METAPHORICAL CONCEPTULIZATIONS OF ANGER IN ENGLISH AND FULFULDE

Sulaiman Dahiru[1],
Abdulhakim Saidu[2i]
[1]Department of General Studies,
Federal College of Horticulture,
Dadinkowa Gombe, Nigeria
[2]Department of English and French,
Umaru Musa Yar'adua University,
Katsina, Nigeria

Abstract:

This study, using Lakoff's (1993) Contemporary Metaphor Theory, compared metaphorical conceptualizations of anger in two typologically unrelated languages, namely, English and Fulfulde, with a view to finding out whether they have similar or different anger conceptual metaphors, and whether the languages differ in the way they elaborate the conceptual metaphors they share. In gathering the data, the researchers employed a focus group discussion in which native Fulfulde speakers living in Dukku Local Government Area, Gombe state, Nigeria participated. The discussion was carried out with ten different groups of participants who live in Dukku and its rural areas, each group comprising ten people. However, only the data that were found representative of all the ten groups were selected for analysis. In line with Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) developed by Pragglejazz Group (cited in Kovecses 2010a), Fulfulde conceptual metaphors for anger were identified from the selected data, and were compared with those of English. It was found out that the two languages share these conceptual metaphors (ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER; ANGER IS FIRE; ANGER IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE; ANGER IS DANGEROUS ANIMAL), although with some differences in metaphorical elaborations and specifications of some source domains. Moreover, it was discovered that Fulfulde has some conceptual metaphors not found in English and vice versa. The Fulfulde conceptual metaphors for anger are ANGER IS HEART; THE HEART OF AN ANGRY PERSON IS UP; WHEN ANGER COOLS THE HEART GOES DOWN; ANGER IS DANGEROUS TO THE ANGRY PERSON. The study concluded that the existence of similar conceptual metaphors in the two languages supports the claim of some cognitive linguists that some conceptual metaphors are universal (Kovecses, 2005; Lakoff, 1987).

Keywords: metaphorical conceptualizations, cognitive linguistics, English language, Fulfulde language

[1] Correspondence: email sulaidukku@gmail.com, saiduabdulhakim@yahoo.com

Introduction

This paper examines metaphorical conceptualizations of anger in two genetically unrelated languages, namely English (a Germanic Language) and Fulfulde (a West Atlantic branch of Niger-Congo). The study is inspired by a number of cross-cultural studies in which anger metaphors of English are compared with those of Chinese, Hungarian, Japanese and Zulu (Kovecses, 2010a). However, there is probably no study conducted on metaphorical conceptualizations of anger in Fulfulde. The present paper, therefore, attempts a comparative study of anger metaphorical expressions in the two languages.

The Concept of Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics

Traditionally, metaphor was restricted to novel poetic language in which words are used not in their ordinary sense; metaphorical expressions were thought to be mutually exclusive with the conventional language. However, in their seminal book, *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) found out that: *Metaphor is pervasive not just in language but in thought and action.* (Lakof and Johnson, 1980: 4). In this view, metaphor is seen not just as an aspect of language but of thought. Human thought processes are largely metaphorical, and thus everyday language is pervasively metaphorical. Moreover, even the literary metaphor is an extension of the ordinary everyday language metaphor (Lakoff, 1993: 203). Lakoff and Johnson' s remarkable discovery was later refined into what is now known as Contemporary Metaphor Theory (Lakoff, 1993).

The central argument, in this theory, is that metaphor involves understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain. Thus, English speakers think and talk about argument in terms of war, love in terms of journey, ideas in terms food, anger in terms of fire etc. That way of using language was proved to be normal, not only in English but in a variety of languages (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Kovecses, 2010a; Kovecses, 2010b). Put differently, metaphor is characterized by cross-domain mapping. The domains that are mapped together are referred to as source and target domains. The former provides the linguistic expressions that facilitate the understanding of the other domain, while the latter is the domain that is conceptualized this way. Target domains are mostly abstract, while source domains are more concrete, thus, they provide a means for conceptualizing the target domains. In English, for instance, anger, an abstract domain, is conceptualized through these source domains: FIRE, HOT FLUID CONTAINER, INSANITY, NATURAL FORCE, and OPPONENT etc., which make up English conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS FIRE, ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, ANGER IS INSANITY and so on. The relationship between the source and the target domains involves a set of systematic correspondences or mappings which constitute a conceptual metaphor. The following are the set of mappings for the English conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE, as illustrated in Lakoff and Kovecses (1987: 203):

Source: Fire   Target: Anger
The fire   the anger;
The thing burning   the angry person;
The cause of the fire   the cause of anger;
The intensity of the fire   the intensity of the anger;
The physical damage to the thing burning   the mental damage to the angry person;
The danger of the fire to things nearby   the danger of the anger to other people

These are the mappings that play a constitutive role in the construction of the folk understanding of anger as fire in English. Mappings in any conceptual metaphor are of two types: ontological and epistemic. Ontological mappings are correspondences between the entities in the source domain and the corresponding entities in the target domain, as illustrated above. Epistemic mappings, on the other hand, are correspondences between knowledge speakers have about the source domain and the corresponding knowledge about the target domain. Examples of epistemic correspondences for ANGER IS FIRE conceptual metaphor are:

Source: things can burn at low intensity for a long time and then burst into flame.
Target: people can be angry at a low intensity for a long time and then suddenly   become extremely angry.

Source: fires are dangerous to things nearby.
Target: angry people are dangerous to other people.

Source: things consumed by fire cannot serve their normal function.
Target: at the limit of the anger scale, people cannot function normally."

<div align="right">Lakoff and Kovecses, 1987: 203</div>

Without these mappings it is difficult to see how fire related vocabulary would be used to talk about anger in expressions, such as, *he was doing a slow burn; he was breathing fire; he was smouldering for days* etc.

The systematic mappings between the source and the target domains make up what is referred to as conceptual metaphor. A conceptual metaphor is a combination of two conceptual domains, in which one domain (source) provides the linguistic expressions that help in understanding the other domain (target). Conventionally, conceptual metaphors are written in small capital letters (e.g. ANGER IS FIRE), signaling ' *that such wording does not occur in the language as* such (Kovecses, 2010a: 4). Thus, **conceptual metaphor** differs from **metaphorical linguistic expressions** in that the former is convenient shorthand for a subconscious organized knowledge in a language, and thus cannot surface in speech, while the latter refers to figurative expressions that are used to talk about the target domains. For instance, the English conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE cannot manifest in speech but is realized through conventional linguistic expressions such as:

Those are inflammatory remarks.
He was doing a slow burn.
He was breathing fire.
Your insincere apology just added fuel to the fire.
After the argument, Dave was smouldering for days.
That kindled my ire.
He was consumed by his anger."

<div align="right">Lakoff and Kovecses, 1987: 202</div>

In the examples above, an abstract concept, anger (target domain) is understood and talked about in terms of a more concret concept, fire (source domain) which provides the fire-related vocabulary, highlighting different aspects of anger, thus *kindled* and *inflammatory* highlight the cause of anger; *smouldering* and *slow burn* relate to the intensity and duration of the anger; *breathing fire* focuses on the danger of anger to the people nearby, and *consumed* highlights the damage anger causes to the angry person himself (ibid).

In recent years, cross-cultural studies have investigated anger (and its rough equivalents) in a variety of typologically unrelated languages (including Hungarian, Japanese, Chinese and Zulu), proving that the languages, and possibly many others not yet researched, have some similar conceptualizations of anger. Bokor (1997, as cited in Kovecses, 2010a: 199), found out that both Hungarian and English have the conceptual metaphors THE BODY IS CONTAINER FOR THE EMOTION and ANGER IS FIRE. Also, both languages have the HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor for anger, although the two languages conceptualize the container differently in that in the former the ' *head'* is perceived as the container, whereas in the latter the container is unspecified. Moreover, the HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor for anger in English is elaborated into a number of metaphorical entailments, as illustrated in the examples below:

WHEN THE INTENSITY OF ANGER INCREASES, THE HOT FLUID RISES: His pent-up anger welled-up inside him

INTENSE ANGER PRODUCES STEAM: Billy s just blowing off steam.
INTENSE ANGER PRODUCES PRESSURE ON THE CONTAINER: He was bursting with anger.

WHEN ANGER BECOMES TOO INTENSE, THE PERSON EXPLODES: When I told him, he just exploded.

WHEN A PERSON EXPLODES, PARTS OF HIM GO UP IN THE AIR: I blew my stack.

WHEN A PERSON EXPLODES, WHAT WAS INSIDE HIM COMES OUT: His anger finally came out"

The above metaphorical entailments for the English HOT FLUID CONTAINER METAPHOR for anger were surprisingly found to exist in Hungarian (Kovecses, 2010a: 124). Tylor and Mbense (1998, as cited in Kovecses, 2010a: 201) observe that Zulu, an African language, has much in common with English in anger conceptualization, albeit with slight differences. For instance, the languages share these conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, ANGER IS FIRE, ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE. However, in Zulu, unlike in English, the container in the HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor is conceptualized as' heart' which when ' pressurized' and ' filled up' with anger, the person is perceived as ' inflated' and is likely to ' burst. Moreover, in Zulu, a person with a small/ short heart is intolerant and is easily offended, and the one with a long heart is tolerant. Furthermore, the two languages differ in the way they elaborate the conceptual metaphors they share. For instance, with regards to the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE, in Zulu the source domain FIRE is elaborated in a metaphorical entailment to talk about putting off one's anger by pouring water on them. This elaboration is not found in English.

Thus far, it appears that the languages under review (and possibly many others not yet studied) have similar or near-similar conceptualizations of anger (and its counterparts). This remarkable discovery suggests that there might be a universal basis that accounts for the near-similarity of the conceptualizations of anger. The most widely accepted explanation in cognitive linguistics is the embodiment hypothesis, which contends that our bodily experiences play a vital role in meaning construction and conceptualization (Koveces, 2010a).

In cross cultural studies, both similarities and variations in metaphorical conceptualizations of emotions have been extensively documented (Barcelona and Soriano, 2004; King, 1989; Kovecses, 2000 etc.). In the cognitive linguistic framework, human conceptual structure is thought to be rooted in embodied cognition—that is ' ' *our physical experience of being and acting in the world, of perceiving environment, moving our bodies* (Saeed, 2004: 353), informs and organizes our thinking which underlies language usage and meaning. In other words, in the emergence of meaning human body and experience play an important role. There are two schools of thought within the embodied cognitive view of language: the experientialists (Lakoff, 1987) and the social constructionists (Lutz, 1989). The former subscribe fully to the embodied cognitive hypothesis, and argue that the similarities in conceptualization of emotions are due to universal human experience and physiology. For instance, in a cross cultural study, Levenson et al (1992, cited in Kovecses, 2005: 41), found out that anger is associated with physiological changes, such as increase in body temperature, blood pressure and pulse rate. Another conceptualization of emotion that was proved to exist in a variety of languages is the container metaphor for anger, which is motivated by human' s perception of their body as containers for emotions (Kovecses, 2008: 390).

Social constructionists, on the other hand, argue that emotions are socio-cultural scripts/ scenarios which depend on a particular aspect of a culture. Thus, different cultures may have different conceptualizations for the same emotion concept because each culture gives one aspect or another of an emotion a different socio-cultural salience. In other words, conceptualizations of emotions tend to differ cross-culturally because they are shaped by

cultural values and social judgments (Harré, 1986, cited in Goddard, 1998: 87). Moreover, even the cultures that appear to have same conceptual metaphors may differ in elaborating or specifying some aspects of the conceptual metaphor. For instance, both English and Chinese have the CONTAINER METAPHOR for anger (Yu, 1995, cited in Kovecses, 2010a: 200); however, in English, the container is perceived as hot, while in Chinese it is not.

Conceptual Metaphors for Anger in English

The following are the most important conceptual metaphors for anger in English, with at least one conventional expression underlying each conceptual metaphor, as illustrated in Kovecses (2008), and Lakoff and Kovecses (1987). The researchers did not analyze these metaphors here, as they are from a secondary source; they however, formed the basis of comparing the metaphorical conceptualizations of anger in the two languages. The conceptual metaphors are:

1. ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER: *She is boiling with rage*.
2. ANGER IS FIRE: *He is doing a slow burn. His anger is smouldering*.
3. ANGER IS INSANITY: *The man was insane with rage*.
4. ANGER IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE): *I was struggling with my anger*.
5. ANGER IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL: *He unleashed his anger*.
6. ANGER IS A BURDEN: *He carries his anger around with him*.
7. ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR: *Don't snarl at me*.
8. ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL: *He has a ferocious temper. That awakened my ire*.
9. ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE: *It was a stormy meeting*.
10. ANGER IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR: *His actions were completely governed by anger*.

Methodology

In gathering the data, the researchers employed focus group discussion with native Fulfulde speakers of Dukku Local Government, Gombe State. The participants live in Dukku metropoly and its rural areas, namely Guli, Baluru, Shabewa, Gombe Abba, Tilel, Waloji and Wuro Tale. While the researchers were facilitating the discussion, a research assistant was audio-recording it. The discussion was carried out with ten different groups of participants, each group comprising ten people. Three groups live in Dukku metropoly, while the remaining seven groups live in the seven rural areas. However, only the data that were found representative of all the ten groups were selected for analysis; expressions that were not used by all the participants were not analyzed, as the expressions might be idiosyncratic of the members a locality. Furthermore, in order to identify the linguistic metaphors from which the conceptual metaphors were inferred, the researchers subjected the selected data into a rigorous analysis, in line with Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) developed by Pragglejazz Group (2007, as cited in Kovecses, 2010a: p5). The procedure is as follows:

After transcribing the data, the researchers read the entire discourse to establish a general understanding of it, and then divided it into lexical units to establish their meanings in context. For each lexical unit, the researchers determined if it has a more basic meaning

than the contextual one. In determining the basic and the contextual meanings of the lexical units, the researchers sometimes looked up the meanings of some lexical units in Croix's (1998) Fulfulde-English Dictionary, and sometimes the researchers resorted to native speaker intuitions, as one of them is a native Fulfulde speaker. If the lexical unit has more basic meaning in other contexts than the one in question, and the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it, the researchers marked the lexical unit as metaphorical.

Data Presentation

The following are Fulfulde conceptual metaphors for anger, with the linguistic realizations of such metaphors written underneath. The primary data as expressed by the participants in the focus group discussion is written in Fulfulde orthography, while the translations, both literal and non-literal, are presented in English thus:

1. ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER
a.   Haalama *fatiniiyam ɓernde*.
       Statement-your *bubled (with hot liquid)-my heart*.
       Your statement angered me.
b.   *ɓernde am wawnyi* nde mo huɗiyam.
       Heart-my boiled when he insulted me.
       I felt angry when he insulted me.
c.   a waɗii *ɓernde am ỳuufii*.
       You made *heart-my frothed up with hot liquid*.
       You made me all steamed up.
2. ANGER IS DANGEROUS ANIMAL
a.   *ɓernde hawiyam*, piimoomi.
       Heart butted me beat-him-I
       Anger drove me to beat him.
3. ANGER IS DANGEROUS TO THE ANGRY PERSON
a.   *Mone faɗɗaiyam*!
       Anger kill-can me.
       Anger can kill me.
b.   *ɓernde halkete* ỳannde go'o.
       Anger destroy-can you day-one.
       Anger can destroy you oneday.
4. ANGER IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE)
a.   Mi *habdii e mone* keenya.
       I *fought with anger* yesterday.
       I *battled with anger* yesterday.
b.   Mi ɗon *fiida e mone*.
       I am *beating with anger*.
       I am struggling with anger.

c. *ɓernde jaalakemo.*
    Heart overwhelmed him/her.
    Anger overwhelmed him/her.

d. Mi *nyoỳỳi ɓernde* am.
    I *pressed heart-my*.
    I suppressed my anger.

5. ANGER IS HEART

a. *ɓernde maako famarde.*
    Heart-his/her small.
    S/he is bad-tempered.

b. O *ɓerɓero.*
    S/he has hearts
    S/he is *hothead.*

c. A *ɓuutiniiyam ɓernde.*
    You *swelled-my heart.*
    You made me angry.

d. *ɓernde maako ɓuutii feshshake*!
    Heart-his swelled and burst.
    He swelled up and exploded with anger.

e. *ɓernde maako metti.*
    Heart-his/her *turned sweetless.*
    He was bitterly angered.

6. THE HEART OF AN ANGRY PERSON IS UP

a. *ɓernde maako maggii.*
    Heart-his/her *climbed.*
    His anger rose.

b. *O magginiimo.*
    He made him climb.
    He caused his anger to rise.

7. WHEN ANGER COOLS HEART GOES DOWN

a. *ɓernde maako jippake.*
    Heart-his/her *dismounted.*
    His anger cooled down.

b. Taa *jippin ɓernde maa dow am.*
    Don't *dismount heart-your* on me.
    Don't unleash your anger on me.

8. ANGER IS FIRE

a. Mo warii *e mo fufta.*
    He came *blowing (hot air).*
    He came fuming.

b. *ɓernde* maako *fewti.*
    heart-his/her cooled.
    his anger cooled down.

c.   *To ɓernde maa metti, yaru munyal.*
      If *heart-your turned sweetless, drink patience.*
      If you felt annoyed, be patient.

Data Analysis and Discussion

Although the two languages appear to share some anger conceptual metaphors, variations in the specification of the source domains and metaphorical elaborations abound. With respect to HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor, for instance, the two languages have same source domain (hot fluid in a container), but differ in the way they specify the container in that in Fulfulde, the container is conceptualized as the ' heart' as in *ɓernde am fatii* (my heart has boiled), a conceptualization that is also found in Zulu (Tylor and Mbense, 1998, cited in Kovecses, 2010a: 201). In contrast, the container, in English, is not specified; the body in general is perceived as the container, as in *you make my blood boil*. Moreover, in English, the HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor for anger, unlike in Fulfulde, is central as it is highly elaborated (Kovecses, 2000: 22). The HOT FLUID in English may be of different stages, indicating the degree of intensity of anger. Thus, for example, ' stew' in *let him stew* reflects the persistence of anger, while "simmer" in *simmer down* focuses on low intensity of anger (Lakoff and Kovecses, 1987: 198). The existence of HOT FLUID CONTAINER metaphor for anger in Fulfulde, as in many other languages, supports Kovecses' s (2005: 64) conjecture that this *is a potentially universal conceptual metaphor* as human beings perceive their bodies as containers. However, the variations between the two languages in elaborating and specifying the HOT FLUID metaphor can be accounted for in terms of socio-cultural constructions (Kovecess, 2000: 120).

Another conceptual metaphor the two languages seem to share is ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL, although only one expression was found to prove the metaphor in Fulfulde. According to Lakoff and Kovecses (1987), the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor for anger presupposes that in each person there is a part of him that is wild which s/he is supposed to control. The dangerous aspect of anger mapped on the behavior of a wild animal (source domain) can be seen in both languages in expressions, such as *he has ferocious/monstrous temper* (English), *ɓernde hawiiyam* (heart butted me), (Fulfulde). This conceptual metaphor is, however, elaborated differently in the two languages. For example, in Fulfulde, the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor is further elaborated into the metaphor: ANGER IS DANGEROUS TO THE ANGRY PERSON as is evident from these expressions *mone faddaiyam* (anger can kill me), *ɓernde halkete* (anger can destroy you). On the other hand, English focuses on the cause of anger in the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor for anger, and thus elaborates the metaphor into: THE CAUSE OF ANGER IS A PHYSICAL ANNOYANCE which is reflected in expressions such as: *Don't be a pain in the ass; you are getting under my skin; he is a pain in the neck* (Lakoff and Kovecess, 1987: 208). Furthermore, in the conceptual metaphors ANGER IS DANGEROUS TO THE ANGRY PERSON (Fulfulde) and ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGRRESSIVE ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR (English), the effect of anger in Fulfulde is directed towards the angry person himself, whereas in English the effect of anger is directed towards people nearby the angry person.

Moreover, the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE is found in both languages, albeit with slight differences. In English, fire is talked about directly, as these examples illustrate: *she was doing a slow burn; that kindled my ire; boy, am I burned up; after the argument, Dave was smouldering for days* etc. Probably, this conceptual metaphor exists marginally in Fulfulde, as the researchers got only one linguistic expression that directly proves the conceptual metaphor *mo warii e mo fufta* = he came blowing hot air. However, in Fulfulde there are expressions that indirectly indicate the existence of the conceptual metaphor in a metaphorical entailment i.e. placation of anger is the absence of fire/heat, as can be seen in these examples: *nde ɓernde maako fewti*, o dilli wuro (when his *heart lost heat*, he went home), *to ɓernde maa metti, yaru munyal* (if your heart has turned sweetless, *drink patience*). Both examples presuppose 'fire'. The word *fewti* (literally, lost heat), in the example above, indicates the absence of heat, while *munyal* (patience) conceptualized as liquid, as the collocate *yaru* (drink) alludes, presupposes that anger is fire which can be doused with liquid.

The final metaphor the two languages seem to share is ANGER IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE) which emphasizes the issue of control (controlling the anger or being controlled by the anger). In both languages, anger is conceptualized as an opponent with whom an angry person fights, as can be seen in these examples: English: *I'm struggling with my anger, he was battling his anger*. Fulfulde: *mi habdii e mone* (I battled with anger), *mi ɗon fiida e mone* (I am struggling with anger), *mi nyoýýi ɓernde am* (I suppressed my anger) etc. In these expressions, anger is conceptualized as an opponent that the angry person tries to defeat.

From the foregoing, it is evidently clear that the central conceptual metaphor for anger in Fulfulde is ANGER IS HEART. This conceptual metaphor is, however, not found in English, but exists in Zulu as reported by Taylor and Mbense (1998, as quoted in Kovecses, 2010a: 201). The centrality of this conceptual metaphor in Fulfulde is obvious in that in almost all the metaphors discussed so far, *ɓernde* (heart) is involved in many ways, such as taking on a particular state (*ɓernde maggi/jippake* = heart has climbed/dismounted; *ɓernde fewtii* = heart has cooled), or having some taste (*ɓernde metti*=heart has turned sweetless). Moreover, in Fulfulde not only does heart take on different states or taste but is itself conceptualized as anger, as these examples indicate: *O won ɓernde* (he has heart= he is easily offended), *O ɓerni* (he did heart= he took offence) and *o ɓerɓero* (he has hearts = he is hothead). Both *ɓerni* and *ɓerɓero* are derived from the word *ɓernde (heart)*.

Another metaphor that is found in Fulfulde but not in English is THE HEART OF AN ANGRY PERSON IS UP. This metaphor exists by virtue of the central metaphor: ANGER IS HEART. The heart, viewed as a container for anger, when filled up with anger and thus became pressurized, the container moves up as this linguistic metaphors illustrate *ɓernde maako maggi* (his/her heart has climbed=his/her anger rose), *O magginiimo* (s/he made him/her climb= s/he caused his/her anger to rise). In English, however, the conceptualization of up-ward orientation of emotion involves happiness as *in I'm feeling up; my spirits rose; you are in high spirits* (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 15). Furthermore, the conceptual metaphor THE HEART OF AN ANGRY PERSON IS UP is systematic in that it involves a metaphorical entailment: WHEN ANGER COOLS DOWN, THE HEART GOES DOWN as is evident from these examples: *ɓernde maako jippake* (his/her heart has dismounted=his/her anger has cooled down), *taa jipporam* (don't dismount on me =don't unleash your anger on me) etc.

In conclusion, the researchers found out that there are both similarities and differences in the conceptualization of anger in the two languages. As for similarities, the two languages share the following conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, ANGER IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE), ANGER IS DANGEROUS ANIMAL, ANGER IS FIRE. As for variation, the conceptual metaphors found in Fulfulde but not in English are: ANGER IS HEART, THE HEART OF AN ANGRY PERSON IS UP, WHEN ANGER COOLS THE HEART GOES DOWN, ANGER IS DANGEROUS TO THE ANGRY PERSON. The conceptual metaphors found in English but not in Fulfulde are: ANGER IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL, ANGER IS A BURDEN, ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE, ANGER IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR, ANGER IS INSANITY. The similarities and variations in the conceptualization of anger in the two languages prove Kovecses' s (2000: 183) proposal that metaphorical conceptualization of emotions is both motivated by human physiology and socio-cultural setup of a people. The researchers, based on the findings of this study, recommend that further study should compare prototypical cognitive models of anger in the two languages. The English model, as Lakoff and Kovecses (1987) postulate, shows how the various conceptual metaphors for anger are interrelated, and how they together characterize a folk understanding of the concept of anger.

References

1. Barcelona, A. & Soriano, C. (2004). "Metaphorical conceptualization in English and Spanish". *European Journal of English Studies,* 8(3): pp 295-307.
2. Croix, F.W. (1998). *Fulfulde-English Dictionary.* Kano: Centre for the Study of Nigerian Languages: Bayero University Kano.
3. Goddard, C. (1998). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. King, B. (1989). *The Conceptual Structure of Emotional Experience in Chinese.* Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University.
5. Kovecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Kövecses, Z. (2008). "Metaphor and Emotion". In R. W. Gibbs (Ed), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp.380-396). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Kövecses, Z. (2010a). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Kovecses, Z. (2010b). "Metaphor and Culture". *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philological,* 2(2): 197-220.
10. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

11. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

12. Lakoff, G. & 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,* (pp. 195-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

13. Lakoff, G. (1993). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In A. Ortony, (Ed), *Metaphor and Thought,* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

14. Lutz, C. A. (1988). *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesia Atoll and their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

15. Saeed, J. I. (2004). *Semantics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.