

Metaphorical Conceptualization of Emotive Concepts in Amharic

Gashaw Arutie Asaye*

Abstract: This article describes the construal of emotive concepts such as anger, fear, love, hate, and sadness in Amharic, a Semitic language spoken in Ethiopia. The study is conducted within the framework of cognitive semantics, specifically guided by the conceptual metaphor theory. The database of the study includes written texts, elicitation, and introspection as supporting methods. The study has shown that emotive concepts can be metaphorically structured in terms of various source domains. For example, anger can be associated with the devil, insanity, fire, wounds, and physical force. Additionally, linguistic expressions that originate from the domain of containment, womanhood, and excretion can be used to describe a state of fear. The source domains of space (more specifically, a bounded region, a moving entity, and a downward type of verticality schema), injury, black color, and bitter taste can be mapped onto the target domain of sadness. It has also been found that the emotion of love can be understood through physical force and as an object. In Amharic, spatialization metaphors, specifically, terms corresponding to an OUT schema can be used to talk about hate. The motivations behind such mappings are physical and cultural experiences.

Keywords: emotive concepts, metaphorical conceptualization, conceptual metaphors, Amharic

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine how metaphorical expressions of Amharic, a Semitic language spoken in Ethiopia, are used to understand emotive concepts such as anger, sadness, hate, love, and fear. Lakoff & Johnson (1980, p. 464) stated that most of our basic semantic concepts are understood by using one or more spatialization metaphors. The article is written within the framework of the conceptual metaphor theory. In this theory, language is seen as providing data that can show how human beings understand concepts (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p.116).

In classic theories, all subject matters can be understood literally. A metaphor was considered a language that is not used in ordinary everyday language. Besides, it was viewed as a matter of

* Assistant Professor of Descriptive and Theoretical Linguistics, Bahir Dar University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Ethiopian Languages and Literature

language (Lakoff 1993, p. 202). However in contemporary theory, i.e., conceptual metaphor theory, a metaphor has been found to exist in all aspects of everyday life, not only in language but also in thought and action where metaphorical expressions are used to conceptualize one mental domain through another domain. Thus, metaphorical expressions can be seen as general mappings across conceptual domains (see Kövecses 2015, p. 2, 2010a, p. 3; Lakoff & Johnson 2003, p. 3; Lakoff 1993, p. 203). There are two types of conceptual domains: the source domain and the target domain. The source domain is a conceptual domain from which metaphorical expressions are drawn to understand another conceptual domain called the target domain (Kövecses 2010a, p. 4).

Within contemporary metaphor theory, metaphor serves to understand or experience one kind of thing in terms of another and can be seen as part of conceptual systems; it is not just a matter of language of mere words (see Lakoff & Johnson 2003, p. 6; Glynn 2002, p. 542; Lakoff 1993, p. 208). For instance, the metaphorical expression LOVE IS A JOURNEY is an ontological mapping between two domains, meaning that, we understand the target domain, LOVE, using the source domain, JOURNEY. Therefore, metaphor is not a matter of a particular word or expression. In general, it is not purely a linguistic expression but a thought or reason. The mapping is primary and language is secondary (Lakoff 1993, p. 208).

Metaphorical expressions map different kinds of image-schemas. The most important image-schemas include containment-related schemas (container, in-out, surface, full-empty, and content), locomotion schemas (momentum, source-path-goal), force-related schemas (compulsion, blockage, counterforce, restraint removal, enablement, attraction, and diversion), space-related schemas (front-back, right-left, up-down, center-periphery, near-far, contact, straight, verticality), balance-related schemas (axis balance, twin-pan balance, point balance, equilibrium), unity-related schemas (part-whole, link, mass count merging, splitting, collection, iteration), identity-related schemas (superimposition, matching), and existence-related schemas (removal, bound space, cycle, scale, process, object) (see Evans & Green 2006, p. 190; Johnson, 1987, pp. 126, 217; Lakoff, 1987, p. 267). Image-schemas that characterize source domains such as containers and paths are mapped onto target domains like categories and linear scales (Lakoff 1993, p. 228).

Metaphorical mappings obey an invariance principle, meaning that, “metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (that is, the image-schema structure) of the source domain, in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain” (Lakoff, 1993, p. 215). This principle ensures that the interiors of container-schemas are mapped onto the interiors of target domains; the exteriors of container schemas are mapped onto the exteriors of target domains and the boundaries of container schemas are mapped onto the boundaries of the target domain. For path schemas, sources are mapped onto sources; goals are mapped onto goals; trajectories are mapped onto trajectories, and so on (see Lakoff 1993, p.215). Thus, image-schemas rooted in human experiences govern mappings across conceptual domains (Li, 2014, p. 26).

Mapping, a systematic correspondence between the source domain and target domain, that allows us to conceptualize one aspect of a concept in terms of another highlights one aspect of a concept, that is consistent with the metaphor while concealing other aspects that are inconsistent with the metaphor. A metaphorical concept allows us to give more emphasis on one aspect of a concept but it can prevent us from focusing on other aspects, unrelated to that metaphorical expression (Lakoff & Johnson , 2003, p. 10).

Geeraerts (2010, p. 204) summarizes that conceptual metaphor theory is based on three fundamental ideas: first, the view that metaphor is a cognitive phenomenon; second, the belief that metaphorical expressions need to be analyzed as mapping between two conceptual domains such as source and target domains; and third, the notion that linguistic semantics is grounded in experience.

Previous Studies

Studying metaphors from the perspective of cognitive semantics in Ethiopian languages is a very recent phenomenon. Previous studies that focus on Amharic metaphorical expressions are Derib's (2016, 2007) papers. The theoretical background of both works is Lakoff's (1993) conceptual metaphor theory. The study by Derib (2016) describes how the concept of time is understood in Amharic. The study identifies that time can be comprehended in terms of an opponent, an authority, a container, a garment, a load, a wealthy person, a resource, and space. On the other hand, Derib's (2007) study dealt with Amharic metaphorical expressions with the source domain of an opponent. The analysis showed that opponent metaphors can be ascribed to various concepts such as emotions, activities, celebrations or events, scarcity or problem, relationships, addiction, longing for food or drink, and states like sleep and life. Besides, the study identified that love can be construed as a fire and as a dangerous animal.

Methods for Collecting Data

The database of the present study is mainly based on written texts and elicitation. The written texts are Amsalu & Dagnachew's (1988) book of Amharic idiomatic expressions and Getaneh's (2017) translated novel. I read both books very thoroughly and pick metaphorical expressions for emotions. For the elicitation, 15 consultants from different core Amhara areas have participated. Moreover, introspective data was used to some extent because I am a native speaker of the language.

Results and Discussions

In Amharic, linguistic metaphors that can be used to organize emotive concepts such as anger, fear sadness, love, and hate were detected. Here, the metaphors are presented based on the target domains that they describe.

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Metaphorical Conceptualization of ANGER

In Amharic, the emotive concept of ANGER can be understood as the devil. This yields the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS THE DEVIL. The supposition is that people usually control their emotions and, when they do not control it, it is labeled as *səjt'an* 'Devil'.

- (1) a. *səjt'an-u* *mət't-o-bb-ət-all*
 devil-POSS3SG.M come.CVB-3SG.M-APPL.MAL-OBJ3SG.M-AUX[†]
 'He is angry.' (lit. His devil has come on him.) (Getaneh 2017, p.42)
- b. *ingidih* *səjt'an-e-n* *al-ti-a-mit'a-w > [attamit'aw]*
 here.after devil-POSS.1SG-ACC NEG-2SG.M-CAUS-come.IMP-OBJ3SG.M
 'Do not make me angry hereafter!' (lit. 'Hereafter, do not bring my devil!')
- c. *dzinnijam*
 one.who.is.possessed.by.the.devil.spirit
 'One who is angry' (lit. One who is possessed by the devil spirit')
 (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988, p. 241)

As can be seen, the morpheme *-u* in (1a) and *-e* in (1b) mark *səjt'an* 'the Devil' as a possessee. That is, *səjt'an* 'the Devil' can be perceived as an entity one can possess of. The linguistic metaphors under discussion reflect that a state of being angry is described as being a locus or goal of the movement of the Devil; the change of state from neutrality to anger is expressed as a movement of the Devil; and a cause of anger is conceived as a cause of motion, as in (1b). Thus, the examples depict anger as the Devil. The metaphor ANGER IS THE DEVIL has a culturally grounded experiential basis. In the culture of Amhara, there is a perspective that the Devil is irrational, violent, and dangerous and does evil things. Similarly, when one gets angry, they may behave irrationally and may do violent and dangerous things.

In addition, Amharic linguistic metaphors suggest that the concept of ANGER can be understood in terms of the concept of FIRE. This results in the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. Consider some of the linguistic metaphors provided below.

- (2) a. *issu isat ləbs-o* *isat g'wərs-o* *mət't'a*
 He fire wear.CVB-3SG.M fire load.CVB-3SG.M come.3SG.M

[†] Note the Following abbreviations: 1 (first person), 2 (second person), 3 (third person), ACC (accusative), APPL (applicative), AUX (auxiliary), BEN (benefactive), CAUS (causative), CNT (contingent aspect), COP (copula), CVB (converb), DEF (definite), F (feminine), GEN (genitive), IDEO (ideophone), IMP (imperative), PL (plural), POSS (possessive), REL (relative), SG (singular), TR (transitive)

eye-POSS3SG.M PASS-bulge.CVB-3SG.M GEN-anger fire
ji-təfa nəbbər
 3SG.M-spit.IPFV COP.PST.3SG.M

‘His eyes bulged out, and he was very angry.’ (lit. His eyes having bulged and he was spitting fire of anger.) (Getaneh 2017,p.42)

In these examples, the terms *isat* ‘fire’ (2a, j), *nəbəlbal* ‘flame’ (2c), *tək’at’t’əl-* ‘burn’ (2b), *tənk’ələk’k’əl-* ‘blaze’ (2c), *k’ək’k’əl-* ‘boil in water’ (2e), *arrər-* ‘scorch’ (2f,g), *kəssəl-* ‘become charcoal’ (2h) and *tʃ’əs-* ‘fume’ (2i) convey information about the notion of fire. Metaphorically, these terms describe different degrees of anger. This shows that the concept of anger is conceptually structured using the concept of fire in the language. The conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE is found in many other languages including English (cf. Kövecses, 2010b, p. 753, 2000, p. 21, 1986, p. 13). This is because it is grounded in a universal physiological experience. When we get angry, our blood temperature rises. That is, anger increases our body heat (cf. Kövecses, 2010b, p. 753, 1986, p. 13).

Moreover, the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER is also found in Amharic (see example (3) below).

- (3) a. *bə=niddet hod-u nəffər-ə*
 with=anger belly-POSS3SG.M boil-3SG.M
 ‘He boiled with anger.’ (lit. ‘His belly boiled with anger.’)
 (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p. 131)
- b. *bə=niddet gənəffəl-ə*
 with=anger boil.over-3SG.M
 ‘He got angry suddenly.’ (lit. ‘He boiled over with anger.’)
 (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p. 248)
- c. *dəm-u fəlla*
 blood-POSS3SGM boil.SBJ3SGM
 ‘He got angry.’ (lit. ‘His blood boiled.’) (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.286)
- d. *niddet-u si=ji-bərd-ill-ət*
 anger-POSS3SGM when=3SGM-cool.IPFV-APPL.BEN-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘When he calms down ...’ (lit. ‘When his anger cools down...’)

The verbs *nəffər-* ‘boil’ (3a), *gənəffəl-* ‘boil over’ (3b), and *fəlla* ‘boil’ (3c) denote a boiling state of the fluid, but they express the concept of anger metaphorically. In addition, the verb *-bərd* ‘cool’ in (3d), which entails that it was hot, shows that one who gets angry is viewed as a hot thing. So the linguistic metaphors in (3) suggest that the abstract concept of anger is conceptualized by means of the concrete concept of hot fluid.

Besides, the concept of anger can metaphorically be conceptualized as insanity. This association yields the conceptual metaphor of ANGER IS INSANITY. Consider the following examples.

- (4) a. *ində=ibd adərrəg-ə-w*
 like=crazy make-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘It made him very angry.’ (lit. ‘It made him like a crazy.’)
- b. *ibd hon-ə*
 crazy become-3SG.M
 ‘He got angry.’ (lit. ‘He became crazy.’)
- c. *al-ti-as-abbid-əp > [attasabbidəp]*
 NEG-3SG.M-CAUS-be.insane.IMP-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘Do not make me very angry!’ (lit. ‘Do not make me crazy!’)
 (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988, p. 151)

The terms *ibd* ‘crazy’ (4a, b) and *-abbid* ‘be insane’ (4c) come from the language of insanity, but they encode the concept of anger metaphorically. This shows that anger can be structured in terms of insanity. The association of insanity and anger may be grounded on our physical experiences. An insane man may not control his mind and may behave and act irrationally. With the same analogy, an angry man may lose his mind and his actions may be irrational and uncontrollable.

Furthermore, the linguistic examples presented below indicate that Amharic speakers can conceptualize anger in terms of a physical force. This results in the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A PHYSICAL FORCE.

- (5) a. *nidet jaz-ə-w*
 anger hold-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘He gets angry.’ (lit. ‘Anger held him.’)
- b. *nidet-u si=ji-lək’k’-əw*
 anger-POSS3SG.M when=3SG.M-leave.IPFV-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘When he calms down’ (lit. ‘When his anger leaves him’)

Notice that the verbs *jaz-* ‘hold’ in (5a) literally expresses the situation of holding someone. In the example, it describes that anger holds the one who gets angry. Here, anger is seen as being capable of exerting force and capable of taking control of the one who gets angry. Similarly, the verb *-lək’k’* ‘leave’ in (5b) entails a state of calmness and presupposes a state of anger. The linguistic metaphor (5b) shows that a state of calmness is viewed as the situation of being released by anger. Thus, the expressions in (5) are the linguistic manifestations of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A PHYSICAL FORCE.

As can be evidenced by the linguistic metaphors below, the emotive concept of anger can also be understood by means of a physical wound. In this association, the feeling that one has when he

experiences physical wound maps onto the feeling one has when he is in a state of anger. Consider the following examples.

- (6) a. *bə=jə-səw-otfif-u > [bəšəwotfifu] tənkol libb-u*
 by=gen-person-PL-DEF ruse heart-POSS3SG.M
k'wəsl-o-all > [k'wəsil'wəll]
 wound.CVB-3SG.M-AUX
 'He gets angry by the ruse of the persons.' (lit. 'His heart has been wounded by the ruse of the persons.') (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.24)
- b. *libb-u-n a-məggəl-ə-w*
 heart-POSS3SG.M-ACC CAUS-suppurate-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
 'He made him very angry.' (lit. 'It made one's heart suppurate.')
 (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.141)

In these linguistic examples, the expressions *k'wəsl-* 'having been wounded' (6a) and *məggəl-* 'suppurate' (6b) come from the language of a physical wound. Metaphorically, they describe a high degree of anger. This implies that the conceptualization of a state of being in an extreme anger in terms of a physical wound is found in the culture of the Amharic speech community.

Finally, it is also found out that an extreme level of anger is metaphorically conceptualized as unnatural features such as having horns (see example (7)).

- (7) *k'ənd a-bək'k'əl-ə*
 horn CAUS-sproute-3SG.M
 'He fumed with rage.' (lit. 'He sprouted horns.')

Note that this linguistic metaphor describes a state of being in an extreme level of anger. In a literal sense, the expression is not acceptable. This is because a human being cannot have horns. The mapping of the unnatural feature (i.e. having horns) onto a higher level of anger shows that Amharic speakers perceive that an extreme level of anger is beyond the level that one can show angeriness.

To summarize, the emotive concept of ANGER can be conceptualized in terms of fire, a hot fluid, the devil, insanity, a physical wound, a physical force and the like.

Metaphorical Conceptualization of FEAR

The more concrete concept of SPACE in a source domain can be mapped onto a more abstract concept of FEAR in a target domain. Fear can be understood as a container.

- (8) a. *istə ahun firhat > [firat] wist' nə-n*
 until now fear in COP-1PL
 'We are still frightened.' (lit. 'We are still in fear.')

- b. *səw-u hulu firhat > [firat] wist' gəbt-o ...*
 person-DEF all fear in enter.CVB-3SG.M
 'Everyone having feared ...' (lit. 'All people having entered into fear ...')
- c. *ahun-imm tə=firhat > [təfirat] al-wət't'a-n-imm*
 now-FOC from=fear NEG-exit-1PL-NCM
 'We still fear.' (lit. 'We still did not exit out of fear.')

The spatial postposition *wist'* 'in' in (8a) and (8b) shows that the concept of FEAR is perceived as a container. In example (8c), the preposition *tə* 'from' suggests that fear can be viewed as a location. In this example, the use of the verb *wət't'a-* 'exit' presupposes that the location is a container.

From the linguistic metaphors in (8), the following set of correspondences can be drawn between the target domain of fear and the source domain of a container. A state of fear is described as a container; being in fear is expressed as being in a container; change of states from a state of neutrality or fearlessness to a state of fear perceived as moving into a container, while from a state of fear to a state of neutrality or fearlessness is moving out of a container; and the one who fears is conceptualized as a spatial figure. Thus, the conceptual metaphor FEAR IS A CONTAINER arises from such mappings.

Fear can also be associated with an excessive amount of excretion. One who fears something can be seen as the one who excretes a lot. This results in the conceptual metaphor FEAR IS AN EXCRETION. See the following examples.

- (9) a. *issu ikko səw al-ji-məta-mm > [ajimətam] fəntam*
 he FOC man NEG-3SG.M-hit.IPFV-NCM one.who.urinate.a.lot
nə-u > [nəw]
 COP-3SG.M
 'He never hits a man; he is a coward.' (lit. 'He is the one who urinates a lot.')
- b. *polis-otif li-ji-jiz-u-h > [lijzuh] bə=məmt'at laj*
 police-PL pros-3-hold.IPFV-PL-OBJ2SG.M by=to.come on
nə-at/itəw > [natitəw] bil-o as-fənnə-ə-w > [afənnaw]
 COP-3SG.M say.CVB-3SG.M CAUS-urinate-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
 'He made him frightened by telling that polices are coming to him.' (lit. 'He made him urinate by having said that polices are coming to hold him.') (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 71)
- c. *antə aram zimm bəl*
 you one.who.defecates.a.lot silent.IDEO say.IMP.2SG.M
 'You coward, do not say a word.' (lit. 'You, the one who defecates a lot, be silent.')

The terms *ʃintam* (9a) and *aram* (9c) literally refer to the one who urinates and defecates a lot respectively. Metaphorically, the expressions connote one who feels great fear. The mapping of an excessive amount of excretion onto fear is grounded on our physical experiences. When one panics, he may lose his motor skills to control his excretion. At that moment of panic, he may excrete a lot.

Moreover, the emotive concept of FEAR can be conceptualized in terms of femaleness. FEAR IS FEMALE. Consider the following examples.

- (10) a. *ine antə-n tə=al-aʃənnəʃ-hu > [talaʃənnəʃhu] k'əmis*
 I you-ACC if=NEG-defeat-1SG dress
ləbss-e-all-əhu > [ləbʃʃalləhu]
 wear.CVB-1SG-AUX-1SG
 'If I do not defeat you, I am a coward.' (lit. 'If I do not defeat you, I have worn a dress.')
- b. *ine dʒib tə=fəra-hu set bil-əh t'iraŋ*
 I hyena if=fear-1sg woman say-CVB-2SG.M call.IMP.2SG.M-OBJ2SG
 'If I fear a hyena, I am a coward.' (lit. 'If I fear a hyena, call me a woman.')
- c. *issu-n tə=al-gəddəl-hu > [talgədəlhu] surri al-tat'ək'-hu-mm*
 he-ACC if=NEG-kill-1SG.M pants NEG-wear-1SG.M-NCM
 'If I do not kill him, I am a coward.' (lit. 'If I do not kill him, I do not wear pants.')
- d. *issu jə-ine-n > [jənən] miʃt li-ji-wəs-d-at > [liwəsdat]*
 he GEN-I-ACC wife pros-3sg.m-take-obj3sg.f
bə=k'immīt'-e ʃəntt-e-all-əhu-a > [ʃəntʃifalləh'a]
 with=sitting.possition-poss1sg urinate.CVB-1SG-AUX-1SG-FOC
 'Is he going to take over my wife? [If so,] I am a coward.' (lit. 'Is he going to take over my wife? [If so,] I urinate in a sitting position.')

The linguistic metaphors in (10) suggest that the mental state of fear can be associated with the female gender. For instance, the utterances *k'əmis ləbissealləhu > [ləbiʃʃalləhu]* 'I have worn a dress' (10a) connotes a state of fear. Notice that males, in Ethiopian culture, particularly in the culture of the Amharic speech community, are supposed to wear pants, while females are supposed to wear a dress. When one says that he wears a dress, he means that he is a coward which is not expected from males. Similarly, the utterances *set biləh t'iraŋ* 'call me a woman' (10b), *surri altat't'ək'humm* 'I do not wear pants' (10c) and *bək'immīt'e ʃənttealləhua > [ʃəntʃifalləh'a]* 'I have urinated in a sitting position' (10d), in literal sense, represent femaleness. However, metaphorically, the expressions can be used to represent a state of fear. The mapping of femaleness into a mental state of fear has cultural motivation. In the culture of Amharic

speech community, males are supposed to be brave but not females. So when one expresses fear, he may use expressions related to the female gender.

Finally, there are few linguistic metaphors showing that fear can be understood by means of sweating (11), stew not containing any pepper (12), the fact of being betrayed by heart (13) and the fact of not having gall (14).

FEAR IS SWEATING.

- (11) *igāle-n allib-o-t-all*
 so-and-so-ACC sweat.CVB-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M-AUX
 ‘So-and-so is afraid [of something].’ (lit. ‘So-and-so perspired.’) (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.138)

FEAR IS STEW NOT CONTAINING ANY PEPPER.

- (12) *jə-wənd allitf’f’a*
 GEN-male stew.not.containing.any.pepper
 ‘Spineless person’ (lit. ‘A man who is a stew not containing any pepper’)

FEAR IS THE FACT OF NOT HAVING GALL.

- (13) a. *ində=antə > [indantə] jə-all-ə-w > [jalləw] hamotə bis nə-u > [nəw]*
 like=you REL-have-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M gall.less COP-3SG.M
jih-in wənz wənt-o jə-imm-jī-ak’warrit’-əw > [jəmmijak’warrt’əw]
 this-ACC river swim.CVB-3SG.M REL-CNT-3SG.M-cross-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘Can a spineless person like you cross this river by swimming?’ (lit. ‘Can a person who does not have the gall, like you, cross this river by swimming?’) (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.142)

FEAR IS THE FACT OF BEING BETRAYED BY HEART.

- (14) *ibakkih libb-ih al-jī-kida-h > [ajikdah] jətim*
 please.3SG.M heart-POSS1SG.M NEG-3SG.M-betray.IPFV-OBJ2SG.M wherever
jətim bil-əh ti-nor-all-əh
 wherever say.CVB-2SG.M 2SG.M-live.IPFV-AUX-2SG.M
 ‘Please, do not be afraid! You can live somewhere.’ (lit. Please, do not let your heart betray you! You can live somewhere.) (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 25)

Metaphorical Conceptualization of SADNESS

Spatialization metaphors reveal that the emotive concept of SADNESS can be perceived as a location including as a bounded space, and also as a moving entity. This means that the conceptual metaphors SADNESS IS A LOCATION and SADNESS IS A MOVING ENTITY underlie the spatialization metaphors of sadness. Consider examples in (15) and (16) below.

- (15) a. *hazən > [azən] laj t’il-a-atf’əw > [t’ilatf’əw] kərrəm-ət’if’ > [kərrəməj]*
 Sadness at drop (TR).CVB-3SG.F-OBJ3PL spend.a.year-3SG.F

‘She made them spend the year with sadness.’ (lit. ‘She spent the year having made them fall in sadness.’)

- b. *hazən* > [*azən*] *laj nə-atʃifəw* > [*natʃifəw*]
 sadness at COP-3PL
 ‘They are sad.’ (lit. They are at sadness.)

- c. *tikkaze wist’ gəbt-o* ...
 melancholy in enter.CVB-3SG.M
 ‘He having felt sad ...’ (lit. He having entered into melancholy.)

The spatial adpositions *laj* ‘at’ in (15a) and (15b) and *wist’* ‘in’ in (15c) show that the concept of SADNESS, which is manifested as *hazən* as in (15a, b) and *tikkaze* as in (15c), can be viewed as a location. The location can be a bounded region in space as in (15c), which results in a more specific conceptual metaphor SADNESS IS A BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE, or unbounded as in (15a) and (15b). Hence, the specific metaphor can be classified as a subclass of the metaphor SADNESS IS A LOCATION. In (15c), the motion verb *gəbt-* ‘having entered’ metaphorically describes being in a mood of sadness. Perceiving the emotive concept of SADNESS AS A BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE can be grounded in our physical experiences. For instance, if we are in a bounded region, its boundary may impede us to move out of it. Similarly, when we are in a mood of sadness, we may restrict ourselves from some activities that we do in a normal mood.

- (16) a. *hazən* > [*azən*] *wəddək’-ə-bb-atʃifəw*, {*wərrəd-ə-bb-atʃifəw*}
 sadness fall-3SG.M-APPL.LOC-OBJ3PL, {descend-3SG.M-APPL.LOC-OBJ3PL}
 ‘Sorrow overcame them.’ (lit. ‘Sorrow fell down {descended} on them.’)
- b. *hazən* > [*azən*] *dərs-o-bb-ət* ...
 sadness arrive.CVB-3SG.M-APPL.LOC-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘He is sad.’ (lit. ‘Sadness having arrived at him ...’)
- c. *tikkaze gəbba-ə-atʃifəw* > [*gəbbatʃifəw*]
 melancholy enter-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
 ‘They are in a mood of melancholy.’ (lit. ‘Melancholy entered into them.’) (Getaneh, 2017,p.79)

As mentioned above, sadness can also be understood as a spatial figure. In the above linguistic metaphors, the morphemes *-ə* (16a, c) and *-o* (16b), show that *hazən* ‘sadness’ and *tikkaze* ‘melancholy’ are the subjects of the sentences. Since the verbs *wəddək’-* ‘fall’, *wərrəd-* ‘descend’, *dərs-* ‘having arrived’ and *gəbba-* ‘enter’ are motion verbs, we can say that the linguistic metaphors (16) characterize the conceptual metaphor SADNESS IS A MOVING ENTITY. The applicative *-bb-* in (16a, b) shows that the person in the mood of sadness can be conceptualized as a spatial goal.

Furthermore, sadness can be elaborated through a VERTICALITY image-schema, specifically through the DOWN schema. Motion verbs that literally denote movement to a downward orientation, e.g., *wəddək'*- 'fall' and *wərrəd*- 'descend' as in (16a) above, and *t'al*- 'drop (TR)' as in (16a) above, metaphorically represent a state of sadness. This means that sadness can be understood as down (SADNESS IS DOWN). The grounding experiences of the conceptual metaphor SADNESS IS DOWN can be cultural and physical. In the case of cultural understanding, there is a perspective that God manipulates everything in our life including sadness and He sends them down upon us. Regarding the physical basis, a person who is in a mood of sadness can be physically down, and he drops his posture.

The emotive concept of sadness can be understood by means of injury on internal organs. This results in the conceptual metaphor SADNESS IS INJURY. The mapping has a physical basis. When one gets injured on his internal organs, the injury may not be seen for others though he experiences physical pain. Similarly, when one feels sad, others may not be able to know the extent of one's feelings of sadness. So the physical experience of pain is mapped onto the psychological experience of sadness.

- (17) a. *jə-tənagər-ə-ŋ* *nəgər* *hod-e-n* *k'orrət'-ə-ŋ*
REL-talk-3SG.M-OBJ1SG thing stomach-POSS1SG-ACC cut-3SG.M-OBJ1SG
'The speech that he talked to me made me very sad.' (lit. 'The speech that he talked to me cut my stomach.') (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.11)
- b. *jə-ihit-u* *mətaməm* *libb-u-n* *səbbər-ə-w*
GEN-sister-POSS3SG.M to.sick heart-POSS3SG.M-ACC break-3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
'His sister's sickness made him sad.' (lit. 'His sister's illness broke his heart.' (Amsalu & Dagnachew 1988,p.11)
- c. *jə-lidz-u* *hunatə* *libb-u-n* *bəlla-u* > [*bəllaw*]
GEN-child-DEF situation heart-POSS3SG.M-ACC eat.3SG.M-OBJ3SG.M
'The boy's situation made him sad.' (lit. 'The boy's situation ate his heart.') (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 25)
- d. *jə-issua* > [*jəss'a*] *nəgər* *hod-e-n* *si=ji-bəla-w* > [*sibəlaw*]
GEN-she issue stomach-POSS1SG-ACC while=3SG.M-eat-OBJ3SG.M
ji-nor-all
3SG.M-live-AUX
'Her situation makes me sad forever.' (lit. 'It lives while her situation eats my stomach.') (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 96)
- e. *ja-nn-in* *bəfitəna* *his'an* *bə=ajjə-hu* > [*bajjəhu*] *k'ut'ir*
that-ACC-FOC patient infant when=see-1SG number
andzət-e-n *ji-bəla-ŋ-all*
intestine-POSS1SG-ACC 3SG.M-eat.IPFV-OBJ1SG-AUX

‘When I see that sick infant, I feel sad.’ (lit. ‘When I see that patient infant, it eats my intestine.’) (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 97)

In the above linguistic metaphors, the phrases *hod-e-n k'orrät'-ə-n* ‘it cut my stomach’ (17a), *libbun səbbəraw* ‘it broke his heart’ (17b), *libbun bəllau > [bəllaw]* ‘it ate his heart’ (17c), *hoden sijibəlaw > [sibəlaw]* ‘when it eats my stomach’ (17d) and *andzəten jibəlaṅall* ‘it has eaten’ (17e) literally denote the injury of internal organs. Metaphorically, such expressions connote a state of being sad. This implies that Amharic speakers construe the abstract concept of sadness in terms of an injury on internal body parts such as stomach, heart, and intestine.

From the linguistic metaphors presented above, we can propose the following mappings.

Source: INJURY	Target: SADNESS
a state of being injured	> a state of being sad
one who gets injured	> one who feels sad
cause of injury	> cause of sadness
degree of injury	> degree of sadness

Moreover, there are few linguistic metaphors showing that sadness can be conceived in terms of bitter taste and black color. Consider the following examples.

- (18) a. *irirr mirirr bil-o alək'k'əs-ə*
 burn bitter say.CVB-3SG.M cry-3SG.M
 ‘He cried bitterly.’ (Amsalu & Dagnachew, 1988, p. 29)
- b. *fit-u bə=hazən kəsəl məssəl-ə*
 face-poss3sg.m with=sadness charcoal look-3SG.M
 ‘He feels very sad.’ (lit. ‘His face looks like charcoal due to sadness.’)
- c. *bə=hazən fit-u t'ək'w'k'wər-ə*
 with=sadness face-POSS3SG.M become.black-3SG.M
 ‘He feels sad.’ (lit. ‘His face became black because of sadness.’)

In utterance (18a), the ideophone *mirirr* ‘bitter’ metaphorically expresses a high degree of sadness. This implies that the abstract concept of sadness is metaphorically conceptualized as a bitter taste (SADNESS IS A BITTER TASTE). This mapping is grounded on our physical experiences. When one tastes bitter, he may need to avoid it. With the same analogy, one may wish to move out of the feeling of sadness. In (18b, c), terms representing black color (i.e. *kəsəl* ‘charcoal’, *t'ək'w'k'wər-* ‘become black’) metaphorically represent a high degree of sadness. This shows that the emotion concept of SADNESS is seen as a black color. The mapping yields the conceptual metaphor SADNESS IS BLACK.

Metaphorical Conceptualization of LOVE

In Amharic, the emotive concept of LOVE can also be organized in terms of spatialization metaphors. The metaphorical linguistic expressions indicate that love can be comprehended as a manipulator (physical force) leading to the metaphor LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE (see examples in (19) below). This conceptual metaphor aligns with LOVE IS AN OPPONENT (cf. Derib 2007, p. 7).

- (19) a. *jə-liz-u=inna* > [*jəlizunna*] *jə-mift-u* *fik'ir*
 GEN-child-DEF=and GEN-wife-DEF love
si=al-ji-g'əttit-əw > [*sajg'əttitəw*]
 when=NEG-3SG.M-pull.IPFV-OBJ3SG.M
 'Without being affected by his child's and wife's love ...' (lit. 'The love of his child and wife does not pull him.')
- b. *bə=fik'ir tə-nfəwak'k'ək'-ə* > [*tənf'ək'k'ək'ə*]
 by=love PASS-drag.onself.along.the.ground-3SG.M
 'She swept him off his feet.' (lit. 'He is dragged along the ground by love.')
- c. *bə=fik'ir-u-a* > [*bəfik'ir'ua*] *tə-bikənəkkən-ə* > [*təbkənəkkənə*], {*wəddək'-ə*}
 by=love-POSS3SG-F PASS-move.quickly-3SG.M, {fall-3SG.M}
 'He falls in love with her.' (lit. 'Her love caused him to move fast {to fell}.'.)

These linguistic metaphors exemplify the description of love as a physical force affecting the person who falls in love. For instance, in example (19a), the cause conflated motion verb *-g'əttit* 'pull' with the third singular masculine marker *ji-* as in *ji-g'əttit* 'he pulls' depicts love as a physical force that pulls a person who experiences it. In utterance (19b) and (19c), the use of the preposition *bə* 'by' shows that love functions as a cause of the metaphorical movement. In such a case, a lover is perceived as a subject to be affected by the force, and one with whom someone falls in love is conceptualized as a possessor of love. Thus, the linguistic metaphors presented above are the surface realizations of the underlying metaphor LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE. This also exists in other languages such as English (cf. Kövecses, 2000, p. 26).

Love can also be perceived as a physical object, and the human body can be described as a container. Consider the linguistic metaphors in (20) below.

- (20) a. *fik'ir-u* *tə=libb-e*, {*tə=hod-e*}
 love-DEF from=heart-POSS.1SG, {from=stomach-POSS.1SG}
al-wət't'a-ll-ij-imm
 NEG-exit.3SG.M-APPL.BEN-OBJ1SG-NCM
 'I still love him.' (lit. His love has not exited from my heart {my stomach}.)
- b. *fik'ir-f* *hulgize-mm* > [*hullemm*] *bə=libb-e* *wist'*
 love-POSS2SG.F everytime-FOC at=heart-POSS1SG in
ji-nor-all

3SG.M-exist-AUX

‘You will always be in my heart.’ (lit. ‘Your love will always exist in my heart.’)

The linguistic metaphors in (20) suggest that love can be linked to a physical object that can reside in one’s body. The body *libb* ‘heart’ and *hod* ‘stomach’ can be conceptualized as loci of love. That is why the postposition *wist* ‘in’ depicts them as the location of love. So the linguistic metaphors in (20) characterize the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT WITHIN ANOTHER OBJECT.

Furthermore, love can be understood as a journey. A person in love can be described as a person in a journey, that is, an experiencer of love as a spatial figure. This yields the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, which is also explored in other studies such as in Lakoff & Johnson (2003, p. 44) and Kövecses (2000, p. 26).

- (21) a. *bə=fik’ir abir-əw al-zəllək’-u-mm*
 with=love be.together.CVB-3PL NEG-go.through-3PL-NCM
 ‘They broke up the relationship.’ (lit. ‘They do not go through together with love.’)
- b. *bə=fik’ir bizu al-tə-gʷaz-n-imm*
 with=love many NEG-MID-walk-1PL-NCM
 ‘Our relationship does not go a long distance.’ (lit. ‘We do not walk much with love.’)

The motion verbs *zəllək’*- ‘go through’ in (21a) and *təgʷaz-* ‘walk’ in (21b) demonstrate that love can be expressed as a journey along a path. Thus, the linguistic metaphors in (21) are the manifestations of the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY.

Metaphorical Conceptualization of HATE

Amharic spatialization metaphors demonstrate that the emotive concept of HATE can be construed as spitting. This yields the conceptual metaphor HATE IS SPITTING. As evidenced by the linguistic metaphors (22) below, the one who is disliked very much can be described as a spit, and change of state from a state of love or neutrality to a state of hate can be perceived as the movement of saliva out of one’s mouth. That is, the state of hate can be expressed as the situation of spitting.

- (22) a. *aləm, {hagər} təffa-t*
 World, {country} spit.3SG.M-OBJ3SGF
 ‘Everyone hated her very much.’ (lit. ‘The world {country} spat her out.’)
- b. *issu-n ank’irr-e > [anj’irre] təfitt-e-w-all-əhu > [təfitt/itəwalləhu]*
 he-ACC gather.phlegm.CVB-1SG spit.CVB-1SG-OBJ3SG.M-AUX-1SG
 ‘I hate him very much.’ (lit. ‘I have completely spat him out.’)

In these examples, the motion verb *təffa-* ‘spat’/ *təfitt-* ‘having spat’ metaphorically depicts a state of hate. The terms *aləm* ‘world’ and *hagər* ‘country’ in (22a) narrow their meanings and

cover the meaning of ‘everybody’. In example (22b), the use of the term *ank’irr-* ‘having gathered phlegm’ adds the meaning of an extreme state of hate.

From the given linguistic metaphors, the following set of mappings can be found.

Source: SPITTING	Target: HATE
the person who spits	→ the person who hates
the saliva to be spat	→ the person to be hated
the event of spiting	→ the state of hate
the event of collecting phlegm	→ high degree of hate

This set of systematic correspondences characterizes the conceptual metaphor HATE IS SPITTING. The metaphor can be rooted in cultural experiences. There is a norm that spitting can be seen as an unpleasant event because a spit is viewed as dirt. Similarly, when we hate someone, we may perceive him as a thing not worth keeping.

In addition, since spitting denotes movement to an outward orientation, we can say that the emotive concept of HATE can be described as a CONTAINMENT image-schema, specifically an OUT image-schema. This yields the conceptual metaphor HATE IS OUT.

Conclusion

This paper examines how Amharic speakers conceive emotive concepts such as ANGER, FEAR, SADNESS, LOVE, and HATE metaphorically. Linguistic metaphors under discussion suggest that understanding emotive concepts through more palpable source domains is not uncommon in the language. For instance, the concept of ANGER can be understood by means of the source domains of fire, the devil, insanity, physical force and wound. It is also found out that fear is metaphorically organized in terms of a container, excretion, and woman. This yields the conceptual metaphors FEAR IS A CONTAINER, FEAR IS EXCRETION AND FEAR IS A WOMAN. Moreover, the emotive concept of sadness can be comprehended as a bounded region in space, a moving entity, an injury, a black color, and a bitter taste. It is explored that Amharic speakers metaphorically conceptualize love through a physical force and an object. Finally, linguistic metaphors show that the concept of hate can be structured by means of an OUT image schema.

References

- Amsalu Aklilu & Dagnachew Worku (አምሳሉ አክሊሉና ዳኛቸው ወርቁ). (1979 E.C. [1988 G.C.]). *jəʔamarijna fəlit’otfif* (የአማርኛ ፊሊዮች) [Amharic idioms]. Addis Ababa: Kuraz.
- Derib Ado. (2007). Love is our enemy: Opponent metaphors in Amharic. A paper presented at the 19th ILS annual conference.
- Derib Ado. (2016). Metaphors of time in Amharic. In Ronny Meyer & Lutz Edzard (eds.), *Time in languages of Horn of Africa*, 103-116. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Evans, Vyvyan & Melanie Green. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Getaneh Anteneh (ጌታነህ አንተነህ). (2009 E.C. [2017G.C]). *gobbew* (ጎቤው) [the hunchback]. Addis Ababa: Dereje.
- Glynn, Dylan. (2002). Love and anger: The grammatical structure of conceptual metaphors. *Style* 36(3). 541-559.
- Johnson, Mark. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the structure of concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (2010a). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (2010b). Metaphor, language, and culture. *D.E.L.T.A.* 26 (especial). 739-757.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconstructing context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 2nd edn, 203-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. (1980). Conceptual metaphors in everyday language. *The Journal of Philosophy* 77(8). 453-486.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*, 2nd edn. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Li, Thomas Fuyin. (2014). The role of image-schemas and conceptual metaphors in learning idioms: An experimental study. In Thomas Fuyin Li (ed.), *Languages and linguistics: Compendium of cognitive semantics, Vol.3*, 25-43. New York: Nova Science.