

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR OF “HEAD” IN FERDOWSI’S SHAHNAMEH, NIZAMI’S KHOSROW & SHIRIN AND ODES OF SHAMS

Gholam Hosein Esmaeli¹

Ahmad Tahan^{2*}

Farzaneh Mozaffarian³

¹Department of Persian Language & Literature, FiroozAbad Branch, Islamic Azad University, FiroozAbad, Iran. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4942-9302>. Email: gholamhosein.esmaeli56@gmail.com.

²Corresponding Author: Department of Persian Language & Literature, FiroozAbad Branch, Islamic Azad University, FiroozAbad, Iran. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3112-0190>. Email: tahanahmad@yahoo.com

³Department of Persian Language & Literature, FiroozAbad Branch, Islamic Azad University, FiroozAbad, Iran. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6958-5890>. Email: F-mozaffarian@yahoo.com

*Corresponding Author: Ahmad Tahan, Department of Persian Language & Literature, FiroozAbad Branch, Islamic Azad University, FiroozAbad, Iran, Email: tahanahmad@yahoo.com

Abstract: Contrary to the traditional rhetoricians who considered metaphor to be limited to literary text used as a mean for decoration of the speech, contemporary theoreticians see metaphor as a linguistic-conceptual mean that man uses it for knowing the surrounding phenomena. According to this theory, many of the most fundamental abstract notions such as time, quantity, cause, goal and etc, become understandable for man by the assistance of metaphor. The present study uses a descriptive-analytic method to comparatively assay the conceptualizations of the organ-word “head” in Ferdowsi’s Shahnameh, Odes of Shams and Nizami’s Khosrow & Shirin, from a cognitive perspective. This essay seeks to show the extent to which these poets have taken advantage of this key word in objectification of abstract concepts by means of conceptual metaphor. The research results show that the aforementioned poets despite their being under the influence of literary and linguistic traditions and the existing cultural roots sometimes have made use of the metaphors of similarity, they have been interested in a special group of abstract notions given the differences in thought and type of worldview and also their literary style and endeavored to conceptualize it by the aid of the organ-word of “head”.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, organ-word, Ferdowsi’s Shahnameh, Nizami’s Khosrow & Shirin, Odes of Shams.

1. INTRODUCTION

Following the emergence of new perspectives in different sciences and technologies, a number of terms find new meaning and notion. For example, the issue of

metaphor is one of the oldest rhetorical issues which has been considered by theoreticians since time immemorial; but the definitions that have been offered in past works regarding the metaphor in the domain of literature or philosophy are fundamentally different from those that are discussed in new fields of philosophy and cognitive linguistics. “Cognitive Linguistics” is an approach to the study of language that deals with the relationship between language, mind and their social and physical experiences (Rasekh Mohanad, 2017). These linguists believe that language is a reflection of human mind, then they “seek to describe and explain the structure and role of language” (Rasekh Mohanad, 2017). According to their analysis, metaphor is a linguistic tool and has a conceptual aspect that constitutes an extensive part of the ordinary system of thought and language and helps us in understanding the world. (Lakoff, 1993) believes that when we want to speak of such abstract notions as feelings, it is evident and essential to take advantage of the metaphor. One of the most significant domains that plays a key role in understanding of metaphorical notions is the domain of body organs particularly the organ of “head” by which various metaphorical expressions have been made.

According to (Quinn & Holland, 1987), cultural patterns used in the construction of metaphor are shared by the citizens of a society play a vital role in their understanding of their surrounding world but since cultures take form within a material environment, “conceptual system in different cultures depends on the environment in which it is created” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The other point that can lead to the difference in people’s conceptual system is the type of their perspective of different issues. As to the poets, this depends on their particular literary style and type. The present essay is a theoretical study based on descriptive-analytic method that intends to assay the quality of the use of “cognitive model” of “head” in the works of Ferdowsi, Nizami and Rumi focusing on their metaphorical system. To this end, we have studied the expressions made of this organ in Ferdowsi’s *Shahnameh*, Nizami’s *Khosrow & Shirin* and Rumi’s *Odes of Shams* and then discussed their differences and similarities in the domain of conceptualization. By this, we intended to clarify how much their method of conceptualization was under the influence of their culture and society and to what extent it was influenced by literary traditions, poetic style and personal ideas? Our reason for choosing these three poets in addition to their temporal and spatial differences, lies in their interest in three types of epic, mystic and lyric literatures. Moreover, it needs to be reminded that due to the space considerations and for the sake of avoidance of redundancy we have sufficed to mentioning just a number of examples in each case.

2. BACKGROUND

Since the release of the theory of conceptual metaphor, considerable studies have been conducted in this field. Outside Iran, some linguists like “*Zoltán Kövecses*” who in his “*Language, Mind and Culture*” and “*Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*” has explained the theories of “Lakoff” and “Johnson” and added several cases to the subsets of “Johnson”. (Anwari, 2014) have studied the influence of four temperaments in traditional medicine on people’s feelings and characters and their bodily functions and concluded that the structure and formation of a number of the metaphors in the language of the European people have been under the influence of traditional medicine. (Afifi, 2004) has also studied the metaphors of “eye” in English and Chinese and believes that the common root of the metaphorical expressions made by the word “eye” in these two languages is their common bodily and cultural experiences. (Biljana, 2012) his colleagues have studied the metaphorical conceptualization of the word “head” in English and Serbian. They have

discussed three conceptual metaphors of the organ-word “head” under the titles of “head is a thing”, “head is a treasure” and “head is a symbol of a man” and since in both languages, head is the symbol of something, these languages are considered to be a “brain-centered” language because they focus on the nature of brain. (Shariari, 1986) studies a number of daily metaphorical expressions in Persian based on the word “heart” and concludes that in Persian, this organ has been deemed as an equivalent or a container for feelings, memories and thoughts. In line with this, he has alluded to the role and influence of the Sufi ideas and traditional medicine in this notion.

Several different studies have also been conducted in Iran in the field of literary and linguistic works within the framework of cognitive linguistics and based on the theories of “Lakoff and Johnson”. For example, Behnam has studied the “conceptual metaphor of light in Rumi’s *Divane Shams*” (Criticism, 2010). The author in this article has used the cognitive theories to assay the functions of the metaphor of light and its relevant pictorial cluster, i.e. sun, candle and light, and concluded that knowledge is a visual picture. Allami and Karimi have studied “conceptual metaphor in *Divane Shams* based on the sensory action of eating” (Criticism, 2010). The authors have concluded that Rumi has taken the utmost advantage of metaphorical concepts for exhibition of material and spiritual spheres and “eating” is among the words that Rumi has used for explanation of his own thought. “A study of systematic models of metaphor and rhetorical forms” (Criticism, 2010) is an article by Tofiqi, Tasnimi and Alavi Moqadam. The authors of this article have outlined ten metaphorical models for understanding of “Rudaki” and his worldview. They claim that Rudaki’s conceptual metaphors represent his special life experiences and this has its origin in Rudaki’s position in the royal court. (Goharin, 1997), in the *Journal of* has published the article “Conceptualization of heart, liver and eye” that studies these themes in Sa’di’s “*The Orchard*” in the form of four conceptual tools of “combination”, “question”, “complication” and “extension”. According to Goharin, the creativity of Sa’di’s poetry is the result of the use of aforementioned four tools.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Cognitive linguists struggle to raise metaphor with a different approach and within a new format and provide an exact report of its nature and mechanism in mind and language. In fact, they seek to extend “metaphor” beyond the domain of rhetoric and limits of stylistic devices insofar as today metaphor is not just limited to the stylistics. These theoreticians claim that all concepts that we use in the daily language are metaphorical and according to this view, metaphor is a linguistic tool that can help the literature and other sciences that are related with language in some way. The discussion of conceptual metaphor begun in late 1970s and through 1980s in the works of “Lakoff” and “Johnson” in a systematic and consistent way. According to this theory, metaphor is something deeper than traditional definitions and has a role beyond the aesthetic issues. Given the fact that “metaphor” has been considered as a marginal issue both in the traditional circles and in contemporary linguistics, they have challenged these schools and founded their new theory of the “epistemological role of conceptual metaphor” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015).

According to this theory, metaphor has its origin in thinking and metaphor is an ordinary way of our conceptualization of world and “substance and basis of metaphor is understanding and experiencing something based on something else” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015). While in traditional rhetoric and since Aristotle’s time, metaphor has been considered just as a stylistic device the function of which is conveying the meaning from

one thing to another thing. (Lakoff, 1993) believes that conceptual metaphor in the domain of cognitive linguistics is a systematic modeling of conceptual elements of a domain of human experience that is tangible and objective over another domain that is usually more abstract, i.e. known as target domain. He holds that metaphor is a tool by the aid of which one can conceptualize intangible experiences based on the tangible experiences (Hashemi, 2015).

Therefore, in conceptual metaphor, there is a correspondence relationship between two domains or two sets to which is referred to as mapping. They have adopted this term from the set's theory in mathematics¹ in order to show the relationship between notions. Mappings create a bridge between two source domain and target domain so that through objective and tangible elements to understand the mental and abstract notions and elements. According to the above definitions, every mapping is not a mere proposition, rather it is a set of conceptual correspondences by the aid of which one can understand the features and relations between the two domains (Lakoff, 1993). One domain is that of the source domain that is an objective and tangible domain while the other domain is the target domain that is the domain of mental and abstract notions. (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015) use the verb "is" in the form of the linguistic expression "target domain is the source domain" in order to show the relationship between these two domains.

4. TOOLS INVOLVED IN THE CREATION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

Providing the possibility of reflection and modeling, metaphor changes into a cognitive tool and allows man to use the objective domains as a pattern in order to conceptualize his own abstract experiences. (Lakoff, 1993) refers to this process as "Discursive Model". Some tools are involved in the construction or creation of conceptual metaphors which are either engaged in the formation of the source domain or directly play the role of source domain.

4.1. Primary Metaphors

Not all metaphors have a simple structure and they are not made easily based on a simple simili and some of them have a more complicated structure. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999) believe that complicated metaphorical expressions are a combination of the primary conceptual metaphors, cultural models and public knowledge. In addition to the primary metaphors which are directly modelled based on our bodily experiences, image schemas also have a basic role in the construction of complicated metaphors.

4.2. Image Schemas

Image schemas are a conceptual reflection of human daily interactions with his surrounding environment. (Johnson, 1987) in his article entitled "Body Is in Mind" defines image scheme as a dynamic and repetitive model of our conceptual adaptations and movement plans that gives meaning to our experiences. "Kovecses" considers schemas to be the most important tool for understanding the world. He believes that the most significant feature of the schemas is their pictorial and abstract nature (Kovecses, 2016). These schemas are often influential in the construction of the primary metaphors that have their origin directly in bodily experiences and primary adaptations. For example, by finding oneself in voluminous environments, man creates the scheme of container that as the source domain participates in the construction of the primary metaphor of "head is a container". This scheme itself is made of a more general scheme of "body is a container".

Accordingly, many of human emotions and feelings are also embodied like an object that is located inside the container of the body (head, chest, heart, eye and so on and so forth). We will allude to the feelings that are located inside the container of the head.

4.3. Figure

Lakoff and Johnson argue that figure has a conceptual nature and like metaphor, it is also a mental and cognitive process that has a clearer foundation and basis than the metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015). Therefore, figure is simultaneously a conceptual tool and of an empirical foundation that is used in objectification of many phenomena. Thus, figure just like metaphor is an ordinary way of speaking that gives an objective content to our thinking and function (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015). As to the importance of figure in conceptualization, they note that although we see metaphor as the systematic modeling between two conceptual domains, we still believe that in this conceptualization not all aspects of a concept are shown rather by concentration on one aspect of the concept we neglect another aspects of the concept that are not consistent with the metaphor. Thus, by means of figure and figurative language we can use metaphorical concepts beyond an ordinary method of thinking and dialogue (Lakoff & Johnson, 2018). Definition of figure differs in western and eastern (Islamic and Iranian) rhetoric and for understanding the discussions of the current essay we need to shortly review them. Figure in west is a stylistic device by which the name of something (H_1) is used to refer to something else (H_2) that is related with the first thing (H_1) (Panter, 2015). Figurative language consciously changes the ordinary language (Hawks, 2001). However, in eastern rhetoric, figure is a very complicated issue and it represents the word that is not used in its real meaning. Of course, there should be a relationship between these two (real and figurative meanings) and based on the type of this relationship, various types of figure have been enumerated but in west there are just two types of figure, i.e. synecdoche and metonymy. Moreover, in western tradition, metaphor is always considered to be the main form of figurative language (Hawks, 2001). Nevertheless, in eastern perspective, figure and metaphor are two different issues. Most scholars consider metaphor to be a *simili* one pillar of which is eliminated be it the tenor or vehicle and there are also another group of scholars who believe that metaphor is a figure with a similarity relationship.

4.4. Metonymy

The other point that is required to be noted at the beginning of the present article is the discussion of “metonymy”. Metonymy is a type of *antonomasia* and means “saying something under a certain guise” and it has three types: 1- subject based metonymy: this refers to bringing an adjective instead of its noun, e.g. instead of “head full of rage” the poet uses “head full of fire” and fire in this context is a metonymy of rage; 2- adjective based metonymy: bringing an adjective instead of another adjective, e.g. in conceptual metaphor of “head full of sharpness”, sharpness and heat are the adjectives of fire that represent a metonymy of rage; 3- verb or infinitive based metonymy: it refers to the use of a verb in a way that in a covered form indicates to the name of a certain thing; e.g. in “his head boiled”, boiling is an act of fire and is again a metonymy of rage. The difference of metonymy and figure lies in the fact that in the former one can think of the possible non-metonymic meaning – of course, in some cases – while in figure there is no possibility of conception of non-figurative meaning, e.g. when one says “the door of X’s house is open” this metonymically suggests that X is generous and we can deem the person who is generous and his door is also open but in the sentence “he drank the whole cup” drinking

refers to the content of the cup, i.e. wine, as no one can drink the cup as an object. In western literature, there is no comprehensive term that can cover the whole gamut of the definition of metonymy in east. In Persian literature, sometimes “Irony” is translated into “metonymy” and this is not correct because irony should be pursued in the character of one person and in a whole story but metonymy is represented in one word or one expression.

5. SCHEME OF HEAD AND CONTAINER

Lakoff and Johnson consider the metaphor of container to be part of ontological metaphors². They believe that each one of us based on our repetitive and systematic experiences in the course of our life and as a result of the relationship that we continuously and immediately have with our body, we recognize that our body acts in the form of a container. Thus, each one of us is a container with a borderline surface and an internal and external direction and we carry these features related to ourselves to other objects and we consider those objects to be containers that have an inside and outside (Lakoff & Johnson, 2015). “Kövecses” believes that given the role of cultural models and physical experiences in these conceptualizations, the governing cultural patterns in the society and also the bodily experiences are two key factors in the formation of the metaphors of container (Kovecses, 2016). It needs to be mentioned that in this conceptualization first the body itself and its organs are objectified in the form of a target domain (the body is a container) and then it serves as a source domain that conceptualizes many notions and feelings (e.g. head or chest or heart full of love or hatred and etc).

Among the body members, head is a member that contains another organs, like eye, ear, mouth and a major part of the neural system, i.e. brain. Therefore, it is natural that in our conceptual system, complicated and even contradicted notions to be formed based on it. In fact, it is as such a great container that contains smaller containers in itself. This scheme allows the possibility of embodiment and understanding of other abstract concepts. Upon contemplation on such sentences as “his head is still full of hatred”, “he is cultivating an idea in his head” and the like, we find out that Iranians consider their head to be a container in objectification of many mental and abstract notions and this scheme is the basis of many metaphorical ideas in them. Thus, in many Persian dictionaries, several metaphorical and metonymical meanings have been suggested for “head” as a body organ that consist of: hair, mind, idea, intention, beginning of everything, start of the space or time and etc (Dekhoda, 1998) and (Moein, 2000) and (Anwari, 2014).

6. DISCUSSION

As previously mentioned, Lakoff believes that metaphor is a mapping between two source and target domains. Mappings are not fixed correspondents and have their origin in the empirical foundation of every individual. Part of these experiences are physical and bodily experiences that due to the bodily common features of humans such metaphors are more global; but another group is concerned with the cultural experiences. Thus, such metaphors vary in different cultures. “Although metaphors are rooted in physical experiences, it is the cultures that play a key role in the formation and conceptualization of them” (Ju, 2008) Among three Persian prominent poets, Ferdowsi as the creator of Shahnameh an epic work of 10th century is a nationalist Iranian. Nizami Ganjawi the religious poet of 12th century is born in Ganja in current Republic of Azerbaijn. Khosrow & Shirin is an ancient romantic story that Nizami has related it in poetic form. Rumi the Sufi poet of 13th century who has left Iran in his childhood and lived the rest of his life in

Kunya in Turkey. As we will see, these three poets despite living in different times and places and having various intellectual and poetic styles all have used the conceptual metaphor of “head is the container of feelings” and this shows the cultural root of this metaphor.

6.1. *Head Full of Wind*

The sentence “head full of wind” is a metonymy of haughtiness as the wind in this phrase indicates arrogance. Thus, based on the scheme of “head is the container” a metonymy (wind=arrogance) has been made. The highest use of this metaphor is found in *Shahnameh* (19 times) and the least use of it can be found in *Khosrow & Shirin* (2 times). Rumi has also used this metaphor for seven times. *Shahnameh* is the story of the victorious kings and warriors and it is natural that the kings and heroes of this epic poem to have a head full of wind relying on their power, wealth and force. Basically, having a head full of wind is a requirement of presence in the battleground. In other words, Ferdowsi’s main goal of authoring this epic poem in 10th century was persuasion of the sense of proud in Iranians who had been defeated by Arabs because in this century semi-independent governments were taking form and streaks of hope were emerging in the heart of Iranians. This is why in this epic even the ideal king like Keikhosrow is depicted with a head full of wind who fights Afrasyab the greatest enemy of Iran (Ferdowsi, 2009). *Khosrow & Shirin* is a romantic poem and as Shirin reminds Khosrow, love and arrogance defy each other (Nizami, 2011). Two main characters of this poem, i.e. Shirin and Farhad, are two woman and man who love each other and have sacrificed their whole life in the path of love and there is nothing but love in their head but Khosrow is not so. Although he loves Shirin, since he is a king, he also has a head full of wind and Shirin criticizes him because of having this feature (Nizami, 2011).

In Sufism, Sufis battle with their own carnal souls, and a requirement of victory in such a battle is leaving oneself aside and acceptance of every hardship and humiliation for overcoming the soul. Thus, Rumi criticizes arrogance for several times, e.g. “Throw dust into the eye that there is wind inside its head” (Rumi, 1999). He also addresses his own heart as follows: “Let the wind out of the head” (Rumi, 1999). Among those who have wind in their heads in his odes, one can refer to “reason” which is depicted by Rumi in an ironical phrase as “artful reason” and he says that when the reason drinks wine, this wind will leave the head. The beloved is also like a hawk that has wind in her head.³ However, Rumi, contrary to Shirin – not only does not reproach her because of having arrogance rather he justifies this arrogance too, for his beloved is divine not like the beloved of Shirin who is an arrogant and selfish king. Moreover, Rumi contrary to two other poets, speaks somewhere of a wind that he has in his head and this wind has nothing to do with arrogance and egotism rather it is a wind of the majesty and magnificence of the love and beloved in his head (Rumi, 1999). This metaphor is also used today in its old sense and is said: “X’s head is full of wind”.

6.2. *Head Full of Hatred*

In *Shahnameh*, the word “hatred” is of high frequency and meanwhile it has been used 39 times in the form of a pictorial scheme of “head full of hatred”⁴ and this is natural in an epic poem. The heroes of *Shahnameh* – Iranian and non-Iranian – are all men with a head full of hatred. The stanza “a head full of hatred, a heart full of hostility” has also been used for Keikhosrow (Ferdowsi, 2009) and at the same time for Afrasyab (Ferdowsi, 2009). However, Afrasyab of Turan by killing Siavash the Iranian prince has himself

triggered the rage and hatred of Iranians including his own grandson Keikhosrow. In the historical part of *Shahnameh*, the same stanza has also been repeated for the Iranian commander Bahram Choobin (Ferdowsi, 2009). For the warriors of *Shahnameh*, hatred not only is not a vice, rather the head commander's including Rostam order their squad: "Every single one of you has to fill your head with hatred". In *Shahnameh*, hatred sometimes is not used in the sense of absolute revenge rather it is used along with war, "He came to the battleground with a head full of hatred and war" (Ferdowsi, 2009). Nevertheless, this does not change the situation that much, because most of the wars in *Shahnameh* end up with the killing of an innocent (e.g. Iraj or Siavash).⁵

Nizami has not used this metaphor, because Khosrow & Shirin is a lyrical poem – though a small part of it depicts the battle of "Bahram Choobineh" with Khosrow – and the characters of this story have a head and brain full of love and if sometimes a lover complains and asks the beloved not to seek revenge, here hatred implies exclamation and mincing of the beloved. It is in this spirit that Farhad in his dialogue with Shirin inside his mind states: "What's wrong with me that you hate me?" (Nizami, 2011). Also, Khosrow asks the same from Shirin, "Let me in and let the hatred out" (Nizami, 2011). (Nizami, 2002) gives the following advice: "Get immersed in love and keep yourself away from hatred"! Odes of Shams are also a reflection of Rumi's love. He just speaks once of the metaphor of "the head and chest full of the hatred of the beloved" (Rumi, 1999). Here hatred is also an indication of rage and mincing of the beloved. In another point, Rumi addresses the beloved as follows: "Forget the hatred and give a kiss from your sweet lips" (Rumi, 1999). Rumi just like Nizami was against all types of war and hatred. In *Masnavi*, he traces the roots of hatred back to inferno and describes it as the enemy of religion (Rumi, 2015). This metaphor does not have any use today.

6.3. Head full of Wine

Head full of wine (and its equivalents: liquor and drink) is another conceptual metaphor that is a combination of a voluminous metaphor "head is a container" and two figures: wine in view of its causal relationship figuratively represents drunkenness, and head due to its relationship as a whole to the parts figuratively represents brain. As throughout *Shahnameh* we are witness to dreadful battles between warriors, we see that these warriors on different occasions and particularly after the victory in war they hold royal feasts (Ferdowsi, 2009). The content of the following verse has been repeated in *Shahnameh* for several times and the second stanza has been repeated for 17 times: "They arranged a party in every place/ They asked for wine, music and dancers" (Ferdowsi, 2009). As some women in *Shahnameh* are present in the battlegrounds, they are also present in wine parties but in a more colorful way; for example, one can refer to the meeting of Rudabeh and Zal, Sudabeh and Siavash and Manizheh and Bijan. These loving women drink wine with their beloved men. Such parties lasted sometimes for one week (Ferdowsi, 2009). Nevertheless, the men who lavish upon wine are harshly reproached in the same way that Rostam criticizes Roham: "Roham is continuously keeping the company of the cup of wine" (Ferdowsi, 2009).

Ferdowsi has used the conceptual metaphor "head full of wine" three times, but Nizami in "Khosrow & Shirin" has not used this metaphor though this story is a lyrical poem and there are several occasions in this story where men and women gather together to feast particularly Khosrow that exceeds in drinking wine.⁶ However, although Rumi is a mystic poet, he has used this metaphor in several occasions. He considers his own head a bowl that has been devoted to the wine of soul (Rumi, 1999). In his drunken whirling,

he describes the bowl of his head as the cup of wine (Rumi, 1999). He does not use any cup for wine but his own head's bowl (Rumi, 1999). Even he believes that his head is a tavern that does not need any cup (Rumi, 1999). He recommends his audience to fill their head with the pure eternal wine (Rumi, 1999) and asks them to use his own head for the wine of the beloved (Rumi, 1999). Wine in *Shahnameh* and *Khosrow & Shirin* is nothing but the wine made of grapes and Nizami just speaks of others who drink wine but Rumi despite insisting on his own wine drinking and drunkenness, he notes that his intended wine is not made of grapes because such a wine does not have any result but becoming blind. Drinking worldly wine leads to war, brawl and nausea but Rumi's feast is divine and there is no room for such things in this feast. He considers himself to be drunken of "eternal wine" (Rumi, 1999) and he drinks the wine that love has prepared it with his own hands. Hundreds of thousands of souls have been sacrificed for such a "wine of eternity". This "true wine", is "otherworldly", "eternal", "primordial", and "pure wine". In *Shahnameh*, (Ferdowsi, 2009) speaks of "royal wine", "king's wine" (Ferdowsi, 2009), and "wine for the monarchs" (Ferdowsi, 2009). But in *Odes of Shams* and in mysticism in general, Shah and Sultan "sometimes refer to the Lord and prophet of Islam and other prophets as a whole and sometimes to the wayfaring Sufi and the spiritual mentor and the perfect men and divine saints" (Goharin, 1997). This metaphor does not have any use today but the adjective "drunken" is still used as to the happy people.

6.4. Head Full of Rage

Ferdowsi has used the phrase "head full of rage" for five times (Ferdowsi, 2009), but in six occasions this conceptual metaphor has been combined with figure and metonymy. For example, "They said you ruined the whole efforts/ the renowned head would never be void of fire" (Ferdowsi, 2009).

Fire in this context is a metonymy of rage.⁷ In *Shahnameh*, the phrase "fire on head" means angry (Ferdowsi, 2009). Ferdowsi has used the conceptual metaphor "head full of smoke"⁸ twice. In these conceptual metaphors, some phrases are used through a figure or a metonymy because "smoke" is associated with fire as a figure and the fire itself is a metonymy of rage. In another verse, "Aghrirath"⁹ says to his advisors of violation of the orders of his brother Afrasyab that if he revolts, this diabolic man's head begins to "boil" (Ferdowsi, 2009). (Dehkhoda, 1998) has understood "boiling" as being enraged and agitated while Ameer argues that it is a figure of "being angry" but this conceptual metaphor has a more complicated structure and it has been made this way: 1- "head is a container"; 2- "rage is fire" and in the phrase "boiling head" instead of fire (rage) that is the cause of boiling the effect (boiling) has been used. In the eighth volume of *Shahnameh* Anooshirwan asks Bozorgmehr: Which temperament is good for the ordinary people? He answers: When they get angry not to allow their brain to boil.¹⁰ Bijan persuades his father Giv not to kindle rage (Dehkhoda, 1998). Here instead of fire – which is itself a metonymy of rage – kindling has been used as an adjective of fire. Ferdowsi has used the conceptual metaphor "head/brain full of sharpness" (Dehkhoda, 1998). In (Dehkhoda, 1998) encyclopedic dictionary "sharpness" is defined as "rage, violence, anger and lack of tolerance". "Sharp brainedness" does also mean "being enraged" but should we simply see sharpness as a metonymy of anger or it is better to take sharpness to be an adjective that is used instead of the noun, i.e. fire which is itself a metaphor of anger based on previous arguments? Ferdowsi has used the adjective "sharp" for fire in several occasions.¹¹ For example, in volume 4, p. 592, Ferdowsi uses this adjective in the aforementioned way. It seems that in such cases the use of this metaphor instead of being used for

conceptualization of rage is more for showing the intensity of the rage. Shahnameh is the story of the battles of the violent warriors and sometimes in the time of war he persuades the commanders to fight with rage. For example, he calls Bahram Choobineh to battle with the anger as pointless anger is not good and it is in this spirit that “Khorad Barzin” asks Bahram to overcome his anger (Dehkhoda, 1998). In Shahnameh, anger is the opposite point of the reason.¹²

Rumi has not used the conceptual metaphor of “a head full of rage”. His work is not the battle ground rather it is a world of love and naturally the one who has the right to get angry is again the beloved who has a sweet and fake rage and Rumi himself is interested in such an anger (Rumi, 1999). He also takes the rage to the task and believes that whenever someone offends others by rage, God’s rage will offend him too (Rumi, 1999).¹³ Nizami has not used this metaphor but in his romantic poem – in addition to such persons as Khosrow who really get angry – Shirin has an anger combined with shame and mincing (Nizami, 2011). Here again rage refers to avoidance and mincing of the beloved. (Nizami, 2009) describes rage as “thought-burning” just like Ferdowsi and considers it to be in conflict with reason. The conceptual metaphor of “head full of rage” does not have any use in the daily language, but for showing the intensity of one’s rage it is said: “the brain inside my head is boiling”.

6.5. *Head full of Love*

Although Shahnameh is an epic poem, it is not void of stories with lyrical and romantic themes. Nevertheless, Ferdowsi has not used the conceptual metaphor “head full of love” more than once (Ferdowsi, 2009). In his mystical odes, Rumi has used this metaphor for nine times while Nizami in his romantic story has used it just for once like Ferdowsi. The difference between Rumi and Nizami with Ferdowsi is that they have used the Arabic word while Ferdowsi insists on the Persian “Mehr”. Nizami and Rumi have used sometimes the word “melancholy” instead of “love” (Nizami, 2018). This metaphor has been made by the aid of a figure (causality) because “melancholy” in past was considered by the physicians to be a type of disease that gives rise to certain illusions and is the source of love and insanity.¹⁴ These two poets have sometimes made use of the conceptual metaphor “having passion in head” that has again made by the aid of a figure because passion means sedition and agitation and it is used figuratively in the sense of enthusiasm.¹⁵ The Poems of all three poets of love are in conflict with the reason but their difference lies in the type of love and the beloved. In Shahnameh and Khosrow & Shirin, love is of the earthly type and the beloved is also a beautiful man but love in the Odes of Shams is of mystical nature and this mystical beloved is sometimes the God while in another point it is an earthly beloved, i.e. Shams Tabrizi. It needs to be noted that the main task of the men in Shahnameh is battling and, in few cases, there is a word of love. We can see love in Khosrow & Shirin along with battle but in the eyes of Rumi, anything but love is meaningless (Rumi, 1999). Today, this metaphor does not have any use in the language.

6.6. *Head Full of Reason*

“Head Full of Reason” is also another conceptual metaphor that has the most frequent application in Shahnameh (eight times). Rumi has used this metaphor for five times but contrary to Ferdowsi, instead of the Persian “Kherad” he has used the Arabic “A’ql”. Nizami has not used this metaphor but in the same way that Ferdowsi considers the reason to be the best bounty of God (Ferdowsi, 2009), he also regards reason to be a divine bounty that has been endowed by God so that by its help we may know Him

(Nizami, 2011). Although Rumi says that when reason goes out of the head there remains nothing but idiocy (Rumi, 1999), but his odes is in some way the battle ground of love and reason. Love takes the mace and breaks the head of reason (Rumi, 1999). He describes reason as a barrier in the path of lovers and the wayfarers (Rumi, 1999) and states that love evades the light of reason (Rumi, 1999). Today, in Persian it is said; “X does not have any reason inside his head”.

6.7. *Head Full of Care*

In Shahnameh eight times the conceptual metaphor of “Head full of care” or its variations (sorrow and anguish) have been used. Care is of high frequency in this epic because after every defeat or death the relatives are sad. Nevertheless, since this world is a transient sphere, sitting sad is not desirable and reasonable man in this transient world should be sorrowful. In Shahnameh the stanza “Why should reasonable men be sad?” has been repeated for five times in different places (cf. vol. 5: 724). The warriors of this epic by the arrival of the sorrow seek to forget it by drinking wine (Rumi, 1999). Nizami and Rumi have not used this conceptual metaphor but both like Ferdowsi have criticized the worldly sorrows (Nizami, 2018) and (Rumi, 1999). All three poets believe that wine is the key to liberation and they have spoken of the sorrow of love. Of course, wine and love in Rumi’s poems are mystical and divine and not only he does not evade such a sorrow rather describes it as sweet sorrow like sugar (Evans, 2007). Today, this metaphor does not have any use.

7. SUMMARY

Given the fact that all three poets discussed in this essay, despite their temporal and spatial distance, have used the head as a container for conceptualization of feelings, we find out that this metaphor has been prevalent among Persian speaking people in different times and places. In all examples, head is a container for conceptualization of feelings, even when one speaks of a head full of wine, wine is not a material object, because it is a figure of drunkenness and an expression of the happiness and joy. Although all three poets due to their shared cultural origin have made use of the primary metaphor of “head is the container” for showing the feelings, in many cases they have combined it with figure and metonymy. In so doing, each of them has taken advantage of this scheme for his own particular intentions (e.g. conceptualization of earthly or mystical love) in line with his intellectual bent. It seems that the use of these compound and complicated metaphors is more for showing its intensity than for conceptualization of one feeling. Moreover, Ferdowsi’s sense of nationalism has caused him to use Persian words in making pictures with “head” while Nizami and Rumi do not have such a sensitivity. Furthermore, in their own time, due to the prevalence of Sufism and also the expansion of religious sciences, Persian has become more combined with Arabic. Although today Iranians in their daily language still use the primary metaphor “head is a container”, its number is lesser than the literary texts and there is no sign of the combination of this primary metaphor with figure and metonymy.

REFERENCES

1. Rasekh Mohanad M. (2017), An introduction to Cognitive Linguistics, Sixth Edition, Tehran: SAMT press, pp: 6-10.
2. Lakoff G. (1993), The contemporary theory of Metaphor. The Andrew or tony, ed., Metaphor and Thought, 203-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 205-213.

3. Quinn N. & Holland D. (1987), Culture and cognition. In Quinn N. & Holland D. (eds.), Cultural models in language and thought,. Cambridge: Caambridge University Press, pp. 3-40.
4. Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp: 146-158.
5. Anwari H. (2014), Great Dictionary of Sokhan, Eighth Edition, Tehran: Sokhan Press, pp: 69-77.
6. Afifi R. (2004), Iranian Myths and Culture, Second Edition, Tehran: Tus Press, pp: 523-530.
7. Biljana R. (2012) Bridge Hand book of Metaphor and Though. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp: 247-261.
8. Shariari P. (1986), Algebra, vol. 1, Seventh Edition, Tehran: Sepehr Press, pp: 320-328.
9. Criticism L. (2010), Odes of Shams, edited by Badi Al Zaman Furuzanfar, First Edition, Tehran: Sorayesh, pp: 66-75.
10. Goharin S. (1997), An Exposition of Sufi Terms, Second Edition, vol. 6, Tehran: Zavvar Press pp: 40-53.
11. Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (2015), Metaphors with which we live, trans. Hajar Aqa Ebrahimi, First edition, Tehran: Elm Press, pp: 71-84.
12. Hashemi Z. (2015), Sufi Love in the Mirror of Metaphor, first edition, Tehran: Elmi Press, pp: 32-41.
13. Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (1999). Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought. New York: Basic Books, pp: 209-222.
14. Johnson M. (1987). The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp: 156-167.
15. Kovecses Z. (2016), Language, Mind and Culture, trans. Jahanshah Mirzabeigi, First Edition, Tehran: Agah, pp: 341-347.
16. Lakoff G. & Johnson M. (2018), Metaphors with which we live, trans. Jahanshah Mirzabeigi, first edition, Tehran: Agah Press, pp: 21-38.
17. Panter D. (2015), Metaphor, trans. Mohammad Mahdi Moqimizadeh, first edition, Tehran: Elm Press, pp: 50-63.
18. Hawks T. (2001), Metaphor, trans. Farzaneh Taheri, Third Edition, Tehran: Nashre Markaz, pp: 12-24.
19. Dekhoda A. (1998), Encyclopedic Dictionary, edited by Moein and Seyed Jafar Shahidi, Second Edition, Tehran: Tehran University Press, pp: 13527-13535.
20. Moein M. (2000), Persian Dictionary, Sixteenth Edition, Tehran: Sepehr, pp: 1847-1856.
21. Ju N. (2008), Metaphor from body and culture in Raymond Gibbs, ed., the cam, pp: 185-196.
22. Ferdowsi A. (2009), Shahnameh, based on Moscow Edition, Fourth Impression, Tehran: Qoqnoos, pp: 247-262.
23. Nizami E. (2011), Khosrow & Shirin, edited and annotated by Hassan Vahid Dastgerdi, Twelfth Edition, Tehran: Qatreh, pp: 317-343.
24. Rumi M. (1999), Masnavi, edited by Karim Zamani, 36th edition, Tehran: Etelaat, pp: 387-390.
25. Rumi (2015), Masnavi, edited by Karim Zamani, 36th edition, Tehran: Etelaat, pp: 684-398.

26. Nizami E. (2002), *Makhzan Al Asrar*, Edited and annotated by Hassan Vahid Dastgerdi, First Edition, Tehran: Barg Negar, pp: 95-109.
27. Nizami E. (2009), *Sharafnameh*, edited and annotated by Hassan Vahid Dastgerdi, Second Edition, Tehran: Zavvar, pp: 82-96.
28. Nizami E. (2018), *Leili va Majnoon*, edited by Hamid Mirza Rezaei, Third Edition, Tehran: Shir Mohammadi, pp: 236-247.
29. Evans V. (2007). *AGlossary of Cognitive Linaistics*. Edinbargh: Edinburgh university press, pp: 190-200.

ENDNOTES

¹ Mapping: Mappings represent a set of conceptual correspondences between the elements of source and target domains with which conceptual metaphors are specified and understood. In mathematics, mapping is used for conceptualization of an unknown concept which refers to the correspondence between the known and unknown sets in a way that the totality of both sets is equal (Shahriari, 1986: 367-8).

² Ontological metaphor is a metaphor according to which abstract notions are embodied in the form of objects, materials, physical containers and an entity (Lakoff and Johnson, 2015: 49).

³ Here Rumi uses the conceptual metaphor of “having arrogance in head” that against “having wind in head” is a metaphor that directly and is made without the mediation of any metonymy.

⁴ Ferdowsi has also spoken 95 times of heart and 1 time of “chest full of hatred”.

⁵ Of course, there are certain exceptions, e.g. the battle of Rostam and Esfandiyar or Rostam and Sohrab.

⁶ Shirin once criticizes Khosrow as follows:

“You were happily cheering with your friends/ While Farhad was digging the mountain with his ax” (Nizami, 2011: 311).

⁷ Wherever something else is being likened to fire the basis of the likening in a simile is also mentioned, e.g. “fire of jealousy” (Ferdowsi, 2009, vol. 1: 62), “fire of hatred” (ibid, vol. 4: 650) and “fire of love” (ibid, vol. 5: 731).

⁸ In contemporary language, the phrase “smoke came out of my head” is used when one is faced with something that is unbelievably surprising, e.g. a great lie or a very outrageous action or a heavy price.

⁹ Aghrirath is the brother of Afrasyab who was finally killed by this oppressive king.

¹⁰ Nizami in *Sharafnameh* (2002: 453) speaks of the armies the brain of whom is boiling of the heat of rage.

¹¹ Nizami states,

If your anger kindles a sharp fire/ pour the water of my tears on it (Nizami, 2018: 128).

¹² According to Ancient Persians, anger is a demon that opposes the peace of the creatures of Ahura Mazda (Afifi, 2004: 523).

¹³ Ferdowsi (2009, vol. 8: 1697) also believes that following religion and righteousness reduces God’s rage.

¹⁴ Melancholy is one of the four temperaments whose place is “milt”: obsession, melancholy, illusion and love (Moein Dictionary).

¹⁵ Having passion in head: Being enthusiastic (Dehkhoda Encyclopedic Dictionary).