

CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF ANGER IN ENGLISH IDIOMS. AN ANALYSIS BASED ON THE EXTENDED CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR THEORY



Forum for Contemporary Issues
in Language and Literature
No. II/2021

ISSN: 2391-9426
doi.org/10.34739/fci.2021.02.02

Sarah Dobiášová

ORCID: 0000-0002-7865-2194

Masaryk University, Brno
Department of English and American Studies

Abstract

The article combines the approach to idiom classification according to Langlotz (2006) and the recently suggested analytical framework for figurative language analysis known under the name of the Extended Conceptual Metaphorical Theory (Kövecses 2020). The aim of the article is to identify some of the conceptual pathways of ANGER idioms in English. The analysis of 37 idioms for expressing ANGER revealed that both metaphorical (e.g. *go through/hit the roof*) and metonymic (e.g. *make someone's hackles rise*) motivations play a crucial role in the transparency of the idiomatic meaning. It was also concluded that three image schemas in particular play a crucial role in metaphorical idioms for expressing the concept of ANGER in English: ACTIVITY IS MOTION, INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY IS HEAT and ANGER IS HEAT. However, contrary to the HEAT element, which is particularly salient in linguistic metaphors for expressing ANGER (e.g. *kindle the wrath*), it is the MOTION element which plays the crucial role in the conceptualizations of ANGER in idioms in English (e.g. *go through/hit the roof*, *flip the lid*, *fly off the handle*).

Key words

figurative language, idioms, motivation, Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory, metaphor, metonymy

Introduction

The Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has brought a fresh look at the role figurative language plays in human communication. Freeing figurative devices such as metaphor and metonymy from the monopoly of literary studies, the early proponents of the CMT maintained that “metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff

and Johnson 1980, 3). Since its birth in the early 1980s, the CMT has branched into several directions. Both the theoretical basis and the scope of possible applications have widened. Among the most notable and influential additions to the original CMT are: Relevance Theory (e.g. Gibbs and Tendahl 2006), Conceptual Blending Theory (e.g. Fauconnier and Turner 2002) and Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Kövecses 2020). The so-called Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory (ECMT), placed at the end of this non-exhaustive list, can be considered as one of the most recent of these additions. Indeed, as its title already suggests, it considers itself a direct descendant of the original CMT of the 1980s. It builds directly on its notions, enlarging and elaborating its original theoretical framework. The latest version of this framework is presented with much detail in the recently published monograph *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (Kövecses 2020). However, the monograph is, in fact, a culmination of ideas and procedures, presented in a number of earlier articles (e.g. Kövecses 1995; Kövecses 2015; Kövecses 2017). Given the relative novelty of the proposed theoretical framework of figurative language analysis, not much empirical work has been done which would make use of it, confirming its advantages and revealing its drawbacks. The presented analysis is meant as an initial case study to test the mentioned theoretical framework in order to prove its suitability for the analysis of metaphorical idioms. The results of the study will be later incorporated into a much larger project, involving a greater number of EMOTION idioms in English.

The aim of the article is to establish the conceptual pathways for the conceptualisations of ANGER in a group of selected English idioms, using the theoretical framework suggested by Kövecses (2020). Although the concept of ANGER has already received considerable attention by different linguists (e.g. Matsuki 1995; Mikolajczuk 1998; Gevaert 2002; Maalej 2004), the actual conceptual mappings such as ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER were mostly based on linguistic metaphors such as *the intestines are boiling*, *anger seethes inside the body* or *anger boils the bottom of the stomach* (Kövecses 2010, 200). A comprehensive analysis of conceptual mappings in a thematically homogeneous group of idiomatic expressions has not been presented so far. Such analysis would, hopefully, yield the following results:

- Different types of motivation in ANGER idioms will be explored.
- Conceptual mappings for a group of thematically related idioms will be established. These mappings will then be compared to/contrasted with the corresponding conceptual mappings, obtained from similar analyses of linguistic metaphors on the same topic.
- The theoretical framework for the establishment of conceptual mappings, suggested by Kövecses (2020) will be tested on previously unused material.

The article can be roughly divided into two parts. The first part presents the compositional approach to idioms, which presupposes the internal motivation of

idiomatic expressions, and hence their transparency. Also, the main tenets of the ECMT, proposed mainly by Kövecses (2020), will be explained. Differences between the original CMT and the ECMT related to the analytical procedure of figurative language analysis will be highlighted. Finally, the methodological steps of the analysis will be listed. The second part is formed by the actual analysis of 37 idiomatic expressions, extracted from the *Oxford Idiom Dictionary* (2004) and thematically related by the target concept of ANGER. The conclusion of the article is focused not only on the summary of the results of the analysis, but also on the problems and challenges encountered in the course of the analysis.

1. Compositional View of Idioms

Idioms do not form a homogeneous group of linguistic expressions; it is therefore rather tricky to provide a universally applicable definition of idioms. Moreover, the character of the definition is influenced by the perspective adopted by the researcher. Broadly speaking, there are two perspectives of idioms: non-compositional and compositional. The non-compositional view of idioms is historically older; the compositional view is currently espoused by a considerable number of linguists and also forms one of the basic assumptions of the present paper.

Adherents of the non-compositional view maintain that: “the essential feature of an idiom is that its full meaning, and more generally the meaning of any sentence containing an idiomatic stretch, is not a compositional function of the meanings of the idiom’s elementary parts” (Katz and Postal 1963, 275). Among the main adherents of the non-compositional view belong generative linguistics, led by Chomsky (e.g. 1980). The compositional view of idioms, on the other hand, maintains that: “some relationship between an idiom’s component parts and its stipulated meaning can be discerned” (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993, 17). However, idiom compositionality is a matter of degree. Different linguists propose different classifications of compositional idioms, each based on a different characteristic. For example, Nunberg et al. (1994) divide idioms into broad groups: idiomatically combining expressions (i.e. ICEs) and idiomatic phrases (i.e. IdPs). ICEs (e.g. *take advantage of*) are conventional expressions whose meanings “are distributed among their parts” (Nunberg et al. 1994, 491). In the case of IdPs (e.g. *kick the bucket*), the meaning of the idiom is not distributed among its components. Probably one of the most elaborate contemporary classifications has been proposed by Langlotz (2006).

Langlotz (2006) offers an elaborate classification of idioms, which is fully in line with the cognitive linguistic approach. His aim is to “chart the complex cognitive universe that is encapsulated by idiomatic constructions” (95). His design is based on three characteristics:

- Compositionality, in this case, is defined as “the direct literal contribution of a constituent to the idiomatic meaning” (Langlotz 2006, 111), as in *to shoot a glance*, where the verb *to shoot* is to be interpreted literally.
- Motivation refers to the transparency of the idiomatic meaning. The meaning of an idiom is to be considered transparent if it is possible to make sense of the projections evoked by the idiom. Generally, two types of motivation are being recognized: global motivation refers to overall interplay of the literal meanings of the idiom constituents, while constituent motivation refers to one or more of the idiom constituents having an extra figurative meaning in itself, thus influencing the final interpretation of the idiom. Thus, *rock the boat* is globally motivated because all constituents are to be interpreted figuratively in this particular idiom. However, their meanings are strictly literal. On the other hand, *swallow the bitter pill* displays constituent motivation because the verb “has the lexicalised figurative sense ‘accept patiently’” (Langlotz 2006, 113). The figurative sense of the verb is in use also in non-idiomatic constructions.
- Isomorphism means that there is “a one-to-one correspondence between the parts and the semantic value of a compound meaning as a whole” (Geeraerts 1995, 60). For example, in *rock the boat*, “rock” equals “spoil” and “the boat” equals “a comfortable situation”.

In relation to the aim of the presented article, the motivation parameter is considered to be crucial. It is the idiom motivation which can be analysed, among other, in terms of the underlying metaphorical mappings. Or, in other words, the motivation for the meaning of an idiom can be very often explained with the help of these metaphorical mappings. Following Langlotz (2006), there are three possible ways to label an idiom according to the motivation parameter: motivated displaying global motivation, motivated displaying constituent motivation and unmotivated..

2. Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory according to Kövecses (2020)

As has already been foreshadowed in the introductory part of the article, the main source of inspiration as well as of the methodological framework for the analysis can be to a considerable extent attributed to the recently published monograph *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (2020) by Zoltán Kövecses. It is for this reason that the main tenets of this modern approach to figurative language are presented first. However, a variety of additional sources were needed to conduct the actual analysis.

The main focus of both the original CMT and the new ECMT is figurative language, or, more concretely, conceptual metaphor. However, the notion of the conceptual metaphor itself has been refined not only in the ECMT, but also in other linguistic theories dedicated to the role of figurative language in human communication. Roughly speaking, the notion of conceptual metaphor has been regarded very

broadly in the original CMT. A conceptual metaphor was considered to be the result of any conceptual mapping between a source domain and a target domain: “Conceptual metaphors are systematic mappings across conceptual domains: one, domain of experience, the source domain, is mapped onto another domain, the target domain.” (Yu 1995, 14). According to Lakoff (1993), “the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another” (202). However, no difference was being made between different kinds of these mappings, and, hence, between different kinds of the underlying conceptual metaphors. In later accounts of conceptual metaphor, different bases of conceptual mappings have been identified. For example, Grady (1997) distinguishes between correlation-based, resemblance-based and generic-to-specific metaphors. While the correlation metaphors, such as LOVE IS A JOURNEY, are based on correlations in people’s experience (Grady 1997, 13), the resemblance metaphors, such as ACHILLES IS A LION, is based on a shared feature of two different entities (Grady 1997, 223). The so-called generic-to-specific metaphors then refer to cases where the course entity is at the same time a specific part of the more general target entity, such as RISK-TAKING IS GAMBLING (Grady 1997, 225). Additionally, the scope of metaphor research has widened, including not only linguistic metaphors in its analyses, but shifting its attention to e.g. visual metaphors as well (Cienki and Müller 2008; Forceville 2008; Forceville and Urios-Aparisi 2009).

The second important distinction, this time directly related to the new theoretical framework presented above, is the number of levels at which the conceptual mappings take place. While the CMT identified only one level of this kind, the domain level (as in the source domain and the target domain), the ECMT maintains that conceptual mappings are happening at four levels: the level of image schemas, the level of domains, the level of frames and the level of mental spaces. The conceptualisation process, or, in other words, the process of concretisation of abstract entities, is gradual, starting with the least schematic conceptualisation and finishing with the most concrete one. A brief characterisation of each of the levels is given below:

- Image schemas can be described as very basic conceptual structures that determine the meaning of people’s experiences. For example, the concept of JOURNEY presupposes a more schematic structure of MOTION.
- Domain is, according to Langacker (1987), a “coherent area of conceptualization” (488) which determines the characterization of linguistic units. Domains are unequivocally conceptually richer than image schemas.
- Frames are even richer than domains, elaborating some of their specific aspects.
- Mental spaces then copy the structure of frames and determine the choice of the actual aspects which will be elaborated in a particular context.

Obviously, the approach makes the identification of conceptual mappings more subtle and less subjective. For example, the linguistic metaphor “to digest an idea” is based on the conceptual metaphor MIND IS A BODY. The concept of BODY is based on the very general image schema of (STRUCTURED) OBJECT. At the domain level, different parts of the body can be used to generate different linguistic metaphors. At the frame level, the chosen body part, DIGESTIVE SYSTEM in this case, is further elaborated, resulting in the above-mentioned linguistic metaphor. The nuances of the actual use of the expression are then subsumed under the mental spaces level.

3. Material

The material for the analysis comprises 37 idiomatic expressions, extracted from the *Oxford Idiom Dictionary* (2004). The dictionary is provided with a theme-based index of idioms. Therefore, a manual extraction, involving the scanning-through of the whole dictionary was not needed. However, it was considered useful to list the pre-selected idioms in a table, providing both their meaning, as presented in the *Oxford Idiom Dictionary* (2004), and various additional notes, mostly related to the regional restrictions of their use or various explanatory comments on their individual components. Interestingly, in the case of several idioms in the following list, possible sources of their motivation are mentioned as well. Marginally, possible variations of some of the idioms are mentioned, too.

4. Method

The method of the presented research project is based on the above-mentioned theoretical frameworks. The preparatory phase starts with a compilation of the initial list of ANGER idioms, based on the *Oxford Idioms Dictionary* (2004). The complete list of the analysed idioms is presented in the table below.

Table 1: ANGER idioms (*Oxford Idiom Dictionary*, 2004)

Idiom	Meaning
1. a red rag to a bull	an object, utterance, or act which is certain to provoke or anger someone
2. bent out of shape	angry or agitated
3. blow a gasket	suffer a leak in a gasket of an engine/lose your temper
4. blow your top	lose your temper
5. breathe fire	be fiercely angry

6. count to ten	count to ten under your breath in order to prevent yourself from reacting angrily to something.
7. do/lose your nana	lose your temper
8. do your nut	be extremely angry or agitated
9. fit to be tied	very angry
10. flip your lid	suddenly go mad or lose your self-control
11. fly off the handle	lose your temper suddenly and unexpectedly
12. froth/foam at the mouth	be very angry
13. get off your bike	become annoyed
14. get on someone's quince	irritate or exasperate someone
15. get on someone's wick	annoy someone
16. get your dander up	lose your temper, become angry
17. give someone the hairy eyeball	stare at someone in a disapproving or angry way, especially with your eyelids partially lowered.
18. give someone the pip	make someone irritated or depressed
19. go crook	lose your temper, become angry/become ill
20. go non-linear	become very excited or angry, especially about a particular obsession
21. go spare	become extremely angry or distraught.
22. go through/hit the roof	(of prices or figures) reach extreme or unexpected heights; become exorbitant/suddenly become very angry
23. have/get a cob on	be annoyed or in a bad mood
24. have a cow	become angry, excited, or agitated
25. have steam coming out of your ears	be extremely angry or irritated
26. have/get your monkey up	be angry
27. hot under the collar	angry, resentful, or embarrassed
28. keep your shirt on	don't lose your temper, stay calm
29. lose your rag	lose your temper

30. make someone's hackles rise	make someone angry or indignant
31. make your blood boil	infuriate you
32. put someone's nose out of joint	upset or annoy someone
33. rattle someone's cage	make someone feel angry or annoyed, usually deliberately
34. rub someone (up) the wrong way	irritate or repel someone
35. see red	become very angry suddenly
36. spit blood	be very angry
37. vent your spleen	give free expression to your anger or displeasure

The actual analysis starts with the division of the selected idioms into motivated and unmotivated, according to Langlotz's (2006) approach. Additionally, motivated idioms are further divided into globally motivated and constituentally motivated. The results are again summarized in the table below:

Table 2: Motivation evaluation of ANGER idioms according to Langlotz (2006)

Motivation	Idioms
MOTIVATED (GLOBAL MOTIVATION)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a red rag to a bull • blow a gasket • blow your top • breathe fire • count to ten • flip your lid • fly off the handle • froth/foam at the mouth • give someone a hairy eyeball • go through/hit the roof • hot under the collar • keep your shirt on • lose your rag • lose your temper • make someone's hackles rise • make your blood boil • put someone's nose out of joint • rattle someone's cage • rub someone up the wrong way • see red

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • spit blood • vent your spleen
MOTIVATED (CONSTITUENTIAL MOTIVATION)	none
UNMOTIVATED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fit to be tied • have/get your monkey up
PROBLEMATIC CASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bent out of shape (motivated - global motivation/unmotivated) • do/lose your nana (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • do your nut (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • get off your bike (motivated - global motivation/unmotivated) • get on someone's quince (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • get on someone's wick (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • get your dander up (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • give someone the pip (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • go crook (constituent motivation/unmotivated) • go non-linear (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • go spare (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • have/get a cob on (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated) • have a cow (motivated - constituent motivation/unmotivated)

According to Langlotz (2006), only motivated idioms can be further analysed in terms of their underlying metaphors. However, the table above reveals that deciding whether an idiom's meaning is motivated or unmotivated may not be a straightforward procedure. In the case of 13 (out of 37) analysed idioms the decision depends on a number of various factors. These idioms are presented in the last row of the table as PROBLEMATIC CASES. This issue will be elaborated on in the following section of the article. The evaluation revealed 3 unmotivated idioms. The total of 22 idioms, labelled unequivocally as metaphorically motivated, became the subject of further analysis based on Kövecses (2020) framework.

The framework revealed a consistent patterning in the case of 11 (out of 22) idioms: *blow a gasket*, *blow your top*, *breathe fire*, *flip your lid*, *fly off the handle*, *froth/foam at the mouth*, *go through/hit the roof*, *hot under the collar*, *make your blood boil*, *spit blood*, *vent your spleen*. These idioms display a common image-schematic basis; the differentiation then takes place at lower levels of conceptualisation (i.e. domain, frame and mental space level). The following table summarizes the results of the analysis. The details of the procedure will be discussed in the following section of the article.

Table 3: Analysis of ANGER idioms (*Oxford Idiom Dictionary*, 2004) according to Kövecses (2020)

Image schema	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTIVITY IS MOTION • INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY IS HEAT • ANGER IS HEAT
Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THE AFFECTED PERSON IS A CONTAINER • THE OBJECT CAUSING ANGER HEATS THE CONTENTS OF THE CONTAINER • THE HEATED CONTENTS OF THE CONTAINER QUICKLY LEAVE THE CONTAINER
Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIFFERENT KINDS OF CONTAINER • DIFFERENT KINDS OF CONTAINER CONTENTS • DIFFERENT KINDS OF OBJECTS
Mental space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>blow a gasket</i> • <i>blow your top</i> • <i>breathe fire</i> • <i>flip your lid</i> • <i>fly off the handle</i> • <i>froth/foam at the mouth</i> • <i>go through/hit the roof</i> • <i>hot under the collar</i> • <i>make your blood boil</i> • <i>spit blood</i> • <i>vent your spleen</i>

5. Discussion of results

In the previous section, the analysis of the selected group of idioms was presented. However, it is important to note that the analysis was far from straightforward. A considerable number of problems have occurred in the course of the analysis. As a matter of fact, this was one of the main, yet underlying, aims of the presented research project. As has already been pointed out, although the Extended Conceptual Theory (Kövecses 2020) is now a fully-fledged linguistic framework for figurative

language analysis, the number of its applications remains limited due to its relative novelty. It is therefore crucial to identify the possible hitches in actual applications in order to refine the framework as much as possible. Additionally, the idea to apply the framework to idioms as a special kind of figurative expressions has not been fully addressed yet.

5.1. Difficulties in Establishing Conceptual Pathways for ANGER Idioms

As the results presented in the section above show, it is indeed possible to apply the framework, suggested by Kövecses (2020) to idioms. However, considerable pre-processing of the selected material is necessary. First of all, not all idioms classify as metaphorical. Simply put, only motivated idioms can be analysed in terms of their underlying metaphorical mappings, although not always. In the presented analysis of 37 idioms, 22 idioms have been labelled unequivocally as motivated, in accordance with Langlotz's (2006) definition of motivation. It was also concluded that 13 idioms might under certain conditions, which will be discussed further below, classify as motivated. Only 3 idioms were considered unmotivated in the presented analysis. In order to avoid further complications, the initial set of idioms, which became the input of the actual analysis in terms of the Kövecses' (2020) framework, was limited to those labelled unequivocally as motivated. The analysed motivated idioms were: *a red rag to a bull*, *blow a gasket*, *blow your top*, *breathe fire*, *count to ten*, *flip your lid*, *fly off the handle*, *froth/foam at the mouth*, *give someone a hairy eyeball*, *go through/hit the roof*, *hot under the collar*, *keep your shirt on*, *lose your rag*, *lose your temper*, *make someone's hackles rise*, *make your blood boil*, *put someone's nose out of joint*, *rattle someone's cage*, *rub someone up the wrong way*, *see red*, *spit blood*, *vent your spleen*.

The kinds of motivation of these idioms differ. In terms of Langlotz's (2006) terminology, the idioms *a red rag to a bull* and *see red* display an emblematic motivation, or, in other words, the transparency of their meanings is based on certain culture related schemas (i.e to bullfighting in this case).

The idiom *count to ten* might be attributed to a metonymic motivation, where the activity of counting to ten stands for waiting and thus gaining distance from a conflicting situation. Similarly, the idiom *give someone a hairy eyeball* can also be regarded as metonymic, as the action described in the idioms stands for a certain kind of look, typically associated with disapproval or anger. The case seems to be the same with the idioms: *keep your shirt on*, *make someone's hackles rise*, *put someone's nose out of joint*, *rattle somebody's cage* and *rub someone up the wrong way*. The common feature of these idioms is that they denote activities, either of causing someone's anger (*make someone's hackles rise*, *put someone's nose out of joint*, *rattle someone's cage*) or expressing it (*count to ten*, *give someone a hairy eyeball*). At the same time, the idioms describe very specific actions, which can be regarded as standing

for more general ones, i.e. those of causing or expressing anger. The underlying motivation of this group of idioms might therefore be labelled as metonymic.

The last type of motivation identified in the analysed set of idioms is metaphorical motivation. In total, 13 idioms were attributed unequivocally metaphorical motivation: *blow a gasket*, *blow your top*, *breathe fire*, *flip your lid*, *fly off the handle*, *froth/foam at the mouth*, *go through/hit the roof*, *hot under the collar*, *lose your rag*, *lose your temper*, *make your blood boil*, *spit blood*, *vent your spleen*. These idioms can be divided into two groups, each based on a different image schema. As determined in the analysis above, 11 out of 13 idioms seem to be based on the combination of the following image schemas: ACTIVITY IS MOTION, INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY IS HEAT, ANGER IS HEAT. The INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY IS HEAT image schema is actually a primary metaphor (Grady 1997), the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT has already been identified by a number of scholars (e.g. Lakoff 1980; Yu 1995). The ACTIVITY IS MOTION image schema can be seen as a modification of the primary metaphor ACTION IS SELF-PROPELLED MOTION, also identified by Grady (1997). What seems to be new here, is the combination of the MOTION and the HEAT element in relation to the examined concept of ANGER. The actual conceptual mapping, happening at the domain level, can be described as follows: the situation involves three elements, i.e. the person getting angry, the object that causes anger and the action of getting angry/causing anger. The person getting angry can be described by means of the CONTAINER metaphor, or, in other words, the person can be viewed as a container of whatever kind, full of contents of whatever kind as well. Anger in this case is viewed as motion or as an entity making the contents of the container move. When the motion reaches a certain intensity, the contents burst out of the container. The element of MOTION seems to be central to each of the 11 idioms, which seems partly in contrast to the already identified conceptual mappings of metaphorical expressions related to the emotion of anger, which seem to highlight the HEAT element: *kindle the anger/wrath*, *spark anger*, *burn with rage* or *be ablaze* (Charteris-Black 2017). Although the HEAT element is also present in the analysed idioms in the form of the concept of INTENSITY, the conceptual pathways identified in these idioms seem rather to highlight the MOTION element. It can be therefore concluded that the present analysis, based on the Kövecses' (2020) framework, revealed two things: first, that the framework employed probably leads to more subtle and precise conclusions regarding the identification of the conceptual pathways of figurative expressions in general, and second, that idioms can be built on different parts of the image schemas, which they share with their metaphoric counterparts.

5.2. Difficulties in the Evaluation of Idiom Motivation

In this section, difficulties in deciding whether the meaning of an idiom can be considered motivated or not will be discussed. This issue has already been

foreshadowed in the previous parts of the article. The idioms which pose problems are: *bent out of shape*, *do/lose your nana*, *do your nut*, *get off your bike*, *get on someone's quince*, *get on someone's wick*, *get your dander up*, *give someone the pip*, *go crook*, *go non-linear*, *go spare*, *have/get a cob on*, *have a cow*.

The common feature of these idioms is that they are regionally bound, or, in other words, that they originate or are in wider use only in certain varieties of English. The original regional affiliation is manifested in the lexis of some of these idioms: *do/lose your nana*, *do your nut*, *get on somebody's quince*, *get on somebody's wick*, *go crook*, *go spare*. For example, given that “nana” is Australian slang term for “head”, constituent motivation can be assigned to this idiom. The question remains whether this constituent motivation remains in force when the idiom is used by speakers of other varieties of English. If the slang word “nana” is unknown to them, the idiom might classify as unmotivated. The case might be the same with the other regionally bound idioms of the group listed above (consider e.g. the word “nut” in *do you nut*, “quince” in *get on someone's quince* or “crook” in *go crook*).

The constituent motivation seems therefore to be a fairly complex phenomenon, which is, at least to a certain extent, dependent on the ability of the conceptualizer to decipher the kind of contribution of the individual lexical constituents of the idiom

Conclusion

The presented research was focused on a group of ANGER idioms and their underlying conceptual mappings, using a recently proposed framework of figurative language analysis (Kövecses 2020), which distinguishes four levels of conceptualisation (image schema, domain, frame, mental space) in contrast to the one-level conceptualisation, used in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The aim of the research was to identify the conceptual mappings of the selected idioms with the help of this framework in order to find out whether the framework is suitable for analyses of this kind.

The proposed framework is designed to identify the underlying conceptual pathways of metaphorical expressions, hence first the motivations of the initial set of 37 idioms had to be determined. For this purpose, the definition of motivation according to Langlotz (2006) was employed. It was concluded that the meaning of 22 idioms can be considered motivated without doubt whereas the meaning of 13 idioms can be considered motivated under certain conditions. Only 3 idioms were labelled unequivocally as unmotivated. Based on the above-mentioned proportions, motivation might be regarded as a considerably salient feature of idiomatic expressions. However, although the definition of idioms seems fairly straightforward, the actual evaluation might pose certain problems. In Langlotz's

(2006) terms, it is the constituential motivation, i.e. motivation based the figurative/more marked meaning of one/more of the constituents of an idiom, which might render the meaning of an idiom less transparent for both native and non-native speakers of English. For example, the meanings of *do/lose your nana* or *and go spare* are based on the slang meaning of “nana” and “spare”, which, additionally, are strongly regionally bound (in this case to Australian English).

The motivated idioms were divided into three groups, according to the types of motivation they displayed. The results of this division are: 2 idioms display emblematic motivation (*like a red rag to a bull, see red*), 7 idioms display metonymic motivation (*count to ten, give someone a hairy eyeball, make someone’s hackles rise, put someone’s nose out of joint, rattle someone’s cage, rub someone up the wrong way*), 13 idioms display metaphoric motivation (*blow a gasket, blow your top, breathe fire, flip your lid, fly off the handle, froth/foam at the mouth, go through/hit the roof, hot under the collar, lose your rag, lose your temper, make your blood boil, spit blood, vent your spleen*).

The vast majority of the metaphorical idioms seem to fit a common pattern. The conceptualisation starts at the very schematic image schema level (ACTIVITY IS MOTION, INTENSITY OF ACTIVITY IS HEAT, ANGER IS HEAT), proceeds to the domain level (THE AFFECTED PERSON IS A CONTAINER, THE OBJECT CAUSING ANGER HEATS THE CONTENTS OF THE CONTAINER, THE HEATED CONTENTS OF THE CONTAINER QUICKLY LEAVE THE CONTAINER) and further to the frame level (DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTAINERS, such as e.g. body or covered container), DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTAINER CONTENTS, such as e.g. blood or inflammable substance), DIFFERENT KINDS OF OBJECTS). However, neither the subjects nor the contents of the container are lexicalized in English idioms for expressing ANGER. It is the MOTION element which seems to be the most prominent aspect of the conceptualisation (consider verbs such as *blow, fly, flip, foam, hit, spit* and *vent*).

The presented analysis has been obviously conducted on a limited amount of material. The conclusions based on the idioms extracted from *Oxford Idioms Dictionary* (2004) seem to be fairly unambiguous, however, a more extensive analysis is needed in order to be able to identify the governing pathways of conceptualising ANGER in English idioms. A sketchy comparison with material provided by *NTC’s Thematic Dictionary of American Idioms* (1997) partly confirms the above-mentioned conclusions (consider e.g. *blow a fuse, blow one’s cork, blow one’s stack, blow up, hit the ceiling, let off steam, blow off steam, pop one’s cork*). However, other idioms seem to foreground the HEAT element (e.g. *burn with a low blue flame, have a low boiling point*). It is therefore clear that a more thorough analysis is needed in order to fully establish the conceptual mappings of ANGER idioms in English. However, the presented procedure based on Langlotz (2006) and Kövecses (2020) seems promising to achieve this purpose.

References

- Cacciari, Cristina, and Patrizia Tabossi. 1993. *Idioms: processing, structure and interpretation*. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cienki, Alan, and Cornelia Müller. 2008. "Metaphor, gesture, and thought". In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Raymond Gibbs, 483-501. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2017. *Fire Metaphors: Discourses of Awe and Authority*. London/New York: Bloomsbury.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. *Rules and Representations*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mike Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think*. New York: Basic Books.
- Forceville, Charles. J. 2008. "Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations". In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Raymond Gibbs, 462-82. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Forceville, Charles, J., and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, eds. 2009. *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1995. "Specialization and reinterpretation in idioms". In *Idioms: Structural and psychological perspectives*, edited by Martin Everaert, Erik-Jan van der Linden, Andr Schenk and Rob Schreuder, 57-73. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gevaert, Caroline. 2005. "The ANGER IS HEAT question: Detecting cultural influence on the conceptualisation of ANGER through diachronic corpus analysis". In *Perspectives on Variation: Sociolinguistic, Historical, Comparative*, edited by Nicole Delbecque, Dirk Geeraerts and Johan van der Auwera, 195-208, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gibbs, Raymond W., Jr. and Markus Tendahl. 2006. "Cognitive Effort and Effects in Metaphor Comprehension: Relevance Theory and Psycholinguistics". In *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 379-403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0017.2006.00283.x>.
- Grady, Joseph. 1997. "Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes". PhD diss., University of California.
- Katz, Jerrold J., and Paul Postal. 1963. "Semantic interpretation of idioms and sentences containing them". In *Quarterly Progress Report of the MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics* 70, 275-282.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2015. *Where Metaphors Come From: Reconsidering Context in Metaphors*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2017. "Levels of metaphor". In *Cognitive Linguistics*, 28(2), 321-47. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2016-0052>.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 1995. "American friendship and the scope of metaphor". *Cognitive Linguistics* 6(4), 315-46. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1995.6.4.315>.

- Lakoff, George. 1993. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mike Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langlotz, Andreas. 2006. *Idiomatic Creativity*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Maalej, Zouhair. 2004. "Figurative language in anger expressions in Tunisian Arabic. An extended view of embodiment." In *Metaphor and Symbol 19(1)*, 51-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1901_3.
- Matsuki, Keiko. 1995. "Metaphors of anger in Japanese". In *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, edited by John Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, 137-151. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mikołajczuk, Agnieszka. 1998. "The metonymic and metaphorical conceptualisations of anger in Polish." In *Speaking of Emotions. Conceptualisation and Expression*, edited by Angeliki Athanasiadou and Elzbieta Tabakowska, 153-190. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nunbreg, Geoffrey, Sag, Ivan, and Thomas Wasow. 1994. "Idioms". *Language 70(3)*, 491-538.
- Siefring, Judith, ed. 2004. *Oxford Idiom Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spears, Richard A., ed. 1997. *NTC's Thematic Dictionary of American Idioms*. Chicago: NTC/Contemporary Publishing Company.
- Yu, Ning. 1995. "Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese." In *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity 10(2)*, 59-92. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1002_1.
-