of behaviour. In his own words:

The anger *is* the interpretation plus the view of a cause (as well as the “object” of emotion) and consequent behaviour. That anger also has biological backing and includes sensation is inessential to understanding the emotion, though no doubt significant in certain measurements, which only *contingently* correlate with the intensity of an emotion or its significance.” (*ibid.*, p. 249)

The problem in the traditional linguistic analysis of anger, he further adds, resides in placing the focus on “urgent” emotions in emergency situations. From his perspective, being angry over a long period of time does not imply being any less angry, nor is it to be construed as a discontinuous sequence of angry reactions. However, the vast majority of research on this type of anger has been conducted not for purely theoretical (e.g.

linguistic-conceptual) purposes but for more practical ones, such as anger regulation, anger treatment, social rehabilitation of violent offenders, business and intercultural communication and the like. In the present paper, I will focus on this type of “urgent” anger.

A conceptual difference that should not be overlooked when doing research in this field is the fact that anger as an interpretation of the world is different from the specific interpretation one gives to a certain anger state. In addition to this, the distinction between perception and interpretation is crucial to understand the difference between feelings and emotions, as shown in the following quote:

Anger *is* a kind of interpretation, not of a feeling (which may or may not be co-present) but *of the world*. It is (...) not an “inner” phenomenon so much as a way of being-in-the-world, a relationship between oneself and one’s situation.

(ibid., p. 250).

Solomon’s conception of the research into emotion as part of a broad inquiry into the evaluative-conceptual schemes that give structure to emotional life and that must include concepts such as blame and praise, status and responsibility, as well as Hertenstein, Butts and Hile’s (2007) consideration of anger as an evolutionary adaptation for social and physical survival and a tool to achieve one’s goals offer linguists and emotion researchers alternative paths to follow as they include concepts that have traditionally been a part of investigation in the fields of anthropology or psychology but not so of linguistics. For the purposes of the present work, however, taking these into account seems a too ambitious enterprise but the definitions provided in this section will be considered when relevant to the understanding of the conceptualization of anger from the folk model perspective.

2. How we talk about *anger*

When we talk about anger and its linguistic manifestations, we should first make a distinction between anger expression and anger description². Some examples of lexical units to convey emotions are *shit!* when one is angry, or *holy cow!* when one is surprised. Nevertheless, sometimes linguistic manifestations are used to report what emotions we or another person we perceive are experiencing or have experienced. This is when we describe emotions to others. Then, words like *angry* or expressions like *I felt like shit!* are used. These linguistic manifestations constitute the focus of this work.

Within the group of descriptive terms, we find figurative expressions which, as Kövecses (2000:4) claims, do not literally “name” emotions but denote aspects of them such as intensity, cause, control, and physiological or behavioural effects³. In the work presented here, I adopt the Cognitive linguistics’ stance towards these figurative devices and consider them not merely as rhetorical devices but as conceptual tools that we utilize in our everyday understanding of the world. In other words, they are thought of as an expression of the structure of thought that arises from systematic conceptual frameworks (Gibbs, 1994).

This way, abstract concepts such as anger are understood in terms of a more physical concept such as that of a “wild animal”, which constitutes what has been called the *source conceptual domain*. There is a set of ontological correspondences or mappings which project our knowledge of this source domain into the so-called *target domain* (e.g. anger). Figurative linguistic expressions may also be of a metonymical nature. Unlike

² This basic distinction has been further dealt with by linguists such as Kövecses (1995) and Foolen (1997).

³ As mentioned by Clausen (2007) (see section 1 in this work.)

conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymy involves a single concept or domain. Kövecses (2000:5) claims that the purpose of metonymy is to provide mental access to a concept or domain through a part of the same concept or domain (or vice versa) or to a part of a domain through another part of the same domain⁴. This is possible as emotion concepts are viewed as having many parts (e.g. emotion trigger, intensity, duration, physiological effects, etc.) So a linguistic expression such as “a heated argument” refers to the physiological effect of anger, i.e. increase in body temperature, and is a linguistic instance of the conceptual metonymy PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECT OF EMOTION STAND FOR THE EMOTION, which is a more specific instance of the general conceptual metonymy PART FOR WHOLE.

However, the notions of metaphor and metonymy are not problem-free as sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between them. Barcelona’s (2002, p. 246) provides the following definitions for metaphor and metonymy:

Metaphor is a mapping of a conceptual domain, the source, onto another domain, the target. Source and target are either in different taxonomic domains and not linked by a pragmatic function, or they are in different functional domains.

Metonymy is a mapping of a conceptual domain, the source, onto another domain, the target. Source and target are in the same functional domain and are linked by a pragmatic function, so that the target is mentally activated.

As the notion of pragmatic function link is crucial in this theory of metaphor and metonymy, I shall clarify its meaning. Barcelona (ibid., p. 230), following Fauconnier (1994), calls *pragmatic function* link between source and target the privileged experience-based link between the two domains (source and target) as exemplified e.g.

⁴ For a more detailed explanation see Kövecses and Radden (1998)

by the link between author and work, path and goal, whole and part. In addition to the aforementioned definitions, Barcelona (*ibid.*) suggests to use the following clues:

- (i) Metonymy consists of a relationship between domains and it does not have to be referential.
- (ii) The fact that source and target domains must be in separate domains in the case of metaphor tends to constitute a difference between metaphor and metonymy, although this is not always so.

3. How we conceptualise *anger*

In cognitive linguistics, linguistic analysis and conceptualization are inextricably linked. Therefore, the linguistic expressions used to talk about the world, including the emotional world, are thought to be determined, at least in part, by conceptualization. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) claimed that the concepts we live by in the most fundamental way emerge as a result of our interaction with the physical environment. They further added (1999) that embodiment limits the possible ways in which anger is conceptualized and, presumably, in how it is expressed. But how much of our conceptualization of anger depends on embodiment?

Following Solomon's (1984:250) definition of emotion as "a system of concepts, beliefs, attitudes, and desires, virtually all of which are context-bound, historically developed, and culture-specific" one is tempted to believe that embodiment plays only a limited role in the conceptualization of anger. He further argues:

One cannot leap from the observation that we share *some* of the concepts constituting anger with another people to the conclusion that we share them *all*, that

is, share the same emotion. One learns to identify the emotional life of a people along with learning everything else, including, not least, what they *say* about their own emotional life. (...) understanding that what people say about their emotions and what they actually feel are part of the same cultural, conceptual package. (ibid., pp. 251-252)

According to this quote, the context in which a human being grows up highly influences not only how he talks about anger but also what he feels as both are determined, at least in part, by his conceptualisation of this emotion. Although I would not go that far in my claim, as the present paper's aim is not to dwell on the nature of human feelings, my own research (Blanco-Carrión 2011, 2012) supports Kövecses's claim that it is necessary to go beyond both the view that the concept of anger is simply motivated by human physiology and the view that it is simply a social construction. I support his view that it is both motivated by the human body and produced by a particular social and cultural environment (Kövecses 2000:14). In fact, previous research has shown that whereas some conceptual metaphors and metonymies may denote universal aspects of emotions, such as the conceptualization of anger as *heat* or *internal pressure* and other key notions associated with them such as physiological changes (e.g., loss of muscular control, redness, rise in body temperature, loss of rationality), others may be specific to a given culture, e.g. Zulus become wet with anger, but Americans do not (Taylor and Mbense, 1998, cited in ibid, p. 188).

Research has also proved the limited use of embodiment for the conceptualization of anger. King's (1989) and Yu's (1995, 1998) works, cited in Kövecses (2010), show that the conceptualization of anger in Chinese relies more on the notion of *pressure* than that of *heat*, as it happens in the case of English. Even within the same culture, Gevaert (2001, 2005), cited in Kövecses (ibid.), found that *heat* is not a constant feature in the

conceptualization of anger in English throughout history. To account for this variation in the conceptualization of anger Kövecses proposes what he called *experiential focus*⁵:

[T]he major idea is that the embodiment of anger consists of multiple components, and cultures may choose which of these components they focus on.” (Ibid., p. 10)

In fact, it is even possible that embodiment is entirely ignored by a given culture in favour of other motivational sources for anger conceptualization⁶.

Returning to the question posed at the beginning of this section, one may argue that embodiment may be regarded as the cornerstone of naturalness. That is, conceptualized physiology evoked by conceptual metonymies provides the cognitive ground for people from different cultures to construe the concept of anger using certain conceptual metaphors, or certain source domains, and not others.

4. Sample analysis

In this section, some target texts are analysed as an attempt at showing how some aspects of the folk concept of anger are illustrated in English. The linguistic manifestations provided correspond, in their vast majority, to scenes in which anger is related to the existence of a conflict between the characters in the story, or appears as the cornerstone of an interpersonal violence episode. For this reason, in this work the focus is on anger as an “urgent” emotion.

⁵ See also Kövecses (2005).

⁶ See Lutz’s work (1988) on Ifaluk language or Kövecses (2010) for a brief summary of her findings.

With regards to the methodology used to formulate the presence of a certain metaphorical or metonymical mapping I follow Barcelona (2002). Also, in cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor and metonymy are expressed in capital letters in order to distinguish them from their numerous linguistic manifestations. I here follow this notation procedure.

Target Text 1: *Her eyes were filled with a smouldering fury* (DL, p. 32)

In TT1, the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS is combined with the metaphor ANGER IS HEAT and EMOTIONS ARE FLUIDS IN THE BODY-CONTAINER to yield the central metaphor of anger experience: ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. This is supported by the fact that *smouldering* contains two relevant conceptual underpinnings in its semantics: the first one is burning without flame and often with much smoke; the other is showing suppressed anger, hate or jealousy⁷. Both underpinnings, in our opinion, are not to be considered mutually exclusive but complementary. The fact that something is “burning without much flame” perfectly matches the conceptualization of anger as a “passive” emotion characterized by silent sulking or any other type of passive angry behaviour as defined by (Clausen 2007). The second part of the definition provided by the dictionary “burning often with much smoke” seems perfectly logical in the folk understanding of ANGER IS HEAT, in this case probably pointing to the extent of the physiological/psychological consequences of the experience of anger. This is consistent with the folk model understanding of anger that leads to expressions such as *letting off steam* or *venting one’s anger*. In the conceptualization of anger as a hot liquid in a container, the pressure originated inside the

⁷ Information extracted from the dictionary Merriam-Webster online [accessed on September, 20th, 2012.]

container as a result of the heat corresponds in the metaphorical mapping onto the target domain (i.e. anger) to the pressure or annoyance felt by the anger experiencer. In this sense, the general metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES is also activated, as the pressure experienced by the angry person results from non-releasing the emotion.

With regards to the second conceptual underpinning found in the dictionary entry for *smouldering*, we can raise the following observation: this adjective collocates with experiences of negative emotions (e.g. anger, hate, jealousy). We believe this is complementary with the information provided in the first definition of *smouldering* as it would seem perfectly logical to imagine that there is *much* smoke resulting from the pressure exerted by a top-of-intensity-scale anger experience, as conveyed by the word *fury*.

Last but not least, TT1 activates via the general metonymy PART FOR WHOLE (e.g. BODY PART FOR THE BODY) the metaphor THE EYES ARE A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS. This is supported by the fact that, in most cases, the experiencer's eyes mirror the emotion he is feeling. Therefore, as the physiological effect(s) of emotions is/are observable by an external eye and we, as users/ builders of the folk model of emotion are aware of this fact, it can be claimed that both our embodiment and our conscious knowledge of the folk model of emotions constrain the creation and use of conceptual metaphors such as the aforementioned ones, and the linguistic expressions, including linguistic metaphors and metonymies, derived from these.

Target Text 2: *McLoughlin's temper, already fired by the heat of the day, nearly erupted* (IH, pp. 13-14)

In TT2, the use of the lexical item “temper” is not casual. It conveys a state of feeling or frame of mind dominated by strong anger. The Merriam-Webster online includes the semantic features *heat*, *dominance* and *strong* in its definition, and the LDOCE shows *anger* as the main emotion conveyed by it. In addition to this, the idea of an increase in the emotion intensity is portrayed by *already fired by the heat of the day*. The lexical item *fired*, which points to the onset of the emotion, and the collocation *heat of the day*, which alludes to a metaphorical “heat”, i.e. the succession of incidents which act as the cause for McLoughlin’s anger, contribute to the interpretation of “temper” as anger. This interpretation is facilitated by our knowledge of the folk model of anger and of the conceptual metaphors operating underneath the linguistic ones.

The main metaphor in this example is ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. It has the following metaphorical entailments: when the intensity of anger increases the fluid rises, that is, the possibilities of emotional release increase, and when they appear they normally do so in a violent manner. The violence inherent in top-of-scale anger expressions is due to the very nature of the human experience of anger and the effort the experiencer is required to make when exerting control over his emotion. A passive-angry behaviour can be maintained for a limited amount of time. Prototypically, the longer anger is maintained the more violent the emotion release will be, as the pressure the negative emotion exerts on the experiencer also tends to increase, unless the emotion finds “some other way out” (e.g. the experiencer may find a “distractor” that prevents him from focusing on his emotion or being stuck in that emotional state).

From the aforementioned entailments, i.e. intense anger produces pressure on the container; and when the pressure is intense the container explodes (e.g. *outbursts of violent temper*), we infer that the general metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES is also at play when interpreting linguistic metaphors such as the ones in TT2. These entailments are possible by our folk understanding of how hot liquids in a container behave and how emotions work.

Target Text 3: *Anger boils over into violence* (WS, p. 412)

The word “boils” in TT3 prompts the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER. The metaphorical mapping or entailment here is the following: when the heat of the liquid increases, it boils. From our folk model of anger we know that intense anger leads to violent behaviour, as this is one of the most prototypical behavioural expressions of anger (see Soriano 2004, p. 267). It is interesting to note that anger in TT3 boils over from a container (the body-container) into another, violence, which is the behavioural effect of intense anger. That is, violence is conceptualized as an enclosed space by the use of the preposition *into*, which implies the conception of a trajector which beginning outside and being oriented towards an enclosed space moves such that it comes to be located within the enclosed space⁸.

The interpretation of VIOLENCE AS A CONTAINER FOR ANGER is a specific instance of the metaphor STATES ARE BOUNDED SPACES, and violence is here conceptualized as a state thanks to the metonymy BEHAVIORAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION. In other words, we produce the following entailment: the change of container undergone by

⁸ Tyler and Evans (2003).

the liquid, i.e. from the body-container to violence-container, implies the change of anger into an entity no longer in the realm of the experiencer's control, and subsequently transformed into violent action.

Target Text 4: *Finding Crampton so unexpectedly at St. Anselm's had roused him to a murderous rage.* (DHO, p. 332)

In TT4, the cause of anger (e.g. *Finding Crampton so unexpectedly at St. Anselm's*) is made the topic of the conversation, whereas the focus is on the consequences (onset of extreme anger). The profiled stage of the emotion scenario is the change in anger intensity or change from a state of non-arousal to an extreme state of arousal that the main character undergoes when he finds Crampton there. In addition to this, "to a murderous rage" indicates the goal / target location, which implies the use of the general metaphor STATES ARE LOCATIONS.

The anger experienced by the main character is a top-of-scale one, i.e. *rage*. Rage, with a neural substrate, is known as the irrational or more instinctive/basic counterpart of anger whereas anger, which does not have a neural substrate, is conceived as a more "evolved" emotion, in the sense that it implies thought processes. The understanding of *rage* as the irrational counterpart of anger as well as its being a top-of-scale emotion makes *murderous* a perfect collocate for it. In fact, this collocation prompts two conceptual metaphors. On the one hand, ANGER IS INSANITY in which the relationship between the *murderous* state (effect) and *rage* (cause) constitutes the metonymic basis of this metaphor, which profiles the following aspects: intensity, danger, lack of control, and negative evaluation of the emotional state. On the other, the more general conceptual

metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES is also prompted by this collocation, in which *rage* is conceptualized as a force that may lead to murder.

Target Text 5: *Bang, bang, bang- the wooden bathroom door shook against the onslaught of the mother's rage.* (MW, pp. 20-21)

In TT5, we have the noun “onslaught” which denotes “an especially *fierce attack*”⁹. *Rage* confirms that the emotion described corresponds to that of an intense arousal state and is identified as the cause of the violent behaviour, i.e. behavioural effect of the emotion, expressed by *onslaught*. Also, linking the behavioural effect to the emotion by means of a prepositional phrase (*of the mother's rage*) leads us to think that in the folk conception of intense anger this is a prototypical behavioural effect, and hence does not require further complexity in its linguistic coding. Furthermore, the onomatopoeic *Bang, bang, bang* introducing the clause is highly informative in terms profiling the lack of control over the emotion and thus, the emotional intensity, supported by the explicit subsequent emotional release that is taking place. The conceptual metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES underlies this emotion scenario. From the perspective of the energy transfer model, the inherent quality *affectedness*, in this case unaffectedness, is profiled by the use of an obstacle (*the wooden bathroom door*) between the source of energy (*mother's rage*) and the target (the daughter, locked in the bathroom).

In addition to this, there is a role reversal in the construal of the causality model (or relationships) of the participants involved in the emotion scenario. Although the chronological sequence of events frame would lead to the interpretation of the mother's

⁹ Merriam Webster online (Italics mine) [accessed on September, 20th, 2012].

rage as the source of energy leading to the door's shaking by an impact on it, in TT5, the door's shaking is profiled against the background of the mother's rage. The verb *shake* in its intransitive sense codes a movement to and fro but does not imply the notion of contact between two surfaces. The idea of impact and, hence, the conceptualization of the door as an obstacle for the mother to achieve her aim (i.e. have access to her daughter) is provided by the use of the preposition *against*. Moreover, the movement leading to the impact is presented from a de-agentivized perspective, i.e. by the introduction of the mother's rage as the entity against which the door's shaking hits.

There is also a double¹⁰ metonymic mapping or metonymic chaining: BEHAVIORAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION. The onslaught, i.e. the behavioural effect of rage, is used instead of the mother's rage. This is a PART FOR PART type of metonymy. The mother's rage, that is the force, is used instead of the mother's body part, the impactor or physical entity establishing contact with the door, in the "impact" scenario.

An alternative reading of TT5 implies the possible use of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS AN OBSTACLE. The peculiar construction of this target text may be far from an accidental "rhetorical move". The door and, metonymically, its function (i.e. to protect the daughter from the mother) find the resistance of the mother's anger as an obstacle. This may be the reason for the foregrounding of the rage in this target text, and the conceptualization of the door as the affected participant.

Target Text 6: I only asked if I could borrow your bike. *There's no need to bite my head off!* (WS, p. 386)

¹⁰ Ruiz de Mendonza and Díez (2002)

TT6 has been selected in order to show passages in which there is no single word describing the emotion anger. However, it can still convey this emotion by other means. For instance, idiomatic expressions like *bite sb's head off* indicate anger via a combination of metaphor and metonymy in which the aggressive behaviour, typical of a wild animal, metaphorically corresponds to angry behaviour, which in turn metonymically stands for anger. That is, the conceptual metaphors underlying this expression are ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL and ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR¹¹. These appear in conjunction with the metonymy BEHAVIORAL EFFECT OF ANGER FOR ANGER.

Target Text 7: *The door slammed behind her.* (IC, p. 51)

TT7 is similar to TT6 in the respect that anger is not conveyed by a single lexical item. However, the reader is able to grasp intense anger via his knowledge of the folk model of emotion, in which anger is a force that prototypically leads to violent behaviour, and their recourse to the context to figure out that the force slamming the door is not external to the emotion scenario, e.g. the wind or some other kind of external force. The general metonymy BEHAVIOURAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION which leads us to infer the type of emotion she may be feeling is prompted here by the metonymy RESULT OF BEHAVIORAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION. The main features of the conceptual structure of anger profiled in the text are high-intensity and lack of control over emotion which in turn lead to the violent behaviour described.

¹¹ In fact, Lakoff and Kövecses (1987, p. 208) propose to extend the ontological correspondences of the ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor to include: "The aggressive behaviour of the dangerous animal is angry behaviour."

The aforementioned metonymy RESULT OF BEHAVIOURAL EFFECT OF ANGER FOR BEHAVIOURAL EFFECT OF ANGER is an elaboration of the superordinate metonymy RESULT OF ACTION FOR ACTION, which in turn is an extension of the more general metonymy PART FOR PART with regards to the action scenario. In fact, this is a typical manner of profiling part of the emotion scenario, i.e. one part of the scenario is profiled against the background knowledge of the reader, who relies on his own folk knowledge of emotions, knowledge of the linguistic resources used for emotions and the other information sources such as the co-text and contextual clues, and his own expectations that arise from his own encyclopaedic knowledge.

The clause selected by the writer to construe the emotion scenario is de-agentivized and profiles the effect of the action resulting from feeling intense anger, i.e. the door's slamming for her slamming the door. There is an energy-transfer in which intense anger is the energy source, the body of the experiencer is the trajector and the door is the goal. Furthermore, a causative event takes place, i.e. her causing the door to slam, as a result of the energy-transfer.

The metaphor ANGER IS A DANGEROUS FORCE can be said to be a more specific instance or an elaboration of EMOTIONS ARE FORCES (Kövecses 2000) and to be equivalent to the metaphor ANGER IS A NATURAL PHYSICAL FORCE, as physical forces are conceptualized in the folk model as dangerous, in the sense that they are beyond human control. In TT7, anger might be interpreted as a "strong wind" as this is the prototypical natural force that makes doors slam.

Target Text 8: *He was shaking with anger, like a man in some kind of fit.* (DHO, 454)

In TT8 the metaphor, EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS FOR THE EXPERIENCERS is used (e.g., *He's in a fit of temper; She is in pain*). Here the emotion experiencer is within the bounded space of the emotion-container. That is, his control is very limited or non-existent as he's "kidnapped" by the emotion itself. The emotion in the linguistic metaphors that use this conceptual metaphor is profiled, i.e. located in the focal position of the clause.

Fit codes a top-of-scale emotion, in which the experiencer has lost the control over the emotion. In the emotion scenario presented here, the emotion finds release via physiological changes in the body of the experiencer, i.e. shaking. The cause that provokes his shaking is expressed as a PP-with. The focus is on the cause, which is why this occupies the focal position in the clause. Expressing the cause of the emotion seems to add emphasis to the behavioural effect expressed by *shaking*.

5. *Summing up*

Although the aim of the paper is not to provide a frequency analysis of the various conceptualizations of anger in English pop fiction stories, for illustrative purposes I shall comment the conceptual metaphors and metonymies discussed in TT1-TT8 in general frequency terms as found in the corpus. The vast majority of the corpus annotated samples use the conceptual metaphor EMOTIONS ARE FORCES (see TT1, TT2, TT4, TT5 and TT7 above). The main conceptual underpinning of this metaphor is that emotions generate some sort of energy that leads the emotion experiencer into action. The corresponding conceptual metaphor for anger is ANGER IS A DANGEROUS FORCE. As our corpus is biased in the sense that it only includes examples in which emotions are

connected to an episode of violence, the finding that this is the most frequent metaphor matches our expectations as violence tends to be the result of intense anger. However, this may also not be as coincidental or biased as we thought. Soriano (2004) claims violent behaviour to be considered to be the most prototypical effect of anger, as reported by participants in a survey. This seems also supported by the fact that *control* (i.e. attempts at controlling the emotion/ loss of control over the emotion) is profiled in the emotion scenarios where this conceptual metaphor is used (e.g. TT2).

The second most frequent metaphor in the corpus as well as in the present work is ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER (see TT1, TT2 and TT3 above), an elaboration of the more general metaphors THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS, ANGER IS HEAT, and EMOTIONS ARE FLUIDS IN THE BODY-CONTAINER. According to Lakoff and Kövecses (1987), this is the most complex conceptual metaphor in terms of the high number of entailments it allows. In fact, as they point out, it seems to be the central metaphor in the conceptualization of anger in English.

The last two conceptual metaphors found in the target texts do not show much difference in terms of frequency of occurrence. They are ANGER IS INSANITY (see TT4) and ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL (see TT6). There is some similarity in their conceptual underpinnings as irrational and violent behaviour is typical for both. Also in both cases there is a negative evaluation of the emotional state. The profile in the former seems to be in the loss of control over the emotion and the subsequent triggering of irrational behaviour. The major entailment of the latter is ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR. In addition to this, there is a desire for action as the anger intensity is rather high. However, this action is conceptualized as undesirable

for its possible negative results (e.g. harm to oneself or others). Other profiled aspects of this metaphor are danger and lack or loss of control.

There are also two “novel” metaphors found in the target texts above. One is the conceptualization of VIOLENCE AS A CONTAINER (see TT3) or an enclosed space. In this case, we commented anger as a liquid was transferred from the body-as-a-container into the violence-container. The second is the conceptualization of an EMOTION AS A CONTAINER (see TT8). Both cases, although different in nature, profile loss or lack of control over the emotion. And also in both cases the container would seem to “gain control” over its contents, be it anger that is governed by violence and therefore no longer a passive-emotion, or the angry person who, being inside the emotion-container, has limited control over his emotion. The idea of limited control may be enhanced by their being within a bounded space.

With regards to conceptual metonymy, it should be pointed out that it is as frequent or, perhaps, more frequent than the most frequent of the conceptual metaphors. Anger seems to be an emotion that is usually conceptualized in terms of its physiological effects. This seems rather predictable when dealing with anger description, as these effects are used to communicate how one feels when angry or what one can observe from angry people’s behaviour (see TT6 and TT7 for instances of BEHAVIOURAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION, which at a subordinate level correspond to AGGRESSIVE / VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR FOR ANGER) or physiological changes, i.e. anger effects. However, I believe a more detailed study is necessary to verify this intuitive claim. These metonymies coincide with the conceptual metaphors ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL and ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR.

There is another metonymy that appears in conjunction with metaphor. This is, in the most basic level, a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy which coincides with the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS, in which the resulting metonymy is A BODY PART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS (see TT1).

In terms of description words, in the target texts analysed we find words like *fury*, *rage* and *fit* which denote a top-of-scale-of-intensity anger, that is, emotions in which control is an issue. The corpus used abounds with top-of-scale description words as “urgent” emotions are the focus of the present study.

We also find collocations motivated by either the conceptual metaphor underlying them or the folk model of anger such as *smouldering fury* motivated by ANGER IS HEAT (TT1); *the heat of the day*, which in fact is a linguistic metaphor: “the negative events that caused anger (or caused anger to increase in intensity) are the heat of the day” based on the conceptual metaphors ANGER INTENSITY IS HEAT and ANGER IS A HOT LIQUID IN A CONTAINER (TT2); *murderous rage* motivated by the metaphor ANGER IS INSANITY (TT4).

Within the group of description words we also find idiomatic expressions like *fire sb.'s temper*, which points to the onset of anger and is motivated by the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT; *raise sb. to a murderous rage* motivated by our folk understanding of the vertical axis in which higher is more and, in this case, corresponds to the most intense type of anger as depicted by *murderous rage*. Here we can postulate the existence of an

underlying conceptual metaphor: CAUSING THE PERSON TO MOVE UPWARDS IN THE VERTICAL AXIS IS INCREASE IN THE PERSON'S EMOTION INTENSITY.

6. General concluding remarks

In this work, some conceptual resources used by native speakers of English for the conceptualization of anger have been presented and illustrated. In broad terms, the folk conceptualization of anger in English relies on the experiencer's multifaceted knowledge of himself and the world around him. This includes different types experiential and culturally-based knowledge which comprise information as varied and, apparently, unconnected as that pertaining to how energy works (e.g. energy transfer model), how human physiology in emotional states changes, how emotional experience feels, how dangerous animals and insane people behave, how hot fluids in a container behave, knowledge of basic conceptual schemas such as more is up, etc. I hope to have been successful in showing that conceptual metaphor and metonymy are part of an apparently "tangled" web, and facilitate the connections between different nodes of information in order to construe realities as complex as emotional experience.

The type of research conducted in this paper has proved useful for its application in more practical fields. For instance, those involved in the treatment of persons for whom anger is a problem get information from the way these people talk about anger to enhance their therapeutic engagement with their patients¹². In this sense, an awareness of the ways in which anger is conceptualized can help therapists to be more precise in their analysis of the implicit beliefs that the patient holds about anger. If those who provide treatment for

¹² Davey and Day (2007)

angry offenders are aware of the multifaceted nature of anger experience and expression, they are less likely to propose contraindicated strategies for anger control.

I acknowledge that the data chosen for analysis in this work condition the results obtained. That is, the information provided here is not valid for all instances of anger, as anger maintained over a long period of time has not been focused on. Should we deal with this type of anger we will surely obtain a complementary view of this emotion. Further research could also focus on what specific entailments are activated in the different conceptual metaphors and metonymies, the complex interaction between these modes of conceptualization, what specific aspects of the folk understanding of anger are profiled for the creation of specific conceptual metaphors and metonymies and whether these remain the profiled aspects throughout time or cross-culturally, as research so far seems to have shown otherwise. What seems undeniable, however, is the fact that how we talk about anger is highly influenced by our conceptualisation of this emotion.

References

Averill, J. R. and Kövecses, Z. 1990, The concept of emotion: further metaphors. In Z. Kövecses (ed.), *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag. pp. 160-181.

Barcelona, A. 1989a, “Análisis contrastivo del léxico figurado de la ira en inglés y en español”. In *Actas del VI Congreso Nacional de Lingüística Aplicada. AESLA*. Santander: Universidad de Cantabria, pp. 141-148.

-----, 1989b, “*Being crestfallen / estar con las orejas gachas*, o por qué es metafórica y metonímica la depresión en inglés y en español”. In Santoyo, Julio (ed.), *Actas del XI Congreso de AEDEAN*. León (Spain): Universidad de León, pp. 219- 225.

-----, 2000, "Introduction. The cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy" In Barcelona, Antonio (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-28.

-----, 2002, "Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics. An update". In Dirven, René and Ralf Pörings (eds.), *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 207-277.

Clausen, E. I. 2007 (ed.), *Psychology of Anger*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Davey, L. and Day, A., 2007, "The Poetics of Anger Control: Metaphorical Conceptualisations of Anger Expression in Violent Offenders". In: Clausen, E. I. *Psychology of Anger*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Blanco-Carrión 2011, "The conceptualization of anger in English: Folk model vs. expert model", Paper presented at The 11th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference. Xi'an, China. July, 2011.

-----, 2012, "The folk conceptualization of anger in contemporary Spanish", Paper presented at the XXX AESLA International Conference. Universitat de Lleida, Spain, April, 2012.

Fauconnier, G., 1994, *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Foolen, A., 1997, "The expressive function of language: Towards a cognitive semantic approach", in Niemeier, S and R. Dirven (Eds.), *The Language of Emotions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gevaert, 2001, Anger in old and middle english: A 'hot' topic? *Belgian Essays on Language and Literature*, pp. 89–101.

-----, 2005, The ANGER IS HEAT question: Detecting cultural influence on the conceptualization of anger through diachronic corpus analysis. In N. Delbecque, J. van der Auwera, & D. Geeraerts (Eds.), *Perspectives on variation: Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative* (pp. 195–208). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Gibbs, R. W., 1994, *The Poetics of Mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hertenstein, M. J., Butts, A., and Hile, S., 2007, *The Communication of Anger: Beyond the Face*. In Clausen, E. I. (ed.). *Psychology of Anger*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

King, B. 1989, *The conceptual structure of emotional experience in Chinese*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

Kövecses, Z., 1986, *Metaphors of anger, pride and love: A lexical approach to the study of concepts*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

-----, 1990, *Emotion concepts*. Berlin and New York: Springer-Verlag.

-----, 1991, A linguist's quest for love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, pp. 77-97.

-----, 1995a, Metaphor and the folk understanding of anger. In: Russell, J. A. et al. *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion. An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology and Linguistics of Emotion*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

-----, 1995b, Anger: Its language, conceptualization, and physiology in the light of cross-cultural evidence. In Taylor, J. R. and MacLaury R. E. (Eds.), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

-----, 2000, *Metaphor & Emotion: Language, Culture & the Body in Human Feeling*. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

-----, 2005, *Metaphor in culture*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

-----, 2010, Cross-Cultural Experience of Anger: A Psycholinguistic Analysis, In Potegal, M., Stemmler, G., and Spielberger, C., (Eds.) *International Handbook of Anger*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

Kövecses, Z. and Radden, G. 1998, Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 17(3), pp. 269-316.

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

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 1980, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-----, 1999, *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

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

Lutz, C., 1988, *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a micronesia atoll and their challenge to western theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ruiz de Mendoza, F. & Diez, O., 2002, Patterns of conceptual interaction. In Dirven, René and Ralf Pörings (eds.), *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 489-532.

Russell, J.A. et al. eds., 1995, *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion. An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology, and Linguistics of Emotion*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sánchez, J. M^a. 2007, Toward a Cognitively-Oriented Critical Discourse Analysis: Framing, Construal and Violence-Related Emotional Meaning. In Hart, C. and Lukes, D. (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis: application and theory*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. pp. 207-231.

Sánchez, J. M^a. and Blanco, O. 2007, Frames and Critical Discourse Analysis in Violence-Related Emotive Event Analysis. In Hart, C. and Lukes, D. (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis: application and theory*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. pp. 232-254.

Solomon, R. C., 1984, The Jamesian Theory of Emotion in Anthropology. In Shweder, R. A. and LeVine, R. A., *Culture Theory. Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soriano, C., 2004, *The conceptualization of anger in English and Spanish. A cognitive approach*. PhD dissertation. Universidad de Murcia, Spain.

Taylor, J.R. and Mbense, T. G., 1998, Red dogs and rotten mealies: How Zulus talk about anger. In *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression*, In Athanasiadou, A. and Tabakowska, E. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 191-226.

Tyler, A. and Evans, V. 2003, *The Semantics of English Prepositions. Spatial scenes, embodied meaning and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilce, J.M., 2009, *Language and Emotion*. Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language 25. Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Witherow, J., 2004, Anger and heat: A study of figurative language, *Journal of Literary Semantics* 33, pp. 71-82.

Yu, N., 1995, Metaphorical expression of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, pp.223–245.

-----, 1998, *The contemporary theory of metaphor. A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Novels that comprise the corpus

Manju Kapur (2003): *A Married Woman*. London: Faber and Faber (abbreviated in the text as MW)

Margaret Murphy (2003): *Weaving Shadows*. (abbreviated in the text as WS)

Minette Walters (1992): *The Ice House*. (abbreviated in the text as IC)

Phyllis Dorothy James (2001): *Death in Holy Orders*. (abbreviated in the text as DHO)

Richard North Patterson (2000): *The Dark Lady*. (abbreviated in the text as DL)

Dictionaries used

Merriam-Webster online [<http://www.m-w.com>]

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1995. Harlow, UK. Longman
[abbreviated in the text as LDOCE]