

**Закарпатський угорський інститут ім. Ференца Ракоці II**  
**Кафедра філології**

Реєстраційний № \_\_\_\_\_

**Кваліфікаційна робота**  
**КОРПУСНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ІДИОМ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ ЕМОЦІЙ В**  
**АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ**  
**ЦОНИНЕЦЬ ХРИСТИНИ ОЛЕКСІЇВНИ**

Студентки 4-го курсу

Освітня програма 014 Середня освіта (мова і література (англійська))  
Ступінь вищої освіти: бакалавр

Тема затверджена Вченою радою ЗУІ

Протокол № / 2022 року

Науковий керівник:

**Лехнер Ілона Густавівна**  
**доктор філософії, доцент**

Завідувач кафедри:

**Берегсасі Аніко Ференцівна**  
**д-р габілітований, доцент**  
**професор кафедри філології**

Робота захищена на оцінку \_\_\_\_\_, «\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2023\_ року

Протокол № \_\_\_\_\_ / 2023\_

**Закарпатський угорський інститут ім. Ференца Ракоці II**

**Кафедра філології**

**Кваліфікаційна робота**

**КОРПУСНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ІДИОМ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ ЕМОЦІЙ В  
АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ**

Ступінь вищої освіти: бакалавр

Виконала: студентка 4-го курсу

**Цонинець Христина Олексіївна**

Освітня програма  
014 Середня освіта (мова і література (англійська))

Науковий керівник: **Лехнер Ілона Густавівна**  
**доктор філософії, доцент**

Рецензент: **Врабель Томаш Томашович**  
**канд.філ.наук, доцент**

Берегове  
2023

**Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education  
Department of Philology**

**CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF IDIOMS EXPRESSING EMOTIONS IN  
ENGLISH**

Bachelor's Thesis

**Presented by:** Christina Tsoninets

a 4th year student

**Professional Education program:**

014 Secondary education (language and literature (English))

**Thesis supervisor:** Ilona Lechner

Doctor of Philosophy

Associate Professor

**Second reader:** Tamás Vrábely

Candidate of Philological Sciences

Associate Professor

**Beregszász – 2023**

## ЗМІСТ

ВСТУП.....	6
РОЗДІЛ 1. Характеристика ідіом.....	9
1.1. Огляд літератури.....	9
1.2. Ідіоми як один з типів фразеологізмів.....	11
1.2.1. Значення ідіом.....	11
1.2.2. Семантична композиційність та концептуальна прозорість.....	14
1.3. Зв'язок між ідіомами та метафорами.....	15
1.3.1. Порівняння ідіом та метафор.....	15
1.3.2. Ідіоми на основі концептуальних метафор.....	22
1.4. Класифікація ідіом.....	24
1.5. Зв'язок ідіом, метафор та емоцій.....	26
РОЗДІЛ 2. Корпусна лінгвістика. Метафори. Обговорення та інтерпретація результатів дослідження.....	31
2.1. Визначення, розмір та цілі мовних корпусів.....	31
2.2. Класифікація мовних корпусів.....	32
2.3. Корпусна лінгвістика та метафора.....	33
2.4. Типи корпусних інструментів.....	33
2.5. Корпусні дослідження метафори.....	34
2.6. Планування дослідження.....	36
2.7. Емпіричний метод дослідження.....	37
2.8. Збір даних.....	37
2.9. Порядок проведення дослідження.....	38
2.10. Результати та їх обговорення.....	39
ВИСНОВКИ.....	50
СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ.....	52
РЕЗЮМЕ.....	58
ДОДАТКИ.....	61

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	6
PART 1. Characteristics of idioms .....	9
1.1. Literature review .....	9
1.2. Idioms as one of the classes of phraseologisms .....	11
1.2.1. The meaning of idioms .....	11
1.2.2. Semantic compositionality versus conceptual transparency .....	14
1.3. The relation between idioms and metaphors .....	15
1.3.1. Idioms versus metaphors .....	15
1.3.2. Idioms based on the conceptual metaphors .....	22
1.4. Types of idioms .....	24
1.5. Idioms, metaphors and emotion .....	26
PART 2. Corpus Linguistics. Metaphors. Discussion and interpretation of results .....	31
2.1. Definition, size of corpora and their purposes .....	31
2.2. Classification of corpora. ....	32
2.3. The Corpus Linguistics and metaphor .....	33
2.4. Types of corpus tools .....	33
2.5. Corpus-based studies of metaphor .....	34
2.6. Planning the study .....	36
2.7. Empirical research method .....	37
2.8. Data collection .....	37
2.9. Procedure .....	38
2.10. Findings and discussion of the results .....	39
CONCLUSIONS .....	50
REFERENCES .....	52
RESUME .....	58
APPENDIX .....	61

## INTRODUCTION

The study of idioms has long been a captivating subject within the field of applied linguistics as they show the cultural and linguistic nuances of a language, having figurative nature and context specific meanings. Idioms expressing emotions are of particular interest, as their study through metaphors improves our understanding of the complex relationship between language and emotions. The emergence of corpus linguistics has changed the way of researching linguistic expressions and their use. Corpus-based analysis enables us to examine a large amount of authentic linguistic material that provides a solid empirical basis for the study of idioms. By analysing idioms that express emotions in English corpora, we can obtain valuable information about their frequency, distribution and variations in different genres and social context, thereby expanding our understanding of the use of idiomatic language. Nonetheless, corpus-based analysis of idioms expressing emotions in English language still has gaps in its study as due to the fact it is mostly studied in American English (see Heredia & Cie, 2016), than in British. Taking this into account, the main purpose of this thesis is to analyze through metaphors English idiomatic expressions collected in British Corpus and compare its results with the results of the research conducted on American Corpus.

A considerable amount of literature has been published on idioms, their characteristics, their connections with the metaphors, corpus linguistics, as well as on “Corpus Linguistics and metaphor.” These studies play a big role in this research. Scholars like Moon (1998a), Gibbs (1994), Kövecses (2010), Nunberg et al. (1994), Sinclair (1991), Carter (1998), Grant and Bauer (2004), and others made a significant contribution to the concept of idioms. Due to the wide variety of linguistic expressions that belong into this category, idiom definition is a complex task. The definitions offered by Moon (1998a), Gibbs (1994), and Kövecses (2010) are based on both traditional and cognitive linguistic perspectives. In contrast to the traditional perspective, which sees idioms as fixed phrases, the cognitive linguistic perspective sees idioms as linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphors or metonymies, or, more simply put, as metaphorical idioms (Andreou & Galamantos, 2008, p. 74). Other researchers including Nunberg et al. (1994) and Sinclair (1991) have highlighted three semantic features that are important, including conventionality, compositionality, and transparency, while we are dealing with interpretation of the idioms.

Idioms, according to Fernando (1996), are expressions with figurative meanings that cannot be inferred from the literal meanings of their constituent words. Brezina (2018) provides a practical guide for the statistical study of collocations in corpus linguistics, while Anderson and Corbett (2017) investigate idioms and collocations using online corpora. In contrast to Antata (2015),

who distinguishes between two types of idioms: partial and prepositional, O'Dell and F. McCarthy, M. (2010) classify idioms into five categories: pure idioms, binomial idioms, proverbs, clichés, and euphemisms. Many scholars such as Carter (1998), Grant and Bauer (2004), Allerton (1984), Nunberg et al. (1994), Horn (2003), Moon (1998b), Fernando (1996), Lakoff and Johnson (1999), and others have made contributions to understanding the similarities and differences between idioms and metaphors in terms of metaphoricity, figurativity, conventionality, lexical and syntactic variability.

Conceptual metaphors have been used by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses et al. (1996) to approach idioms. They emphasize the importance of context in deciphering the meanings of colloquial expressions. Additionally, metaphors are considered as a crucial component of figurative language, and researchers like Demjén (2015), Fauconnier and Turner (2002), and Cameron (2011) have examined metaphorical language in a variety of circumstances. Gevaert (2001a) and Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995) have also studied the cultural and historical contexts in which idioms and metaphors originate. Studies by Kennedy (1998), Anderson, Wendy, and Corbett (2017), Sinclair (1991), Sampson (2001), McEnery and Wilson (2001), Hunston (2002), and McEnery and Hardie (2012) have contributed significant information on corpora, their definitions, sizes, and purposes. Deignan (2005), Semino (2008, 2017), Semino et al. (2015), Lakoff (1993), Stefanowitsch (2006), Musolff (2006), Zinken (2007), and others have contributed extensive data on "Corpus Linguistics and metaphor."

The *object* of thesis is the analysis of idiomatic expressions gathered in British National Corpus (BNC) through metaphors and their comparison with the results of research conducted on American Corpus.

The *subject* of the research are “anger” idiomatic expression gathered from BNC.

This study sets out to compare metaphors of British metaphors of “anger” idiomatic expressions collected from BNC and American metaphors of “anger” idioms gathered from American Corpus.

The *tasks* of the research include:

- Analyzing the relevant academic literature;
- Collecting 250 random “anger” and 250 “angry” expressions from BNC;
- Figuring out idiomatic expressions (linguistic expressions with figurative meaning) among 500 random expressions collected from BNC;
- Finding a conceptual metaphor to each idiomatic expression;
- Grouping metaphors and idiomatic expressions they relate to from ontological to elementary ones and analyzing them;

- Finding the dominant metaphor among ontological metaphors and defining whether the same specific structural metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors or not;
- Comparing the results of the research with American metaphors of “anger” idioms gathered from American Corpus.

The *theoretical method*, i.e. analysis, comparison, classification, generalization and the *method of corpus linguistics*, i.e. “moving from the bottom upwards” were used in this study.

The *novelty* of this research is filling a gap in field of applied linguistics connected to the corpus-based analysis of idioms expressing anger emotion in British English.

The *theoretical* and *practical value* of the study is that idioms are considered from a new perspective. Linguistic research of the corpus allowed us to draw conclusions based on a huge amount of data from different sources. Moreover, the figurative meaning of idioms was not simply analyzed semantically, but it was investigated on the basis of the theory of conceptual metaphor.

The Bachelor’s thesis has been divided into an introduction, two chapters, conclusion and appendix. Part 1 presents the data on the main characteristics of idioms, including their definitions, classification, differences and similarities between idioms and metaphors and the issues regarding metaphor, idiom and emotion. The focus of Part 2 is on corpus linguistics, and general implications of corpus-based studies for metaphor theory. Moreover, it provides the findings, discussion and interpretation of results of the research.

The formatting in the text of the volume has the following meaning:

- SMALL CAPITAL: conceptual contents (conceptual metaphor, category, etc.);
- *Italic*: linguistic example, metaphorical linguistic expression;
- **Bold**: highlight within an example sentence, or an idiomatic expression taken into consideration;
- Apostrophes: the words in the apostrophes are concepts.



## PART 1

### CHARACTERISTICS OF IDIOMS

Part 1 includes the general data about idioms, such as their definition (traditional and cognitive linguistic views), their meaning in translating (conventionality, compositionality, and transparency) and their classification. Moreover, this part provides the data about differences and similarities between idioms and metaphors. In addition, the issues regarding metaphor, idiom and emotion are discussed in Part 1.

#### 1.1. Literature review

Due to the fact, that the topic of this Bachelor thesis “Corpus-based analysis of idioms expressing emotions in English” is still not sufficiently researched, the characteristics of idioms, the connection between idiom and metaphor, metaphor and emotion, as well as corpus linguistics and metaphor are considered as integral part of this research, that will help to better research and develop this topic.

The main contribution to the characteristic of idioms was made by Moon (1998a), Gibbs (1994), Kövecses (2010), Nunberg et al. (1994), Sinclair (1991), Carter (1998), Grant and Bauer (2004), and others. When we speak about the definition of idioms, we should take into account, that it is quite problematic to name them, because a great amount of linguistic expressions can belong to this group. Moon (1998a), Gibbs (1994) and Kövecses (2010) defined idioms according to the traditional and the cognitive linguistic views. In traditional view the idioms are represented as fixed expressions, while in cognitive linguistic view they are linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphors/metonymies, in other words, they are metaphorical idioms (Andreou, & Galamantos, 2008, p. 74).

The scholars, such as Nunberg et al. (1994), Sinclair (1991) and others distinguish three semantic properties, such as conventionality, compositionality, and transparency, when we are dealing with interpretation of the idioms. Fernando (1996) defines idioms as phrases with figurative meanings that cannot be predicted from the literal meanings of the constituent words. Anderson & Corbett (2017) present an exploration of idioms and collocations using online corpora, whereas Brezina (2018) offers a practical guide to statistical analysis of collocations in corpus linguistics. O’Dell and F. McCarthy, M. (2010) list five types of idioms, such as pure idioms, binomial idioms, proverbs, a cliché, and euphemisms. There are two types of idioms partial and prepositional created by Antata (2015). Researchers as Carter (1998), Grant and Bauer (2004), Allerton (1984), Nunberg et al. (1994), Horn (2003), and Moon (1998b), Fernando

(1996), Lakoff and Johnson (1999), Goatly (1997), Deignan (2005) and others, contributed into defining the similarities and differences between idioms and metaphors, according to metaphoricity and conventionality, lexical and syntactic variability, and figurativity. As it turned out, idiomatic expressions that incorporate other figurative devices besides metaphor cannot be classified as metaphors, while the most innovative and highly adaptable metaphors differ significantly from typical idioms in terms of their lexical and syntactic structure. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses et al. (1996) are the researchers who considered the idioms based on the conceptual metaphors. So, all these researchers offer a fresh look into collocation networks, emphasizing the relevance of context in understanding the meanings of idiomatic expressions.

Metaphors are another important aspect of figurative language. Demjén (2015) examines the language of affective states in written discourse, using the poetry of Sylvia Plath as an example. Fauconnier & Turner (2002) describe conceptual blending as a process by which people create new meanings by integrating elements of different mental spaces. Cameron (2011) investigates the use of metaphor in post-conflict discussions, focusing on the importance of empathy in reconciliation. Another area of interest is the cultural and historical environment in which idioms and metaphors emerge. Gevaert (2001a) investigates the impact of cultural traditions on the metaphorical patterns used in Old and Middle English to describe anger. Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995) investigate the metaphorical expressions of anger in various cultures.

In addition, Kennedy (1998), Anderson, Wendy and Corbett (2017), Sinclair (1991), Sampson (2001), McEnery and Wilson (2001) provided with data on definition of corpus, its size and purposes. Hunston (2002) and McEnery & Hardie (2012) classified corpora into reference (general), comparable, specialised, synchronic, diachronic, annotated, parallel, learner and pedagogic corpora. Furthermore, some researchers, such as Deignan (2005), Semino (2008, 2017), Semino et al. (2015), Lakoff (1993), Stefanowitsch (2006), Musolff (2006), Zinken (2007), and others presented a great amount of data on “Corpus Linguistics and metaphor.”

In conclusion, the study of idioms and metaphors in language is a rich and complex field of study that covers a wide range of topics, such as the nature and structure of idiomatic expressions, the use of figurative language in discourse, and the cultural and historical context in which idioms and metaphors emerge, many studies on corpus analyses are developing. Despite this, some aspects of this research are still not fully revealed in different investigations. Thus it will help us to contribute to this field.

## **1.2. Idioms as one of the classes of phraseologisms**

Defining the idioms, we can face some problems because of a great amount of linguistic expressions that can be a part of this group. In this case, we can refer to sayings, proverbs, idiomatic turns, etc. There are two views that define idioms: traditional and cognitive linguistic.

Let us consider the first one - the traditional view. In this point of view, Moon (1998a) suggests, that it is based on semantic, lexical, syntactic, functional and lexicographic approaches. In this manner, an idiom is seen as a fixed expression, a chunk with unpredictable meaning. So, we cannot deduct meaning from individual words that form an idiom. Here can we see the connection between an idiom and its figurative meaning. Moreover, in the traditional approach, idioms are directed as a particularly linguistic phenomenon, a component of the intellectual vocabulary, that are autonomous of our system of concepts. Additionally, these expressions are independent of each other, and therefore, can be both syntactically and semantically defined separately. Only connections of meaning exist between idioms (Kövecses, 2010).

The cognitive linguistic view is an opposite to all characteristics mentioned above in the traditional view. The classification of idioms given by Gibbs (1994) shows more flexible perspective than traditional aspect. Gibbs (1994) suggests, “that a conceptual syllabus should contain idioms, which beyond any doubt appear to be linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphors/metonymies, that is imageable idioms or metaphorical idioms or more general figurative idioms” (Andreou & Galamantos, 2008, p. 74).

Studying the semantics of idioms, Kövecses (2010) outlines the position of cognitive linguistics on the topic. Here are the main ideas of his study:

- the biggest part of an idiom’s meaning is motivated but not totally predicted;
- metaphor, metonymy and conventional knowledge are cognitive mechanisms that make an idiom’s meaning motivated;
- idioms have their psychological identity. More of them are not only a part of the mental lexicon but a product of human’s conceptual system, as well. This phenomenon originating in the conceptual system is based on our knowledge of the world.

### **1.2.1. The meaning of idioms**

Reproduction plays the main role in phraseology, because during our conversation we reproduce ready phrases and do not create them as they are fixed. (Shanskiy, 1985, p. 20) Based on this statement, we can say that idioms as a part of phraseology are also reproduced as finished phrases during our talk. When we are dealing with the interpretation of idioms, it is very important to define their right meaning.

For example, Nunberg et al. (1994) distinguishes three semantic properties such as conventionality, compositionality, and transparency, when we translate idioms.

Idioms and so-called collocations share the semantic property of conventionality, as noted by Sinclair (1991) and Torner & Bernal (2017). While collocations can be interpreted with relative accuracy outside of their context, unlike idioms, they cannot be constructed correctly without familiarity with commonly used expressions within a speech community. For example, the difference between the American English *thumb tack* and the British English *drawing pin* illustrates this point (Croft & Cruse, 2004, pp. 249-250). Fillmore et al. (1988) compared collocations to coding idioms in that they have standard rules of interpretation and are associated with a specific meaning.

Conventional idiomatic expressions are characterized by their unpredictable meaning or usage based on the individual meanings of their components when taken out of context. In a restricted sense, the difference between literal interpretation and figurative or idiomatic meaning defines the conditionality of idioms. Expressions such as *kick the bucket* and *spill the beans* are considered conventional idioms since their meanings ('to die suddenly' and 'to divulge secret information', respectively) cannot be predicted solely from their literal components.

Decoding idioms, such as *kick the bucket*, are those that listeners are unable to comprehend or interpret. In contrast, any idiom that cannot be decoded becomes an encoding idiom, since if the listener cannot understand its meaning, he/she also cannot guess that it is a common way of expressing that particular meaning in language.

The extent to which the meaning of a phrase may be examined by knowing how it is divided across its constituent parts is referred to as compositionality. Nunberg et al. (1994) exploited this semantic feature to distinguish between non-composite idiomatic phrases (IPs) and compositional idiomatic expressions. For instance, let us consider the expressions *kick the bucket* and *spill the beans*. The first idiom's meaning is not dispersed among its parts; rather, the entire expression as a whole reveals its metaphorical meaning. In contrast, the meaning of the second idiom is distributed between its parts: individual components of a literal expression can be mapped onto the components of the figurative or idiomatic meaning. For instance, *spill* can mean 'publicize' and *beans* can mean 'information' or 'a secret.' Therefore, by understanding the meaning of each individual part of the literal expression, we can infer the figurative meaning of the idiom.

It is important to note that Nunberg et al. (1994) actually made a weaker claim, which is that speakers are able to recognize the compositionality of an idiom, such as *spill the beans*, by "first predicting its meaning based on contextual signals" (ibid, p. 499). In other words, these authors

distinguished between conditionality and non-compositionality. They contended that, while all idioms are acceptable by definition, the vast majority of them are semantically compositional.

Some authors, such as Mateu (2020), choose to avoid the potentially contentious term “compositional idioms” and instead use the alternative label “idiomatic collocations” (ibid, p. 273). This terminology helps to support the widely accepted belief that idioms have non-compositional meanings while collocations have compositional meanings. Therefore, there are two categories of idiomatic expressions: proper idioms and idiomatic phrases.

Compositionality or non-compositionality has been associated with syntactic flexibility or inflexibility (Gibbs & Nayak, 1989; Nunberg et al., 1994). Non-compositional idioms are expected to be syntactically inflexible, while idiomatic collocations are predicted to be more flexible. Nunberg et al. (1994, pp. 500-503) argue that grammatical operations, such as modification, quantification, topicalization, ellipsis, and anaphora, provide evidence that the components of compositional idiomatic expressions interact semantically with each other. The expression *pull strings*, for example, might be called an idiomatic collocation because its components can be given two meanings, with *pull* referring to exploit and *strings* referring to human relationships.

Contributing to the interpretation of the whole, let us compare:

- 1) Steve got the job by *pulling strings* that weren't available to anyone else;
- 2) We could *pull* yet more *strings*;
- 3) Those *strings*, Tom wouldn't *pull* for you,
- 4) Kim's family *pulled* some *strings* on her behalf, but they weren't enough to get her the job (ibid).

The idiomatic property of transparency should not be confused with compositionality and non-compositionality. The meaning of a transparent idiom is motivated by metaphor. For example, idiomatic expressions related to anger like *blow your stack*, *flip your lid*, *hit the ceiling*, *get hot under the collar*, and *get steamed up* (Gibbs, 1995, p.105) can be considered conceptually transparent. According to Gibbs (1995) these expressions are motivated by the conceptual metaphor of anger as HEATED FLUID IN A CONTAINER (ibid, p.105).

In brief, idioms are not isolated verbose constructions stored in our mental lexicon, but form networks through the intervention of conceptual metaphors that motivate their related meanings. So, conceptual metaphors make their meanings more transparent.

Several researchers, including Lakoff (1987), Gibbs and O'Brien (1990), and Gibbs (1995, 2007), contend that conceptual metaphors should not be viewed simply as generalizations of linguistic meaning. They argue that idioms referencing intense anger do not rely solely on a conceptual metaphor, but rather on the abstract meanings of words like *stack*, *cover*, *ceiling*, *hot*,

and *steam*, which convey the notion of anger. Gibbs (1995, 2007) and his colleagues counter this potential objection by proposing that a thorough examination of speakers' conceptual images for idioms can reveal their metaphorical knowledge.

Various psycholinguistic analyzes made by Gibbs (1995, 2007) showed that:

- by imagining the idioms of anger, the subjects knew that pressure causes action;
- the person has little control over this pressure;
- his forcible release was unintentional;
- after the release has taken place (i.e. after the stack has been blown, or the ceiling has been hit), it is difficult to change the action. According to Gibbs (1995, 2007) and other researchers, alternative lexical theories cannot account for the specific conceptual models associated with certain conclusions. As a result, they conclude that folk concepts related to anger are motivated by two conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS PRESSURIZED HEAT and THE MIND IS A CONTAINER. This inaccurate information from the source (e.g. *hot liquid in the container*) to the target (e.g. the emotion of anger) influences our understanding of anger and creates idioms expressions used to describe it. Additionally, it is worth noting that the first metaphor can apply not only to idioms like the ones listed before, but also to non-idiomatic statements like *I exploded in anger*.

### **1.2.2. Semantic compositionality versus conceptual transparency**

After considering all three semantic properties, it is crucial to understand that we should not confuse semantic compositionality with conceptual transparency, particularly when analyzing idioms. Although there is some relationship between the them, it is quite simple to find idioms that are transparent but not compositional. For instance, the idiom *hit the ceiling* (meaning to become very angry) is said to be transparent (metaphorically motivated) but is not compositional. This is evident in the passive expression *the ceiling was hit by Joe*, which is only grammatically correct in its literal interpretation.

Another distinction between semantic compositionality and conceptual transparency is the different effects of *lexical* versus *syntactic flexibility* of idiomatic expressions.

Lexical flexibility is related to conceptual transparency but not to semantic compositionality, e.g. to compare transparent ICEs, such as *throw one's hat/cap into the ring* with transparent IPs such as *hit the ceiling/the roof*. Of course, such a lexical flexibility is not generally at all due to the typical lexicalized nature of idiomatic expressions: e.g., ICEs *spill the beans/the peas* and IPs *kick the bucket/the pail*.

Syntactic flexibility can only be found in semantically compositional idiomatic expressions. It is only semantic meaning that is relevant to syntactic processes. Dealing with this affirmation, Mateu and Espinal (2007) argue that, when we cope with the meaning of idiomatic expressions,

two different kinds of meanings can be distinguished: syntactically transparent meaning when the one relevant for semantic compositionality, and syntactically non-transparent meaning for example, when the one relevant for conceptual/metaphorical motivation.

### **1.3. The relation between idioms and metaphors**

The distinction between idioms and metaphors is not always clear, and some researchers define them differently. Grant & Bauer (2004) suggest that metaphors are pragmatically reinterpretable as true, while idioms are not. However, the line between these categories is not always sharp, and idioms are a graded set with varying degrees of idiomaticity. Some linguists, i.e. Nunberg et al. (1994), Horn (2003), and Moon (1998b) consider metaphor as a type of idiom, and others, i.e. Fernando (1996) and others distinguish between live metaphors that are productive and dead metaphors that have lost their metaphoricity. Researchers such as Kövecses (2005, 2010), Kövecses et al. (1996) argue that the idioms are based on conceptual metaphors. Overall, the relationship between idioms and metaphors is complex and varies depending on the researcher's perspective.

#### **1.3.1. Idioms versus metaphors**

It may come as a surprise that some researchers differentiate between metaphor and idiom. Carter (1998, p.55), in discussion of the lexical field of cooking, identifies two categories of figurative language. The first comprises idioms (in addition to proverbs and sayings) and another includes metaphor and slang. This implies a clear distinction between idioms and metaphors, but the examples provided do not demonstrate such a distinct separation. While all the idioms are phrases consisting of multiple words, e.g., *to stew in one's own juice*, *in the soup*. Metaphorical words e.g., *this place is an oven*, phrasal verbs e.g., *she told me to simmer down*, and metaphorical phrases e.g., *he came off the boil after a while* resemble idioms, as they comprise more than one word and do not allow for a literal interpretation. Furthermore, in other contexts, metaphors are grouped with semi-idioms and idiomatic similes and are located near the transparent end of the opacity/transparency spectrum (Carter 1998, p. 71).

Grant and Bauer (2004, pp. 49-51) attempt to redefine idioms and suggest that metaphors are literally untrue but can be pragmatically reinterpreted as true, while this is not possible with idioms. Therefore, they assign *a small fish in a big pond* to the set of metaphors, while *a red herring* is considered an idiom. The term idiom is reserved for expressions that are opaque and unmotivated, and often require specialized knowledge of etymology or history for interpretation.

The desire to establish a clear distinction between idioms and metaphors may be a result of traditional views on categorization, where different category labels (names) indicate different

categories. This traditional approach assumes that categories have distinct boundaries, thus the categories of metaphor and idiom must also have sharp distinctions. Grant & Bauer's (2004) objective is to refine the category of idioms by excluding well-motivated expressions and only retaining the opaque examples in this class. However, the line separating these categories is not clear-cut. As mentioned earlier, some of Carter's (1998) metaphorical expressions are indistinguishable from idioms. Moreover, both classification systems suggest varying degrees of idiomaticity. Carter (1998, p. 71) proposes the concept of a cline and introduces the term semi-idiom, while Grant & Bauer (2004, pp. 52-53) equate their redefined idioms with core idioms. The use of core idiom, semi-idiom, and the emphasis on degrees of a property along a continuum indicate that the category of idiom has prototypes as well as less typical members.

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the set of idioms is not a fixed category but rather a graded set, where the members can have varying degrees of idiomaticity. While prototypical idioms are opaque, metaphors are transparent. This idea of idioms as a continuum is also shared by Allerton (1984), who distinguishes between metaphor and "true idiom" based on motivation, suggesting that true idioms have a meaning that cannot be derived from their literal meaning (ibid, pp. 17-40). However, if the label idiom is used more broadly to include less central members, the line between metaphor and idiom becomes less clear.

According to Nunberg et al. (1994), Horn (2003), and Moon (1998b), metaphor is considered a kind of idiom. Nunberg et al. (1994, p. 492) argue that idioms usually involve figurative language such as metaphors (e.g., *take the bull by the horns*), metonymies (e.g., *lend a hand*, *count heads*), hyperboles (e.g., *not worth the paper it's printed on*), or other kinds of figures of speech. Horn (2003) uses the term metaphor to describe clear idioms. Moon (1998b, pp. 19, 22-23) considers metaphor a subset of fixed expressions and divides it into three groups based on motivation: transparent (e.g., *behind someone's back*), semi-transparent (e.g., *grasp the nettle*), and opaque (e.g., *bite the bullet*). All of these researchers seem to share a view that idioms are graded, but they differ in their emphasis on prototypes and their preference for contrasting prototypical idioms with prototypical metaphors or adopting a broader perspective.

Now let us consider similarities and differences on the basis of:

- metaphoricity and conventionality;
- lexical and syntactic variability;
- figurativity.

Moon (1998b) is not the only linguist who has identified different types of metaphors. Fernando (1996, p. 120) also acknowledges that the expressions *the emperor's new clothes* and *red herring* were once metaphorical, where one thing is understood or communicated in terms of another. However, they are no longer considered live metaphors, which are productive and have



multiple linguistic realizations, such as *He's nuts/crazy/mad/wild about her*, all of which convey the idea that LOVE IS MADNESS (ibid, p.121). Unlike these examples, there is no group of fish-related metaphors that includes *red herring*, which exemplifies the concept of a misleading diversion strategy (ibid, p. 134).

Fernando (1996) uses the term “live metaphor” (ibid, p,110) to refer to a productive metaphor that has multiple linguistic realizations, while “isolated metaphors” (ibid, p,121) are those that are no longer alive. Other scholars prefer to use the term “dead metaphor” (ibid, p,110) to refer to metaphors that have lost their metaphoricality over time and are now considered literal. Lakoff and Johnson (1999, p. 125) provide types of both live and dead metaphors and explain that some live metaphors have undergone a semantic shift, losing their original literal meaning. One type is the word *comprehend*, which originally meant ‘hold tightly’ in Latin, but now only retains its target domain meaning in English. In contrast, *grasp* is another type of live metaphor that has retained both its literal meaning and the metaphorical mapping of grasping onto understanding.

Goatly's (1997, pp. 31-34) typology is as follows:

Metaphor type	Example
Dead	<i>germ</i> 'a seed', <i>germ</i> 'a microbe'
Buried	<i>clew</i> 'a ball of thread', <i>clue</i> 'a piece of evidence'
Sleeping	<i>crane</i> 'species of marsh bird', <i>crane</i> 'machine for moving heavy weights'
Tired	<i>cut</i> 'an incision', <i>cut</i> 'budget reduction'
Active	<i>icicles</i> 'hanging rod-like ice formation, <i>icicles</i> 'fingers' as in ‘He held five icicles in each hand’

**Table 1.** Goatly's (1997) metaphor types

It is difficult to evoke a dead metaphor's source domain is challenging, and the connection between the literal and figurative meanings is homonymous. Buried metaphors occur when a change of form disguises the metaphorical connection. The difference between sleeping and tired metaphors is unclear, and the literal and metaphorical senses are polysemous. Lastly, active metaphors are extremely unpredictable because they rely on context. Conventionality diminishes as we go down the list in the table (Goatly, 1997, p. 35).

Deignan (2005, p. 39) develops a classification from a corpus linguist's perspective:

Metaphor type	Example
Innovative	<i>icicles</i> as in <i>He held five icicles in each hand</i>
Conventionalized	<i>grasp, whisper</i> (of the wind)
Dead	<i>crane, deep</i> (of colour)
Historical	<i>comprehend, pedigree</i>

**Table 2.** Deignan's (2005) metaphor types

The frequency information can be used to distinguish between innovative and historical metaphors (ibid, p. 40). An innovative metaphor is not frequently used in its metaphorical sense, whereas a historical metaphor's literal sense is absent from a corpus. However, it is more challenging to differentiate between conventionalized and dead metaphors. Conventionalized metaphors rely on the core literal meaning, which can be identified by examining the data and looking for target domain collocates in the surrounding co-text (ibid, pp. 40-46). If the figurative sense is regularly modified by target domain lexis, then there is evidence for dependence, such as the figurative use of machinery, which can be found in patterns like civil service machinery, the machinery of the government, or arcane machinery that finances the public schools.

The use of corpus evidence is not always necessary, but it can be sufficient to determine dependence. If the corpus does not provide evidence, semiotic analysis can be used as an additional tool. Deignan (2005, p. 45) argues that concrete meanings are more central than abstract meanings, so a concrete-abstract mapping such as *My spirits soared* is considered dependent. The evaluative meaning of phrases like *She's such a little monkey* and the metaphorical use of body part words like *heart of a city* are also considered dependent. (ibid, p. 46) These examples are classified as conventionalized metaphors, in contrast to dead metaphors like *deep blue*, where no dependence on literal meaning is evident.

When examining the different types of metaphors, there is a significant overlap between idioms and metaphors. Like historical metaphors, some idioms have lost their original literal interpretation, making a literal interpretation impossible. Some examples of such idioms include *to boot*, *by dint of*, *get short shrift*, and *in a trice*. These idioms contain cranberry words, which do not occur outside the given expression. Many native speakers may not be aware that *boot* originally meant 'advantage', (Ammer, 1997, p. 433) *dint* meant 'stroke', 'blow' (ibid, p. 62), *short shrift* referred to the brief time a prisoner made a confession to a priest before execution, (ibid, p. 376) and *trice* meant 'a single pull at something' (ibid, p. 207).

The term dead metaphors (Gibbs et al., 1997, p. 142) refers to metaphors that have lost their figurative meaning over time. According to traditional approaches, idioms are considered dead

metaphors because they no longer have a metaphoric interpretation and instead have an arbitrary meaning. (Gibbs, 1993) However, many contemporary linguists argue that idioms are motivated by deeply entrenched conventional metaphors. For instance, idioms related to anger such as *blow your stack*, *flip your lid*, and *hit the ceiling* are all motivated by the metaphorical mapping of ANGER IS HEATED FLUID IN A CONTAINER (ibid, pp. 66-67). Similarly, many idioms of criticism like *come under fire* and *shoot someone down in flames* are based on the metaphorical mapping of the source domain of war onto the target domain of criticism. (Cserép, 2001, pp. 180-182). Such idioms are not different from word metaphors that instantiate the same mapping. Some source domains are more widespread than others, such as space and spatial concepts like UP or DOWN. (Dávid, 2002) Speakers may believe that such idioms are dead metaphors because they are so easily and automatically comprehended. However, it is not claimed that all idioms are live metaphors.

The following expressions may be considered metaphorically dead since they are not easily understood by most native speakers today: *kick the bucket*, *read the riot act*, and *red herring*. When there is a change in form, the original metaphor may become weakened or obscured, as in buried metaphors. This can also occur in idioms such as *through thick and thin* and *curry favour*, which have undergone changes in form and lost their original metaphorical meaning. Goatly (1997, p. 45) classifies various forms of formal change as *burying*, including the use of classical words, archaic words, pronunciation changes, addition of suffixes, compounding, addition of adverbs or prepositions to a verb, and inclusion of metaphorical words in multiword expressions. The inclusion of morphemes is an example of shallow burying. While idioms are conventional, many innovative metaphors are based on the same ordinary metaphors that motivate idioms.

According to Lakoff & Turner (1989, p. 67), expression for *in that sleep of death what dreams may come?* builds upon the conventional metaphor of DEATH IS SLEEP by introducing a new element from the source domain: dreaming. Novelty can arise from elaborating on existing source domain elements, as in *eternal exile of the raft*, where the DEATH IS DEPARTURE metaphor is used but with the state of being away specified as exile and an unusual vehicle is employed. In some instances, creativity emerges from questioning the appropriateness of a conventional metaphor, as in *there's one perpetual night to be slept through*, where Kövecses (2002, p. 48) contends that the poet describes death as a night that does not turn into day, thereby challenging the suitability of A LIFETIME IS A DAY and DEATH IS NIGHT. Combining conventional metaphors is also a source of creativity, as illustrated in *black night doth take away* (the twilight), where take away fuses LIFE IS A PRECIOUS POSSESSION and EVENTS ARE ACTIONS (Lakoff & Turner, 1989, pp. 70-71).

The innovative examples previously mentioned differ from conventional idioms despite having an underlying conventional metaphor. One major difference is that one-shot image metaphors are used in innovative examples, where a detailed image is mapped onto another, instead of mapping one domain onto another. For instance, the phrase “My wife...whose waist is an hourglass” (Lakoff, 1993, p. 229) is an example of a one-shot image metaphor.

Just as novel metaphorical expressions have some degree of conventionality due to the underlying metaphors, idioms can also have some degree of novelty in discourse. A quick look at a corpus shows that the institutionalized version of the idiom is often utilized.

To be creative and innovative with idiomatic expressions, one can add inserted material that is not part of the original idiom's form. In Rudyard Kipling took *the art world bull by the horns* (Fernando 1996, p. 48), the phrase “art world” is added to the idiom to make the message more precise. In contrast, the inserted material in *You'd go out - bang! - just like a candle!* from Carroll's *Through the Looking-glass* is not integrated into the idiom (Naciscione, 2001, p. 93).

Another way to be creative with idioms is to substitute one or more of its components with other words, as shown in *He burns the candle at five ends*, which replaces *both* with *five*. (Moon, 1998b, p. 170). This substitution decreases the level of conventionality.

**Lexical and syntactic variability.** While lexicogrammatical variability can help differentiate between idioms and metaphors, it would be wrong to assume that all metaphors are completely flexible, just as it would be wrong to assume that all idioms are completely static. Studies of language corpora have shown that words used in metaphors often become part of idiom-like phrases. This does not mean that metaphorical words can never be used freely, but typically they have some degree of inflexibility. For instance, body part metaphors like *heart centre* and *hand help* may retain their figurative meanings across different contexts. (Deignan, 2005, p. 160) However, such usage often comes with some degree of fixedness. For example, (ibid, pp. 160-161) *face* is usually used in *lose/save face*, while *fruit* is commonly used with bear or in a post-modified phrase. (ibid, p. 181) Some words, like *odds*, are only used in certain idiomatic expressions. (ibid, p. 31) Certain words and syntactic structures may also be highly restricted, such as the metaphorical use of *clean* in *clean up one's act*, (ibid, p. 151) or the nouns *bud* and *bloom*, which are mainly used in *nip in the bud and (full) bloom/into bloom*, respectively. (ibid, p. 176) These expressions may lack the opacity typical of prototypical idioms, but their fixedness in form makes them difficult to distinguish from idioms.

Although idioms are typically more restricted than metaphors, some idioms exhibit a high degree of variability similar to freely combining metaphors, even without considering creative variations. Moon (1998b) examines examples where the lexicon is variable but the structure is fixed and cases where both the lexicon and structure vary.

In *one card short of a full deck, a six-pack short of a case, one shingle shy of a roof*, (ibid, p. 159) the examples follow the same pattern: noun phrase with a quantifier + short/shy of + noun phrase, expressing mental inadequacy or mild insanity. The lexical components can change, but the variants maintain the same fixed syntactic structure and idiomatic meaning, making them variant realizations of an idiom rather than a free metaphor. The idiom variants in *wash/air one's dirty linen/laundry, dirty laundry/linen/washing* have the same metaphorical image, but the structure and lexicon are more flexible. Other examples of this idiom include *wash/air one's linen/laundry in public* and *launder one's dirty washing* (Moon, 1998b, p. 162).

**Figurativity.** Although historical metaphors can be taken literally, most metaphors are figurative in nature. In contrast, idioms can have partially literal constituents. Cserép (2001) provides examples of idioms that contain literal components, some of which are listed below: *learn the ropes, white lie, promise the moon, look daggers, talk shop* (ibid, p. 74). Distinguishing a partially literal idiom from a metaphorical word that is accompanied by a literally interpreted lexical item may not be straightforward. If the syntax and surrounding words are restricted, the figurative item can be analyzed as part of an idiom. For example, *ropes* can be combined with the verbs *learn/know/teach/show*, *white* in the same figurative meaning co-occurs with *magic/lie*, *moon* combines with *ask for/cry for/promise*, and *look* can be replaced by synonyms such as *stare/glare/shoot* in the context of *daggers* (ibid, p. 74). *Shop* is used only in the given combination in its metaphorical sense. (ibid, p. 74) These lexical environment restrictions turn these phrases into idioms. Although metaphorical words tend to form restricted word strings, as previously discussed in terms of lexical and syntactic variability, the term metaphor seems more appropriate in cases where the lexical environment is highly variable.

According to Fernando (1996), the main characteristic of idioms is their limited variability, and she believes that figurativity is not a necessary property of idioms. Fernando (1996) argues that the term “literal idiom” is not contradictory since there are idiomatic expressions that have no figurative meaning, such as *on foot, in the meantime, and arm in arm* (ibid, p. 32). However, she acknowledges that non-literalness is an important characteristic of idioms (ibid, pp. 60-61), and a comprehensive view of idioms should include completely literal non-compositional expressions in the category of idioms.

In addition to metaphors, idioms can also contain other figurative devices such as simile (e.g., *like a bear with a sore head*), hyperbole (e.g., *a storm in a teacup*), truism (e.g., *not hold water*), irony (e.g., *a fine/pretty kettle of fish*), and metonymy (e.g., *hate sb's guts*) (Moon, 1998b, pp. 193-200). However, it can be difficult to distinguish some of these figures from metaphors, and the boundary between metonymy and metaphor can be particularly unclear since they often co-occur in the same expression.

The idiomatic expressions *have a roof over one's head*, *speak one's mind*, and *new blood* are considered pure metonyms because they use a part to represent the whole (Deignan, 2005, pg. 65). For instance, *roof over one's head* represents a home, *mind* represents thoughts or opinions, and *blood* represents a person. Similarly, *hold one's breath*, *sb's jaw drops*, and *scratch one's head* are also metonymic since their literal meanings represent an emotional or mental state associated with the physical gesture. (ibid, p. 65) However, it is not always clear whether these idioms involve the actual gesture, and the context may not always provide a clue. Therefore, when the physical action is absent, these idioms may no longer be considered purely metonymic. Some scholars, e.g. Deignan (2005), Goossens (2002) and Riemer (2002) argue that these expressions illustrate the shift from metonymy to metaphor, while others suggest they are examples of postmetonymy.

Moving along the continuum, we encounter phrases like *all hands on deck*, which can be interpreted metonymically but are more often used metaphorically. Kövecses (2002, p. 209) views *all hands on deck* as a metonymy where THE HAND STANDS FOR THE PERSON, but Sieftring (2005, p. 134) argues that it can also be used to mean that everyone on a team is required to be involved. An example of metaphorical use is shown in the sentence *hold a gun to someone's head* (Ammer, 1997, p. 198) which can be seen as metonymic since the action of aiming a gun at someone's head is a specific instance of exerting pressure, which is the more general action.

Fauconnier & Turner (1998) consider metaphor as a type of conceptual operation involving two domains. They argue that in several cases a deeper insight can be gained if a linguistic expression is analyzed as a blend. Blending is a conceptual operation that develops emergent structure not found in the input spaces. These input spaces correspond to the source and target domains in a metaphorical approach. In the blend for *dig one's own grave* digging the grave causes death. Blend idioms, just like idiomatic similes or metonyms, are less similar to metaphors than purely metaphorical idioms (ibid, pp. 133-134).

In conclusion, there is a significant overlap between idioms and metaphors, as both categories have blurred boundaries and varying levels of membership. Differentiating between them requires consideration of factors such as conventionality, lexical and syntactic flexibility, and figurative language usage. Idiomatic expressions that incorporate other figurative devices besides metaphor cannot be classified as metaphors, while the most innovative and highly adaptable metaphors differ significantly from typical idioms in terms of their lexical and syntactic structure.

### **1.3.2. Idioms based on the conceptual metaphors**

Mentioning all this information, let us determine how do conceptual metaphors supply semantic motivation for phenomenon of particular words in idioms. In the expression *fire went out*, the

domain of fire is used to understand the domain of love. Following the conventions of cognitive semantics, we can name it the LOVE IS FIRE conceptual metaphor (Kövecses, 2010). Thus, we can see, that conceptual metaphors can function as a link between an abstract domain, love, and a physical domain, fire.

In addition, let us consider the more precise meaning of particular idiomatic expressions. There is a set of correspondences, so-called mappings between two domains - the source and the target, conceptual metaphors can be imagined as a system of mappings. Taking an example of the idiomatic expressions such as *be a dead-end street*, *spin one`s wheel*, *be at a crossroads*, etc., we can see that all these idioms are built on the cognitive metaphor: LOVE IS A JOURNEY. This metaphor has its own mapping system, which is following (Kövecses, 2010, p. 9):

Source: journey	Target: love
the travellers	the lovers
the journey	accidents in the relationship
the obstacles encountered	the experienced difficulties

**Table 3.** *Mapping system of the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY*

Considering the examples above (see Table 3), we can draw conclusions, that it is not an easy task for usual speaker to give such analysis of the conceptual metaphor. To apply them in our everyday life, we do not need such detailed analysis. We just use them, according to the social circumstances we live in (Kövecses, 2005).

Let us take another example of the fire-metaphors, LOVE IS FIRE, ANGER IS FIRE, etc. These metaphors are constituted by conceptual correspondences or mappings, such as (Kövecses et al., 1996, pp. 23-24):

- the thing burning is the person in a process or state;
- the fire is the state (anger, love, etc.);
- the cause of the fire is the cause of the state;
- the beginning of the fire is the beginning of the state;
- the existence of the fire is the existence of the state;
- the end of the fire is the end of the state;
- the intensity of the fire is the intensity of the state.

These correspondences explain more accurate meaning of the idioms based on the domain of fire. For example, it illustrates why to carry a torch for someone has a great variety of its meaning, from 'for love to exist for someone' to more simply 'to love someone'. (ibid)

In short, in many cases, the target domain of the conceptual metaphor determines the general meaning of an idiom, while the accurate and deeper meaning of the idiom depends on the

specific conceptual correspondence applied to the idiom. Though, not every idiom is based on conceptual metaphor, and not all expressions that are hinged on conceptual metaphors are idioms (ibid).

#### 1.4. Types of idioms

There are 7 main types of idioms, such as pure idioms, binomial idioms, partial idioms, prepositional idioms, proverbs, euphemisms and clichés.

Pure idioms are the idioms, the meaning of which cannot be logically understood. So, analyzing such idioms it is impossible to understand the meaning in the logical way, because of the loss of their original meaning. These idioms usually do not have a significant match with language figures such as metaphors and comparisons, because there is no comparison or meaning that can be derived from them. (O'Dell, F. & McCarthy, M., 2010)

##### Examples:

- *It's raining cats and dogs* (it is raining heavily).
- *A chip on my shoulder* (to have a grievance about something).
- *Wrap my head around* (to understand something).

The next type of idioms is binomial idioms. This kind of idioms contains two opposite in meaning words, which are linked by conjunction and create a contrast in the expression (O'Dell, F. & McCarthy, M., 2010).

##### Examples:

- *black and white* (there are clear differences).
- *night and day* (there has been a distinct and remarkable change).
- *more or less* (something is close enough to correct).
- *give or take* (there is some room for error).

The partial idioms consist of 2 parts: literal and non-literal. As an example, “storm brewing in his eyes” that refers to a look of ferocity in someone’s face that can usually be identified in the intensity of their eyes. A literal part in the idiom is when we are referring to something in someone’s eyes, and a non-literal part (the storm). By ‘storm’, the speaker means that the person’s eyes are intense and fierce (Antata, 2015).

##### Examples (with highlighted literal element):

- Red *hair*.
- Eat *humble*.
- *Change* is as good as a holiday.
- Turn over a *new* leaf.



Prepositional idioms are idioms that consist of prepositional verbs with an adverb or a preposition to create non-literal meaning. This type of idioms should be used in the sentences, but not by themselves, as they are not ‘fixed collocational idioms’. It is difficult to recognize that prepositional idioms are idioms, however, their meanings do not derive from the sum of the words in the phrase, but rather through the re-learning of English (Antata, 2015).

**Examples:**

- *Look for* (care for).
- *Put up with* (tolerate something).
- *Go for* (try something).

Proverbs are the idioms that provide an universal truth or a piece of advice. They were usually written by wise people and are passed on from generation to generation (O’Dell, F. & McCarthy, M., 2010).

**Examples:**

- *A bad workman always blames his tools.*
- *An apple a day keeps the doctor away.*
- *Beggars can’t be choosers.*

Euphemisms are used to soften the message of expressions that can be harsh or even blunt. So, if we want to speak about uncomfortable things, or on taboo topics, we can use euphemisms to be more polite (O’Dell, F. & McCarthy, M., 2010).

**Examples:**

- *Passed away.*
- *Between jobs* (unemployed).
- *Correctional facility* (prison).
- *Big-boned* (fat).
- *Powder my nose* (use the restroom).

A cliché is an element of an artistic work or saying that has been so overused, that it became uninteresting and unoriginal (O’Dell, F. & McCarthy, M., 2010).

**Examples:**

- *Diamond in the rough.*
- *Take a chill pill.*
- *Don’t judge a book by its cover.*
- *I’ll give it my best shot.*

### 1.5. Idioms, metaphors and emotion

As could be seen from the data mentioned above, there is a connection between emotions and metaphors, because with their help we can express our emotions. So, let us take a look how do emotions and metaphors related to each other in greater detail.

In Kövecses's (2000b) opinion, metaphor is one of the components of an emotion. The feature of emotion language is highly figurative and dominated by metaphorical expressions, that belong to a variety of conceptual metaphors. Let us look at the examples of such conceptual metaphors in two emotion concepts: *anger* and *love* in Table 4 and Table 5. (Kövecses, 2000a, pp. 21,26)

Metaphor	Example
ANGER IS FIRE	<i>He's doing a <b>slow burn</b>. His anger is <b>smoldering</b>.</i>
ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE	<i>It was a <b>stormy</b> meeting.</i>
ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER	<i>She is <b>boiling</b> with anger.</i>

**Table 4.** *The concept of anger*

Metaphor	Example
LOVE IS A JOURNEY	<i>It's been a <b>long, bumpy</b> road.</i>
LOVE IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER	<i>She was <b>overflowing</b> with love.</i>
LOVE IS FIRE	<i>I am <b>burning</b> with love.</i>

**Table 5.** *The concept of love*

The examples illustrated in Table 4 and Table 5 show that the conceptual metaphor consists of the source and the target domains, and the source domain is better understood and more a specific domain than the target one. So, according to Kövecses (2000b), emotion metaphors are those conceptual metaphors that are indicated in small caps above.

The next question that was considered by Kövecses (2000b) is if emotion has a “master metaphor” (ibid, p. 7) or does not. In other words, the researcher wants to define whether the conceptual metaphors that characterize particular emotions are independent of each other, or not. A study of such different emotional concepts illustrated above shows that there are many similarities between metaphors that characterize them (ibid). In this case, we can assume that the “master metaphor” exists for the emotions. To find out what it looks like, Kövecses (2000a) turns to Len Talmy's (1988) research on “force-dynamics” by which, according to Talmy (1988) many aspects of language can be explained. The “force-dynamics”, in order to describe an event, consist of the following parts: (Kövecses, 2000a, p. 62)

- force entities, such as *agonist* and *antagonist*;
- result of the force interaction: *action* and *rest(inaction)*;
- intrinsic force tendency like *toward action* and *toward rest (inaction)*;
- balance of strengths: *weaker* or *stronger* entities.

Examining the most basic and skeletal emotion scenario in the theory of emotion mentioned above, we can conclude, that a cause leads to emotion or a person who has an emotion, and emotion leads to some response. (ibid, p. 63) To apply force dynamics to the emotion domain, Kövecses (2000b) offers to consider the metaphor proposed by Lakoff (1990) CAUSES ARE FORCES.

Taking into account the agonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency *toward rest*, the corresponding entity will be the self in the emotion domain. If we think of the antagonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency toward action, to overcome the inaction of the agonist and cause it to act, the corresponding entity will be the cause of emotion itself in the emotion domain (Kövecses, 2000b).

Using the same definition of agonist and antagonist, let us regard the emotion itself. If it is an agonist with the same characteristics, as before, the corresponding entity will be similar to the corresponding entity mentioned above. If we think of the antagonist as an entity with the same features previously mentioned, the corresponding entity will be the emotion itself. Source domains that focus on the first part of the basic emotion script, that is cause, are mostly PHYSICAL FORCES, MECHANICAL OR MAGNETIC, and source domains that concentrate on the second part, an emotion itself, include OPPONENT, NATURAL FORCE, SOCIAL SUPERIOR, etc (ibid).

Taken some conceptual metaphors such as EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE), NATURAL FORCE AND EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL (MECHANICAL, ELECTRIC, GRAVITATIONAL, MAGNETIC) FORCE, Kövecses (2000b) has seen how force dynamics applies to them. He concluded, that there are two main points of tension in the experience of emotion: the first is between the cause of emotions and the rational self, which leads to emotions, and the other between the self, who has emotion but still controls it the power of emotion, and the force of the emotion, which causes self to lose control and to answer emotionally. Most metaphors in the emotion domain can be described as interaction of forces. From this, we can conclude that there is one master metaphor of emotion: EMOTIONS ARE FORCES. There are many emotional metaphors instances of a specific level of this higher-level metaphor, each of them plays a slightly different role in the conceptualization of the emotion domain.

The next point discussed by Kövecses (2000b) is whether emotion metaphors are unique to the emotions, or not. In this research, the main task was to check whether the various FORCE metaphors identified for the emotion domain such as PRESSURIZED CONTAINER, OPPONENT,

NATURAL FORCE, BURDEN, etc. are used in the conceptualization of domains other than the emotions. Analyzing the first idioms, it was found that the various metaphors of FORCE that were considered have outside application area of emotions, and in this case, they cannot be considered as specific to emotions. Instead, they were structured by more extensive metaphorical source domains such as FORCE.

Also, it was discovered, that some source domains can be both specific to a particular emotion and limited to the emotion domain. These source domains include: TRESPASSING, PHYSICAL ANNOYANCE for ANGER; HIDDEN ENEMY, SUPERNATURAL BEING for FEAR; BEING OFF THE GROUND, AN ANIMAL THAT LIVES WELL, PLEASURABLE PHYSICAL SENSATION for HAPPINESS; HAVING NO CLOTHES ON, DECREASE IN SIZE, BLOCKING OUT THE WORLD for SHAME. Such features as dancing about (in *being off the ground*), trespassing, and decrease in size helped to define which source domain is used for anger, happiness and shame.

To explain the emotion specificity of these source domains, Kövecses (2000b) suggests two factors via which emotions can be comprehended: their assumed typical causes and their assumed typical effects. For example, *dancing and jumping up and down* (but not stomping your feet) is typically associated with happiness and can be seen as a result or effect of this emotion.

Considering metaphors and emotions, it is crucial to discuss whether emotion concepts and emotion metaphor are universal. The great contribution to this field was made by Kövecses (2000b), who researched this issue in three languages: English, Chaga, an African language spoken in Tanzania and Chinese. Let us do it in more detail.

To begin with, let us find out how does this variation arise if the concepts of emotions and metaphors are embodied in the universal human experience. Kövecses (2000b) offers three variations as a result of:

- differential framing;
- differential experiential focus;
- differential experiential focus through time.

Let us consider the first variation as a result of differential framing. The researcher considers *lust*, or *sexual desire*, as an example, that in English this concept is generally conceptualized as *heat* or *fire* (Lakoff, 1987; Kövecses, 1988, pp. 45-46). According to this, there are conventionalized expressions such as: 1. She's *burning* with desire. 2. I've got the *hots* for her. 3. He's *on fire* for her.

Another example LUST IS HEAT is based on mappings, as the following:

- The thing that is hot (from fire) is seen as the lustful person;
- The heat is seen as the lust;
- The degree of the heat is the intensity of the lustful feeling.

In Chaga, an African language spoken in Tanzania, as Emanatian (1995) suggests, the LUST IS HEAT metaphor has different meanings. For example, *Nkeóka* that translated as ‘she roasts and *Nékeha* ‘she burns’ (Kövecses, 2000b). The meaning of these expressions is ‘She is sexually desirable’ (Emanatian, 1995). Here can we see a contrast with English, where a similar expression associated with extreme heat would mean ‘She has intense feelings of lust.’ (Kövecses, 2000b)

The next example in Chaga language is *náworé ’úshangu lo móro* that in English translated as “she has a heaven of fire” again indicates sexually desirable qualities. This expression means that ‘she has desirable sexual attributes (skills, natural endowments, interests)’ (ibid).

The absence of these qualities are expressed, by the concept of coldness, that can be seen in example *kyamúya rikó lilya*. The English equivalent is ‘she’s cold’, that means she lacks desirable sexual attributes. Thus, we find that the differences in English and Chaga reflection roughly correspond metaphors SEXUAL DESIRE IS HEAT and SEX IS HEAT are the result of differential shots in both source and target domains (ibid).

Now, let us consider the second variation. Kövecses (2005) defines experiential focus as a general explanation of why even high embodied metaphors may differ depending on language and time. The main concept of this variation is that any of the aspects or components contained in this embodiment can be a preferred one at the time and in culture that is given. But which of these aspects or components of the embodiment will get more attention from the speaker depends on the broader cultural context. The study of this concept was conducted on the example of a metaphor denoting anger in English and Chinese languages. Considering the ANGER IS HEAT metaphor in both languages, Kövecses (2000b) refers to the results of a study by King & Brian (1989) and Yu & Ning (1995, 1998), that demonstrate that conceptualization of anger in terms of heat is less preferred in Chinese than in English. In Chinese language, the major metaphors of anger are based on pressure, not on pressure and heat. Also, it was found that speakers of Chinese have relied on another aspect of physiology, than it did English speakers. In this case, it showed that usually, the universality of experience does not necessarily lead to a universally equivalent conceptualization, at least not to a specific hot liquid level, in case of anger.

Let us take another example, offered by Michelle Rosaldo (1980) in her description of anger of Ilongot, a former headhunting tribe living in Northern Luzon. As it was found out, that for Ilongot anger is energy, by which they successfully accomplish their head hunting raids. It suggests that Ilongot anger is a generalized state of excitement, that motivates their actions. To sum up, the conceptualization of anger or other concepts of emotion is insignificant based on metaphors.

The last variation that will be discussed is the variation as a result of differential experiential focus through time. The main task is to consider how changes of history are influenced on the usage of metaphors in particular language. The study by Caroline Gevaert (2001a) demonstrates that the conceptualization of anger with regard to heat is not a constant feature of the concept of anger in English, but that it fluctuates during the development of the English language. She found that heat was a main component in the meaning of anger between 850 and 950, and then after a long period of time it began to play a key role again at 1400; pressure was a major part of the conceptualization of anger until around 1300, but then it began to decline, only to emerge strongly again, together with heat, in the form of the HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor later. (Gevaert, 2001a,b; Geeraerts & Grondelaers, 1995). This finding directly refers to the issue of the universality of the metaphorical conceptualization through time. We can draw a conclusion, that the conceptual metaphors may be found on one component in one culture, while on another component in another culture. This component or aspect can change through time, but which is chosen depends on different factors in particular cultural context.

## PART 2

### CORPUS LINGUISTICS. METAPHORS. DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Part 2 comprises the main information about corpus such as its definition, size, purposes, classification, corpus tools. Moreover, this part describes general implications of corpus-based studies for metaphor theory. In addition, it provides the findings and the discussion and interpretation of results of the research.

#### 2.1. Definition, size of corpora and their purposes

A corpus (plural: corpora) is a collection of written texts or a transcription of recorded speech. According to Kennedy (1998, p. 3), corpus is a set of texts in electronic database, that can be used for linguistic analysis. Anderson, Wendy and Corbett (2017) consider corpus as a considerable “body of texts” (ibid, p.4) that is produced for a specific purpose.

The size of corpora can differ, including from just one text or a few to millions of them. Researchers argue about it. For example, Sinclair (1991) claims that the larger a corpus, the more likely it is to provide a suitable representation of a language and frequent appearance of the subjects under investigation. Sinclair’s (1991) like-minded person, Sampson (2001, p. 6), points out that due to “sizeable sample of real-life usage”, we can assure, that there is a sufficient evidence for creating and examining suppositions about language. Regarding to the study of specific items, McEnery and Wilson (2001) notice that the smaller the probability of the feature to be researched, the bigger the corpus should be. This refers to the content words, that are likely to have lower frequency than grammatical words tend to have in any type of corpus. The texts in a corpus can be: 1. from one or various authors, 2. written on a certain topic or in a specific year - all these limitations depend on the representativeness of the corpus. (Kennedy, 1998)

It should be mentioned that a corpus is conceived for a particular purpose. So, let us consider them in more detail.

- **Linguistic purpose.** A corpus is designed to answer linguistic questions, taking into account the grammar, lexis and prosody of language. To see the frequency and place, where exactly these features (lexical, grammatical or phonological) occur, a corpus can be analysed distributively. (Kennedy, 1998)
- **Socio-pragmatic purpose.** In this case, a corpus is seen as a social artifact, the research of which can find out a socio-pragmatic behaviour of particular discourse communities (Stubbs, 1996; Tognini Bonelli, 2001). So, in other words, a corpus will help us to analyse how the

behaviour of a particular discourse community differs, including gendered language use, issues of politeness, the nature of power relations, and distance.

## **2.2. Classification of corpora.**

Let us have a look at some types of corpora, that are designed for a different purpose.

The first one is a reference corpus also known as a general corpus, which is a basic one used to compare a text or genre with a standard language. A general corpus can also be used to provide reference materials for translation or language learning, which is why it is often referred to as a reference corpus. It typically exceeds a specialized corpus in size and comprises the greatest variety of texts conceivable. The British National Corpus, which has 100 million words, and the Bank of English, which has 400 million words, are currently the two most well-known reference corpora. Both of these corpora are made up of a variety of smaller corpora from various sources (Hunston, 2002).

A comparable corpus is made up of texts with the same subject matter and literary form in several languages; for instance, they will have an equal distribution of novels, newspapers, and other text types. This corpus can be used in order to determine the differences and equivalents in each language. Well-known comparable corpus is International Corpus of English of 1 million words of different varieties of English (McEnery & Hardie, 2012).

The next one is a specialised corpora which covers different language varieties, examine and compare them. These corpora comprise writings that are specialized in a particular era, subject (art, politics, literature), or genre (legend, poetry), as well as texts written by certain authors or language users. It attempts to reflect a specific genre of text. In order to reflect the type of language they intend to study, researchers frequently compile their own specialized corpora. Additionally, corpora can be synchronic, that covers only one period of time, and diachronic, that involves different periods of time, written texts and spoken language (different media) and can be built on different languages (Hunston, 2002).

Annotated corpora provide an additional information about the texts such as a non-linguistic information or metadata, that is the information about authors of the texts, speakers, the material of the corpus, etc., and a linguistic information (parts of speech). (McEnery & Hardie, 2012)

The texts that have been translated or simultaneously written in two or more languages such as European Union rules that are published in all of the EU's official languages, are examples of parallel corpora. These corpora are typically used by language learners or translators to look up potential synonyms in each language and analyze linguistic distinctions (McEnery & Hardie, 2012).



Also, there are a learner and a pedagogic corpora. A collection of texts such as essays, authored by language learners is called a learner corpus. This corpus was created to highlight the differences between language learners' and native speakers' texts. The International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE), which compiles 20,000 words and comprises essays produced by English language learners from a particular language background, is the most well-known learner corpus. The Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) is a comparable corpus of essays written by native English speakers (Hunston, 2002).

Pedagogic corpus is a set of texts, collected by a teacher or a researcher. These texts can be extracted from all course books used by learners, the tapes they have listen to etc. The corpus covers those words and phrases a learner encounters in different contexts (Hunston, 2002).

### **2.3. The Corpus Linguistics and metaphor**

The main point discussed in this passage is how are corpus methods apposite to the studies of metaphor.

In order to better understand any linguistic phenomenon, it should be carefully analyzed using vast amounts of naturally occurring data or other sorts of analyses that are provided by corpus methods. This is especially true for any phenomenon that is said to occur frequently in language and, as a result, is given prominence in theory development at least in part because of this. One of such phenomena is a metaphor, especially in the context of Corpus Linguistics. The ubiquitous and regular use of metaphor in language is the foundation of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), which asserts that metaphor is essential to thought. Linguistic examples in many CMT studies, e.g. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, provide us with an argument, that specific conceptual metaphors are the mappings between 'source' and 'target' domains in conceptual structure. Following developments in CMT such as Grady's (1997) theory of main metaphor and Fauconnier's et al. (2002) account of metaphor in Blending Theory are based on linguistic evidence. Moreover, it refers to investigations of metaphor across different cultures and languages as well as to assertions regarding the universality or lack thereof of certain metaphors e.g. Kövecses (2005). Compared to the earlier research studies on CMT, that included decontextualised illustrations created or remembered by authors themselves, nowadays, in contrast, it has increasingly used authentic language data to study patterns of metaphor use in electronic corpora.

### **2.4. Types of corpus tools**

Corpus tools are used to find and to analyse frequency (occurrence) of metaphor in corpora of various sizes. There are 4 types of corpus tools, such as:

- concordancing' tools;
- semantic annotation tools;
- keywords;
- collocation tools.

In this research, a corpus tool such as keywords is used. They are defined as words that are used statistically significantly more often in one's corpus of data compared to a (typically bigger) reference corpus. The same happens with an important semantic domain for semantically annotated corpora (Rayson, 2008). If it is about metaphor analysis, then specific expressions or semantic domains do not need to be considered as a key in the linguistic corpus because some instances of those expressions or domains may be used metaphorically in the corpus under analysis, the reference corpus, or both. However, strong claims about the predominance of a specific type of metaphor in the data can be made when a metaphorically used expression or domain is important in a corpus in statistical terms. As an example, both words *tough* and *strong* and USAS semantic tag 'Tough/strong' in New Labour corpus (L'Hote, 2014, p. 91) are considered as key, comparing to the Labour corpus that comprise writing from earlier era. This indicates that the New Labour corpus regularly uses metaphors relating to physical prowess to contrast the party's earlier "soft" reputation in British politics (ibid, p.94). Comparing a corpus of reviews from the Times Literary Supplement to the Partington corpus of opinion articles in British newspapers, some signaling devices for metaphoricity are keywords. This discovery is used to back up the assertion that the former collection contains significantly more humorous metaphors and similes than the latter (Semino, 2017).

## **2.5. Corpus-based studies of metaphor**

Corpus Linguistics is an approach that is not associated with specific or general theory, its methods used not only to study actual linguistic behaviour systematically, but also is taken into account by any theoretical model of language. Cognitive Linguistics is in agreement with Cognitive Linguistics usage-based models of a language, as well. In terms of metaphor in particular, corpus techniques have been used to make a variety of contributions to metaphor theory and analysis (Semino, 2017).

A great contribution to the metaphor theory was made by Deignan (2005), Semino (2008), Lakoff (1993), Stefanowitsch (2006), Musolff (2006), Zinken (2007), and others. Let us consider the general implications for their metaphor theory.

Deignan (2005) presented findings from the Bank of English corpus that support the overarching claims of CMT, particularly with respect to the prevalence of conventional metaphorical expressions and their patterns that can be used to support specific conventional

conceptual metaphors. He also methodically demonstrated how the de-contextualized linguistic illustrations used in CMT are frequently insufficiently indicative of actual language use to be used as support for claims about conceptual metaphors. Additionally, Deignan (2005) used corpus techniques to uncover metaphor usage patterns that, at least up until that point, had not been taken into account or taken into account by (conceptual) metaphor theory. Some systematic relationships between specific source domains and linguistic metaphors from various word classes, as well as the fact that some words have various conventional metaphorical meanings for various morphological inflections e.g. *rock* as a singular noun vs. *rocks* as a plural noun, are examples of these. Moreover, Deignan (2005) discovered proof that the target domains have more of an impact on metaphorical mappings than Lakoff's (1993) invariance hypothesis suggests.

Semino (2008) contributed into conceptual metaphors, finding no evidence for Lakoff's (1993, pp. 202-205) assertion that the phrase *rich life* is a realization of the mental metaphor A PURPOSEFUL LIFE IS A BUSINESS in the British National Corpus. Instead, corpus evidence is presented for a distinct conventional pattern which explains the expression *rich life* along with other metaphorical uses of *rich*, such as *rich soil* and *rich culture*. The metaphorical expressions that co-occur with mood words in the British National Corpus are systematically analyzed by Stefanowitsch (2006). He offers extensive rebuttal to previous assertions regarding the use of emotion metaphors in CMT (Kövecses, 2000a). However, he also reveals patterns that were not discussed in earlier studies, and gives information about the frequencies of different metaphors in British English, as represented in the corpus. (Semino, 2017)

Mussolf (2006) has indicated, based on corpus evidence, that conceptual metaphors related to claims should be made at a general level, which is in contrast to some other views. In a bilingual English-German corpus of news reports about the EU, Musolff (2006) examined the utilization of metaphor and concluded that it is more accurately explained by specific scenarios such as *End-of-honeymoon* and *Adultery* rather than broad conceptual domains like *Marriage*.

In a broader sense, studies on metaphor that are corpus-based often uncover linguistic patterns that are challenging to account for using the conventional conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) and metaphor theory in general. Let us look at examples mentioned above *rock* as a singular noun vs. *rocks* as a plural noun. Considering the singular noun *rock* metaphorically 'the rock on which society is built', we can conclude that it has a positive meaning, while considering the meaning of plural form of noun *rock* in 'The marriage has been on the rocks for a while', it conveys a negative semantic feature. (Deignan, 2005, pp. 158-159). Deignan (2005) claims that 'each linguistic metaphor has a life of its own' (ibid, p.166).

The concept of discourse metaphors has been put forward by Zinken (2007, pp.445-466), which refers to form-meaning pairings that emerge in communication as a result of a conceptual pact between interlocutors. For instance, in German, *Boot* ('boat' in English) and *Schiff* ('ship' in English) have similar literal meaning, but different usage in metaphors: *Boot* is commonly used in phrases like "in the same boat" and to depict a place as overcrowded, whereas *Schiff* is often utilized in metaphorical descriptions of challenging ventures. These discourse metaphors represent an intermediary stage between newly-formed metaphors and completely established ones (ibid, 464-466).

Some researchers in the field of metaphor such as Cameron (2011), explain these observations using Dynamics Systems Theory. According to this perspective, the meanings and functions of metaphors arise from the dynamic interplay between various factors, including lexicogrammatical, semantic, cognitive, pragmatic, and affective factors, within actual communication contexts. Within this framework, conceptual metaphors are just one of the components involved in the emergence of metaphorical meanings, which also encompasses established ones. Deignan (2005) has also presented similar arguments. Johansson F. & Gibbs (2012) have demonstrated how embodied simulations linked to specific words are one of the interacting factors that contribute to the formation of metaphorical meanings. Similar to Zinken (2007), they investigate a pair of words *road* and *path* that have similar literal meanings, but distinct metaphorical meanings. Their analysis of the British National Corpus shows that the term *path* is usually employed metaphorically to denote lifestyles and often implies possible challenges. On the other hand, *road* is commonly utilized metaphorically to characterize deliberate actions. Johansson F. & Gibbs (2012) compare the results of their corpus analysis with the mental images that participants reported in a questionnaire regarding their experiences with roads and paths. By combining the information gathered from both sources, they propose that people's embodied experiences with the objects denoted by *path* and *road* may account for the distinct metaphorical meanings attributed to these terms in the corpus.

## **2.6. Planning the study**

Anger is seen as the most studied emotion concept from a cognitive semantic point of view (Kövecses, 2000a, p. 21). Due to this, anger plays a role of keyword in this research. The main task of this research is to analyze emotion "anger" in the idiomatic expressions through metaphors. On the basis of the collected data, the main hypothesis and the following questions are aimed to be answered:

1. What metaphor is dominant among idiomatic expressions gathered among 500 random “angry” and “anger” expressions in BNC<sup>1</sup>?

Hypothesis: The metaphor ANGER IS A FORCE is the dominant among all gathered idiomatic expressions as a force is a dynamic for almost every phenomena, e.g. a *weapon is a tool that makes us powerful against someone*, etc.

2. Can the same specific structural metaphor be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors?

Hypothesis: The same specific structural metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors.

3. Do the metaphors of the anger idiomatic expressions studied in American Corpus have the same features in “anger” idiomatic expressions studied in British National Corpus?

Hypothesis: As the anger is considered to be one of the basic emotions, we can assume that it will be expressed in similar ways. It can be a fluid that fills in our body, a force, that rules us, etc. Thus, the metaphors of the anger idiomatic expressions studied in American Corpus have the same features in anger idiomatic expressions studied in British National Corpus.

## 2.7. Empirical research method

The main method used in the research is a “moving from the bottom upwards” method of corpus linguistics, that allowed us to made a transition from ontological metaphors to more specific structural metaphors during our analysis. The practical investigation can be separated into two major sections. Firstly, a language corpus was compiled from British English database, using keywords such as “anger” and “angry” along with full-sentence concordance. Secondly, in order to investigate anger emotion, 250 samples of anger random language expressions<sup>2</sup> and 250 samples of angry expressions<sup>3</sup> were gathered in BNC. The next step was finding out the idiomatic expressions among them and defining their metaphors based on Kövecses (2000a) emotion concept.

## 2.8. Data collection

The research was conducted on British National Corpus (BNC), containing 500 anger expressions<sup>4</sup>. The Corpus is a comprehensive compilation of written and spoken language samples from various sources (e.g. regional and national newspapers, specialist periodicals and

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>

<sup>2</sup> “Anger” expressions: <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/?c=bnc&q=113918067>

<sup>3</sup> “Angry” expressions: <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/?c=bnc&q=113933456>

<sup>4</sup>. Expressions collected from BNC: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Zx1fxszu7GIB1FGG\\_xVID1RynaC5EI3A/edit?rtpof=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Zx1fxszu7GIB1FGG_xVID1RynaC5EI3A/edit?rtpof=true)

journals for all ages and interests, academic books and popular fiction), containing 100 million words that represent British English during the latter part of the 20th century. The keywords searched in BNC are “anger” and “angry”. For “anger” keyword were found 3638 matches, while for “angry” 3945 samples. From both of the results, random 250 expressions were collected. Among gathered 250 “anger” and 250 “angry” samples 224 idiomatic expressions (expressions with figurative meaning) were found, that were determined as metaphorical, according to the metaphor identification process elaborated by the Pragglejaz group (2007) (MIP) Steen et al. (2010) (MIPVU).

## 2.9. Procedure

As it was mentioned above, a language corpus was compiled from British English database, using keywords such as “anger” and “angry” along with full-sentence concordance and random 250 “anger” and 250 “angry” expressions were collected from BNC<sup>4</sup>. Among these samples the idiomatic expressions were found and determined as metaphorical applying the process of identifying metaphors, which was developed by the Pragglejaz group (2007), is referred to as MIP, and it is also known as MIPVU according to Steen et al. (2010). According to Kövecses (2010, p. 5), following a multi-stage procedure helps eliminate subjectivity and the researcher's language intuition. The procedure involves:

1. Reading the entire text, including full example sentences, to determine its overall meaning.
2. Dividing the text, including example sentences, into language units and individual words.
3. Conducting a semantic analysis of the words to identify any polysemantic words.
4. Establishing the primary meaning of all the words in the text.
5. Considering the context and identifying the metaphor's basis if there is a difference between the primary meaning and the meaning in the text.

The idiomatic expressions were grouped based on their conceptual metaphors and examined the identified source domains. Where it was possible, the identified conceptual metaphors were organized into main groups and subgroups. During the analysis, a transition was made from ontological metaphors to more specific structural metaphors. The mappings and metaphorical entailments forming conceptual metaphors were identified, with it being considered an important step since the more mappings involved in creating meaning and language manifestation, the more complex the conceptual metaphor becomes. In addition, the results of the analysis of idiomatic expressions found in BNC and their metaphors, were compared to the Kövecses's findings of the research based on American idiomatic expressions (Heredia & Cie, 2016). Taking into account all this procedure, we accomplished to answer our research questions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Expressions collected from BNC: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Zx1fxszu7GIB1FGG\\_xVID1RynaC5EI3A/edit?rtfpof=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Zx1fxszu7GIB1FGG_xVID1RynaC5EI3A/edit?rtfpof=true)

## 2.10. Findings and discussion of the results

To assess 250 “anger” and 250 “angry” random expressions collected from British National Corpus the method of corpus linguistics BNC such as “moving from the bottom upwards” was used. It allowed us to move a transition from ontological metaphors to more specific structural metaphors during our analysis. Among the collected data from BNC, there were found (see Appendix):

- 224 idiomatic expressions among 500 random expressions;
- there are 54 repeated idiomatic expressions.

What is interesting in this data that the elementary metaphor ANGER IS A WEAPON is found in both ontological metaphors ANGER IS A FORCE and ANGER IS AN OBJECT. Thus we may prove our hypothesis about that the same elementary metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors.

In addition, there were found that the dominant ontological metaphor is ANGER IS A FORCE that comprises 27 elementary metaphors. As it turns out, force is something that is controlled by someone/something or it keeps us under control.

Comparison of the results of analysis of “anger” idiomatic expressions collected from BNC and AC (American Corpus) showed, that metaphors of both corpora have the same features.

The results of the research conducted on “anger” idiomatic expressions and their metaphors in American Corpus is taken as a basis for this research. According to the results the main source domains in metaphors of “anger” idiomatic expressions in American English are container, possessed object and opponent. The first CONTAINER source domain expressed in two conceptual metaphors: ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER and ANGER IS A FORCEFUL ENTITY IN A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER. The first conceptual metaphor comprises the following mappings or correspondences (Heredia & Cie, 2016):

<b>Mappings</b>	<b>Example</b>
THE LEVEL OF INTENSITY IS THE DEPTH OF THE CONTAINER	<i>a deep vein of anger</i>
THE LEVEL OF INTENSITY IS THE LEVEL OF THE LIQUID IN THE CONTAINER	<i>level of anger</i>
GROWING INTENSITY IS THE RISING OF THE LIQUID	<i>fill somebody with anger</i>
DECREASING INTENSITY IS THE LEVEL OF THE LIQUID GOING DOWN	<i>anger subsides</i>
LOSING CONTROL IS THE LIQUID GOING OUT OF THE CONTAINER	<i>anger spills out</i>
COMPLETE LOSS OF CONTROL IS THE LIQUID BEING OUT OF THE CONTAINER	<i>to soak up the anger of the street</i>

**Table 6.** *Mappings of ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER metaphor*

The conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A FORCEFUL ENTITY IN A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER comprises 3 mappings:

1. controlling anger is trying to keep the liquid inside the container, e.g., *to suppress anger*;
2. losing control is a substance going out of the container, e.g., *outbursts of anger*;
3. losing control over anger is the substance causing the lid to go up in the air, e.g., *anger forces the lid off* (Heredia & Cie, 2016, p. 346).

The second source domain possessed object (anger) is seen as the essence possessed by a person under the influence of a given emotion through the constructions like *X's anger*, *the anger of X*, or *to have anger* (ibid, p. 346).

The last source domain opponent has two subtypes: 1. anger acts as an opponent that the individual (referred to as the rational self) must battle in order to maintain control. The result of this conflict can either lead to the person successfully retaining control (such as *to push anger down* or *to get anger under control*) or losing it altogether (such as *anger takes over* or *to be erased by anger*); 2. the emotion is seen as a weapon in the ongoing struggle between the two opponents, potentially used *to hold anger at somebody* or *to turn anger on somebody*.

The conceptual correspondences of the ANGER IS AN OPPONENT IN A STRUGGLE conceptual metaphor are as follows:

- struggle with the opponent is trying to keep control over anger (e.g., *huffing with anger*);
- keeping the opponent down is maintaining control (e.g., *to push anger down*);
- losing the struggle is losing control (e.g., *to be overcome by anger*);
- opponent 1 being afraid of opponent 2 is the rational self being afraid of anger (e.g., *to be afraid of anger*);
- winning the struggle is maintaining control (e.g., *to fight off anger*);
- opponent 2 becoming more intense due to a cause is the emotion becoming more intense due to a cause (e.g., *widespread anger*);
- opponent 2 fighting against control is the emotion fighting against control (e.g., *anger struggles*) (Heredia & Cie, 2016, p.347).

The conceptual metaphor has 2 conceptual mappings:

- anger used is a weapon used, e.g., *to hold anger at somebody*;
- the amount of anger used is the amount of weapon used, for instance, *to have a lot of anger against somebody* (Heredia & Cie, 2016, p.347).

It is evident that two of the most prominent metaphors for anger in American English revolve around the concepts of intensity and control. These aspects of anger are emphasized through the use of the source domains of container and opponent. According to Kövecses (2000a), this represents the primary focus of a metaphor. The notions of intensity and control are central to the



conceptualization of anger and are linked cohesively in the mappings of these metaphors. While other anger metaphors also emphasize these aspects, they are not linked in the same way. For example, the CAPTIVE ANIMAL metaphor emphasizes control but not intensity.

Regarding this the idiomatic expressions and their metaphors are analysed in British National Corpus to compare results of both corpora and answer the research questions.

#### ANGER IS A FORCE

As in Chapter 1 (see 1.5.) we understand emotion through force dynamics. In case of anger, ANGER IS A FORCE is regarded as a central metaphor. When the force takes a control under somebody or something, e.g. speech in *mounting anger was making his speech more and more incomprehensible* (for more examples see Appendix), then we become angry. According to the results of the research, ANGER IS A FORCE is one of the ontological metaphors. The metaphor itself denotes its source domain force as something that under somebody's control, e.g. *he kept his anger under control* or it can keep something or somebody under control e.g. *kicked her down (in your anger)*, where anger controls person, that caused to kicking her down. Moreover, taking into account all elementary metaphors of the main one ANGER IS A FORCE, it is shown as something that can damage somebody or something. In addition to this, force is expressed as an evil, a source of power, fire, a weapon, a killer, an enemy, and so forth. Let us discuss each of them in more detail on the examples of elementary metaphors and the idiomatic expressions they refer to.

The metaphors such as ANGER IS AN EVIL FORCE, ANGER IS A WEAPON, ANGER IS AN ENEMY, ANGER IS A CONFRONTATION, ANGER IS ENERGY can be gathered in one subgroup due to their connection with opposition to evil. In case, if we do not want anger to dominate us, then we fight an internal battle with anger, which acts as a force on us. Thus, these metaphors are within the idealized cognitive model of combat. Let us have a look on them.

ANGER IS AN EVIL FORCE. Evil is seen as a force of others, that we are either afraid of, e.g. 1. *These people are afraid of anger to such an extent that they are dishonest*, 2. *to be afraid of the anger of others who make life unpleasant for us*, or as in the next example evil force is shown as our possession we are afraid of: *we are often afraid of our own anger*. In contrast, evil is presented as a force we can undergo, e.g. *I have withstood your anger*.

ANGER IS A WEAPON. A weapon can be seen as a force that can protect, e.g. 1. *Anger can be used as a defence against depression*, 2. *using Daphne's expression of anger not only to protect, cause harm as in anger and frustration injures us*, or even compel us to do something *using anger to force a child into what we believe they should or should not do*. In addition, the metaphor ANGER IS A WEAPON AGAINST THE OVERT ANGER of the idiomatic expression *anger*

*which has been turned inwards, can protect from overt anger* illustrates a weapon as a force that can protect us from overt anger.

ANGER IS AN ENEMY. Enemy can be considered as a force as it introduces a power, that we are usually afraid of. Analysing all idiomatic expressions represented the actual metaphor, anger is seen as enemy that controls and rules us, e.g. *Her anger brings on an attack*, that is against someone, e.g. *Anger against professionals*, destroys something, e.g. *Anger - the destroyer*, something that we are afraid of, e.g. *fear of anger*, something that our courage and conviction tend to face, e.g. *the courage and conviction to face the process of anger, do not face our anger or frustration at work*, something that we are supposed to protect themselves from, e.g. *parker is defended against his own expression of anger*, something that attacks us, e.g. *bouts of anger*.

ANGER IS ENERGY. The source domain force can be represented as an energy. This metaphor is expressed in the idiomatic expression *to channel anger into movement*. In this case, a person has a kind of control under anger as he channels it into movement.

ANGER IS A CONFRONTATION. Let us take an example *this statement will anger many well-meaning vegetarians and vegans*. It shows that statement is a cause for anger of many well-meaning vegetarians and vegans. So anger as a force will get better of vegetarians and vegans. The same situation with *the authority aroused much anger among writers and their first reaction was one of anger at his disregard of their wishes*. In this example, aroused anger is a force that rules somebody (writers). In addition, the metaphor ANGRY CONFRONTATION IS A GRADUAL ACCUMULATION denotes that growing of anger, 'angry confrontation', its force happens gradually, e.g. *an angry confrontation can develop from an anxious nigger*.

In contrast, let us consider metaphors where anger acts as something that rules us, keeps us under control.

ANGER IS A SOURCE OF POWER. Source of power is considered as a spring that anger arouses from (e.g. *Catherine's anger was also aroused*) and begins to appear. The same happens with metaphor ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE where in *column of rock that rises 200 feet out of the angry waves at its base* a force is seen as a source the rocks rise out. In contrast, force can be a source of envy, that is quite opposite to the source of power, got from a conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A SOURCE OF ENVY, e.g. *Envy [...] is one of the strongest antidotes to love and has its roots in the innate and primitive anger and anxiety of infancy*.

ANGER IS FIRE. Fire is a force that flashes anger, e.g. *sparked racial anger, to overlook sudden flashes of anger*. Also fire can be repressed, e.g. in *anger about Clive's absences and frequent lateness remained firmly repressed*. Thus, it can be considered as ANGER IS FIRE IN A CONTAINER. Moreover, it can be suppressed, e.g. *We have to do this as to suppress anger is to turn our negativity inward*. It suggests that anger keeps our body under control.

The metaphor ANGER IS EXPLOSION that can be considered to be similar with the previous one (ANGER IS FIRE) as fire is presented here as well, e.g. *self-righteous anger, which seem to erupt for no apparent reason.*

ANGER IS A MOTIVATION. Let us have a look at the linguistic expression with figurative meaning *lower income groups is more likely to be motivated by anger at the focus one up-market housing.* Here motivation is seen as an inner force for lower income groups they are endowed with to focus on up-market houses. Another example, *the dog interpreting your anger as excitement* illustrates a motivation as an inner force that can cause a change in someone's behaviour, in this case it makes the dog's behaviour excited.

ANGER IS A STATE. A force is illustrated as a state of somebody or something, e.g. *Nature is in an angry mood here.*

ANGER IS A FUEL FOR DETERMINATION. Fuel in this linguistic expression is a force that gives energy for determination, e.g. *fuel your determination with that anger.*

ANGER IS TEARING. In *Johnson tore up all her letters in his anger at her marriage* anger can be considered as a force that keeps somebody (Johnson) under control. So, anger made Johnson to tear all letters up.

ANGER IS A KILLER. Killer can be considered as a kind of enemy that has hostile intentions to damage something or to kill somebody. In this conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A FORCE that keeps under control the executors, thus it made them to kill somebody (George), e.g. *could easily have killed George through their anger* or even can represent the executor (killer) itself, e.g. *his anger with his brother had actually killed him / his anger had killed his brother.*

ANGER IS PRESSURE. Anger in the idiomatic expression *having its legs brushed with anger* (taken from “we don't want the horse to get really angry, and to associate having its legs brushed with anger and a need to kick”) is pressure that is regarded as a force that the owners of horse (we) do not want to direct against horse.

ANGER IS OUT OF BODY'S CONTROL. The expression *shaking with anger* conveys anger as a force that freed from body, that is why the body lost the control under it. The opposite metaphor ANGER IS UNDER CONTROL shows anger that is controlled, e.g. 1. *He was tall, slim and dignified, and showed no anger even when provoked;* 2. *she never gave way to anger nor showed her annoyance.*

ANGER IS FERTILIZER. In *the Aube population nigh on fermented with anger*, anger is represented as a force that controls the Aube population and destroys it.

ANGER IS A LEGITIMATE CAUSE. *Anger is legitimate -- it can be a good thing to 'let off steam'* shows that anger is a force that helps us to “let off steam”.

ANGER IS A CAUSE. This metaphor denotes basic emotion anger as a force that controls person,

so it caused redness of the face, e.g. *his face red from alcohol and anger*.

ANGER IS ANTHROPOGENIC FORCE. In this case, anger is a force that keeps somebody under control, e.g. *the break out in angry and violent rebellion* and led him/her to break out in the rebellion.

ANGRY BEES ARE MERCILESS. Angry bees in (two lorry drivers were) *stung from head to foot by thousands of angry bees* are seen as natural forces that are merciless towards people. Thus, small living beings in great amount (thousands) guided by force injured (stung) two lorry drivers.

ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR. A linguistic expression *Leeds swoop for angry Andy* suggests that anger manifested in form of angry behaviour is a force that rules person (Leeds), and appears as uncontrolled animal behaviour (*swoop for*). More over, angry behaviour can become aggressive animal behaviour, e.g. *The great Dane threw an angry supporter off the pitch, or a small rotund figure, angry as a bee*. Comparing this expression to the *stung from head to foot by thousands of angry bees* and taking into account that angry bees are merciless, in this case ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR.

Discussing the metaphors connected to the aggressiveness, it worth to mention metaphor, i.e. ANGRY EYES ARE AN ANIMAL AGGRESSIVE GLARE metaphor, and its linguistic expression in a figurative meaning *two angry eyes beaming at me*. In this case *angry eyes beaming at me* denote anger as a force that keeps under control (eyes) and have an influence on a person (*beaming at me*).

The last elementary metaphor related to the main ANGER IS A FORCE that we are going to analyze is ANGRY STORM OF CRITICISM IS A NATURAL FORCE. Let us consider the linguistic expression it is expressed in *the angry storm of criticism which arose from the 'crucifix action'*. Here we can observe that anger is a natural force in *angry storm of criticism* as it (storm of criticism) aroused from 'crucifix action'.

#### ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE

The second ontological metaphor is ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE. A substance itself seen as something that fills us with, e.g. *I was suddenly filled with great anger* or vents, e.g. *to vent his anger upon those around him*. According to the elementary metaphors, found during the research, it (substance) can be flammable, e.g. *The anger this sparked in the population*, growing, e.g. *She became particularly angry*, have a quantity as in *a little bit of anger*. In idiomatic expressions it expressed as a fluid, a substance that we can get a little and a lot, a hot fluid, a fluid in a large amount, the filth, a boiling fluid, in a container or out of a container, a fuel for determination, etc. Let us consider them through the elementary metaphors and the idiomatic expression they refer to.

ANGER IS A FLAMMABLE SUBSTANCE. The examples of idiomatic expressions: 1. *outbursts of anger*; 2. *the anger this sparked in the population*; 3. *lest any anger triggers the explosion of hers*, 4. *anger exploded* illustrate that substance the anger possesses as something that triggers the explosion (example 3), it is sparked (examples 1, 2) or represents explosion itself (example 4).

ANGER IS A GROWING SUBSTANCE/ ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE THAT CAN GROW. The linguistic expression *She became particularly angry* denotes anger as something that reached high level of its state. Thus, it can be seen as a substance that from low level grew to the higher one. The next linguistic expression *I would feel very, very angry about it* shows anger as a substance that would grow. The words 'very, very' create this effect of growth, that suggests that once the emotion will be increased. The same situation happens in *actions of the Italians in getting very very frustrated and angry now*. In addition, the idiomatic expression *Anger growing inside* denotes that the process of growth develops inside. (see Appendix)

ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE THAT WE CAN GET A LITTLE AND A LOT. Substance in this metaphor is seen as a kind of source, where we can get it in any quantity, e.g. *much of [...] anger*.

ANGER IS A FLUID. Fluid is seen as a substance that has no fixed shape. Let take as an example *carry a lot of anger towards him*. In this case, anger is a fluid that we carry towards somebody. In *the unmitigated anger may well seep out in constant irritation* anger is a liquid substance that seeps out in constant irritation. Anger is a liquid substance is considered also in *all your anger [...] surge out as you let go of your feelings about the meeting, as it pours out*.

ANGER IS A HOT FLUID. A hot fluid is a substance that fills males and needs to be cooled, e.g. *Projects directed at cooling the anger of the male unemployed*. Moreover, anger from hot state can reach the boiling state. So let us consider metaphor ANGER IS A BOILING FLUID. Anger is a liquid substance that boils, e.g. 1. *the composition was that of a witch his anger boiled over*, 2. *had adrenalin pumping out the top of my hat in anger that my man had left me to die* (boils due the adrenalin exploded in it), or welling up within somebody, e.g. *feel anger welling up within you*.

ANGER IS FLUID IN A LARGE AMOUNT. Here anger is a substance that is enough, e.g. *a great deal of anger*.

Besides it, fluid can be considered as a substance in the form of mud that needs to be cleaned, e.g. *to purge his anger and hurt*. Regarding this the appropriate metaphor for this expression is ANGER IS THE FILTH.

As the research showed, the fluid takes place in something closed. Thus, the elementary metaphor ANGER IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER illustrates it the best through as appeared the constant expression *to be* or *to do something in anger*. For instance, *to kick a ball in anger* shows

anger as a fluid, liquid substance in which something happens or in which a person is immersed, e.g. *in the anger he felt at*. For more examples see Appendix.

ANGER IS A HOT STEAM COMING OUT OF A CONTAINER THAT HELP US TO AVOID AN EXPLOSION. The related to this metaphor expressions are 1. *to vent his anger upon those around him*, 2. *vents his anger*, and others (see Appendix). In this examples, the hot steam is the result of boiling of a fluid, as it gives off. If we get angry, the steam of the hot liquid comes out of the container.

ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN OR OUT OF A CONTAINER. The substance can be in something (container, bottle), e.g. *headaches and tension are the end result of keeping anger bottled up* or somebody (person), e.g. *I zipped up the flaps, not daring to show my anger*. Anger can have no bounds (e.g. *Queen's anger knew no bounds*), it can be released (e.g. 1. *As her anger was released*, 2. *Jack's anger was taken out on Piggy*, 3. *letting out anger*) or leave something or somebody (e.g. *his anger left him suddenly*).

Abyss in the metaphor ANGER IS ABYSS and related idiomatic expressions, such as 1. *to plunge his wife into an abyss of anger*, 2. *provide a more or less uniform picture of deep shock, dismay, anger, and outrage* can be considered as a container, where anger as a fluid/substance takes place.

#### ANGER IS AN OBJECT

The next ontological metaphor is ANGER IS AN OBJECT. Anger is seen as an object, that we can hid, (e.g. *hid their anger*), share (e.g. *share the Queen's anger*), voice (e.g. *anger was voiced at the action of the socialist majority*), find (e.g. *women find their lonely anger or isolated oppression*), direct at somebody (e.g. *we direct our anger and frustration at them*), etc.

The source domain (object) can be someone's (your, my, his, her, own) as a possession, sparked racial, festering, deep, frustrated, justified, pure, lonely, calming, mutual, and mounting. In the linguistic expressions, an object is expressed as a weapon, coin, and so forth. Let us have a look at them in more detail, taking into account the elementary metaphors and their idiomatic expressions. Before we start it is important to admit that in the examples below, word 'something' refers to the object.

It is important to begin with those elementary metaphors where object depicted directly:

ANGER IS AN OBJECT. (e.g. 1. *I got a very defensive angry stare from a young man*, 2. *get me so angry*. Here anger is something that we can get);

ANGER IS AN OBJECT THAT CAN BE IN EVERYBODY'S POSSESSION (e.g. *This can lead to mutual anger and resentment*. As keyword in this expression is considered 'mutual' that helped us to define the appropriate metaphor);

ANGER IS AN OBJECT IN SOMEONE'S POSSESSION (e.g. *there is only my anger, to have angry words with Zoff, their own anger*, etc. As can be noticed in this case the possession is shown through such constructions as *X's (own) anger*, and *to have X*.

ANGER IS AN OBJECT IN SOMEBODY ELSE'S POSSESSION (e.g. *anger not strictly her due*. The construction *X's anger* is used.)

ANGER IS AN OBJECT WE MAY RECEIVE FROM THE INTERLOCUTOR (e.g. *I'll have an angry response from men who'll say*. In this example object acts as a response we may receive from our interlocutor);

Now, let us consider examples, where the main metaphor is conveyed as a weapon, an opponent, etc. In other words it is shown indirectly.

ANGER IS A WEAPON. Weapon is seen as an object that is directed at somebody, e.g. 1. the fans were only being impatient with three false starts and *directed their anger at 30-year-old Johnson*; 2. *we direct our anger and frustration at them*; 3. *direct her anger towards the medical or nursing staff who cared for her husband* or in contrast it can be diverted into something that will not cause harm anyone, e.g. *divert anger into some activity where it will not hurt others*. In addition, weapon is considered as something that we use against somebody, e.g. *who shows anger only against those who break the code of decency*. Taking into account that weapon was considered as a force in analysis above, we can prove our hypothesis that the same specific structural metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphor, in our case it is ANGER IS A WEAPON.

ANGER IS ENTITY THAT WE CAN ILLUSTRATE. Anger is an object (entity), that can be illustrated, e.g. *nowhere was the anger better illustrated*.

Anger can be also an opponent (ANGER IS AN OPPONENT) that is in examples 1. *dealing with anger*, 2. *anger I had not dealt with* can be considered as an object, we are/are not dealing with. Moreover, the source domain of the main metaphor ANGER IS AN OBJECT can be expressed as a component of minefield (e.g. *A minefield seems to open up: complexity, controversy, doubt, anxiety, anger, bitterness*), a currency (e.g. *He then runs out of anger*), the horse's raised feet (e.g. *the horse will always associate having its feet picked up with anger and fear*), a possession (e.g. 1. *Their own anger*; 2. *we are all victims to the angry itching bumps they leave all over us*, etc.), and one side of the coin (e.g. *Love and anger, it seems, are two sides of the same coin*). The source domains of elementary metaphors the object is expressed through create the following metaphors:

ANGER IS AN OPPONENT;

ANGER IS A COMPONENT OF MINEFIELD;

ANGER IS A CURRENCY;  
ANGER IS THE HORSE'S RAISED FEET;  
ANGER IS A POSSESSION;  
ANGER IS ONE SIDE OF THE COIN;  
ANGRY ITCHING BUMPS ARE IN SOMEONE'S POSSESSION.

#### ANGER IS A LIVING BEING

ANGER IS A LIVING BEING is the last ontological metaphor we are going to analyze. Living being occurs as somebody we get in touch with, who can walk, can run (e.g. *anger runs in furrows*), can be healed (e.g. **the anger** and depression caused by the announcements **will be healed'**), who is famous, untamed, who is respected as we give the way for it. Thus, it can be an interlocutor, celebrity, majesty, the untamed being, a plant, etc. Let us have a look at the elementary metaphors and the idiomatic expressions they present.

ANGER IS A LIVING BEING THAT CAN WALK. Anger acquires new features, as it becomes a living being that can walk, e.g. *anger came after Rovers*.

ANGER IS MAJESTY. In idiomatic expression *to give way to anger* anger is considered as someone we respect, give a way to.

ANGER IS CELEBRITY. This metaphor is quiet similar with the previous one, as both of them are considered to be famous and respectful. The idiomatic expression of this metaphor is *there have been times of anger*. "Times of anger" denote the fact, that there were times, when anger was considered as popular and even powerful attracting attention of others. Another example that denotes the similar phenomenon is *anger entered the parade*. Both source domains 'majesty' and 'celebrity' refer to people, a living being.

ANGER IS AN INTERLOCUTOR. In this case, anger is seen as a living being we get in touch with, e.g. *Rose Greenacre managed to get in touch with the anger*.

ANGER IS A UNTAMED BEING. Anger is a living being that is untamed, e.g. *anger could be tamed*. It can be described as free and even wild.

ANGER IS A PLANT. Here anger is a living being that spoils, e.g. *festering anger*, or is growing, e.g. *anger growing inside you*.

Anger can be presented as a living being that controls somebody, e.g. *anger of which they have command* (ANGER IS A CONTROLLER). Moreover, it can be a hunter, e.g. *And who is **the object of this anger?*** (ANGER IS A HUNTER).

Regarding to the analysis above of the collected data on "anger" and "angry" idiomatic expressions from BNC, let us compare the its results with the results of research conducted on American Corpus illustrated at the beginning of this sub-heading.



The first main source domain obtained in the research of American idiomatic expressions that we are going to compare with is container. In our research considering the metaphor ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER we focused on how a substance and force in the container behaves. The results of the analysis showed that the degree of intensity is a depth of a container, e.g. *provide a more or less uniform picture of deep shock, dismay, anger, and outrage or an abyss of anger*. Moreover, it denoted that when somebody or something loses control under anger, the substance is going out of a container, e.g. *his anger left him suddenly*. In addition, when somebody loses control over anger the substance is coming out of a container in the air, e.g. *to vent his anger upon those around him*. In this case, a fluid becomes a hot steam that is going out of a container helping us to avoid an explosion. Comparing these results to the outcome of analysis in American Corpus, where the source domain container is expressed in the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER, we can assume that their main features are the same in both investigations.

The next source domain we are going to consider is a possessed object. In both researches it is illustrated through the construction as X's anger (e.g. *my anger*).

The last source domain presented in the research of American idioms is opponent. It subdivided into two types:

1. Anger is seen as an opponent that we need to battle in order to not lose control over it. This battle can lead to two different consequences: we may either to retain it successfully (e.g. *to get anger under control*) or to lose it (e.g. *to be erased by anger*). In our research, this subtype is elucidated as an evil force that we can undergo (e.g. *I have withstood your anger*) or lose control over it (e.g. *his face red from alcohol and anger*).

2. Anger is presented as a weapon we use in the struggle between two opponents. The analysis of idiomatic expressions collected from BNC depicts a source domain weapon as an object we may direct against somebody (e.g. *we direct our anger and frustration at them*) or as a force that can protect us from enemy (e.g. *anger which has been turned inwards, can protect from overt anger*). The former feature is not presented among the results of research of idioms in AC.

Deriving from it, we may draw a conclusion that despite the differences occurred in the opponent source domain we can claim that the metaphors of the "anger" idiomatic expressions studied in American Corpus have the similar features as in British National Corpus.

## CONCLUSIONS

There are numerous studies of idioms in the field of applied linguistics. Most of them illustrated idioms as phrases or expressions that offer the unique insight into the cultural and linguistic shades of language. In addition, the study of idioms expressing emotions through conceptual metaphors made the relationship between idioms and emotions more precise and clear, while the appearance of Corpus Linguistics enabled us to investigate them in different context, in a large number of texts.

The study is relevant as the English idioms expressing emotions through conceptual metaphors in the Corpus Linguistics are not fully researched in this field. The research on “anger” idiomatic expressions conducted on American Corpus (see 2.10.) showed that the main source domains in metaphors of “anger” idiomatic expressions in American English are *container*, *possessed object* and *opponent* (Heredia & Cie, 2016). Thus, the main focus of this research is on the analysis of idiomatic expressions based on conceptual metaphors found among 250 “anger” and 250 “angry” random expressions collected from British National Corpus and comparing the results of the research with the findings on American Corpus (see 2.10.). The study is also aimed at answering three main questions and the hypothesis on them:

1. What metaphor is dominant among idiomatic expressions gathered among 500 random “angry” and “anger” expressions in BNC?

Hypothesis: The metaphor anger is a force is the dominant among all gathered idiomatic expressions as a force is a dynamic for almost every phenomena, e.g. a weapon is a tool that makes us powerful against someone, etc.

2. Can the same specific structural metaphor be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors?

Hypothesis: The same specific structural metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors.

3. Do the metaphors of the “anger” idiomatic expressions studied in American Corpus have the same features in “anger” idiomatic expressions studied in British National Corpus?

Hypothesis: As the anger is considered to be one of the basic emotions, we can assume that it will be expressed in similar ways. It can be a fluid that fills in our body, a force, that rules us, etc. Thus, the metaphors of the anger idiomatic expressions studied in American Corpus have the same features in anger idiomatic expressions studied in British National Corpus.

The first part of this study deals with the meaning of idiom from the traditional and the cognitive linguistic view and its types. Additionally, it considers the similarities and differences between idiom and metaphor, as well as the relationship between idiom, metaphor and emotion. In the second part, the Corpus Linguistics is introduced, including its main characteristics, types

of tools and corpus-based studies of metaphor. Furthermore, it includes the corpus-linguistics method research of “anger” idiomatic expressions gathered from BNC, its findings and discussion of the results.

The findings of this study has proven our hypothesis that:

- the dominant metaphor is ANGER IS A FORCE, where a force is occurred to be presented in almost every idiomatic expression;
- the same elementary metaphor can be used in a subgroup of different ontological metaphors, that is ANGER IS A WEAPON that occurred in two ontological metaphors ANGER IS A FORCE and ANGER IS AN OBJECT;
- metaphors of idiomatic expressions gathered in American Corpus have the same features with the metaphors obtained among idiomatic expressions collected from BNC. These features are:
  - a) the level of intensity is the depth of the container (e.g. *deep anger*);
  - b) losing control is the liquid going out of the container (e.g. *to vent his anger*);
  - c) anger as a possessed object is expressed through the same construction *X’s anger*;
  - d) anger is an opponent (evil force) that is the battle that we may retain (undergo) or lose (unable to control it). In addition, an opponent can be expressed a weapon that is used to direct anger against somebody (ANGER IS AN OBJECT) or as a force that can protect us from enemy (e.g. *anger which has been turned inwards, can protect from overt anger*) that turned out to be present only among British idioms.

Additionally, this research showed that the figurative meaning, which cannot be explained by traditional semantic analysis, can be elucidated by cognitive metaphor analysis.

Future research can be continued in 2 ways:

1. Further study of “anger” idiomatic expressions in British National Corpus in next collected 500 random samples, excluding the belles-lettres style from the analysis;
2. Comparison of the results derived from the research with the investigation of the “anger” idiomatic expressions collected in a language corpus of another language.

This thesis is an important aspect for the further development of the research in the field of applied linguistics connected to the “anger” and “angry” idiomatic expressions studied in Corpus Linguistics.

## REFERENCES

1. Allerton, D. J. (1984). Three (or four) levels of word cooccurrence restriction. *Lingua* 63, 17-40.
2. Ammer, C. (1997). *The American heritage dictionary of idioms*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
3. Anderson, W., & Corbett, J. (2017). *Exploring English with Online Corpora- Second Edition*. United Kingdom: Palgrave.
4. Andreou, G., Galamantos, L. (2008). Designing a conceptual syllabus for teaching metaphors and idioms in a foreign language context. *Porta Linguarum*, 9, 69-77
5. Antata, P. (2015). The Types of Idiom and Their Meaning in Maroon 5'S Hands All Over Album. Paper presented at *Faculty of Letters Udayana University*.
6. Brezin, V. (2018). *Statistics in Corpus Linguistics- A Practical Guide*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
7. Brezina, V., McEnery, T., & Wattam., S. (2015). Collocations in context: a new perspective on collocation networks. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 20, 139-173.
8. Cameron, L. (2011). *Metaphor and reconciliation: the discourse dynamics of empathy in post-conflict conversations*. London: Routledge.
9. Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2003). Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(3), 149-160.
10. Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary*. London and New York: Routledge
11. Croft, W., & Cruse, A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Cserép, A. (2001). *Motivation behind idioms of criticizing*. PhD dissertation. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadója
13. Dávid, G. (2002). *Spatiality underlying the conceptual system of figurative English*. PhD dissertation. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetem Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadója.
14. Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
15. Demjén, Zs. (2015). *Sylvia Plath and the language of affective states: written discourse and the experience of depression*. London: Bloomsbury.
16. Demmen, J., Semino, E., Demjén, Zs., Koller, V., Hardie, A., Rayson, P. and Payne, Sh. (2015). A computer-assisted study of the use of Violence metaphors for cancer and end of life by patients, family carers and health professionals. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 20(2), 205-31.

17. Emanatian M. (1995). Metaphor and the expression of emotion: The value of cross-cultural perspectives. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, 163-182.
18. Fauconnier, G. & Turner M. (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science* 22(2), 133-187.
19. Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
20. Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and idiomaticity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
21. Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. K. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone. *Language*, 64, 501-538.
22. Geeraerts, D., & S. Grondelaers (1995). Looking back at anger: Cultural traditions and metaphorical patterns. In J. Taylor and R. MacLaury (Ed.), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World* (pp.153-179). Berlin: Gruyter.
23. Gevaert C. (2001a). Anger in Old and Middle English: a 'hot' topic? *Belgian Essays on Language and Literature*, 89-101.
24. Gevaert C. (2001b). The anger is heat question: detecting cultural influence on the conceptualisation of anger through diachronic corpus analysis. In Nicole Delbecque, Johan van der Auwera, and Dirk Geeraerts (Ed.), *Perspectives on Variation* (pp. 195-208). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
25. Gibbs, R. W. (1993). Why idioms are not dead metaphors. In C. Cacciari & P. Tabossi (Ed.), *Idioms: structure and interpretation* (pp. 57-78). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
26. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
27. Gibbs, R. W. (1995). Idiomaticity and human cognition. In M. Everaert, E. J. van der Linden, A. Schenk, & R. Schreuder (Ed.), *Idioms: Structural and psychological perspectives* (pp. 97-132). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
28. Gibbs, R. W. (2007). Idioms and formulaic language. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics* (pp. 697-725). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Gibbs, R. W., & Nayak, N. (1989). Psycholinguistic studies on the syntactic behavior of idioms. *Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 100-138.
30. Gibbs, R. W., & O'Brien, J. (1990). Idioms and mental imagery: The metaphorical motivation for idiomatic meaning. *Cognition*, 36, 35-68.
31. Gibbs, R. W., Bogdanovich, J. M., Sykes, J. R., & Barr, D. J. (1997). Metaphor in idiom comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37(2), 141-154.
32. Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge.

33. Goossens, L. (2002). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In Dirven, R. & Pörings R. (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 349-377). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
34. Grady, J. (1997). *Foundations of meaning: primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Berkeley: University of California.
35. Grant, L. & Bauer, L. (2004). Criteria for re-defining idioms: are we barking up the wrong tree? *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (1), 38-61.
36. Heredia R., & Cieślicka A. B. (2016). Anger metaphors across languages: a cognitive linguistic perspective. In *Bilingual Figurative Language Processing* [Online] (pp. 342-367). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available: [https://www.academia.edu/7156763/K%C3%B6vecses\\_Zolt%C3%A1n\\_Arika\\_Akk%C3%B6k\\_E\\_Blanco\\_Carrion\\_O\\_Nucz\\_E\\_Szab%C3%B3\\_R\\_Szel%C3%ADd\\_V\\_2015\\_Anger\\_metaphors\\_across\\_languages\\_A\\_cognitive\\_linguistic\\_perspective\\_en\\_Roberto\\_Heredia\\_y\\_Anna\\_B\\_Cieslicka\\_Bilingual\\_Figurative\\_Processing\\_Cambridge\\_Cambridge\\_University\\_Press](https://www.academia.edu/7156763/K%C3%B6vecses_Zolt%C3%A1n_Arika_Akk%C3%B6k_E_Blanco_Carrion_O_Nucz_E_Szab%C3%B3_R_Szel%C3%ADd_V_2015_Anger_metaphors_across_languages_A_cognitive_linguistic_perspective_en_Roberto_Heredia_y_Anna_B_Cieslicka_Bilingual_Figurative_Processing_Cambridge_Cambridge_University_Press) [2023, March 19]
37. Horn, G. M. (2003). Idioms, metaphors and syntactic mobility. *Journal of Linguistics* 39 (2), 245-273.
38. Hunston S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Johansson F., M., & Gibbs R.W. (2012). Embodied motivations for metaphorical meanings. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 23(2), 251-272.
40. Kennedy, G. (1998). *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited
41. King & Brian (1989). *The Conceptual Structure of Emotional Experience in Chinese*. Paper presented at Ph.D.diss., Ohio State University.
42. Kövecses Z. (1988). *The Language of Love: The Semantics of Passion in Conversational English*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press.
43. Kövecses Z. (2000a). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
44. Kövecses, Z. (2000b). Metaphor and Emotion. ResearchGate [Online], 42. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299392688\\_Metaphor\\_and\\_Emotion](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299392688_Metaphor_and_Emotion) [2023, March 12]
45. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
46. Kövecses Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
47. Kövecses Z. (2010). *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

48. Kövecses Z., Tóth M., & Búlcsú B. (1996). A picture dictionary of English idioms. *Volume 2: Human relationships*. Hungary, Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
49. L'Hôte, E. (2014). *Identity, narrative and metaphor: a corpus-based cognitive analysis of New Labour discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
50. Lakoff G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
51. Lakoff G. (1990). The invariance hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics, 1*, 39-74.
52. Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
53. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
54. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
55. Lakoff, G., & Tumer, M. (1989). *More than cool reason*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
56. Mateu, J. (2020). Lexicalized Syntax: Phraseology. In J. Argenter & J. Lüdtke (Ed.), *Manual of Catalan Linguistics* (pp. 271-286). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
57. Mateu, J., & Espinal M. T. (2007). Argument structure and compositionality in idiomatic constructions. *Linguistic Review, 24(1)*, 33-59.
58. McEnery, T. & Hardie, A. (2012) *Corpus Linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
59. McEnery, T. & Wilson, A. (2001) *Corpus Linguistics*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
60. Moon, R. (1998a). *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English. A Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
61. Moon, R. (1998b). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
62. Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 21(1)*, 23-38.
63. Naciscione, A. (2001). *Phraseological units in discourse: Towards applied stylistics*. Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture.
64. Nunberg, G., Sag, I., & Wasow, T. (1994). *Idioms. Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 491-538.
65. O'Dell, F. & McCarthy, M. (2010). *English Idioms in Use Advanced with Answers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

66. Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1-39.
67. Rayson, P. (2008) . From key words to key semantic domains. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 519-549.
68. Riemer, N. (2002). When is a metonymy no longer a metonymy? In R. Dirven, & R. Pörings (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 379-406). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
69. Rosaldo M. (1980). *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
70. Sampson, G. (2001). *Empirical Linguistics*. London and New York: Continuum.
71. Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
72. Semino, E. (2017). Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In B. Dancygier, (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 463-476). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
73. Semino, E., Demjén Zs., Demmen, J., Koller, V., Payne, Sh., Hardie, A., & Rayson, P. (2015). The online use of Violence and Journey metaphors by patients with cancer, as compared with health professionals: a mixed methods study. *BMJ Supportive and Palliative Care*.
74. Shanskiy N. M. (Шанский Н. М.) (1985). *Фразеология современного русского языка*. Москва: Высшая школа
75. Siefiring, J. (2005). *The Oxford dictionary of idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
76. Sinclair, J. McH. (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
77. Steen, Gerard J., Dorst, Aletta G., Herrmann, J. Berenike, Kaal, Anna A., Krennmayr, T. & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification. From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
78. Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Words and their metaphors: a corpus-based approach. In Anatol Stefanowitsch and Stephan Th. Gries (Ed.), *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy* (pp. 63-105). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
79. Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
80. Talmy L. (1988). Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 12, 49-100.
81. Tognini Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
82. Torner, S., & Bernal, E. (Eds.). *Collocations and other lexical combinations in Spanish*. New York: Routledge.



83. Veale, T. (2012). *Exploding the creativity myth: the computational foundations of linguistic creativity*. London: Bloomsbury.
84. Yu & Ning (1998). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. A Perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
85. Yu & Ning. (1995). Metaphorical expression of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, 223-245.
86. Zinken, J. (2007). Discourse metaphors: the link between figurative language and habitual analogies. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18(3), 445-466.

## RESUME

Існує безліч досліджень ідіом у галузі прикладної лінгвістики. Більшість із них зображують ідіоми як фрази чи вирази, які представляють унікальне розуміння культурних і мовних відтінків мови. Крім того, вивчення ідіом, що виражають емоції через концептуальні метафори, зробило зв'язок між ідіомами та емоціями більш точним і зрозумілим, а поява корпусної лінгвістики (Corpus Linguistics) дозволяє нам досліджувати їх у різному контексті та великій кількості даних.

Актуальність теми полягає в тому, що англійські ідіоми, що виражають емоції через концептуальні метафори в корпусній лінгвістиці, не повністю досліджені в цій галузі. Дослідження ідіоматичних виразів “anger”, проведене на основі Американського корпусу (див. 2.10.), показало, що основними джерелами метафор ідіоматичних виразів “anger” в американській англійській мові є контейнер (container), одержимий об'єкт (possessed object) і опонент (opponent) (Heredia & Cie, 2016). Таким чином, основна увага цього дослідження зосереджена на аналізі ідіоматичних виразів, заснованих на концептуальних метафорах, знайдених серед 250 “anger” і 250 “angry” випадкових виразів, зібраних з Британського національного корпусу, і порівняння отриманих результатів даного дослідження з результатами дослідження проведеного на основі Американського мовного корпусу. (див. 2.10.). Дослідження також спрямоване на отримання відповідей на три основні питання дослідження та їх гіпотез, а саме:

1. Яка метафора домінує серед ідіоматичних виразів, зібраних серед 500 випадкових виразів “anger” і “angry” у Британському національному корпусі (BNC)?

Гіпотеза: Метафора ANGER IS A FORCE (ГНІВ - ЦЕ СИЛА) є домінуючою серед усіх зібраних ідіоматичних виразів, оскільки сила є динамікою майже кожного явища, напр. зброя - це інструмент, який робить нас сильними проти когось тощо.

2. Чи можна використати ту саму конкретну структурну метафору в підгрупі різних онтологічних метафор?

Гіпотеза: одна і та ж конкретна структурна метафора може бути використана в підгрупі різних онтологічних метафор.

3. Чи мають метафори ідіоматичних виразів гніву (“anger” idiomatic expressions), вивчених на основі Американського корпусу, такі ж особливості в ідіоматичних виразах “anger”, вивчених у Британському національному корпусі?

Гіпотеза: оскільки гнів вважається однією з основних емоцій, можна припустити, що він буде виражатися в однакових формах. Це може бути рідина, яка наповнює наше тіло, сила, яка керує нами тощо. Таким чином, метафори ідіоматичних виразів гніву, вивчених в

Американському корпусі, мають ті ж особливості в ідіоматичних виразах гніву, вивчених у Британському національному корпусі.

У першій частині даного дослідження розглядається значення ідіоми з традиційної та когнітивно-лінгвістичної точки зору, а також класифікація ідіом. Крім того, розглядаються подібності та відмінності між ідіомою та метафорою, як і зв'язок між ідіомою, метафорою та емоцією. У другій частині представлено корпусну лінгвістику, включаючи її основні характеристики, типи інструментів і корпусні дослідження метафори. Більше того, вона включає дослідження методу корпусної лінгвістики ідіоматичних виразів “anger”, зібраних з Британського Національного Корпусу (BNC), його висновки та обговорення результатів.

Результати даного дослідження підтвердили нашу гіпотезу про те, що:

- домінуюча метафора - ANGER IS A FORCE (ГНІВ - ЦЕ СИЛА), де сила виявилася майже в кожному ідіоматичному виразі;
- однакова елементарна метафора може бути використана в підгрупі різних онтологічних метафор, тобто ANGER IS A WEAPON (ГНІВ - ЦЕ ЗБРОЯ), яка зустрічається у двох онтологічних метафорах ANGER IS A FORCE й ANGER IS AN OBJECT (ГНІВ - ЦЕ СИЛА, а ГНІВ - ЦЕ ОБ'ЄКТ);
- метафори ідіоматичних виразів, зібраних в Американському корпусі, мають ті ж особливості, що й метафори, отримані серед ідіоматичних виразів, зібраних з BNC, а саме:
  - a) рівень інтенсивності - це глибина контейнера (наприклад, *deep anger*);
  - b) втрачає контроль - рідина витікає з контейнера (наприклад, *to vent his anger*);
  - c) гнів як об'єкт у чийсь володінні виражається тією ж конструкцією X's anger;
  - d) гнів - це супротивник (opponent) (зла сила), яка є битвою, яку ми можемо виграти (витримати) або програти (нездатні її контролювати). Крім того, опонент може бути виражений як зброя, яка використовується для спрямування гніву проти когось (ГНІВ - ЦЕ ОБ'ЄКТ) або як сила, яка може захистити нас від ворога (наприклад, *anger which has been turned inwards, can protect from overt anger*), що був наявним лише серед британських ідіом.

Крім того, це дослідження показало, що переносне значення, яке не можна пояснити за допомогою традиційного семантичного аналізу, можна з'ясувати за допомогою аналізу когнітивної метафори.

Подальші дослідження можна продовжити двома способами:

1. Дослідження ідіоматичних виразів “anger” у Британському національному корпусі в наступних 500 випадкових зразках, включаючи стиль художньої літератури з аналізу;

2. Порівняння результатів дослідження з дослідженням ідіоматичних виразів «гнів», зібраних у мовному корпусі іншої мови.

Дана тема є важливим аспектом для подальшого розвитку досліджень у галузі прикладної лінгвістики, пов'язаних із ідіоматичними виразами “anger” і “angry”, які вивчаються в корпусній лінгвістиці.

**APPENDIX**  
**FINDINGS OF RESEARCH**

<b>An ontological metaphor</b>	<b>Elementary metaphors related to the ontological metaphor</b>	<b>Idiomatic expressions</b>
ANGER IS A FORCE		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>beg all your anger on myself;</i></li> <li>2. <i>struggling to contain his anger;</i></li> <li>3. <i>he <b>kept his anger under control</b>;</i></li> <li>4. <i>the Labour movement <b>would be unable to control the justified anger of extremists</b> who were already forming anti-fascist organizations;</i></li> <li>5. <i>have generated an anger that she has tempered to a cause.;</i></li> <li>6. <i>kicked her down (in your anger);</i></li> <li>7. <i>we retaliate with force and anger;</i></li> <li>8. <i>A frustrated player can strike out in anger;</i></li> <li>9. <i>His mounting anger was making his speech more and more incomprehensible through his stroke-stiffened mouth;</i></li> <li>10. <i>people may remain frightened, consciously or unconsciously, <b>of the strength of their anger</b>;</i></li> <li>11. <i>a previously repressed anger comes back into consciousness and it becomes safer for a person to acknowledge his hostility;</i></li> <li>12. <i>makes her angry with the male;</i></li> <li>13. <i>had made him angry;</i></li> <li>14. <i>make you angry.</i></li> </ol>
	ANGER IS AN EVIL FORCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>I have withstood your anger;</i></li> <li>2. <i>in a way which will not rouse the horse's fear or anger;</i></li> <li>3. <i>we are often afraid of our own anger;</i></li> <li>4. <i>It is quite understandable to be afraid of the anger of others who make life unpleasant for us;</i></li> <li>5. <i>These people are afraid of anger to such an extent that they are dishonest;</i></li> </ol>

		6. <i>We can still be afraid of expressing our anger.</i>
	ANGER IS A WEAPON	1. <i>anger and frustration injures us;</i> 2. <i>using anger to force a child into what we believe they should or should not do;</i> 3. <i>using Daphne's expression of anger not only to protect;</i> 4. <i>Anger can be used as a defence against depression.</i>
	ANGER IS A WEAPON AGAINST THE OVERT ANGER	<i>Anger which has been turned inwards, can protect from overt anger or fear of violence</i>
	ANGER IS AN ENEMY	1. <i>Her anger brings on an attack;</i> 2. <i>have to face anger and disgust from your children;</i> 3. <i>Anger Against professionals';</i> 4. <i>ANGER -- THE DESTROYER;</i> 5. <i>Fear of anger;</i> 6. <i>the courage and conviction to face the process of anger;</i> 7. <i>We can still be afraid of expressing our anger, unable to vent our rage;</i> 8. <i>do not face our anger or frustration at work;</i> 9. <i>parker defended against his own expression of anger;</i> 10. <i>bouts of anger.</i>
	ANGER IS A CONFRONTATION	1. <i>This statement will <b>anger many well-meaning vegetarians and vegans;</b></i> 2. <i>the authority aroused much anger among writers;</i> 3. <i>their first reaction was one of anger at his disregard of their wishes.</i>
	ANGRY CONFRONTATION IS A GRADUAL ACCUMULATION	<i>an angry confrontation can develop from an anxious niggles</i>
	ANGER IS A SOURCE OF POWER	1. <i>Catherine's anger was also aroused;</i> 2. <i>we described the defence of splitting between the anger and the yearning aroused by the absence of the needed, safe figure.</i>
	ANGER IS A SOURCE OF ENVY	<i>Envy [...] has its roots in the innate and primitive anger.</i>
	ANGER IS FIRE	1. <i>to overlook sudden flashes of anger;</i> 2. <i>sparked racial anger;</i> 3. <i>anger is suppress it;</i>

		<p>4. <i>Suppression of anger;</i>  5. <i>We have to do this as to suppress anger is to turn our negativity inward.;</i>  6. <i>anger can be suppressed by a clenched jaw;</i>  7. <i>Suppression of feelings such as anger, disappointment;</i>  8. <i>suppressing anger.</i></p>
	ANGER IS A FIRE IN A CONTAINER	<i>anger about Clive's absences and frequent lateness remained firmly repressed.</i>
	ANGER IS EXPLOSION	<i>self-righteous anger, which seem to erupt for no apparent reason</i>
	ANGER IS A MOTIVATION	<p>1. <i>lower income groups is more likely to be motivated by anger at the focus on up-market housing;</i>  2. <i>the dog interpreting your anger as excitement.</i></p>
	ANGER IS ENERGY	<i>to channel anger into movement.</i>
	ANGER IS A FUEL FOR DETERMINATION	<i>Fuel your determination with that anger</i>
	ANGER IS TEARING	<i>Johnson tore up all her letters in his anger at her marriage</i>
	ANGER IS A KILLER	<p>1. <i>his anger with his brother had actually killed him;</i>  2. <i>his anger had killed his brother;</i>  3. <i>could easily have killed George through their anger.</i></p>
	ANGER IS PRESSURE	<i>having its legs brushed with anger</i>
	ANGER IS OUT OF BODY'S CONTROL	<i>shaking with anger</i>
	ANGER IS A FERTILIZER	<i>the Aube population nigh on fermented with anger.</i>
	ANGER IS A LEGITIMATE CAUSE	<i>Anger is legitimate -- it can be a good thing to' let off steam'</i>
	ANGER IS A CAUSE	<p>1. <i>the innate, primitive anger and anxiety of infancy, when food and comfort were withheld;</i>  2. <i>his face red from alcohol and anger.</i></p>
	ANGER IS ANTHROPOGENIC FORCE	<i>break out in angry and violent rebellion</i>
	ANGRY BEES ARE MERCILESS	<i>(TWO lorry drivers were) Stung from head to foot by thousands of angry bees yesterday.</i>
	ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR	<i>Leeds swoop for angry Andy</i>
	ANGRY BEHAVIOUR IS AGGRESSIVE ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR	<p>1. <i>The great Dane threw an angry supporter off the pitch;</i>  2. <i>a small rotund figure, angry as a bee.</i></p>

	ANGRY EYES ARE AN ANIMAL AGGRESSIVE GLARE	<i>reversing lights two angry eyes beaming at me</i>
	ANGRY STORM OF CRITICISM IS A NATURAL FORCE	<i>the angry storm of criticism which arose from the 'crucifix action'</i>
	ANGER IS A NATURAL FORCE	<i>column of rock that rises 200 feet out of the angry waves at its base.</i>
ANGER IS AN OBJECT		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. hid their anger;</li> <li>2. share the Queen's anger;</li> <li>3. anger was voiced at the action of the socialist majority;</li> <li>4. a mood of <b>frustrated anger</b> which tinted the utopian cravings;</li> <li>5. women <b>find their lonely anger</b> or isolated oppression;</li> <li>6. can you allow that determination, that anger, to drain away;</li> <li>7. the dog interpreting your anger as excitement; get me so angry (others: he gets very angry; we got angry; get upset or angry; get angry; to get angry; to get really angry; do not get angry; get angry about this bully);</li> <li>8. I feel/felt angry; they feel angry; feel very angry; I feel really angry, etc.</li> <li>9. I got a very defensive angry stare from a young man;</li> <li>10. stave off an angry attack;</li> <li>11. trigger an angry response;</li> <li>12. There is a danger that in getting angry with yourself,</li> </ol>
	ANGER IS A WEAPON	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. directed their anger;</li> <li>2. who shows anger only against those who break the code of decency; we direct our anger and frustration at them</li> <li>3. Divert anger into some activity where it will not hurt others;</li> <li>4. direct her anger towards the medical or nursing staff who cared for her husband;</li> <li>5. have feelings of guilt and anger against herself;</li> </ol>



		6. <i>to express anger at the perpetrator;</i> 7. <i>to express anger at the perpetrator.</i>
	ANGER IS AN OBJECT THAT CAN BE IN EVERYBODY'S POSSESSION	<i>This can lead to mutual anger and resentment</i>
	ANGER IS AN OBJECT IN SOMEBODY ELSE'S POSSESSION	<i>anger not strictly her due.</i>
	ANGER IS AN OBJECT WE MAY RECEIVE FROM THE INTERLOCUTOR	<i>I'll have an angry response from men who'll say</i>
	ANGER IS AN OBJECT IN SOMEONE'S POSSESSION	1. <i>their own anger;</i> 2. <i>anger of which they have command;</i> 3. <i>his own anger;</i> 4. <i>to have angry words with Zoff;</i> 5. <i>there is only my anger.</i>
	ANGER IS ENTITY THAT WE CAN ILLUSTRATE.	<i>nowhere was the anger better illustrated</i>
	ANGER IS AN OPPONENT	1. <i>DEALING WITH ANGER;</i> 2. <i>anger I had not dealt with;</i> 3. <i>What to do about anger.</i>
	ANGER IS A COMPONENT OF MINEFIELD	<i>A minefield seems to open up: complexity, controversy, doubt, anxiety, anger, bitterness.</i>
	ANGER IS A CURRENCY	<i>He then runs out of anger</i>
	ANGER IS THE HORSE'S RAISED FEET	<i>the horse will always associate having its feet picked up with anger and fear</i>
	ANGER IS A POSSESSION	1. <i>Their own anger;</i> 2. <i>where even my pure anger had been stolen from me.</i>
	ANGER IS ONE SIDE OF THE COIN	<i>Love and anger, it seems, are two sides of the same coin.</i>
	ANGRY ITCHING BUMPS ARE IN SOMEONE'S POSSESSION	<i>the angry itching bumps</i>
ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE		
	ANGER IS A GROWING SUBSTANCE/ ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE THAT CAN GROW	1. <i>She became particularly angry;</i> 2. <i>I would feel very, very angry about it;</i> 3. <i>actions of the Italians in getting very very frustrated and angry now;</i> 4. <i>get very angry with us</i> 5. <i>anger growing inside you.</i>
	ANGER IS A FLAMMABLE SUBSTANCE.	1. <i>anger exploded;</i> 2. <i><b>The anger this sparked in the</b></i>

		<p>population;</p> <p>3. lest any anger triggers;</p> <p>4. the explosion of hers;</p> <p>5. outbursts of anger</p>
	ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE THAT WE CAN GET A LITTLE AND A LOT	<p>1. much of the anger;</p> <p>2. much of the hate and anger.</p>
	ANGER IS A FLUID	<p>1. in the anger he felt at;</p> <p>2. <b>the unmitigated anger may well seep out in constant irritation</b> over relatively trivial things;</p> <p>3. anger which has been turned inwards;</p> <p>4. his anger seeped out in irritation;</p> <p>5. Rose, in her newly felt anger, started to complain about Clive's detached behaviour;</p> <p>6. all your <b>anger</b> and frustration <b>surge out</b> as you let go of your feelings about the meeting;</p> <p>7. anxiety can <b>turn a normally peaceable horse into an angry, rearing, uncontrollable animal;</b></p> <p>8. carry a lot of anger towards him.</p>
	ANGER IS A HOT FLUID	<p>Projects directed at cooling the anger of the male unemployed</p>
	ANGER IS A BOILING FLUID	<p>1. the composition was that of a witch his anger boiled over;</p> <p>2. I had <b>adrenalin pumping out the top of my hat in anger</b> that my man had left me to die;</p> <p>3. feel anger welling up within you.</p>
	ANGER IS A FLUID IN A LARGE AMOUNT	<p>a great deal of anger</p>
	ANGER IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER	<p>1. to kick a ball in anger;</p> <p>2. left in anger;</p> <p>3. shouting in anger</p> <p>4. he said it in anger</p> <p>5. don't even say things in anger</p> <p>6. the least touching of someone in anger.</p>
	ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE IN OF A CONTAINER	<p>1. headaches and tension are the end result of keeping anger bottled up;</p> <p>2. anger about Clive's absences and frequent lateness remained firmly repressed;</p> <p>3. column of rock that rises 200 feet out of the angry waves at its</p>

		<i>base;</i> <i>4. I zipped up the flaps, not daring to show my anger.</i>
	ANGER IS A SUBSTANCE OUT OF A CONTAINER	1. <i>all Jack's anger was taken out on Piggy;</i> 2. <i>release his anger;</i> 3. <i>his anger left him suddenly;</i> 4. <i>Queen's anger knew no bounds.</i>
	ANGER IS THE FILTH.	<i>to purge his anger and hurt</i>
	ANGER IS A HOT STEAM COMING OUT OF A CONTAINER THAT HELP US TO AVOID AN EXPLOSION	1. <i>he vents his anger for his dead friend on nature;</i> 2. <i>to vent his anger upon those around him;</i> 3. <i>vents his anger;</i> 4. <i>vented their anger.</i>
ANGER IS A LIVING BEING		1. <i>Anger runs in furrows;</i> 2. <b><i>the anger</i></b> and depression caused by the announcements <b><i>will be healed.</i></b> ; 3. <i>her expression of anger kept him in touch with that unrecognized part of himself;</i> 4.
	ANGER IS MAJESTY	<i>to give way to anger</i>
	ANGER IS CELEBRITY	<i>there have been <b>times of anger</b></i>
	ANGER IS AN INTERLOCUTOR	<i>Rose Greenacre managed to get in touch with the anger</i>
	ANGER IS A UNTAMED BEING	<i>anger could be tamed.</i>
	ANGER IS A LIVING BEING THAT CAN WALK	<i>anger came after Rovers</i>
	ANGER IS A PLANT.	1. <i>festering anger;</i> 2. <i>anger growing inside you.</i>
	ANGER IS A CONTROLLER	<i>anger of which they have command.</i>
	ANGER IS A HUNTER	<i>And who is <b>the object of this anger?</b></i>

Ім'я користувача:  
Каталін Гнатик

ID перевірки:  
1015079549

Дата перевірки:  
15.05.2023 09:46:22 CEST

Тип перевірки:  
Doc vs Internet + Library

Дата звіту:  
20.05.2023 16:26:19 CEST

ID користувача:  
100011753

Назва документа: Coninesc\_Krisztina\_szakdolgozat

Кількість сторінок: 68 Кількість слів: 24765 Кількість символів: 163863 Розмір файлу: 637.89 KB ID файлу: 1014764846

## 6.09% Схожість

Найбільша схожість: 1.37% з Інтернет-джерелом (<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anna-Cieslicka/publication/2906>).

6.09% Джерела з Інтернету

281

Сторінка 70

Не знайдено джерел з Бібліотеки

## 17.6% Цитат

Цитати

156

Сторінка 71

Посилання

1

Сторінка 79

## 1.04% Вилучень

Деякі джерела вилучено автоматично (фільтри вилучення: кількість знайдених слів є меншою за 8 слів та 0%)

0.81% Вилучення з Інтернету

68

Сторінка 80

1.03% Вилученого тексту з Бібліотеки

50

Сторінка 81

## Модифікації

Виявлено модифікації тексту. Детальна інформація доступна в онлайн-звіті.

Замінені символи

6