

The Embodiment of 'Head' through Metonymic Metaphors in Jordanian Arabic as Compared to Tunisian Arabic: A Sub-Cultural Perspective

Aseel Zibin¹, Abdel Rahman Mitib Altakhaineh² & Ola Musmar³
^{1,2,3} University of Jordan, a.zabin@ju.edu.jo,
a.altakhaineh@ju.edu.jo, omusmar@ju.edu.jo

Keywords: Cognitive Linguistics, Embodiment, Metaphor, Metonymy

This study aims to explore the target concepts of metaphorical and metonymical uses of “head” in Jordanian Arabic (JA) compared to those used in Tunisian Arabic (TA). Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory as envisaged by Kövecses (2020) is adopted as the theoretical framework. Given that there is no online accessible corpus representative of Jordanian Arabic, the researchers built their own corpus. The manually-built specialized corpus consists of 195 *head* metaphorical and metonymical expressions in Jordanian Arabic (thirty seven after excluding repetitions). These expressions were collected from two sources: 20 native-speakers of Jordanian Arabic as well as the Jordanian Facebook page titled ‘Al-Wakeel Radio program’ which is freely accessible to users. The data of Tunisian Arabic was collected from Maalej’s (2014) study. The researchers employed a bottom-up approach where linguistic expressions were the basis for establishing cross domain mappings (Zibin, 2022). MIP was used to identify metaphorical expressions (Pragglejaz Group, 2007), then Steen’s (2007) five steps were followed to extract the conceptual metaphors. Data analysis reveals that through metonymic metaphors, the *head* in JA is used to profile CHARACTER TRAITS, MENTAL FACULTY, CULTURAL VALUES and EMOTIONS. The head in JA is also capitalized upon to provide explanations of several daily life experiences. The primacy of head in JA was clear in the informants’ comprehension of the means by which embodiment provides the grounding for cognition, perception and language, which supports Gibbs’ (2014) ‘embodied metaphorical imagination’. Similarities in the cultural model of *head* between the two dialects were found, yet differences were also detected and were attributed to: the existence of a cultural filter that has the ability to function between sub-cultures, and differences in experiential focus between the two examined speech communities.

References

- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2020. An extended view of conceptual metaphor theory. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 18(1). 112-130.
- Maalej, Zouheir & Ning, Yu. (eds.). 2011. *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures (Vol. 31)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Maalej, Zouheir. 2014. Body parts we live by in language and culture: The raaS ‘head’ and yidd ‘hand’ in Tunisian Arabic. In Brenzinger, Matthias & Iwona Kraska-Szlenk (eds.), *The body in language: comparative studies of linguistic embodiment*, 224-259. Boston: Brill.
- Pragglejaz Group, 2007. MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor Symbol* 22 (1). 1–39.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José. 2021. Conceptual metonymy theory revisited: Some definitional and taxonomic issues. In Xu Wen & John Taylor (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cognitive linguistics*, 204-227. London & New York: Routledge.
- Steen, Gerard. 2007. Finding metaphor in discourse: Pragglejaz and beyond. *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación/Culture, Language and Representation* 5. 9-25.
- Zibin, Aseel. 2022. The type and function of metaphors in Jordanian economic discourse: A critical metaphor analysis approach. *Language Sciences* 93. 101488.