

Metaphor in Day-to-Day Arabic Speech: A Conceptual Approach

Dr. Jalal Raii*

(Received 18 / 9 / 2008. Accepted 1 / 12 / 2008)

□ ABSTRACT □

This paper examines the pervasiveness of metaphorical constructions in day-to-day variety of language. It claims, in accordance with Lakoff and Johnson (1980), that the metaphorical expressions are not mere words, but they are part and parcel of our everyday speech and the way we conceptualize things and that metaphor is not restricted to poetic language or the literary style. The examples we give here are used to show that we use existing physical concepts to conceptualize these abstract concepts.

Key words: Metaphor; Metaphorical conceptual system; conceptualize; cognitive domain.

* Assistant Prof, Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

الاستعارات في الحديث اليومي العربي: مقارنة معرفية

الدكتور جلال راعي *

(تاريخ الإيداع 18 / 9 / 2008. قبل للنشر في 1 / 12 / 2008)

□ الملخص □

يسلط هذا البحث الضوء على وفرة وجود عبارات الاستعارة في حديثنا اليومي. و استناداً إلى جورج لايفكوف و مارك جونسن (1980) ندعي أن تعابير الاستعارة ليست قضية متعلقة بالكلمات و حسب بل هي جزء لا يتجزأ من الطريقة التي نعي بها الأشياء و نعقلها و أن الاستعارة ليست حكراً على اللغة الشعرية أو الأدبية. و نعطي أمثلة كثيرة لكي ندلل على أننا نستخدم القضايا المادية المحسوسة المتوفرة لدينا لكي نعي و نعقل الأفكار المجردة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: استعارة، مجال معرفي، يعقل، الاستعارة المعرفية، اللغة اليومية.

Introduction:

*مدرس علم اللغة- قسم اللغة الانكليزية- كلية الآداب - جامعة تشرين - اللاذقية -سورية.

Traditionally, metaphorical expressions have been viewed as characteristic of language as opposed to thought. They were taken to be seen in poetic literary style in contrast to day-to-day variety of language (Lakoff 1992: 417). Moreover, metaphors have been the subject of study for a long time in different intellectual disciplines and fields ranging from literary study, philosophy of language, psychology and linguistics, to mention just a few. In addition, the study of metaphor has been traced back to Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. For a long time metaphor was seen as the exclusive field and territory of literary scholars (Ungerer & Schmid 1996: 114).

In this traditional view, metaphor is regarded as a linguistic incident which comes mainly in the sphere of poetic and figurative speech or discourse and it ascribes this very important happening to the rhetorical style employed in literature. Moreover, there is a stable and unambiguous concept of literal meaning and that there is a distinct demarcation between what is literal and the non-literal. In addition to that, this traditional look sees that the literal language is totally precise and transparent, while figurative literary discourse is imprecise and it is the main claim and field of poets and literature¹.

However, since 1979, a huge number of works have been written and doubted the traditional view concerning metaphorical language. The turning point in the metaphor research domain could be said to be marked by the publication of two seminal books, which revolutionized the view concerning metaphor from taking it to be a tool of literary imagination and rhetorical style (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:3) to a more cognitive view in which metaphor is seen as a phenomenon firmly rooted in our conceptual system and verbal behavior (Lakoff 1993:1). The first book is Ortony (1979) *Metaphor and Thought*, and the second one is Lakoff & Johnson (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. One central idea within these works is that metaphor is rooted in day-to-day speech and that it is a device used in our daily discourse automatically and unconsciously to the extent it goes sometimes unnoticed.

Metaphor: a Traditional View

The traditional view concerning metaphor has certain assumptions, the first of which is that metaphors, like all other rhetorical tools, are deviation from literal language and day-to-day speech and they are alien to semantics proper or direct literal meaning (Fauconnier 1994: 1). This view, or false view, can be ascribed to the false assumption that "all everyday conventional language is literal, and none is metaphoric" (Lakoff 1993:2).

The other presupposition on part of the traditional studies is that metaphors are only a matter of the lexicon; that is, the use of words. This assumption can be attributed to the view that "all subject matter can be comprehended literally without metaphor" (Lakoff 1993:2). We can see the use of expressions such as "his heart is white" and "كذبه" "a white lie" in which the use of the word "أبيض" means "honest and harmless" respectively. We may also see the expression "أحمد تور شغل" "Ahmad is an ox at work" which means "Ahmad is a very patient and hard worker". And we also notice the expression "أحمد خنزير درا" "Ahmad is a maize pig" which means "Ahmad is a very dirty vandalizing person".

The traditional view will take these examples to be a matter of only language where the literal words are substituted with the metaphorical ones. A more deep and interesting

¹ For more details see Malmkjar & Anderson (1996:308ff), Abrahams (1957: 66ff) and Evans & Green (2006:292ff).

metaphor used in Latakia is when one says *"we have not seen this type of pigness² before"* referring to a very cunning and vandalizing person.

Moreover, in the traditional theory of metaphor, we have concentration on the law of transference of qualities from one subject to another: from the vehicle to the tenor (Richards 1936, cited in Arseneault 2005: 42)³. For example, metaphor is defined by Aristotle as "giving the thing a name belonging to something else, the transference being...on the grounds of analogy" (cited in Coulson 2005:32). In the expression *"أحمد خنزير درا"* "Ahmad is a maize pig", the vehicle *"خنزير"* "pig" is used in place of "a very dirty vandalizing person". On the traditional view, metaphor is seen as "a novel or poetic linguistic expression where one or more words for a concept are used outside of its normal conventional meaning to express a *similar* concept" (Lakoff 1993: 1).

The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor

In contrast to the traditional view of metaphor as a literary device used mainly in the literary works and poetic style or language, cognitive researchers such as Lakoff & Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1993), Sweetser (1990) and Turner (1989) see that the metaphor is a pervasive phenomenon in day-to-day communication and that it represents a conceptual process output which helps us understand one domain in terms of another (Coulson 2005: 32ff) and (Taylor 2005: 569ff). Cognitive linguists claim that the proper place of metaphor is in our cognitive system, where it plays an important role in characterizing the structure of abstract concepts, making us understand abstract concepts via more concrete ones (Lakoff 1992: 417). Moreover, metaphor is defined as reference to one domain using words more commonly associated with another one. And each metaphor is seen as a structural mapping from one domain onto another. In other words, metaphor is seen not simply as a stylistic device or feature of speech but that our thought is basically metaphorical in essence (Lakoff 1993:5-6) and (Evans & Green 2006: 286ff).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), our thoughts are shaped and framed by metaphor. In other words, the main claim of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is that metaphor is a transfer between two conceptual domains or subject areas: that is, the source and the target⁴. For example, quantity is interpreted metaphorically via verticality; *more is up* and *less is down*. For instance, *prices rise or they may fall or even hit the bottom too* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 185)⁵. In these examples, verticality is the source domain, and quantity is the target domain. So, here the metaphor is mapping from verticality onto quantity (Lakoff 1993: 9).

The Importance and Purpose of This Research Paper

We may claim that this is new in the sense that it studies day-to-day metaphoric expressions from a cognitive perspective. Moreover, we try, along the line of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), to prove that metaphors are not restricted to poetic literary style or rhetoric. The study highlights the pervasiveness of metaphor expressions in day-to-day speech. Our examples are taken from Latakia speech community of which the researcher of this present paper is a member himself.

² That is pig-like acts reflected in first eating to the full and then destroying what remains of the maize field, which is reflected in our famous expression *كيف بدأ تتعرف الخنزرة* "how will one recognize bad acts?"

³ See also Black (2005: 13).

⁴ Lakoff 1993:4-5

⁵ See also Lakoff 1992: 417

Data and explication

1. Time

Time is conceptualized in terms of space. In other words, the concept of time is understood via things, such as entities, location and motion as well, as the following day-to-day examples in table-1 may show:

Table-1

Arabic	English translation
إجا وقت الجد	the time of seriousness has come
طار الوقت	time flied
وقف الوقت	time stopped
رمضان جاي بكير	Ramadan has <i>come early</i>
مر تشرين بسرعه	October passed fast
راح آذار	March went away
طولت هالسنة	this year lasted long/ it stayed long
العام اللي مرق	the year that passed
العام الجاي	the year coming
أيلول صار عاللبواب	September has reached the doorsteps
قرب تشرين	October is approaching nearer
تأخر الوقت	Time <i>is late</i>
مرق آذار وما حسينا فيه	March <i>passed by us</i> and we did not feel that
جايك مستقبل منيح	A very good future will come to you
دقر أيلول	September stopped

We may notice that the use of the expressions إجا “came”, مر “passed by”, طولت “stayed for long”, قرب “came near” and the like are all used with time expressions and the metaphor *time passing-is-motion* can account for them all.

1.1 Times are Locations

Times can also be *fixed locations* and *we are moving with respect to them*, as in the following day-to-day time expressions in table-2:

Table-2

Arabic	English translation
المستقبل ناظرکم	The future is waiting for you
قربنا من رمضان	We are getting nearer to Ramadan
قربنا من الامتحان	We are getting nearer to the exam
صار ع بواب أيلول	He reached the <i>doors of September</i>
صرنا ع حدود أيلول	we reached the <i>boundaries of September</i>

صرنا ع تخوم التسعين	we <i>reached the frontiers of ninety</i>
وصل ع التسعين	He <i>reached at ninety</i>
صرنا ع عتاب أيلول	we reached the <i>doorsteps of September</i>
طلع فوق التسعين	He <i>stepped over ninety</i>
نط فوق التسعين	He <i>jumped over ninety</i>
نط التسعين	He <i>jumped over ninety</i>
صار حوالي التسعين	He is near by <i>ninety</i>
لحق التسعين	He <i>caught up with ninety</i>
طف التسعين	He <i>stretched into ninety</i>
قحص التسعين	He <i>jumped over ninety</i>
قطع التسعين	He <i>passed by ninety</i>
دعس فوق التسعين	He stepped over ninety ⁶
وصل التسعين و دعس	He reached ninety and he is still accelerating
العمر إلو حدود	Age has limits

Moreover, *time is personified*. It can teach us, it can wake us up. It can also break our backs or smile and laugh too *and it can be measured* too. Moreover, it can be possessed, won, lost or *collected and eaten and even cut* as in the following examples in table-3

Table-3

Arabic	English
بكر الزمن بيعلمو	Later on time will teach him
بكر الزمن بيقيقو	Later on time will awake him
هالشهر كسر لي ضهري	This month broke my back
ضحكوا الزمن	Time laughed to him
ما بقي من العمر أكثر مللي مرق	What <i>remains</i> of life is not more than what is <i>passed</i>
شباط قصير	February is <i>short</i>
هالسنة ألف سنة	This year is a thousand years
عندو تسعين سنة	He <i>has</i> ninety years
طبّق التسعين	He <i>made ninety layers of years</i>
رّوح سنة	He let one year go
ربح سنة	He won one year
خسر سنة	He <i>lost one</i> year
ضيع سنة	He lost one year

⁶ This expression is taken from driving where one can accelerate the car by stepping on the accelerator.

موت سنة	He <i>killed one</i> year
فوت عليه سنة	He let one year elapse
أكل عمرو	He ate his life
خلص عمرو	He finished his own life
أكل عمرو و عمر غيره	He ate his life and the life of others
عم بيقطع وقت	He is passing time
كيف مرقت الوقت	How did you pass time

We may note that the metaphor *time-is-Entity* can account for the expressions in table-3. Notice the use of the expression “أكل عمرو” “he ate his years”. As if we have *canned* our years and we eat them day after day. This is why we also say “عطاه الله عمر جديد” “God gave him a new life” and we eat it afresh until we finish it too.

2 Argument is War

Our speech and verbal discourse can be conceptualized as a kind of conflict, as the following expressions in Table-4 may illustrate:

Table-4

Arabic	English translation
ما فيك تدافع عن موقفك	You cannot defend your position
نسف كل حكيو	He exploded his own speech
ما بتقدر عليه بالحكي	you cannot overpower him with speech
ما فيك تهزمو ابداً	You cannot defeat him
حكيو بمحللو	His speech is in its right position
حكيو صاب عين الحقيقة	His speech hit the eye of truth
حكيو قوي	His speech is strong
حجتو قويه	His argument is powerful
تبتو	He fixed him
كتفو	He twisted his opponent's shoulder back
دبحو	He slaughtered him
دبحو بالسليطه	He slaughtered him with a granite stone
حلقو برم	He cut the opponent's hair round
كبسو	He pressed him hard
صدو	He parried the blow
كسرو	He broke him
قتلو	He killed him

إجيتو قاضيه	It came to him a knockdown
مرغو	He put the opponent's face in dust
ملخو	He took him by the teeth and hands
صرعو	He killed him
دوخو	He made him faint
ربطو	He fixed him with a rope
نتقو	He made him small pieces
حزكو	He slaughtered him
هرلو سنيو	He made his opponent's teeth fall down
كلخو	He took the teeth with a pliers
كريجو	He blocked him
وقفو ع إجر وحده	He made stand on one leg
روحو فته	He made him small pieces of bread
سواه زحيلوطات	He made him pellets
فركو فرك البرغوط	He pressed and rubbed him like rubbing a flea
شواه	He grilled him
سلخو	He skinned him
نتقو لشعرو	He plucked his hair
مسكو من حنكو	He took him by the jaws
ركبو الجحشه بالمقلوب	He made him ride the donkey up side down
شدلو الرسن	He tied the leash
لجمو	He reined him
جابو كب ع بوزو	He made him fall forcefully at the mouth
لفلو المرسي و عقدا	He wrapped the rope on him and knotted it too
عقدو	He made knots around him
ما كان يفلتو	He did not let him go
طحنو	He grounded him
عجنو	He kneaded him
هلسو	He overcooked him
هبلاو	He steamed him
نبرو	He hit him too hard with a stick
نفضو	He hit him hard to take dust out of him

فوتو بالحيط	He made him enter into the wall
حصرو	He surrounded him
عصرو	He squeezed him
شدلو اللجمه	He dragged the rein
بطحو	He threw him down
هزمو	He defeated him
ريح عليه	He won over him
ردلو	He hit him back
ما تركلو	He did not let the rope get longer
حرقو	He burnt him
نشرو	He sawed him
سواه قمله	He made him a louse
سواه مساحه	He made him a dirty mat
سواه بالأرض	He flattened him with earth
مرغو بالتراب	He rolled him in dust
عركو	He battled him down
لوا دراعو	He twisted his arm
كسحو	He took off his big branches
رقو	He flattened him
شحورو	He made him black
ورمو	He caused him to swell
اشتبكو	They got into the fight
كسر قرنو	He broke his opponent's horn
بندو	He fixed him with nails
قرفو ⁷	He arm-wrestled him down
	He broke his opponent's hand

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 20ff) state that we do not just speak about arguments in terms of war but we really *win* and *lose* arguments. Moreover we consider the person in the argument with us an opponent and we attack his position, we defend ours. And many of the things we do in an argument are structured by the concept of war or conflict, fighting, wrestling and boxing too. They claim that even though we have no physical battle, we have a verbal one and the structure of arguments shows this: the attack, defense, counter-attack, injury, pain, punishment, humiliation or even destruction “It is in this sense that the *argument is war* metaphor is one that we live by; it structures the actions we perform in

⁷ The public poetry competition is known as *مكساره* or *مقارفة* “arm-wrestling”

arguing”⁸. The above expression in table-4 may confirm this idea. And we may also defend our idea with the following expressions in Table-5 in reference to speech and arguments, where they are referred to as having weapon-effect:

Table-5

Arabic	English translation
حكيو ضرب ع الراس	His speech is hitting on the head
حكيو صدمني	His speech shocked/ blew me
حكيو فلقني	His speech split me
حكيو هزني	His speech shook me
حكيو فقعنني	His speech exploded me
موتني	His speech killed me
طققني	His speech exploded me
ألمني	His speech caused pain
فطسني	His speech muffled me
قهرني	He conquered me
حكيو دج	His speech is striking
حكيو مدافع	His speech is guns
حكيو نبر	His speech is club-hitting
حكيو خبط	His speech is beating up
حكيو هبر	His speech is hitting
حكيو طخ	His speech is gun-shooting
حكيو قاسي	His speech is hard
ماسك معو	He is holding with him
شادد معو	He is pulling with him
واقف معو	He is lining up with him
صافف معو	He is standing on the same line
هو يدك و انت بتقوس	He loads the gun and you fire
حشكو	He cornered him

The metaphor *argument-is-war* can be taken as one instance for how a metaphorical concept frames our acts and structures our understanding of what we do in arguments. The claim on part of Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 9) is that “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another”. Moreover, argument and wars are two different kinds of objects; one is verbal act and the other is conflict using arms. However, arguments are framed with reference to war. Hence the concept and the

⁸ Cf Lakoff and Johnson (1980:9)

activity are metaphorically framed Lakoff and Johnson (1980: ibid). We may also notice that the language of arguments is neither poetically ornamental nor is it literary. In this respect, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10) observe that we talk about arguments in the way we do because we behave in accordance with how we really conceptualize things.

3. Ideas and Speech are Food and Commodities

When we refer to ideas or speech we use expressions such as the ones in table-6. We use expressions referring to food to talk about ideas and speech:

Table-6

Arabic	English translation
أفكارو حلوه	His ideas are sweet
أفكارو لذيزه	His ideas are tasty
أفكارو بلا طعمه	His ideas are without taste
أفكارو خمه	His ideas are stale
أفكارو محمضه	His ideas are soar
كل قصصو بابته	All his stories are stale
حديثو ناشف	His speech is dry. It has no oil
حط الموضوع عا نار هاديه	He put the subject on quiet fire
كلامو فقوع	His speech is unripe green figs
كلامو بطيخ مبسمر	His speech is bad quality melon
كلامو حد	His speech is hot
كلامو فح	His speech is green/ hard/ unripe
كلامو معلب	His speech is tinned
كلامو فاضي	His speech is empty (like empty nuts)
شامم بحكيك ريحا موطييه	I smell bad smell in your words
هالموضوع مدهن	This subject is fatty/ greasy
موضوع دسم	This subject is oily
أكل الكتب أكل	He ate the books
سلق الموضوع سلق	He boiled the subject
كلامو ما بينهضم	His speech cannot be digested
احكي دغري و بلا تبهير	Talk straight with no spices
حكيو بطيب خاطر	His speech flavors the soul
شو قاعدين عم تطبخو	What are you cooking
كلامو ما لو قيمه	His speech has no value
ما بشتري كلامو بفرنك	I do not buy his speech for a coin
ما بشيل حكيو من أرضو	I do not take his speech from his land

كلامو ما بينزل ع الأرض	His speech does not come down on the ground
زبدة الموضوع	The butter of the subject

4. Seeing is Touching and Eyes are Limbs⁹

Table-7 shows some of the expressions we use to express sight.

Table-7

Arabic	English translation
ما شال عينو عني	He did not lift his eyes off me
ملزق عيونو علي	He stuck his eyes on me
صايبتو عين	An eye hit him
طرقيتو عين	An eye struck him
أكلني بعيونو	He ate me with his eyes
حط عينو عليها	He put his eyes on her

5 States and Changes are Locations¹⁰

We use expression such as in the following table:

Table-8

Arabic	English translation
وقع بالحب	He fell in love
وقع بمشكلة	He fell in a problem
طلع من ازمه	He came out of a problem
نزل بمشكلة	He went down into a problem
دخلنا بمشكلة جديدة	We entered into a new problem
علق بالمشاكل	He got stuck in problems

6 Difficulties are Impediments to Motion

These can be blockages, burdens, counterforces or lack of energy, as in table-9. They can be like commodities you buy, throw away, or search up for:

Table-9

Arabic	English translation
الهم كسر ضهرو	Worry broke his back
الهم شيبو	Worry made his hair grey
الهم ببسقي سم	Worry brings you poison to drink
خلص كازو	His oil (petrol) finished
حامل هم الدني	He is carrying worry on his shoulders
أخرنا الامتحان	The exam made us late

⁹ Cf. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:39)

¹⁰ Ibid:180

لاحق المشاكل	He is walking behind troubles
مدور ع المشاكل	He is searching for troubles
بيشترى المشاكل	He buys troubles
بيشترى الهم مشترى	He buys worries
أكل هم	He is eating worries
عائل هم	He is carrying worries
داير ع الفقر	He is looking for poverty
داير ع البهله	He is searching for humiliation
داير ع اللعن	He is searching for abuse
رفس النعمه	He kicked bounties

7 Lack of Purpose is Lack of Direction

Table-10

Arabic	English
عم بيحوم حوال الموضوع	He is just floating around
عم بيعفس	He is drifting aimlessly
متيس و ماشي	He is bull-like walking
مضيع كر خالتو	He has lost the donkey of his aunt

8 Trying to Achieve a Purpose is Hunting

Table-11

Arabic	English
عم بيكيوز ع الوظيفه	He is aiming at the job
منيشن عليها	He is aiming at it
قنص الفرصه قنص	He hunted the opportunity
كان صالي طافوحا	He made a bird-trap for it

In addition to the abundant examples we have already given, let's notice the set of words denoting body parts and some other sets denoting environmental objects to show the pervasiveness of metaphor in day-to-day language, as in table-12:

Table-12

Arabic		English
راس	راس الجبل	Head of the mountain
	راس البيت	Head of the house
	راس العيله	Head of the family
	راس الصفحه	Head of the page
	راس الفتته	Head of the trouble

	راس المشكله	Head of the problem
	راس الخيمه	Head of the tent
	راس النبع	Head of the spring
	راس القلم	Head of the pen
	راس الشعره	Head of the hair
	راس الحريره	Head of the spear
	راس السكين	Head of the knife
	راس الابره	Head of the needle
	راس اللسان	Head of the tongue
	راس الشجره	Head of the tree
قلب	قلب القلم	Heart of the pen
	قلب الجبسه	Heart of the melon
	قلب الموضوع	Heart of the subject
	قلب الدولاب	Heart of the wheel
	قالب الكتاب	Heart of the book
عين	عين العقل	Eye of the brain
	عين الرأي	Eye of the opinion
	عين المي	Eye of the spring
	عين الأبره	Eye of the needle
	عين الشمس	Eye of the sun
وجه	وجه الورقه	Face of the paper
	وجه السحاره	Face of the box
	وج الباروده	Face of the gun
	وج الحقيقه	Face of the truth
قفا	قفا أيديو	Back of his hand
	قفا البيت	Back of the house
	قفا العلبيه	Back of the tin
	قفا الورقه	Back of the paper
	قفا التقلايه	Back of the frying pan
	قفا الراس	Back of the head
جلد	جلده الكتاب	Skin of the book
تم	تم المدفع	Mouth of the gun

	تم الجره	Mouth of the jar
	تم الحاره	Mouth of the locality
	تم الكاسه	Mouth of the cup
	تم البلوعه	Mouth of the sink
	تم الوادي	Mouth of the valley
إجر	إجر الكرسيه	Leg of the chair
	إجر الطاولة	Leg of the table
ديل	ديل الورقه	Tail of the paper
	ديال الشجره	Tails of the tree
كعب	كعب الوادي	Heel of the valley
	كعب الدست	Heel of the big cooking pot
	كعب الفنجان	Heel of the cup
	كعب الصبات	Heel of the shoe
	كعب المسدس	Heel of the gun
بومه	واحد بومه	He is an owl
أرنب	واحد أرنب	He is a rabbit
قط	قط بسبع رواح	He is a cat with seven lives
حيه	حيه من تحت التبن	He is a snake in the hay

We may look at some of the metaphorical expressions we have in table-12 to illustrate the point further that metaphor is part of a bigger way of conceptualization. Let's take the metaphor *paper-is-a body*. The paper has "face", "back", "head", and "tail". So, this metaphor explains our use of the expressions involving these words. Out of this cognitive metaphor we get lots of metaphorical expressions based on it and used in our day-to-day discourse: they are not simply a matter of language alone but our way of conceptualizing the world around us. In the metaphor *paper-is-a body*, the paper is the target and the body is the source. Applying the same analysis, we can explain the other examples and similar ones as well.

Another metaphorical expression is the use of the word *راس العيله* in *راس* "the head of the family", "the breadwinner", "and the chief decision maker". The conceptual metaphor may be taken as a mapping from *body* onto *family* and according to Lakoff (1993:5) this mapping is a set of ontological correspondences by mapping knowledge about the structure of a family onto knowledge about the body structure. In this case *family* is the target domain and *body* is the source domain. In other words, the correspondence between the category *body* and the category *family* is that the body has the head as the most significant part; hence the father is the head or the most important member. This metaphor is not only language but it also reflects our world view at a certain time.

9. Examination is Farming and Racing or Sliding

Let's consider one of the most common topics in our society: studying and the examination, and see the expressions we use to talk about it, as in table-13:

Table-13

Arabic	English
كيف <i>الدرس</i>	How is your study
<i>الدرس منيح/ مليح</i>	the study is very good
<i>بيدرس بس ما في خواص</i>	He studies but gets no result
<i>رحنا عالفحص</i>	We went to the examination
<i>سقط بالفحص</i>	He failed in the exam
<i>عفس بالفحص</i>	He did very bad in the exam
<i>فحصونا بالعربي</i>	We were examined in Arabic
<i>سبقت كل رفاقتي</i>	He is the top student
<i>حطيت كل رفاقتي وراي</i>	I am the top student
<i>جمع علامات منيحة</i>	He got very good marks
<i>ضربونا بالفحص</i>	The questions were very difficult
<i>ما خلونا ننقل شي</i>	We were not allowed to copy
<i>جاب تسعين بالنقد</i>	He got ninety marks
<i>كسح كل رفاقو</i>	He is in the first place
<i>فلى الكتاب</i>	He scrutinizes the book
<i>حفظ <i>الدرس</i></i>	He memorized the lesson
<i>فلح <i>بالدرس</i></i>	He did very well in his study

We may notice the metaphor *exam-is- farming, racing and sliding* may account for the expressions we have in table-12, as in the name of the exam itself is *فحص* which means literally “sliding”. This is why we use *سقط* “fell down” or “slip” and *سبق* “get ahead of” or outdistanced”. We also use farming terms like *الدرس* “thrashing” to mean “the exam” and we *نكسح الكل* “we trim all the people in the field, as if they were trees”¹¹. In other words, the source domain is farming and racing and the target domain is the exam: we thrash the wheat, we collect the seeds, we run, slide, slip, fall, be hit and we carry flags.

Limitations of the Work

¹¹ The expression *يكسح* is used to refer to the act of cutting the branches of olive trees after collecting the olive fruits.

We have not exhausted the whole topic and the day-to-day metaphorical expressions we use. That is because of space limits. For this reason we keep that for further research and investigation.

Conclusion and Results

The aim of this paper is to show the pervasiveness of metaphorical expressions we use in our day-to day interaction and speech, which show that metaphor is not only restricted to the poetic literary style. Moreover, the background for this approach is Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1993). The following results and observations may be noticed:

1. Metaphorical language is the superficial reflection of our conceptual system.
2. Metaphors help us comprehend abstract domains in terms of more concrete ones.
3. Metaphors are mappings from one cognitive domain onto another: From the source domain onto the target one.
4. The examples mentioned above are a few of their like, but they show the pervasiveness of metaphorical expression in our daily speech to the extent it is sometime not easy to recognize them

REFERENCES:

1. ABRAHAMS, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. London: Rinehart Winston.1957, 1993.
2. ARSENEAULT, M. "Metaphor: Philosophical Theories", in Brown (ed.). 2005, 40-43.
3. BLACK, J. "The Study of Metaphor".
<http://eagle.northwestu.edu/academic/ministry/faculty/bstallman/Dissertation/2.pdf>>, (12.6.2006). 2005.
4. BRIGHT, W. *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP. 1992.
5. BROWN, Keith (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Elsevier: Pergamon. 2005 <E-mule download version, 11.3.2006>.
6. COULSON, S. "Metaphor and Conceptual Blending". In Brown, Keith (ed.). 2005,32-39.
7. EVANS, V. & GREEN. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: EUP. 2006. <E-mule download version, 10.4.2007>.
8. FAUCONNIER, G. *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: CUP. 1997
9. ----- . *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge: CUP. 1994
10. HAASE, C. "Understanding Metaphors in Everyday Language". http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/chairs/linguist/independent/kursmaterialien/termpapers_online/reck_metaphors.pdf. 2002
11. LAKOFF G. & TURNER. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: CUP. 1989
12. LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: CUP. 1980.
<E-mule download version, 7.3.2007>.
13. LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. Chicago: CUP. 1999
14. LAKOFF, G. "Metaphor and Semantics", in Bright 2, 1992,417-419.
15. ----- . "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor", in Ortony, 1993: 202-251.
<E-mule download version, 11.1.2007>.
16. LEVIN, S. *The Semantics of Metaphor*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press). 1977
17. LYCAN, W. *Philosophy of Language: A Contemporary Introduction*. New York: Routledge. 1999.
18. MALMKJAR & ANDERSON. (eds.). *the Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.1996
19. MARTINICH, A.P. "A Theory for Metaphor," *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 13, 1984. 35-56. <E-mule download version, <12.2.2007>.
20. ORTONY, A. (Ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: CUP. 1993.
21. RICHARDS, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: OUP. 1936.
22. SAEED, J. *Semantics*. Oxford: OUP .1997.
23. SEARLE, J. "Metaphor", in Searle. *Expression and Meaning*, 76-116. 1979.
24. ----- . *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: CUP.1969
25. SHEN, Y. "Principles of Metaphor Interpretation and the Notion of 'domain': A Proposal for a Hybrid Model", *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 1999.1631-1653. <www.elsevier.nl/locate/pragma>, 12.6.2006).

26. SWEETSER, EVE. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: The Mind-as-Body Metaphor in Semantic Structure and Semantic Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
27. TAYLOR, J.R.. "Cognitive Semantics". In Brown (ed.). 2006,569-582.
28. TURNER, M. *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Chicago: CUP. 1989.
29. UNGERER, F. & SCHMID. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London: Longman: LUP. 1996.
30. WHITEHEAD, J. "Metaphor".
<<http://www.jackwhitehead.com/teesonphd/005c4.pdf>> (12.6. 2006). 2005

