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To Emote a Feeling or to Feel an Emotion: a View from Turkish

Mustafa Aksan and Yeşim Aksan

Abstract:
Research on emotion terms has documented fundamental differences between collectivistic and individualistic cultures. Emotional events and emotional experiences are represented differently in collectivistic cultures where emotions are commonly conceptualized as relational, interpersonal and holistic in the sense that they incorporate situational antecedents. To find out the ways in which contemporary Turkish culture conceptualizes emotion, this study analyses the basic emotion lexicon as it is represented in dictionaries by comparing existing terms with their English counterparts. Furthermore, the study also discusses emotion metaphors retrieved from a corpus of Turkish to account for culture specific conceptualizations.
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1. Introduction

In their introduction to the special issue of Cognition and Emotion, Fischer and Manstead (2002) present a review of the recent developments pertaining to research on the universality of emotions. Cross-cultural studies have produced two positions on this issue. Cultural anthropologists have concluded that emotional experiences of many cultures are quite distinct from those that are experienced in the West. On the other hand, a number of researchers have also argued that despite some apparent differences, emotions are essentially universal and are experienced similarly regardless of cultural differences (Kitayama and Markus, 1994; Strauss and Quinn, 1997). After decades of extensive research, it is now concluded, as in many other similar cases, that the extreme positions of universalists or cultural relativists are both inconclusive. Instead, recent research has found that it is possible to find both similarities and dissimilarities in emotions across cultures. Thus, “the question is not so much whether or not there is cultural variation, but rather to what extent, and at what level of analysis, such cultural variation exists” (Fischer and Manstead, 2002: 4).
There has been a wealth of research that has focused on the topic of "lexicalization of emotion" (Sabini and Silver, 2005). Issues discussed cover, among others, whether different languages have their own words corresponding to the emotions that are named in English. Cross-linguistic studies have revealed that while the majority of emotions are lexicalized in various languages, there are also significant differences. Cultures may differ in their interpretation of the same emotion and this can be observed more concretely in their language use. Furthermore, there are emotions that are named in one language and totally missing in another. Wierzbicka (1992, 1999) argues that even the term emotion is culture-specific; there are languages that lack the term emotion, and its use in other languages requires proper understanding of the ways in which the concept in a particular culture is distinct from its conceptualization in English. Additional complexities in the lexicalization of emotion arise from the fact that while its expert use in psychology and in other related areas distinguish between emotion, sensation, and feeling, the lay manifestations of these concepts are far from distinct and clear. Even in the scientific domain, it seems that there exists no definition of emotion upon which psychologists can agree. After reviewing 359 articles published in specialized journals, Russell and Barret (1995: 805) conclude that emotion cannot be a proper object of study as almost everything counts as emotion.

The lexicon of emotion terms in Turkish is no less complex than it is in Western languages. In this respect, Turkish displays more similarities than differences with Western languages. Evidently, it follows that the same complexities observed in other languages are also observed in Turkish regarding the intricate connections between emotion, feeling, and sensation. Most often, the Turkish terms for these can easily replace each other in the majority of contexts of use.

In this paper, we will address the problem of defining emotion in Turkish. We will focus on the category terms rather than individual emotion concepts. In the first section of the paper, we will discuss basic terms in the Turkish lexicon, both their lay and expert uses. Here, we will illustrate certain language-specific aspects of emotion lexicalization in contemporary Turkish with reference to underlying aspects of a collectivistic culture. We examine the basic emotion terms as represented in contemporary dictionaries. First, we will provide Turkish equivalents of the terms emotion and feeling in the official dictionary of the Turkish Language Institute. The definitions provided here are written in nontechnical terms to explicate and represent lay senses of these two terms. Then, the terms emotion and feeling are reviewed from their technical uses in scientific dictionaries of psychology. The definitions provided in such dictionaries are for professionals of the field, and hence are expected to be specific scientific definitions. We will show that lexical semantic analyses of the definitions provided in technical and nontechnical dictionaries do not explicitly
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distinguish between the senses of \textit{duygu} “emotion” and \textit{his} “feeling” in Turkish.\footnote{For ease of exposition, we will represent \textit{duygu} as “emotion” and \textit{his} as “feeling”. However, Turkish in fact does not distinguish emotion and feeling, as we will discuss in this study.} Even in technical dictionaries these two terms and sometimes even less common other terms easily replace each other in similar contexts. We will further check the lexical choices in the translations of two popular novels, Elif Şafak’s \textit{The Saint of Incipient Insanities} and Orhan Pamuk’s \textit{The Black Book}, to see which of these two terms are translated into English as \textit{emotion} or \textit{feeling}. In the second part of the paper, we will establish more firmly the relationship between language and culture in the conceptualization of emotion. In doing so, we will analyze the conceptual metaphors which explicate the conceptualizations that are missing in the lexical domain. We will conduct a corpus search on two target domain lexemes \textit{duygu} “emotion” and \textit{his} “feeling” in a 2 million word Corpus of Contemporary Written Turkish.\footnote{\textit{Corpus of Contemporary Turkish Fiction} and \textit{Corpus of Contemporary Turkish News Texts} are two sub-corpora developed from the databases of an ongoing Turkish National Corpus Project (grant no: 108K242) which is funded by The Scientific and Technological Council of Turkey (http://www.tnc.org.tr).} Then, we will analyze the concordance data from the Corpus to identify the metaphorical manifestations of \textit{duygu} and \textit{his}.

\section{The lexical material}

In one of the rare studies on emotion concepts in Turkish, Smith and Smith (1995), adopting the prototype approach, note that Turkish and English emotion concepts share important similarities as well as differences. They indicate in the introduction that Turks conceptualize particular emotional experiences as reflections of a “broader category” in which the emphasis is on “situational contexts”. The authors further argue that the “outer-directed” focus of Turkish follows from the collectivistic orientation of the culture.

Smith and Smith (1995: 105) identify three lexemes in Turkish that are used interchangeably in referring to concepts that “parallel” emotions:

\begin{quote}
\textit{“... duygu} (a Turkish word that corresponds to “feeling”); \textit{heyecan} (an Arabic term denoting excitement and enthusiasm, corresponding to the English term passion in its archaic sense); and \textit{his} (the Arabic equivalent of \textit{duygu}).”
\end{quote}

In the official \textit{Ruhhilim Terimleri Sözlüğü} (The Dictionary of Psychology) of the Turkish Language Institute, two of these terms are translated into the English words, \textit{feeling} “\textit{duygu}”, and \textit{emotion} “\textit{heyecan}”. \textit{His} (the Arabic borrowing) is
absent in the dictionary, and _heyecan_ is defined as the older term for _emotion_. The dictionary gives the modern _coşku_ as a new term for _emotion_. Additionally, the same dictionary provides two new terms for _sense_ and _affect_, namely _duyum_ and _duygulanım_, respectively. Both nominals share the same verb root with _duygu_ ‘feeling’, namely ‘duymak’, a polysemous verb which we will return to below in detail.

A recent terminological electronic dictionary of psychology\(^3\), defines Turkish equivalents of _emotion, feeling, sense_ and _affect_ as well as many other nominal compounds in which these terms appear either as a head of the compound or a complement. To select a few:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>emotion</th>
<th>duygu</th>
<th>emotion</th>
<th>duygu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attribution of</td>
<td>duygu attravers</td>
<td>feeling tone</td>
<td>duygu tonu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary emotions</td>
<td>birincil duygu</td>
<td>guilt feelings</td>
<td>suçluluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>duygu ları</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense</td>
<td>duygu</td>
<td>affect</td>
<td>duygu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense</td>
<td></td>
<td>affect</td>
<td>duygu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstacle sense</td>
<td>engel hissi</td>
<td>affective domain</td>
<td>duygu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>duygu alan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to observe that the official terminological dictionary offering, i.e., “coşku”, appears only in this dictionary and nowhere else. Furthermore, just as in the case of the electronic dictionary, inconsistencies of translation equivalences are abundant in the official terminology dictionaries. For example, the supposedly distinct scientific terms, _coşku_ and _duygu_, replace each other freely in the following: “emotional stability” is “coşkusal denge”, but “affective fixation” is “coşkusal saplanım”; while “affective psychosis” is “duygusal çıldırı,” and “emotional blocking” is “duygusal tikanma.” Thus, _emotion_ and _affect_ may correspond either to _duygu_ or _coşku_ with no predictable semantic criteria. As a final note on the terminological dictionaries, we observe that the definitions given encode somewhat equivalent readings; _emotion_ is defined as a “powerful feeling,” _feeling_ as “impressions”, _affect_ as a “state,” and _sense_ as “stimulus”.

Smith and Smith (1995: 106-107), also refer to the dictionary definitions: “Emotion does not appear in Turkish-English dictionaries as the first translation for _duygu_, _heyecan_ or _his_. Emotion does appear as an alternate translation for both _duygu_ and _heyecan_, and it is the only English equivalent that they share.” As noted by the authors, the 1983 edition of _Redhouse Dictionary_ translates _duygu_ as “sensation, impression, sentiment; feelings, attitude; emotion.”

---

\(^3\) [http://www.termbank.net/psychology/](http://www.termbank.net/psychology/)
At the first glance, it seems as though the dictionary definitions can be blamed for this confusion. They do not propose distinct labels for emotional experiences, or they cannot "match" experiences with appropriate labels for each distinct type of experience in question. Although this may indeed be the case, there is evidence that dictionary writers are only partially responsible. We believe that there are two reasons for these inequivalences. The first concerns the particular cultural conceptualization of emotion, and the second is based on translation problems arising from the agglutinative nature of Turkish.

Recall that Smith and Smith (1995) refer to a "broader category" and "situational contexts" in the expression of emotions in Turkish culture. They underline culture-specific aspects of contemporary Turkish society: "Turkey is at once Western and non-Western, 'modern' and 'traditional'; its culture and language are blends (often officially enforced) of outside influences and strong indigenous features. This complexity extends to emotion concepts within the Turkish language." This dual psyche of Turkish culture reflects its particular interpretation of the concept of emotion in various distinct ways, as will be discussed below.

In a prototype study that aimed to find Turkish equivalents of emotion, Smith and Smith (1995) asked 200 Turkish students to list the members of this category. A pilot study revealed that subjects tended to include in their list of emotion terms "situational sources of emotion." As a result of this, they instructed the subjects overtly not to include situational sources in their free listing of emotions. Yet, 48% of the entries listed were situations; half of the emotions that were listed were citations of sources rather than emotions. Smith and Smith (1995:108) predict that "... it seems likely that had instructions not discouraged them from doing so, Turkish subjects would have listed more situations than states.” Furthermore, the list also included concepts like "annelik / babalık / arkadaşlık duygusu” meaning "the feeling of motherhood / fatherhood / friendship” relating to social roles rather than emotions. Hence, they conclude that emotional experiences are conceptualized holistically in Turkish culture without distinguishing subjective emotional states form their respective situational contexts nor from the resulting behavior. According to Smith and Smith (1995: 110), “This concept would parallel Turks’ general outlook on life, which is also more holistic and focused on the needs of others, and results of ethnographic studies elsewhere suggesting an emphasis on situational antecedents in definitions of emotions.”

Mesquita (2001) conducted a questionnaire study on Dutch, Turkish and Surinamese to test cultural differences in emotions. On the bases of the respondents’ data she concluded that emotions in collectivistic cultures are assessed more on their social value, and tend to reflect "reality” rather than "inner world”. In order to account for the lexicalization of emotions in different cultures, Semin and Fiedler (1991) developed the Linguistic Category Model.
The model aims to determine the aspects of emotion events and the ways in which they are linguistically represented in a language. It predicts that concrete terms (verbs) are used in the representation of emotion events in cultures where interdependence and in-group relations are valued. In such contexts, the emotion terms function as relationship-markers. On the other hand, more abstract terms (adjectives, nouns) are used in cultures that value individuality. In such contexts, emotion terms function as self-markers (Semin et al., 2002).

The lexicalization of emotions in Turkish reflects the collectivistic tendencies noted above. For example, the situational antecedents like event components, physiological symptoms or associated behaviors function as alternates for emotion. In this way, *heyecan*, “agitation, excitement” that refers to physiological arousal enters into verbal expressions of emotions. It is thus no surprise that *duygu* as the label of a “broader” category is translated as *emotion, feeling, sense,* and *affect.* Smith and Smith (1995: 110) conclude from the free listing of emotions that connotations of *duygu* and *heyecan* imply that “Turks may not distinguish between *emotion* and *feeling.*” This is clearly seen in the case of *duygu,* which sometimes is associated with *emotion* and sometimes with *feeling.* “*Duygu* may therefore overlap with both *emotion* and *feeling*” (1995: 116).

*Duygu* is a nominal derived form of the verb *duymak.* The entry of the verb in the bilingual Redhouse Dictionary includes the following:

**duymak:** 1. to hear 2. to get word of 3. to be aware of 4. to feel, sense, perceive, experience. 5. to have the sensation of 6. to feel (pride, joy, pleasure, sorrow).

The monolingual official Turkish Language Institute’s *Turkish Dictionary* entry for *duymak* is similar to the above:

**duymak:** 1. to hear, to perceive a sound 2. to receive information about, to learn, to hear the news about 3. metaphorically, to notice, to realize, to feel. 4. to sense via sensory organs, to feel something as in touching or smelling 5. to gather information about the physical state of objects, i.e., their density, weight, movement, their hot or cold state. 6. to enter into an emotional state.

We have already seen that Turkish emotion concepts are perceived as holistic. Linguistically speaking, we see that the base verb for emotion is polysemous. Since the senses associated with this verb include, *to feel, to sense,* and *to emote,* the meaning of the derived nominal, *duygu,* likewise comprises *feeling, sense,* and *emotion.*
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Turkish is a classical textbook example of an agglutinative language. Furthermore, the vowel harmony that governs the phonological structure, makes allomorphy predictable. Morpheme boundaries are always clear-cut and morpheme concatenation is "logically" ordered. With these properties of its morphological structure, Turkish tends to carry over semantic encoding of concepts into derivational morphology. In other words, in very simplistic terms, rather than assigning for each different sense a different lexical item, it "holistically" assigns a single item various senses. As noted by many Turkish scholars, polysemy is quite widespread in the language. Finer semantic distinctions are expressed by the productive use of various derivational morphemes in different orders. For example, in the case of duymak, we find the following derived nominals: duy-u “sense”, duy-um “hearing, notice”, duy-ar “sentiment”, duy-arga “antenna (of a bug)”, duy-gu-lan-im “affect”, duy-gu-daş “sympathizing”.4 Given that the verb duymak encodes the senses to emote, to feel, and to sense, it is possibly for this reason that dictionary writers offer duygu as a translation equivalent of emotion, feeling, sense, and affect simultaneously.

Basically, there are three options here: first, we may say that Turkish does not distinguish between feeling and emotion. After all, similar observations are made for many other languages of mainly collectivistic cultures (Harkins and Wierzbicka, 2001). Second, we may say that Turkish does distinguish between feeling and emotion, but simply assigns the same lexeme duygu for both; it is only in their particular contexts that this homonymy is resolved. Third, we may say that his is more than a simple Arabic borrowing but owes its very existence in Turkish to the need to express a finer semantic distinction.

For the last option, we will simply argue that both duygu “emotion” and his “feeling” can combine freely, i.e., the verbal bases (duymak and hissetmek) of these lexemes can be the head in a verb phrase or they themselves can be the object of the phrase, as in “duygu hissetmek,” “to feel an emotion” and “his duymak” “to emote a feeling”. The existence of these forms and their literal translations imply that, at least in such uses, there is evidence to distinguish feeling from emotion. However, they both mean “to feel an emotion”; the truth value of the propositions in which they occur are the same. Thus, in the verbal

---

4 There are almost 200 entries derived from the base verb duymak in the Turkish Dictionary of the Turkish Language Institute.

5 The two proposed terms, heyecan and coşku do not appear in contexts where one can use duygu or its Arabic equivalent his. In no context other than technical psychological writing do these terms occur in Turkish to express feeling or emotion. Even in their technical use, they both are very restricted. Heyecan is an old term that was once used in the relevant literature. Coşku, has never gained popularity among psychologists. Furthermore, both words were already in the language when they were proposed as terms and language users were happily using them in their nontechnical sense in ordinary daily contexts. In other words, they were not newly coined terms to serve specifically for their expected function.
domain for both \textit{duymak} and \textit{hissetmek}, the contexts of emotion or feeling expression do not differ. For example, as opposed to English, both can be used felicitously in the expressions, \textit{yalnızlık hissetmek/duymak} “to feel/emote loneliness” and \textit{açlık hissetmek/duymak} “to feel/emote hunger”. They simply differ only in very specialized contexts and quite rarely. There are however certain contexts in which their differences in meaning becomes apparent. Nevertheless, even in those cases where \textit{duygu} matches with \textit{emotion} more than \textit{feeling} and his with \textit{feeling} more often than \textit{emotion}, they still can both correspond to either concept.

We will not pursue the analysis of homonymy since it requires more detailed identification of contexts of use. To complement the data from the dictionaries, we will present data from translations. In ordinary daily uses, it is the task of translators to find translation equivalences. The following is an illustration of the problem facing translators. Contemporary Turkish writer Elif Şafak’s novel The Saint of Incipient Insanities, was originally written in English and later translated into Turkish. Nowhere in the novel do we find the lexeme ‘emotion’. Here again, in the case of literary translation, both his and \textit{duygu} correspond to \textit{sense} and \textit{feeling} as seen in the excerpt below:

\begin{quote}
“My feelings” murmured ... 
summarizing my feelings 
had this strange feeling 
our feelings for them 
observe some deep sense of ... 
... retained a sense of place
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
“Hislerimi” diye mırıldandi ... 
Hislerimi özetliyorum... 
tuhaf bir \textit{duyguya} kapılıdı 
onlara \textit{duydüğümüz hisler} konusunda... 
derin bir bıkkınlık \textit{hissinin} 
bir yere geldiği \textit{duygusu}
\end{quote}

The following are some sentences with their translations from \textit{Kara Kitap} ‘The Black Book’ by Nobel Prize winner Orhan Pamuk:

\begin{quote}
...\textit{duygusuna} kapılıdı ... 
... bu korkunç şeyi \textit{sezdiği}mi düşünmüştüm... 
paketin tuhaf bir şekilde 
\textit{âğırlaştırığı} \textit{hissetti}... 
bir \textit{duyg}u da olsa ... özgürlik 
\textit{duygusu}... 
gittikçe zorlaşacağını 
\textit{hissetdiyor}du... 
... Galip ...okuyabileceğini 
düşünüyordu... 
...isteğinden başka bir şey 
uyanmadı...
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Galip had a feeling...
... I had a feeling that I’d already 
guessed... 
... he noticed the package 
... though it was a \textit{sensation}..., still this 
\textit{feeling} of freedom... 
... had a feeling... 
... Galip had the \textit{feeling} that he could 
read... 
... could get no \textit{feeling}...
\end{quote}
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... oyun duyguşuna, ... bir pişmanlık duyguşuna...
... bir kadının – hatta iki kadının diye düşündü.
... bir heyecana kaptırdı kendisini...
...aynı sevgi, saygı ve sessizlikle...

... tuhaf bir esrarı aradığın şeyle ilgili gördüğüm için...
... gizleme isteği...
Kadının bir oyun duyguşuyla iteklemesiyle belirsiz bir isyan ve hürriyet duyguşuyla
... kişilerde hissetliğimiz bir tür...
...bekleyişi duygu...
... izlerini aradığını sezerdim...
... nasıl hissediyordu daha iyi anlayabilsin...
Celal Amcanla paylaştığım tek bir duygu vardır.

Uncle Jelal and I share only one emotion:

Here again, feeling is simultaneously translated as Turkish duygu and his, and in some cases even as sezmek “to notice”: duyguşuna kapıldı “a feeling”, bir duygu da olsa “though it was a sensation”, zorlaşacağını hissediyordu “had a feeling”, aradığını sezerdim “I used to sense that”. Similarly, sense also translates exactly the same set of lexemes and emotion as both duygu and his. Furthermore, English “feeling” translates not only emotion-related lexemes but also düşünmek “to think”, istek “desire, wish”, and görmek “to see”: okuyabileceği ni düşündiyordu “the feeling that he could read”, gizleme isteği “sense of secrecy”, aradığın şeyle ilgili gördüğüm “a feeling it’s related to the object...”.

overcome with the feeling... with a sensation of regret
... he had the feeling it might even be two women...
... seized by an excitement that...
... same feeling of respect, tenderness, and silence...
... have a feeling it’s related to the object...
...sense of secrecy...
... Goaded by the woman’s sense of play
...heeding some vague sense of rebellion...
... that we sense in certain people...
I used to sense that...
... emphathize with Rüya’s emotions...

Uncle Jelal and I share only one emotion:
To explain why Turkish does not distinguish between *feeling* and *emotion*, we will resort to conceptual metaphors. We will confine ourselves to the data of conceptual metaphors in which the target lexeme is part of the expression. In other words, we will analyze manifestations in which the target lexemes *duygu* “emotion” and *his* “feeling” occur in metaphors.

3. Emotions, feelings and conceptual metaphors

In their conceptual metaphor theory Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) explore the pervasive, and constitutive nature of conceptual metaphor in human thinking. They point to the unconscious and automatic properties of metaphorical thought in everyday experience. In Lakoff and Johnson’s view, metaphor arises out of a cognitive mapping between two conceptual domains. A cognitive mapping is a systematic correspondence between the source domain, which is relatively concrete and simple, and the target domain, which is abstract and complex. A number of conceptual inferences are drawn from the source domain to understand the target domain. For example, the abstract concept of anger is conceptualized through the intensity of heat in the metaphor anger is fire. Since fire (heat) is related to a universal and tangible physical experience it is intersubjectively available to speakers as a source domain. Inferences based on common knowledge about fire is projected upon the target domain of anger. The metaphorical basis or motivation in conceptual metaphors such as anger is fire can either be a correlation or a resemblance between the source domain and the target domain.

For the purposes of this study, we can simply say that emotion language is commonly conceived as figurative or metaphorical in nature. Abstract entities like emotions or feelings are targets of various concrete source domains, among which we find the human body as the primary source of emotional experiences.

---

6 The problem facing Smith and Smith (1995) was to discourage their subjects from including situational sources of emotion to their list of emotions. Though they did not continue their study of Turkish emotion terms to include language-specific expressions, they are well aware of the issue:

“How might we encourage Turkish subjects to articulate more fully the subjective component of emotion that appears to go unnamed in Turkish? Phenomena lacking literal names are often expressed idiomatically; a number of Turkish idioms suggest a particularly rich source of information about the subjective component of *duygu* /heyecan” (1995: 118).

Two lexemes in particular, namely, *içi* ‘inside’, (*içi kararmak* ‘one’s inside darken’, to be dismayed or without hope) and *can* ‘soul’ (*can ağzına geldi* ‘soul came out of his/her mouth’, frightened) stand out as the most common in the conceptualization of emotional experiences. This is not unique to Turkish but applies to languages of many other collectivistic cultures.
The role of embodiment in the conceptualization of emotions and the universality of human body parts as source domains have been a topic of much current research (Gibbs, 2006; Yu, 2007).

We analyzed the concordance data from the Corpus of Contemporary Written Texts that represents metaphorical manifestations of two nominals, duygu “emotion” and his “feeling”. Before we proceed with our comments on the data, we can say that as opposed to native duygu, the Arabic borrowing his most often appears in formulaic and frozen expressions, rarely occurring in new contexts of use. It may be argued that the preference of one of these lexemes over the other is becoming more of a stylistic issue.

Corpus-based analyses of the metaphors of duygu “emotion” point to 6 different source domains. Table 1 represents the major source domains and some instantiations.

---

7 The Corpus of Contemporary Written Texts consists of two subcorpora; The Corpus of Contemporary Turkish Fiction and The Corpus of Contemporary Turkish News Texts. Each corpus is a 1 million word corpus, and covers a period of 20 years (1990-2009). Representativeness and balance of the corpora are ensured by including a wide range of texts through equally sized samples. The Corpus of Contemporary Turkish Fiction mainly includes samples from novels and short stories; The Corpus of Contemporary Turkish News Texts contains news texts from different sections of five national newspapers which represent different ideological standpoints.
Table 1. Number of occurrences of the metaphorical expressions involving *duygu* “emotion” derived from the basic source domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source domains</th>
<th>No of citations</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN OBJECT</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A STRUCTURED OBJECT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>duygu yarat</em> “create emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A HIDDEN OBJECT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>duygularım gizle</em> “hide emotions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A POSSESSED OBJECT</td>
<td>83</td>
<td><em>duygusu var</em> “have/exist emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A FORCE</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A PHYSICAL FORCE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>duygu patlaması</em> “explosion of emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A NATURAL FORCE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>duygu seli</em> “flood of emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL AGITATION</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>duygusuyla ezil</em> “crushed by an emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL PRESSURE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>duygubarması</em> &quot;swell of emotion&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GET RID OF AN OPPONENT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>duygudan kurtul</em> “get rid of an emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN OPPONENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>duyguya boğuş</em> “struggle with an emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPRESS FLUID IN A CONTAINER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>duyguyu bastır</em> “suppress emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN INTERNAL SENSATION</td>
<td>69</td>
<td><em>duyguyu uyandır</em> “evoke emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>duyguya kapıl</em> “sense emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTION</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTION CAUSED BY FORCE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>duyguları ayaklandır</em> “cause emotions to rise up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL MOVEMENT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td><em>duyguyu yayıl</em> “spread of emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>33</td>
<td><em>içteki duygu</em> “emotion inside”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>duygularla dolu</em> “full with emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUNDED SPACE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>duygusu içinde</em> “being in emotion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corpus-based analysis of his “feeling” metaphors point to 4 different source domains. Table 2 represents the major source domains and some instantiations.
Table 2. Number of occurrences of the metaphorical expressions involving *his* “feeling” derived from the basic source domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source domains</th>
<th>No of citations</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| INTERNAL SENSATION        | 25              | *hisse kapıl* “sense feeling”  
                          *his uyandır* “evoke feeling”  |
| AN OBJECT                 | 13              |                                                                          |
| A STRUCTURED OBJECT       | 3               | *his oluştur* “form feeling”                                             |
| A HIDDEN OBJECT           | 1               | *his bul* “find feeling”                                                  |
| A POSSESSED OBJECT        | 9               | *his kaybet* “lose feeling”                                               |
| CONTAINER                 | 12              | *hisle dolu* “full with feeling”  
                          *içinde kalan his* “feeling remained inside”  |
| MOTION                    | 6               | *his gel* “coming of feeling”  
                          *his dolas* “wandering of feeling”  |
| FORCE                     | 5               | *his tetikle* “trigger feeling”  
                          *hislere hakim ol* “control feelings”  
                          *histerden arın* “purify feelings”  |
| **Total**                 | **61**          |                                                                          |

The number of citations of metaphors that conceptualize *duygular* “emotion” as a constructed, possessed or hidden object exceeds the number of the conceptual metaphors in other source domains. The elaboration in this source domain signals the collectivistic attitude of the Turkish speakers that the subjective aspect of emotion should be kept inside. This may indicate that Turkish metaphorical instantiations of subjectivity of emotion possibly exceeds the number of metaphors in this domain compared to languages of individualistic cultures, and at the same time, it may also imply that the conceptualization in this domain emphasize relatively more varied aspects of the subjectivity of emotion. Thus, *duygular* “emotion” as a constructed, possessed or hidden object should be hidden, buried or be kept deep inside so that they are concealed, as seen in the following examples:

(1) ... bütün *duygularımı*, arzularımı, korku ve çelişkilerimi *gizleyip* ...
    “hiding all my emotions, desires, fear and conflicts”
(2) ... her seferinde bu *duyguyu* usulca içine *gömüp saklamıştı.*
    “she always buried this emotion inside her and concealed it quietly.”
(3) ...*gizli kalmış duyguları açığa çıkarmak* için çaba harciyordu.
    “she tried hard to reveal the hidden emotions.”
The conceptual metaphors with the lexeme *his* “feeling” in their linguistic representation conceptualize emotion as a possessed object and a hidden object.

(4) ... *acıma hissini kaybetmiş insanlar* ...  
“people who have lost their feeling of mercy”

(5) ... duygu ve *his yoklugu* zararlı olduğunu biliniyor.  
“it is known that absence of emotion and feeling is harmful.”

(6) ... zafere ilişkin bir *his buldular* o harekette.  
“they found a feeling related to victory in that action.”

The main meaning focus of the structured object metaphor is the creation or the making of some sort of an emotion. In some cases, it is not emotion but sense that translates more appropriately the compounds as in “*sense of freedom*” or “*sense of satisfaction*”. In these conceptualizations, emphasis is on the creation of an emotion as an entity (examples 7 and 8) and constructed emotions can also be destroyed or knocked down (example 9).

(7) ...yoğun bir *tatmin duygu* oluşturulabilir.  
“an intensive sense of satisfaction may be formed.”

(8) ...yapay bir özgürlük *duygusu yaratacağı*...  
“that would create a false sense of freedom.”

(9) *Beslediği soylu duyguların yıkılışı, yanışıydı bu dalga geçiş*  
“this mocking is the destruction or burning down of the noble feelings inside.”

His “feeling” metaphors also conceptualize emotion as a structured object:

(10) ... korkunç bir yalnızlık *hissi oluşturuldu.*  
“she formed / created a terrible feeling of loneliness.”

(11) ...ışık çakması benzeri bir *his meydana getirir.*  
“it forms a feeling similar to a flash.”

Out of 126 citations in the object metaphor 83 of them are instantiations of the possessed object metaphor. In other words, almost 66% of instantiations in the data conceptualize emotion as a possessed object whereas all the remaining conceptualize emotion as either a structured (12%) or a hidden object (22%). More concrete than abstract, the emotion language of a collectivistic culture conceives emotion as an object that can be earned (example 12), conveyed (example 13), possessed, lost (examples 14-16), saved (example 17), exhibited (example 18), or even carried (example 19):
(12) Bu duygu abisiyle yarışırken edinmişti.  
“She acquired this emotion when she competed with her brother.”
(13) Duygularını kardeșine iletme başardı.  
“She managed to convey her emotions to her sister.”
(14) ... duygu ve his yokluğunu ...  
“the absence of emotion and feeling”
(15) Bu duygu bende bir süredir vardı.  
“I had this emotion with me for some time.”
(16) Sahadaki hakemde adalet duyusu yoktu.  
“The referee in the field did not have the emotion of justice.”
(17) ... 2005 yılından beri duyuları biriktiren...  
“has been collecting emotions since 2005”
(18) ... bu duygu ve dürtülerin sergilenmesi ...  
“displaying these emotions and instincts”
(19) Ben sizen gibi hayranlık duyuguları taşımıyoruz.  
“I don’t have emotions of admiration as you do.”

Kövecses (2000) asserts that in the event structure metaphor causes are forces. In the context of emotions, he argues that in Western cultures emotions are conceptualized as forces that cause responses or have an effect on individuals. The master metaphor emotion is force and its various instantiations can be found in several non-Western cultures as well, as predicted (Kövecses, 2005). Turkish corpus data includes a number of different manifestations of this master metaphor. The differences may be attributed to differences in culture specific interpretations or differences in elaborations. For example, in Turkish the force of emotion is conceptualized as the force that vibrates “wires” or “fibers” violently, as in (20) below. Alternatively, while its instantiation in English elaborates the force metaphor as a volcanic eruption (Omori, 2008), in Turkish the force of emotion is manifested as an “explosive substance”, as in (21).

(20) ... duygu titreşimlerinin şiddeti...  
“the force of vibration of emotion”
(21) ... çok bastırılmış duyuların patlaması gibi görünüyor...  
“it seems that it is the explosion of highly suppressed emotions”
(22) ... duyuların etkisi altında ezildiğini duyumsamaktaydı.  
“she sensed that she was crushed by the effect of her emotions.”
(23) Sorumluluk duyusu kabarıp beni aradı.  
“When his emotion of responsibility increased, he called me.”
(24) ... yalnız olma hissini tetiklemiştir.  
“She aroused a feeling of loneliness.”
Attempting to control the force of emotion appears to be the most complex of all the source domains that we have reviewed so far in this paper. In this domain, culture-specific Turkish elaboration emphasizes the struggle of an individual trying to get rid of an opponent, namely the emotion, as in example (25).

(25) ...dayanılmaz yalnızlık duyguşudan kurtulabilmek için...
   “to get rid of this unbearable feeling of loneliness”
(26) “boşunalık duyguşundan kaçınmasını sağlar”
   “makes one avoid the feeling of emptiness”
(27) “içinden gelen duygu zorla bastırıp sustu.”
   “Suppressing the emotion that was rising forcefully inside, he resigned.”
(28) ... hisslerimize hakim olmamızı gerektirecek engellerde ...
   “in the obstacles that require us to control our feelings”
(29) ... hislerden arınmış ...
   “purify the feelings”
(30) ... kontrolü sizde olmayan bir hisir.
   “a feeling that you cannot control.”

The third major source domain with 69 citations in the corpus data of duygu “emotion” is internal sensation. In this conceptualization, the cause of emotion comes from the physical body and sensation is placed inside the body. It is most often manifested in a nominal compound and the causative verb uyan-dir-mak “cause to awake”; some antecedent acts as a cause that makes the individual feel an emotion gradually and steadily awakening, i.e., an emotion is sensed inside:

(31) ... sadece bıkkınlık ve acıma duyguları uyandırmaktaydı bende.
   “she evoked emotions of weariness and mercy.”
(32) ...yasamın güzel olduğu duygu veren bir günde geldim.
   “I arrived in a day that makes one feel that life is good.”
(33) ... terkedilmiş olduğu duygusuna kapildi...
   “felt an emotion of being abandoned”
(34) İşte yine o garip duygu beliriyordu.
   “Here, again that strange emotion was emerging.”

Just like duygu “emotion” metaphors, his “feeling” metaphors conceptualize similar experiences of internal sensations:

(35) ... onu görecekmışım gibi bir his vardı içimde.
   “I had a feeling inside me that I saw her.”
(36) ... bu iş zaten bitmiş hissine kapılıyorlar ...
   “they felt that the work has already finished”
To Emote a Feeling or to Feel an Emotion

Being almost a fixed expression, the “feeling/emotion evoked” phrase in Turkish is relatively frequent. This expression targets emotion and feeling in both **duyu** and his conceptual metaphors.

Emotions are also conceptualized as self-moving entities. The conceptualization here does not define the individual who has been moved by the force of the emotion. Rather, emotions as forceful entities move themselves. In other words, it is the emotions that are moving form one place to another:

(38) ... gözlerinden sızan ince **duygular** yureğimize inmemeli...
   “the emotions flowing out her eyes must not go down our hearts”

(39) Şöyle bir **duyu** ge**çti** içinden.
   “Such an emotion passed inside her.”

(40) ... içine çok kötü bir **duyu** yayıldı.
   “a bad emotion spread all over her.”

(41) sık sık gelen o tuhaf **duyu**
   “that strange emotion which comes frequently”

(42) ... içimde çok kötü bir isyan **duyusu** yükseldi...
   “a very bad emotion of rebellion raised inside me”

(43) Bu **duyu** dalga dalga hüzne **biraktı** yerini.
   “This emotion left its place to grief.”

Emotions and feelings, in both **his** “feeling” and **duyu** “emotion” conceptual metaphors can move around, spread, rise, pass through, as self-propelled entities:

(44) ... insanın içine başka bir **his** gelsemeyor.
   “no other feeling comes inside a person.”

(45) ... **icinde dolaşan** ılık **hisleri** düşünüyordu.
   “she is thinking of the warm feelings wandering inside her”

(46) ... bedenime yayılan korkunç bir tiksinti **hissi**...
   “a terrible feeling of disgust spreading through my body”

Another universal image schema for emotions is the container and its universality is well-established by data from different languages. This major source domain applies to almost all emotions, giving an “inside-outside” perspective for the human body (Kövecses, 2000: 37), rendering the body, especially the inside of the body as a container for emotion in many languages.
(47) Hafiflik duygusu kaplıyor içimi.
   “An emotion of lightness surrounds me.”
(48) ...nedense içimdeki bir duyguy...
   “anyhow an emotion inside me”
(49) içimi yüce duygularla doldururken
   “...while filling myself with sublime emotions”
(50) ... bir his kaplıyor içimi...
   “a feeling fills my inside”
(51) ... düşmanlık hisleriyle dolu...
   “she is full of hostile feelings”

Kövecses (2000: 55) indicates that emotion metaphors correspond to the state part of the event structure metaphor. This gives the sub-metaphor states are locations that manifests in cases where entities move from one state to another. The ordinary expression “being in an emotional State” is as common in Turkish as it is in English. The conceptual metaphors of bounded space in Turkish are similar to their English counterparts.

(52) ...yalnızlık duygusu içindeydik...
   “we were in an emotion of loneliness”
(53) ...sorumluluk duygusu içinde...
   “(acting) in a sense of responsibility”

We may summarize the basic findings of our corpus-based analysis of emotion metaphors in Turkish as follows:

1) The number of citations that involve the target domain lexemes, duygü “emotion” and his “feeling”, is significantly different. There are 867 citations for duygü “emotion” and 147 citations for his “feeling”. There were 375 metaphorical expressions for duygü “emotion” and 61 metaphorical expressions for his “feeling”. Thus, in terms of quantity, the corpus representation of duygü “emotion” exceeds his “feeling”.
2) Almost all metaphors that target duygü “emotion” also target his “feeling”. In other words, duygü “emotion” and his “feeling” do not display differences in their conceptualizations. The only difference we observe concerns the bounded space metaphor. In the corpus data, there is no instantiation of this conceptual metaphor that targets his.
3) Duygu “emotion” and his “feeling” differ significantly in the salience of their respective source domains. In 375 metaphorical expressions of duygü, the source domain object forms the largest group with 126 citations. In contrast, in 61 metaphorical expressions of his, the domain internal sensation is the largest with 25 citations.
4. Conclusion

In this study, we have presented data from contemporary Turkish to determine whether the language distinguishes between feeling and emotion. The analysis of the relevant lexemes as represented in dictionaries, both technical and non-technical, did not produce conclusive results. We have demonstrated that at the lexical level and in both technical and non-technical uses, the terms that correspond to the English equivalents of emotion and feeling (and also sensation and affect), namely duygu and his, do not denote different psychological states or emotional experiences. Rather, in contemporary Turkish culture, language users conceptualize emotional experiences holistically. Antecedents, situational components, physiological arousal and even resulting behavioral responses enter into the conceptualization of subjective experience. This is the case for culture in general, and in the lexicalization of emotions there is a tendency to use a more concrete language. Hence, cultural determinants of the emotional experiences do not refer to thinking, feeling and the body separately.

We also analyzed the naturally occurring language data of conceptual metaphors from the Corpus of Contemporary Written Texts. The findings that are derived from the corpus data further supported the conclusions for the lexical data. The Turkish tendency to express abstract entities in concrete terms became apparent once again in the linguistic manifestations of conceptual metaphors that target emotion and feeling. The citations of the conceptual metaphors that conceptualize emotion as object or structured object outnumber the metaphors in other source domains. Quantitatively we showed that the number of metaphorical expressions for duygu “emotion” exceed the number of metaphorical expressions for his “feeling” almost 6 times. This indicates that the native term is preferred in the conceptualization of emotional experiences in Turkish, most likely following from the fact that duygu “emotion” is a semantically transparent lexeme. Furthermore, duygu “emotion” metaphors also instantiate relatively more source domains than his “feeling” metaphors. For example, while both duygu “emotion” and his “feeling” metaphors use force as a significant source domain, duygu “emotion” metaphors exploit a more variety of subdomains. Finally, the corpus based analysis of the conceptual metaphors of duygu “emotion” and his “feeling” displayed differences in the salience of source domains: while duygu “emotion” manifestations tend to prefer the object source domain, his “feeling” manifestations tend to prefer the internal sensation source domain. To a certain extent, we may say that the corpus data of conceptual metaphors imply certain differences between duygu “emotion” and his “feeling” in Turkish. It is evident that further extensive studies are required to derive more conclusive results to pinpoint the fundamental differences between these two co-existing terms in Turkish.
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