



ARTICLE

# Head metonymies and metaphors in Jordanian and Tunisian Arabic: an extended conceptual metaphor theory perspective

Aseel Zibin , Abdel Rahman Mitib Altakhaineh  and Ola Musmar

Department of English Language and Literature, The School of Foreign Languages, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

**Corresponding author:** Abdel Rahman Mitib Altakhaineh; Email: [a.altakhaineh@ju.edu.jo](mailto:a.altakhaineh@ju.edu.jo)

(Received 01 August 2023; Revised 17 February 2024; Accepted 13 May 2024)

## Abstract

This study aims to explore the target concepts of metonymical and metaphorical uses of ‘head’ in Jordanian Arabic (JA) compared to those used in Tunisian Arabic (TA). Extended conceptual metaphor theory (ECMT) as envisaged by Kövecses (2020, *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 18, 112–130) is adopted as the theoretical framework. 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, *The Bloomsbury companion to cognitive linguistics*, pp. 167–184) ‘embodied metaphorical imagination’. Similarities in the cultural model of *head* between the two dialects were found, yet differences were also detected. In contrast to TA, the head is more productive in JA in profiling CHARACTER TRAITS and EMOTIONS. These differences were attributed to the existence of a cultural filter that has the ability to function between two cultures that belong to one matrix Arab culture and differences in experiential focus between the two examined speech communities.

**Keywords:** cognitive linguistics; culture; embodiment; Jordanian Arabic; metaphor; metonymy

## 1. Introduction

The notion of embodiment is integral to any analysis conducted from the viewpoint of cognitive linguistics (Maalej & Yu, 2011; Gibbs, 2014; Maalej, 2014; Zibin, 2021 and others). It is not only a matter of allowing the body to access the mind, but also necessarily a part of human understanding (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 178; Gibbs, 2006). According to Johnson (1987, p. xx), the notion of embodiment is triggered by prelinguistic image-schematic structures emerging from both personal and



sociocultural embodied experiences which are deemed to have ‘a figurative character as structures of embodied imagination’. This suggests that the things that we see and how they can be meaningful to us, the way such meanings can be expanded and articulated, our ability to understand and reason about experience and the actions we take are directly influenced by the centrality of human embodiment (Johnson, 1987, p. xiv). Lakoff and Johnson (1999, p. 6) argued that humans’ conceptual systems draw heavily on the commonalities of their bodies and the environments they live in, which suggests that the mind is strongly embodied. Consequently, much of an individual’s conceptual system is ‘either universal or widespread across languages and cultures’ (ibid, p. 6). The ‘mind is embodied in a way that maps the features of the human body and the surrounding environment’ (Zibin & Hamdan, 2019, p. 243).

Thanks to two full-length edited volumes on embodiment as well as a plethora of research studies across languages, studies on embodiment through body parts have started to gain more momentum (see Niemeier, 2008; Sharifian *et al.*, 2008; Aksan, 2011; Siahhaan, 2011; Maalej & Yu, 2011; Yu, 2011; Maalej, 2014; Gibbs, 2014; Kraska-Szlenk, 2014; Zibin, 2021; Baş, 2021; Soler, 2021 and others). These studies explore the conceptualization role of internal and outer body parts, proposing that they target knowledge domains, for example, EMOTIONS, MENTAL FACULTIES, CHARACTER TRAITS and CULTURAL VALUES. The majority of these researchers examined the body parts of eye, heart, stomach, liver, hand and head; however, upon further examination, it appears that studies that investigated these body parts in Arabic in general and in other under-investigated spoken varieties such as Jordanian Arabic (JA) are scarce. While embodiment in body-part metaphors may be a well-established concept, this study seeks to contribute by exploring the specific similarities and variations in HEAD metaphors and metonymies in two varieties of Arabic: TA and JA. We argue that even within Arabic dialects that belong to one matrix Arab culture, variation in embodiment exists and that could be affected by geographical, social, historical or ideological factors. For example, in Tunisia, a country in North Africa with a unique linguistic and cultural landscape, HEAD metaphors and metonymies are likely shaped by the coexistence of Arabic with other languages such as French, Berber and Amazigh. Jordan, on the other hand, is a country in the Middle East with a prevailing Bedouin culture and a variety of subdialects, some of which originated from neighboring countries, for example, Palestine and Syria due to immigration (see Zibin *et al.*, 2024). These linguistic and cultural differences, reflective of Jordan’s distinct societal fabric, likely differ from those found within Tunisian Arabic (TA). Accordingly, the novelty of this study lays in its examination of two subcultures that belong to the same matrix Arab culture, the first of which (Tunisian culture) has been explored by Maalej (2014) and the second of which (Jordanian culture) has not been examined in relation to HEAD and has not been compared to another Arab culture.

## 2. Theoretical framework

### 2.1 Extended conceptual metaphor theory (ECMT)

The modified version of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), that is, ECMT, is quite distinct from its previous version.

Concerns about CMT according to Kövecses (2016, 2020) arise from the unidirectional mapping from the concrete domain to the abstract domain. It is

commonly accepted that the core of conceptual metaphor lies in interpreting a relatively abstract domain through the lens of a more concrete one, with the belief that the concrete domain can be grasped in a literal sense. However, Kövecses challenges this definition, highlighting that numerous concrete experiences are conceptualized metaphorically. Contrary to the conventional belief that the literal meaning of the concrete domain is straightforward, Kövecses argues that it can be figuratively understood (Zou, 2020). Furthermore, he emphasizes the metaphoric and metonymical origins of concrete concepts from an etymological standpoint. This implies that many well-known concrete concepts today inherently possess figurative qualities (Zou, 2020).

These perspectives, though bold, offer insightful considerations. Kövecses contends that the rigid binary classification of concepts into purely concrete or abstract is overly simplistic. In his view, all concepts embody both concrete and abstract elements. It is crucial to note that Kövecses does not advocate for a complete reversal of the 'seeing abstract through concrete' approach. Instead, he points out the limitations introduced by the oversimplified binary division of concrete and abstract concepts in classical CMT. The traditional mind-set of distinguishing between concrete/literal and abstract/figurative is characterized as an outdated way of grappling with the complexities of reality. Taking a more inclusive stance from the outset, considering these aspects as blended, provides a more comprehensive perspective on metaphorical concepts (Zou, 2020). Thus, his definition reflects that the fact that the mappings are not established unidirectionally rather it can go both ways.

In his revision of CMT, Kövecses (2020) proposed a new model he referred to as ECMT. This extended view focuses on how metaphors, primed by context, are constructed online in a schematicity hierarchy containing four levels, that is, the image-schema, the domain, the frame and the mental space. He argues that three different types of metaphorical meaning can be identified, namely, meaningfulness, decontextualized meaning and contextual meaning (Kövecses, 2020, pp. 118–119). The first one is based on the image schema level which provides naturalness as well as bodily motivation for specific cases of metaphorical conceptualization, for example, the *PATH* schema. Decontextualized meaning is based on both the domain and frame levels in the hierarchy. The meaning here are based on more specific conceptual metaphors along with the mappings that constitute them, for example, 'inability to continue journey maps onto inability to go on with one's life' (Kövecses, 2020, p. 119). Finally, contextualized meaning is found in the mental space level in which the decontextualized conceptual structures as well as the meanings that they rely on become fully individuated, detailed, specific and rich. The latter takes place as a result of narrowing down domain and frame-level structures to a single or few aspects and then expanding on such aspects in various ways (Kövecses, 2020, p. 119). At that last level of the hierarchy, conceptual integration breaks up conventionalized conceptual structures to reflect them in a new way or construct novel metaphors (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Kövecses, 2020, p. 120; Zibin & Altakhaineh, 2023). In addition to the context, Kövecses (2020, p. 120) also highlighted the issue of memory in his schematicity hierarchy whereby long-term memory stores: image-schema (in the form of analogous conceptual structures), domain-and frame-level metaphors (in the form of a propositional format), whereas mental space-level metaphors occur in working memory.

## 2.2. Metonymy

Another figurative device often discussed with metaphor is metonymy. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (2021) argued that CMT's attention has mainly been directed towards metaphors rather than metonymies. Hence, metonymy was viewed as a conceptual mapping between two domains, yet these mappings occur within one conceptual domain. Conversely, in recent studies metonymy has become the subject of study on its own. For example, Alazazmeh and Zibin (2022) do not only examine the metaphors of ANGER in JA as compared to English, but also the metonymies and the interaction between metaphors and metonymies, that is, conceptual metonymies with metaphorical interpretation. Kövecses (2021) suggested that the cognitive grounding of metonymy can be distinguished from metaphors or similes. That is, in metonymies, a conceptual source domain provides a point of access to a target domain based on a relationship of contiguity or closeness of association (Kövecses, 2021). In turn, the target is conceived of from the viewpoint of the source, for example, Putin attacked Ukraine, Putin here stands for the Russian Air Force; however; this attack is conceptualized as Putin's responsibility (Kövecses, 2021).

This extended and modified version of CMT is adopted in this study to account for the metaphors in which *head* is the source domain.

## 2.3. Embodied metaphorical imagination

Embodiment can be defined as the dynamical interactions between the body, the brain and the physical/cultural environment (Gibbs, 2014, pp. 66–67). Interestingly, speakers do not have to be conscious of such sensations, but certain regularities in bodily experiences are tacitly incorporated into higher-level cognition (*ibid*). People's creation and use of symbols are grounded through recurring patterns of bodily sensations and action. A crucial part of comprehending the means by which embodiment provides the grounding for cognition, perception and language is through examining the way people imaginatively employ aspects of their phenomenal experience to construct abstract concepts. Naturally, such an investigation takes us to metaphor since it has an important role in mapping concrete aspects and elements concerning subjective bodily experiences onto abstract domains of knowledge (Kövecses, 2021). To explain different levels of the interaction between embodiment and linguistic meaning, Gibbs proposed the following hypothesis (Gibbs, 2014, p. 67):

- Speaker's use and understanding of the reason why different words and expressions mean what they do is motivated by embodiment.

Such hypothesis, as put forward by Gibbs (2014), represents a hierarchy of possibilities regarding the interaction of embodied experience and various aspects of language use and understanding. Researchers can test this hypothesis against data using empirical research methods. This study aims to analyze data pertaining to the embodiment of *head* in JA as compared to TA in the light of this hypothesis.

## 2.4 Related studies on head and body parts

Through reviewing the related literature, it seems that various studies have investigated the importance of the human body and its role in shaping humans'

conceptualizations and categorization of the world (Gibbs et al., 2004; Goschler, 2005). These studies explored the embodiment of various body parts in different languages and relied mainly on corpus data from various sources, for example, informants, newspapers, TV shows and others (e.g., Maalej, 2004; Aksan, 2011; Maalej & Yu, 2011; Siahaan, 2011; Yu, 2011; Gibbs, 2014; Hanh & Long, 2019; Zibin, 2021; Baş, 2021; Soler, 2021 and others).

In one study, Radic-Bojanic and Silaski (2012) compared metaphoric and metonymical conceptualizations of the head between English and Serbian. The study focused on three metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the head, namely, *THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER*, *THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT* and *THE HEAD STANDS FOR THE PERSON*. The researchers aimed to explore whether the differences between the two languages manifest at the linguistic or the conceptual level. The data analysis revealed that there were no differences at the conceptual level, but only at the linguistic level motivated by some cultural differences between the two languages.

Siahaan (2011) explored the figurative uses of two source concepts, namely, head and eye, and compared them across typologically unrelated languages, namely, German and Indonesian. The data analysis showed that a given source concept is usually used to conceptualize the same conceptual domain in two languages, for instance *CHARACTER TRAITS*. However, the analysis reveals language-specific distinctions between the two examined languages. For example, the quantitative data analysis showed that there were striking differences between the two languages concerning the metaphoric and metonymic extensions of head and eye in terms of frequency of occurrence. One of these differences was related to the preference of speakers of the two examined languages for targeting either the function or position of head and eye; the Germans target the function of head and eye, whereas the Indonesian speakers target the position of head and the appearance of the eye.

In another study, Maalej (2014) investigated embodiment in TA, focusing on head and hand metaphors. The data analysis demonstrated that the head in TA was used to conceptualize knowledge, reasoning and intelligence through the containment schema. The head was also shown to be representative of certain cultural values such as dishonor and hospitality in addition to certain character traits, for example, stubbornness. With regard to metonymy, the primary metonymy used in TA for the head is part for whole metonymy in which the head is used to refer to the whole person.

Al-Saleh et al. (2020) studied the conceptualization of head and heart through metaphors in two languages: English and Spanish. The study also investigated the role of the human body experiences in forming and conceptualizing the body-based metaphorical expressions. The results showed that conceptualization in the two examined languages differ in terms of the linguistic expressions used and the conceptual metaphors from which these expressions are extracted.

Zibin (2021) examined an internal bodily substance rather than a body part, namely, blood. The study investigated the use of blood as a source domain to conceptualize abstract concepts in JA compared to English. The findings suggest that blood can be employed to conceptualize *ESSENCE*, *EMOTION* and *CHARACTER TRAITS* via scenic metaphors where the source domain is constructed metonymically and metonymy-based metaphors. The similarities found between JA and English were attributed to cognitive embodiment of bodily substances, namely, blood to conceptualize abstract concepts such as *EMOTION*, whereas the differences were ascribed to sociocultural embodiment of certain qualities of blood which are shared by people in the Jordanian community.

In another recent study, Baş (2021) explored the metaphoric and metonymic extensions of eye ‘göz’ in Turkish. The results revealed that conventional meaning of göz as an organ of sight in Turkish has various metonymic and metaphoric extensions which can be categorized under OBJECTS, FUNCTIONS, EMOTION, MENTAL FACULTIES such as JUDGMENT, PERSONAL TRAITS, CULTURAL VALUES and TIME. The study provides support for the mind-as-body metaphor in conceptualizing the world. In his examination of head in Turkish, Aksan (2011, pp. 247–48) suggested that başı ‘head’ is profiled as head as RULER, HIGH STATUS and TALENT.

Based on the above review, it appears that studies on metaphorical and metonymical extensions of body parts have been conducted in various languages such as English, Spanish, Serbian, German, Indonesian and others, yet few studies have explored these extensions in Arabic and particularly in JA, especially taking into account that this language variety contains interesting examples that profile the MIND-AS-BODY metaphor. The only study found was on TA by Maalej (2014); thus, it could be interesting to examine the similarities and/or differences between Maalej’s work on TA and head metonymic metaphors in JA. Hence, this study aims to provide answers to the following research questions:

- 1) What are the similarities and/or differences between the target concepts of metonymical and metaphorical uses of HEAD in JA as compared to TA?
- 2) Can *head* metonymical and metaphorical expressions in JA be motivated by embodiment based on the informants’ answers?

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Corpus and data collection

Due to the fact that there is no online accessible corpus representative of JA, the researchers had to build their own corpus (see Zibin, 2021). The corpus of the study consists of 195 head metonymical and metaphorical expressions in JA (twenty-seven after excluding repetitions). These expressions were collected from two sources: 20 native speakers of JA as well as the Jordanian Facebook page titled ‘Al-Wakeel Radio program’ which is freely accessible to users. The informants were sampled using convenient sampling procedure since they were known to the researchers. They were six men and 14 women, and their mean age was 25 years old. The informants were required to provide common expressions where the word ‘head’ is used in JA. To ensure that the informants understood the task, two illustrative examples were given to them. They were not restricted in the number of expressions they had to provide and were instructed to write as many as they can recollect (see Alazazmeh & Zibin, 2022). The data were collected from the informants face to face inside the campus of the University of Jordan, Jordan. The informants were assured that their identities and answers will only be seen by the researchers themselves and that their identities will be anonymized if their examples are used in the study. Following data collection from the informants, the researchers discussed the examples these informants provided, as well as the examples we found in the Facebook page, in a semi-structured focus group discussion including all the informants and the researchers (for approximately 1 hour) to get more insight into their answers and to determine whether their use of these expressions is motivated by embodiment. Questions that were asked during the discussion was as follows: What is the meaning of this

expression? In which context is it used? What is this expression used to describe? And others. This discussion was tape-recorded and was analyzed by the researchers to test Gibbs' (2014) hypothesis.

With regard to the second source, this particular Facebook page was selected as it is representative of JA since the users post their comments in their spoken dialect. In addition, upon cursory examination, the researchers noted that the comments section is rich in metaphors and metonymies especially those related to body parts such as *eye*, *hand*, *head*, *heart* and others. To collect the data from this page, certain keywords were used, namely, *ra:s* 'head', *ra:si* 'my head', *ra:suh* 'his head', *ra:sha* 'her head' and *ru:s* 'heads'. All the expressions containing these keywords were manually collected and then filtered based on whether they contained metaphors and/or metonymies or on whether they were used literally. To protect the privacy of the users who posted the comments, the researchers anonymized them. The procedure followed to identify metaphors and metonymies is supplied in the next section. The data of TA were collected from Maalej's (2014) study.

### 3.2 Data analysis

The researchers employed a bottom-up approach where linguistic expressions were the basis for establishing cross-domain mappings not the other way around (see Ansa, 2014; Krennmayr, 2013; Zibin, 2022). Metaphor identification procedure (MIP) involves a five-step method (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). This approach identifies the metaphorical expressions as surface expressions of possible underlying cross-domain mappings (Zibin, 2021). Basically, through making a distinction between basic senses of words (pertaining to human senses or historical origin) and other contextualized senses, a word can be identified as metaphorical if it is not used in the former sense. Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) is employed in this study rather than Metaphor Identification Procedure Vrije Universiteit (MIPVU) since this study aims to identify indirectly expressed metaphors rather than directly expressed ones such as similes (see Zibin & Hamdan, 2019; Steen et al. 2010). The three researchers analyzed the data collected from the two sources separately at first to identify the metaphors and metonymies. Then, their analyses were compared and inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's kappa coefficient (see Altakhaineh & Melo-Pfeifer, 2024), which showed that the agreement between the researchers was high (0.82).

Following the identification of a linguistic expression as metaphorical, five steps were followed to extract the conceptual metaphor (Steen, 2007):

- 1) *ra:s-uh* *mʔabbah* (JA)  
 head-his filled.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is filled.  
 'He is gullible.'

Referring to MIP, the head in the above example is not used literally; it is used metaphorically as one's head cannot be literally filled with ideas similar to a container. In the second step, to change the linguistic expression above to a conceptual metaphor, a series of propositions are established, namely, HEAD and CONTAINER. In the third step, a single proposition is formed from the previous ones

and other related concepts yielding an open comparison SIM  $\{\exists F \exists a [F (\text{HEAD})]_t [\text{CONTAINER} (a)]_s\}$ . In the fourth step, the abovementioned open comparison is changed to a closed comparison which has the formal structure of analogy and an interpretation to the open values is supplied (Steen, 2007, p. 18). In the final step, the analogical structure derived in step 4 is changed into a mapping structure between two conceptual domains, namely, HEAD and CONTAINER, based on the similarity between head and container where the former can be metaphorically filled with ideas similar to a container. A metonymy can also be identified here since the CHARACTER TRAIT ‘gullibility’ is a trait that characterizes the person but the conceptual domain ‘head’ is used to provide access to the target domain, that is, person through PART FOR WHOLE metonymy (see Kövecses, 2021; Littlemore, 2015).

#### 4. Data analysis

Data analysis shows that head in JA is used as a source domain to conceptualize various target concepts, including MENTAL FACULTY, CHARACTER TRAITS, EMOTION and CULTURAL VALUES. These target concepts are discussed in detail in this section together with illustrative examples.

##### 4.1. Mental faculty

Not only in the Jordanian culture, but also in other cultures, the head is linked to reason, while the heart is linked to emotions (Maalej, 2014). This is motivated by the metonymy: PART FOR WHOLE where the head serves as the locus of reasoning:

- 2)  $\text{ʕiml-at} \quad \text{ʔilli fi: ra:s-ha} \backslash \text{btitʕarraf} \quad \text{min ra:s-ha} \quad \text{(JA)}$   
 did-3SGF that in head-hers\act.3SGF from head-hers  
 Lit. she did what is in her head.  
 ‘She acted on her own without advice.’
- 3)  $\text{tilf-at} \quad \text{fi: ra:s-i:} \quad \text{hassah} \quad \text{(JA)}$   
 came.up-3SGF in head-my now  
 Lit. it came up in my head now.  
 ‘I acted impulsively without thinking.’

In TA, the head tells the person how to act as if it is a sound inside (see Maalej, 2014, p. 229; ‘*amill illi qallu raaSu* ‘He did what his head told him.’), but in JA, the head is not perceived as entity\person that communicates with the speaker rather it is the one controlling the speaker; that is, the head has the upper hand motivated by CONTROL IS UP. In general, in example (2), the linguistic expression is disapproving of the mental behavior of the speaker where it is usually stated in contexts in which one acts irrationally but that does not apply to example (3) in which the decision, even though made instantaneously, could be good. Examples (2–3) may seem contradictory at first glance as they could be indicative of lack of reasoning rather than the locus of reasoning. The intention was to illustrate that these linguistic expressions are often used in contexts where an individual acts impulsively or irrationally. However, it is important to note that these examples highlight the perception of the HEAD as the source of decision-making, whether rational or impulsive. The seemingly disapproving nature of these expressions does not necessarily imply a lack of reasoning but



rather underscores the subjective evaluation of the decisions made. It reflects how actions stemming directly from one's head are perceived in JA, emphasizing that the head is the origin of decisions.

In JA, if the person's decisions are not well chosen, nonsensical or even offensive, then it is thought that the head needs breaking rather than repairing as in TA (Maalej, 2014, p. 229). Compare (4) in JA and (5) in TA:

- |    |  |                       |                     |                                    |
|----|--|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4) | ra:s-uh<br>head-his<br>Lit. his head<br>'Someone should force him to change his mind.' | bidd-uh<br>needs-3SGM | taksi:r<br>breaking | (JA)                               |
| 5) | qa'ad-l-u<br>[you] repair to him<br>'Repair his head.'<br>Can you reason him?          | ra:s-u<br>head his    |                     | (TA)<br><br>(Maalej, 2014, p. 229) |

In example (5), TA assumes that the head is not operating properly and thus is in need of repairing, suggesting that someone needs to reason with the person possessing that head. This is motivated by the metaphor *THE HEAD IS A MACHINE*. However, in example (4), JA has a more extreme approach where the *HEAD* is perceived as an *OBJECT* (cf. Radic-Bojanic & Silaski, 2012) to be broken; that is, Jordanians do not reason with an unreasonable person, and they force him\her to abandon his\her viewpoint. The strict method in JA of considering the head as an object to be corrected forcefully rather than by reasoning may originate from the dominant Bedouin culture in Jordan. Bedouin communities frequently thrive in challenging surroundings, necessitating prompt and resolute decision-making for their survival. Cultural and ideological dynamics can thus influence linguistic expressions and attitudes, which leads to different approaches than those seen in TA.

Conversely, *THE HEAD IS A MACHINE* is manifested in a different way in JA compared to TA (cf. Maalej, 2014). It is a part of the conceptual metaphor, *THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE AND KNOWLEDGE*, where *THE HEAD* is seen as malfunctioning, that is, thinking unreasonably, through being described as containing a static noise that hinders its operation. This metonymic metaphor is used to convey the idea that when there is a static noise in one's head (metaphorically), the person is perceived to be unreasonable and even stupid as follows:

- |    |   |                  |                  |      |
|----|---|------------------|------------------|------|
| 6) | ra:s-uh<br>head-his<br>Lit. there is a static noise in his head.<br>'He is not making any sense.' | fi:-h<br>in-3SGM | waʃʃih<br>static | (JA) |
|----|---|------------------|------------------|------|

In addition to being *THE LOCUS OF REASONING AND LOGIC*, the head is also a *CONTAINER* of reasonable ideas that are allowed to get inside it, that is, that a person can make a sense of, whereas unreasonable ideas are not permitted to get inside the head (metonymy *HEAD FOR PERSON*). Both TA and JA have similar conceptualizations of states related to the source domain *HEAD* in this case as well as similar linguistic manifestations as follows:

- 7) *f-fay-leh ma: fa:tat fi: ra:s-i* (JA)  
 DEF-thing-3SGF Not get inside.3SGF in head-my  
 Lit. the thing did not get inside my head.  
 ‘The idea did not make sense to me.’
- 8) *l-iHkaja ma daxlitš l-raaS-I* (TA)  
 the story No enter-PERFnot to head my  
 ‘The story did not get into my head.’  
 The story did not make sense to me. (Maalej, 2014, p.229)

When the head does not make good use of reasoning and thinking, it can be manipulated by others. This is similar in JA and TA at the conceptual level with some differences at the linguistic level (*lifib* ‘played’ and *dawwar* ‘turn’):

- 9) *liʿib fi: ra:s-ha* (JA)  
 played.3SGM in head-hers  
 Lit. he played with her head.  
 ‘He made her change her mind.’
- 10) *dʒa:bat-uh tabb ʕala widʒ-hu\ra:s-uh* (JA)  
 brought.3SGF-3SGM hit on face-his\head-his  
 Lit. she brought him down on his face\head.  
 ‘She tricked him into marrying her.’
- 11) *dawwar-it-l-u raaS-u* (TA)  
 [she] turn-PERF-FEM to him head his  
 ‘She turned his head.’  
 She made him change his mind.
- 12) *TaiHit-tu ʕala raaS-u* (TA)  
 [she] fall-PERF him on head his  
 ‘She made him fall on his head.’  
 She seduced him. (Maalej, 2014, pp.230–1)

While in TA, the linguistic expression *dawwar* ‘turn’ in (11) is taken from the domain of MACHINE in the sense that it can be turned on and off (Maalej, 2014), in JA, the linguistic expression *lifib* ‘played’ in (9) is again taken from the domain of OBJECT and more specifically TOY where the head is played with as if it is a toy in the hands of a child. In examples (10) and (12), BEING SEDUCED in JA and TA is conceptualized as falling on the head\face entailing that since the head is not on its uppermost position of the body, it cannot perform its function of thinking and reasoning normally (for more details on the conceptualization of LOVE in JA, see Zibin *et al.*, 2022).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In the example *dʒa:batuh kta:f* lit., she brought him down on his shoulder ‘she destroyed him’ which was written down by one of the informants, falling on one’s shoulder means that someone is as good as dead. This is taken from the Islamic culture in which Muslims are expected to slaughter a sheep in Eid, and when the sheep is slaughtered, it is brought down by the butcher on its right side first.

#### 4.2. Character traits

In addition to its role as a MENTAL FACULTY, the head in JA and TA is also used to conceptualize CHARACTER TRAITS such as STUBBORNESS, ARROGANCE, GULLIBILITY and others as in:

- 13) ra:s–uh kbi:r (JA)  
 head–his big. 3SGM  
 Lit. his head is big.  
 ‘He is arrogant’.
- 14) raaS–u kbiir (TA)  
 head his big  
 ‘His head is big.’  
 He is stubborn. (Maalej, 2014, p. 231)

According to Maalej (2014), the conceptualization of STUBBORNESS in TA maximizes on size making the head bigger than its normal size which is found in other non-stubborn people. This suggests that in TA, the size of the head is manipulated in a way to make it bigger than normal in order to conceptualize STUBBORNESS. On the other hand, in JA, ARROGANCE capitalizes on size which suggests that having a bigger head means that you think you are better than other people which can be captured as BEING ARROGANT IS HAVING A BIG HEAD. Thus, the size of head is conceptualized differently in JA and TA. Culture manipulates HEAD to conceptualize various abstract concepts. For instance, in the case of stubbornness, TA manipulates SIZE. Aggrandizing the head in TA has come to mean stubbornness. In conceptualizing EMOTIONS, CHARACTER TRAITS and CULTURAL VALUES, body parts are culturally manipulated as aided by the imaginative dimension of metaphor. One of the ways this is done is by using SIZE, aggrandizing them or making them shrink in size to convey positive and negative meanings. For instance, in *muxxuh kbi:r* ‘his brain is big’, the brain is conceptualized as growing beyond its normal size, suggesting that his reasoning capacity is not that recognized for his age. Here, BIG BRAIN STANDS FOR WISDOM. As to *ra:suh kbi:r* ‘his head is big’, the explanation follows the same pattern. It conveys the idea that the head has grown out of proportion without the brain following suit, which suggests that the head owner has, as a result, thought he could dispense with the counseling, advice or exchange of opinions with others. His behavior will then reflect his stubbornness. Here, BIG HEAD STANDS FOR STUBBORNESS. Of course, all this has also to be seen within an overall cultural model of interpersonal relations where *la: xa:ba man sta:fa:r* ‘He who seeks advice will not go astray’ occupies an important place in Arab society. Now, dispensing with counseling, advice, or the exchange of opinions with others reflects arrogance in practice in JA. In TA, if one thinks of oneself as a know-all, they are immodest. It seems that at the level of ideas or thought, this is so. It becomes arrogance in practice, in action, which can transpire from one’s way of speaking.

Conversely, TA and JA are similar in the use of the following metaphorical expressions:

- 15) ra:s–uh hadzar (JA)  
 head–his stone.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is stone.  
 ‘He is stubborn.’

- 16) ra:s-uh ja:bis (JA)  
 head-his hard.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is hard.  
 'He is stubborn.'
- 17) ra:s-uh na:ʃif (JA)  
 Head-his dry.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is dry/crusty  
 'He is stubborn.'
- 18) raaS-u SHiiH (TA)  
 Head his hard  
 'His head is hard.'  
 He is stubborn.
- 19) raaS-u naaʃif (TA)  
 head his dried up  
 'His head is dried up.'  
 He is stubborn. (Maalej, 2014, p. 231)

In the above examples, the way STUBBORNNESS is conceptualized in both JA and TA is based on the idea of hardness and inflexibility as it indicates resistance to persuasion. At the linguistic level, in JA, the head being hard and more specifically a stone is used to conceptualize a stubborn person through PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy, while in TA, the head is mainly described as hard without referring to any particular hard object.<sup>2</sup>

In examples (17) and (19) which are identical in JA and TA, being stubborn is described as inability to retain reason because of the head metaphoric structure; it is not just because of the head being hard. According to Maalej, the head here has sponge-like structure as it cannot retain much water as a result of its porous structure; hence, drying up quickly owing to its permeability (Maalej, 2014, p. 232). So, through analogy, a spongy head is incapable of retaining reason inside it to function properly causing it to dry up. Because of drying up, the person possessing a spongy head cannot be easily persuaded.

Besides STUBBORNNESS and ARROGANCE, the head in JA can also be used to conceptualize GULLIBILITY as in:

- 20) ra:s-uh mʃabbah (JA)  
 head-his filled.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is filled.  
 'He is gullible.'

In example (20), the head is perceived as A CONTAINER OF IDEAS and the attempt to persuade people of your ideas is perceived as if ideas are being put inside that container. A container is closely related to the FULL-EMPTY schema clearly shown

<sup>2</sup>Under CHARACTER TRAITS, Maalej (2014) only discusses the use of head in conceptualizing STUBBORNNESS in TA. He does not discuss other CHARACTER TRAITS. It is not certain whether the head in TA is used to conceptualize other CHARACTER TRAITS or not.

in *mʕabbah* ‘filled’ (Maalej, 2014). If one allows others to do that often (filling his head with their own ideas and gossip), then he is seen as gullible.

The shape of the head can also be used to profile someone who has strange ideas or a smart-ass, and because of this person’s bizarre ideas, he/she may be perceived as stupid by some people, as follows:

- 21) ra:s-uh      mrabbaf      (JA)  
 head-his      square.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is square-shaped  
 ‘He is eccentric\stupid.’

In example (21), ECCENTRICITY seems to be a CHARACTER TRAIT that finds locus in the head; specifically, someone is eccentric\stupid owing to their head shape. Since the shape of human head is relatively oval\circular, describing someone that has a square-shaped head is used to conceptualize his BIZARRENESS using PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy. Another explanation provided by the participants is that the idea of someone’s square-shaped head could have been inspired from previous discourse in which certain connotations\cultural connotations can be deduced. In particular, certain cartoon characters such as Lina’s grandfather in the show *Adnan wa Lina* ‘Adnan and Lina’ had a square-shaped head, and he is rather bizarre. Another character is SpongeBob SquarePants who is used excessively in Arabic memes (see Younes & Altakhaineh, 2022) to describe someone as either stupid or bizarre. The head in JA is also capitalized upon to conceptualize HAVING AN OBSESSIVE PERSONALITY:

- 22) ḥa:ti:tn-i:      fi ra:s-ha      (JA)  
 put.3SGF-1SG in head-hers  
 Lit. she put me inside her head.  
 ‘She is obsessive about my life.’

Putting someone in one’s head is used in JA to conceptualize OBSESSION; to be deeply engrossed in someone else’s life observing everything he/she does as if the individual’s head is full of that person leaving no other space for other ideas. Thus, the idea of having somebody in your head is perceived negatively since you are living that person’s life (used to conceptualize OBSESSION). In the example below, the head is used to conceptualize OBNOXIOUSNESS:

- 23) fataḥ      bi ra:s-i      ta:?a      (JA)  
 Open.3SGM in head-my window  
 Lit. he opened a window in my head.  
 ‘He is nagging on me.’

In example (23), the head is also perceived as a CONTAINER that can be opened through a window from which ideas from an obnoxious person can get inside. The idea that someone can cause a window to forcibly open in a closed container so that it can be filled is used to profile the character trait OBNOXIOUSNESS in JA since such a person is extremely unpleasant as he/she is continuously nagging on another.

Other examples which capitalize on the *head* to conceptualize a CHARACTER TRAIT are provided below:

- 24) wa:l ma: ?at?al ra:s-uh (JA)  
 Oh my heavy head-his  
 lit. Oh my, how heavy his head.  
 ‘He is a heavy sleeper.’
- 25) ra:s-i: xafi:f (JA)  
 head-my light  
 Lit. my head is light.  
 ‘I am a light sleeper.’

Using PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy, examples (24–25) use the metaphorical lightness/heaviness of the head to conceptualize heavy/light sleepiness where someone either does not wake up easily or does so quite fast, respectively.

### 4.3. Cultural values

In addition to MENTAL FACULTY and CHARACTER TRAITS, the head as a source domain can also profile various cultural values in JA and TA, such as INDUSTRIOUSNESS:

- 26) miʃ ga:dir ?aħukk ra:s-i: (JA)  
 not able.1SGM scratch.1SGM head-my  
 Lit. I cannot scratch my head.  
 ‘I am overwhelmed.’
- 27) saakai-h a‘la min raaS-u (TA)  
 feet his high-COMPARATIVE than head his  
 ‘His feet were higher than his head.’  
 He was head over heels. (Maalej, 2014, p.234)

The way INDUSTRIOUSNESS is conceptualized in JA is different from TA; in the former, it is a hyperbole where being overwhelmed is conceptualized as not being able to scratch one’s head (PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy). In the latter, it is conceptualized as an image metaphor where overwhelmed people are depicted as drawing a circle with their bodies and having their feet above their head (Maalej, 2014). Exaggeration is a common trait in Jordanian culture, frequently seen in the everyday language of JA. Several phrases used in everyday conversation are not meant to be taken literally. Expressions such as *?ana majjit min dʒu:f* ‘I am dying from hunger’ to convey extreme hunger or *ra:si: bidduh jinfid ʒir* ‘my head is about to explode’ to express a severe headache illustrate this pattern. These hyperbolic expressions are used to highlight feelings or events, showing a cultural preference for using vivid and exaggerated language to portray emotions or experiences in JA.

On the other hand, JA and TA share the same conceptualization of the cultural value HOSPITALITY. The similarity also appears at the linguistic level. The two languages rely on THE UP-DOWN image schema:

- 28) *hattn-i*                 ʕala ra:sh-u                                 (JA)  
 put.3SGM-1SG on head-his  
 Lit. he put me on his head.  
 ‘He was very hospitable.’
- 29) ʕala                 ra:s-i   (JA)  
 on head-my  
 Lit. on my head.  
 ‘You are very welcome’.
- 30) *xalla-ni/hazz-ni*   fuq raaS-u                                 (TA)  
 [he] put-PERF me/lift-PERF me over head his  
 ‘He put/lifted me over his head.’  
 He was hospitable to me.
- 31) ‘ala raaS-i w ‘ain-I   (TA)  
 On head my and eye my  
 ‘On my head and myeyes.’  
 You are welcome.   (Maalej, 2014, p.234)

Examples (28–31) conceptualize HOSPITALITY as a vertical movement. Specifically, examples (28) and (30) conceptualize the head as a space over which the guest is raised and put by a hospitable person. In examples (29) and (31), being hospitable is conceptualized as putting people over one’s head (Maalej, 2014, p. 235). A generic metaphor underlies this one, namely, UP IS GOOD. Example (28) in JA is also used to show gratitude.

The same image schema (UP-DOWN) is also used in both languages to conceptualize PRIDE and DISHONOR. That is, if the head is raised as the uppermost part of the body, this means that the person feels PRIDE (cf. raise my head up high) giving rise to the metaphor BEING PROUD IS HAVING ONE’S HEAD UP. Conversely, when it leaves this position and lands down to the feet and even be buried in the sand, this is used to conceptualize DISHONOR and SHAME. The two metaphors are based on the generic metaphors GOOD IS UP and DOWN IS BAD.

- 32) *rafaʕl-na*                 ra:s-na: la-s-sama                                 (JA)  
 raised.3SGM-1PL head-ours to-DEF-sky  
 Lit. he raised our heads to the sky.  
 ‘We are so proud of him.’
- 33) *hatt*                 ra:s-i                 fi l-ʔard / t-tra:b                                 (JA)  
 put.3SGM head-my in DEF-land/ sand  
 Lit. he put my head in the ground\sand.  
 ‘He dishonored us.’
- 34) *xalla-l-na*                 raaS-i                 fi-t-traab                                 (TA)  
 [he] cause-PERF to us head my in the sand  
 ‘He caused our head to be in the ground.’  
 He dishonored us.
- 35) *hazzil-na*                 raaS-na   (TA)  
 [he] lift-PERF to us our head  
 ‘He lifted our head for us.’  
 He made our pride.   (Maalej, 2014, p.235)

The head can also be used in JA to conceptualize HIGH STATUS when related to morality as in example (36). The head here is used metonymically to refer to people in high status or authority. The choice of *head* as a representation is due to the association of the head with the leadership or decision-making aspect of a group or society. It is a transfer of meaning where the head symbolically stands for the individuals who hold high status. The act of slaughtering by the ‘big heads’ metaphorically conveys the destructive impact of people in high status on people’s way of life, particularly emphasizing the negative consequences of power abuse and lack of morality.

- 36) r–ru:s            l–kbi:reh    ḍabahu:–na                            (JA)  
 DEF–heads    DEF–big    slaughtered–1PL  
 Lit. the big heads slaughtered us.  
 ‘People of high status destroyed our way of life.’

#### 4.4. Emotions

So far, it can be seen that the head in JA and TA is a very productive source domain for many target domains and by extension many daily life expressions. However, in JA, the head can also be a source domain to conceptualize EMOTIONS which has not been discussed by Maalej for TA. TA may have different cultural and linguistic influences that shape the conceptualization of emotions. The use of the HEAD in metaphorical and metonymical expressions to convey emotions may not be as prevalent or may manifest differently compared to JA. Cultural norms, historical context and the overall linguistic landscape of Tunisia could contribute to distinct patterns of expression regarding emotions, possibly relying on alternative metaphors that could be related to the heart rather than the head. For instance, using the image schema UP-DOWN, the head is capitalized on to conceptualize BEING IN LOVE as in:

- 37) wiʔiʔ            ʕala ra:s–uh    tabb                                        (JA)  
 fell.3SGM on head–his    headlong  
 Lit. he fell headlong.  
 ‘He fell deeply in love.’

When someone falls in love, he behaves in a reckless manner and is not thinking clearly (cf. example 10). Furthermore, the head can be used to conceptualize feeling ANNOYED. If one asks another person to get out of their head, where the head is conceived of as A CONTAINER, then this person is expressing his annoyance as in:

- 38) ʔitlaʕ            min ra:s–i:                                    (JA)  
 get.out.3SGM from head–my  
 Lit. get out of my head.  
 ‘Stop making me annoyed.’

In the above example, this metonymic metaphor profiles the head in a PART-WHOLE metonymic relation; the person is not seen as gullible since he refuses the interference



and the attempt of persuasion by others; that is, he is resisting inference with his ideas. Another metonymic metaphor employing HEAD as a source domain is the following which is used to conceptualize EXTREME IRRITATION AND ANGER:

- 39) ?inħarag ra:s-i min has-su:la:fiħ<sup>3</sup> (JA)  
 Burnt.3SGM head-my from this.story.3SGF  
 Lit. my head burned from this topic.  
 'I am extremely irritated'.

This metonymic metaphor profiles PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy and ANGER IS FIRE metaphor, where the head being on fire is used to perceive EXTREME IRRITATION and ANGER (see Alazazmeh & Zibin, 2022).

The head can also be used in JA to conceptualize FEELING RELAXED as in:

- 40) bidd-i ?aʕddil ra:s-i: bi findʒ a:n ?ahweħ\ ra:s-i nʕadal  
 want-1SG tweak head-my by cup coffee\ head-my tweaked  
 Lit. I want to tweak my head with a cup of coffee\my head is tweaked.  
 'My mood needs tweaking\my mood is tweaked (I am relaxed).'
- (JA)

Through using PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy and the CONTAINMENT schema, JA conceptualizes a RELAXED MOOD as BEING TWEAKED through filling the container, that is, head with coffee and other drinks. If the head is not tweaked, that is, the container is empty and in need of refilling, the person experiences irritation.

## 5. Discussion

The data analysis reveals that the main target concepts of metaphorical and metonymical uses of head in JA include MENTAL FACULTY, CHARACTER TRAITS, CULTURAL VALUES and EMOTIONS. Through the use of PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy and the containment IMAGE schema, the head serves as THE LOCUS OF REASONING. Metonymic metaphors that underlie the MENTAL FACULTY domain include CONTROL IS UP, THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, THE HEAD IS A MACHINE, THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT, and THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE AND KNOWLEDGE. The head also profiles CHARACTER TRAITS such as STUBBORNNESS, ARROGANCE, GULLIBILITY, OBSESSION, ECCENTRICITY and OBNOXIOUSNESS. The head in JA is also capitalized upon to conceptualize CULTURAL VALUES such as INDUSTRIOUSNESS, DISHONOR and PRIDE. Furthermore, the head in JA can be a source domain to conceptualize EMOTIONS, such as LOVE, ANNOYANCE, ANGER and RELAXATION.

Thus, THE HEAD as a source domain is productive in JA construing metaphors related to four abstract domains. The *head* has been reported to be a source domain to conceptualize various abstract concepts in other languages including English and Serbian (Radic-Bojanic & Silaski, 2012), German and Indonesian (Siahaan, 2011), Spanish (Al-Saleh et al., 2020), Turkish (Baş, 2021) and other languages. For instance, according to Aksan (2011), the head in Turkish can be used to profile HIGH STATUS

<sup>3</sup>Note that since the informants spoke different subvarieties of Jordanian Arabic, namely, Urban, Rural and Bedouin, this variation is reflected in the examples provided in this section.

through the use of the head position, and the same applies to JA. These results from different languages may lend support to the notion that *head* metaphorical and metonymical expressions are motivated by embodiment in JA and in other investigated languages. Based on the interviews conducted with informants, it can be proposed that their use and understanding of the reason why different words and expressions mean what they do are motivated by embodiment (Gibbs, 2014). Their interpretations of the meaning of certain expressions such as example (20) which is reproduced here as (41) clearly suggest that their understanding of this expression is motivated by embodiment:

- 41) ra:s-uh mʕabbah (JA)  
 head-his filled.3SGM  
 Lit. his head is filled.  
 ‘He is gullible.’

Significant links between bodily experience of filling something in a container and other types of experience, on the one hand, and abstract thought, metaphorical language and action, on the other hand, were found in the informants’ answers. Most notably, the analysis of the informants’ answers demonstrates the primacy of head as a part of the body in movement through space (UP-DOWN image schema and FULL-EMPTY image schema) in people’s descriptions of abstract concepts such as their CULTURAL VALUES such as PRIDE and DISHONOR. For instance, four informants reported that it made sense to them to conceive of PRIDE in terms of head since one who feels proud walks with his head up high. What is more interesting is that the participants indicated that although there are other expressions that may give a similar meaning, expressions related to *head* have something unique in them that cannot be expressed using other words. For example, *habi:leh* ‘naïve’ can also be used to convey the idea that someone is easily persuaded by others, yet the majority of informants reported that *ra:suh mʕabbah* ‘he is gullible’ provides a more vivid description of how someone can act on ideas that were metaphorically put in his/her head. Thus, it can be suggested that they are aware of the idea of embodiment.

Here, one may argue that the examples provided in this study could be regarded as dead metaphors by some scholars. Indeed, the dichotomy of dead versus alive metaphors lies at the core of cognitive metaphor theory, and thus, a systematic reflection on this distinction is relevant for any metaphor analysis (Müller, 2009, p. 10). A new classification, a bipolar one that relates to use, was proposed by Müller (2009) distinguishing dead, novel and entrenched verbal metaphors based on the criteria of conventionalization, novelty and transparency. Relying on this classification, dead metaphors are highly conventionalized and opaque, novel metaphors are not conventionalized and transparent, and entrenched metaphors are conventionalized and transparent (Müller, 2009, p. 11).<sup>4</sup> This new classification only applies to transparent metaphors (novel and entrenched) and relies on the criterion of cognitive activation in a given speaker at a given moment in time (Müller, 2009, p. 11). The

<sup>4</sup>The term ‘entrenched’ was used by Lakoff and Turner (1989, p. 129) to argue that dead metaphors are mediated through the concept of embodiment. They suggest that the most deeply entrenched metaphors are efficient and powerful as they are so automatic and effortless.

advantage of this classification is that it is scalar allowing for various degrees of metaphoricality rather than viewing them as a set of two rigid categories (ibid). The examples provided in this study can be regarded as entrenched with regard to the linguistic system and waking metaphors (rather than sleeping) concerning the activation of metaphoricality in language use. The metaphors were activated by the informants during the focus group discussion, and they came to them so effortlessly through mediation by embodiment. An example can be provided to show how a metaphor such as *ra:suh mfabbah* 'he is gullible' can be constructed online using Kövecses' (2020) schematicity hierarchy:

**Image-schema-level metaphor:**

CONTAINERS ARE EMPTY\FULL.

**Domain-level metaphor:**

THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, A FULL HEAD IS A FULL CONTAINER.

**Frame-level metaphor:**

FILLING A HEAD WITH IDEAS IS FILLING A CONTAINER WITH A SUBSTANCE, IDEAS ARE SUBSTANCES.

**Mental-space-level metaphor:**

FILLING SOMEONE'S HEAD WITH IDEAS IS PERSUADING HIM\HER TO ACT ON THESE IDEAS, HAVING AN EMPTY HEAD THAT CAN BE FILLED WITH SOMEONE'S IDEAS IS BEING GULLIBLE.

Another illustration of *ra:suh mrabbaf* 'he is stupid\eccentric' is found below:

**Image-schema-level metaphor:**

CONTAINERS ARE FULL\EMPTY, CONTAINERS ARE SHAPED.

**Domain-level metaphor:**

THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, A SQUARE HEAD IS A SQUARE CONTAINER, HAVING NORMAL HEAD SHAPE (OVAL\CIRCULAR) IS HAVING COMMON\NORMAL IDEAS.

**Frame-level metaphor:**

HAVING A SQUARE HEAD IS HAVING A CONTAINER FILLED WITH UNCOMMON IDEAS, IDEAS ARE SUBSTANCES.

**Mental-space-level metaphor:**

HAVING SOMEONE WITH A SQUARE HEAD IS HAVING SOMEONE WITH ECCENTRIC IDEAS, BEING SQUARE-HEADED IS BEING ECCENTRIC\STUPID.

In another example which is used to describe falling in love (repeated below as (42):

- 42) wi?iʕ      ʕala ra:s-uh      tabb      (JA)  
 fell.3SGM on head-his      headlong  
 Lit. he fell headlong.  
 'He fell deeply in love.'

The majority of informants indicated that even though other expressions are used in JA to describe the emotion of LOVE (see Zibin et al., 2022), example (42) has a unique aspect since it implies that the person fell in love without thinking probably, and this could have consequences later when he is more sensible. Such findings may support the argument that emotions and other abstract concepts such as CHARACTER TRAITS can be experienced even if metaphorically in terms of the body in action (Gibbs, 2014).

Finally, the data analysis showed that TA and JA share many target concepts of metaphorical and metonymical uses of *head*. Both varieties of Arabic capitalize on HEAD to conceptualize MENTAL FACULTY, the CHARACTER TRAIT of STUBBORNNESS

and CULTURAL VALUES. However, the head in JA is more productive in profiling other CHARACTER TRAITS and EMOTIONS as opposed to TA. Differences in both dialects were found at both the conceptual and linguistic levels. Based on Maalej's (2014) suggestion, internal body parts are more likely to be based on metaphor and to be used to conceptualize EMOTIONS and MENTAL FACULTIES but less with CULTURAL VALUES and CHARACTER TRAITS. Conversely, external body parts are more likely to be based on metonymy and to be employed to conceptualize CHARACTER TRAITS and CULTURAL VALUES but get less involved with EMOTIONS and MENTAL FACULTIES.

Based on the analysis, it seems that Maalej's argument is not fully in support of JA data since as shown, *head* which is an external body part, through the use of metaphor and metonymy, can get involved with CHARACTER TRAITS, EMOTIONS, CULTURAL VALUES and MENTAL FACULTIES. Hence, we argue that Maalej's suggestion could be modified as such: Not all external body parts have the same embodied significance \salience, for example, head versus foot, the head has more potential to be embodied than foot, and his argument (external versus internal body parts) could be subject to cultural variation even within subcultures that belong to the same matrix Arab culture. Even though both dialects are dialects of Arabic, data analysis has demonstrated that despite the similarities found, differences may appear between Arab cultures due to cultural, geographical and ideological reasons. This suggests that the cultural filter through which different types of bodily experience pass to participate in metaphor mappings can also function between subcultures not only between cultures (cf. Zibin, 2021). Differences in embodied metaphoric conceptualizations within Arab cultures can also arise due to variation in experiential focus since speakers who live in different geographical and social contexts could be attuned to different aspects of their bodily experience; hence, this could result in partial motivation of differences in the ways they express themselves metaphorically or metonymically or both (cf. Gibbs, 2014).

## 6. Conclusion and recommendations

The paper has shown that the head in JA is a productive source domain profiling CHARACTER TRAITS, MENTAL FACULTY, CULTURAL VALUES and EMOTIONS as target concepts. The cultural model of *head* in JA reflects these conceptualizations using metonymic metaphors. Analysis of the informants' answers exhibit the primacy of head as a body part in movement through space (UP-DOWN image schema and FULL-EMPTY image schema) in people's descriptions of various abstract concepts such as CULTURAL VALUES, providing credence to Gibbs' (2014) hypothesis. That is, the use and understanding of the reason why different words and expressions mean what they do is motivated by embodiment. The *head* is capitalized on in JA and TA to provide explanations of several daily life experiences, and despite the similarities found in the uses of HEAD as source domain in the two dialects at the conceptual and linguistic levels, variations were detected and were ascribed to differences in experiential focus between Jordanians and Tunisians as well as the existence of a cultural filter that functions between Arab cultures. Future researchers need to explore similarities and differences in the conceptualization of body parts in other cultures to provide more insight into the multifaceted nature of embodied cognition.

**Data availability statement.** All data have been presented in the manuscript.

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to express our gratitude to Prof Zouheir Maalej for his insightful feedback and comments on the revised version of this paper. In addition, we would like to extend our gratitude to the informants who took part in the study. We would also like to thank the three anonymous reviewers and the editor-in-chief for their useful comments on an earlier draft of the paper. All remaining errors and inaccuracies are, of course, ours alone.

**Funding statement.** This research received no funding.

**Competing interest.** The authors declare none.

## References

- Aksan, M. (2011). The apocalypse happens when the feet take the position of the head: Figurative uses of 'head' and 'feet' in Turkish. In Z. Maalej, & Y. Ning (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures* (pp. 241–255). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Alazazmeh, H., & Zibin, A. (2022). The conceptualization of anger through metaphors, metonymies and metaphonymies in Jordanian Arabic and English: A contrastive study. *Cognitive Semantics*, 8(3), 445–482.
- Al-Saleh, T., Al-Shuaibi, J., Sharab, M., & Al Momani, R. (2020). A cognitive analysis of head and heart metaphors in English and Spanish. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IIAES)*, 20(2), 115–132.
- Altakhaineh, A., & Melo-Pfeifer, S. (2024). "This topic was inconsiderate of our culture": Jordanian students' perceptions of intercultural clashes in IELTS writing tests. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(1), 263–286. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2021-0183>.
- Ansah, G. N. (2014). Culture in embodied cognition: Metaphorical/metonymic conceptualizations of fear in Akan and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 29(1), 44–58.
- Baş, M. (2021). A Corpus study of the semantic extensions of the eye in Turkish. In M. Baş & I. Kraska-Szlenk (eds.) *Embodiment in cross-linguistic studies* (pp. 70–92). Brill.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
- Gibbs, R. (2014). Embodied metaphor. In Taylor, J. R., & Littlemore, J. (ed.), *The Bloomsbury companion to cognitive linguistics* (pp. 167–184). London: Bloomsbury.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2005). Embodiment in metaphorical imagination. In Pecher, D., & Zwaan, R. A. (eds.), *Grounding cognition: The role of perception and action in memory, language, and thought* (pp. 65–92). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2006). Metaphor interpretation as embodied simulation. *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 434–458.
- Gibbs, R. W., Lima, P. L. C., & Francozo, E. (2004). Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1189–1210.
- Goschler, J. (2005). Embodiment and body metaphors. *Metaphorik. de*, 9(2005), 33–52.
- Hanh, N., & Long, N. (2019). English idioms containing human-body parts and their Vietnamese equivalents: A case study of two English verbs and their Vietnamese translation versions. *Journal of Foreign Studies*, 35(3), 83–103.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2016). Conceptual metaphor theory. In E. Semino, & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of metaphor* (pp. 31–45). Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (2020). An extended view of conceptual metaphor theory. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 18(1), 112–130.
- Kövecses, Z. (2021). Standard and extended Conceptual theory revisited: Some definitional and taxonomic issues. In X. Wen & J. R. Taylor (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cognitive linguistics* (pp. 191–204). Routledge.

- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2014). Semantic extensions of body part terms: Common patterns and their interpretation. *Language Sciences*, 44, 15–39.
- Krennmayr, T. (2013). Top-down versus bottom-up approaches to the identification of metaphor in discourse. *Metaphorik*, 24, 7–36.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maalej, Z. (2004). Figurative language in anger expressions in Tunisian Arabic: An extended view of embodiment. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 19(1), 51–75.
- Maalej, Z. (2014). Body parts we live by in language and culture: The raaS ‘head’ and yidd ‘hand’ in Tunisian Arabic. In M. Brenzinger, & I. Kraska-Szlenk (Eds.), *The body in language: Comparative studies of linguistic embodiment* (pp. 224–259). Brill.
- Maalej, Z., & Yu, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Müller, C. (2009). *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and waking: A dynamic view*. University of Chicago Press.
- Niemeier, S. (2008). To be in control: Kind-hearted and cool-headed. The head-heart dichotomy in English. In F. Sharifian, R. Dirven, N. Yu, & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages* (pp. 349–372). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1–39.
- Radic-Bojanic, B., & Silaski, N. (2012). Metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the head- A dictionary-based contrastive analysis of English and Serbian. *Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 29–39.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. J. (2021). Conceptual metonymy theory revisited: Some definitional and taxonomic issues. In X. Wen, & J. Taylor (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of cognitive linguistics* (pp. 204–227). Routledge.
- Siahaan, P. (2011). HEAD and EYE in German and Indonesian figurative uses. In Z. Maalej, & Y. Ning (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures* (pp. 93–113). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sharifian, F., Dirven, R., Yu, N., & Niemeier, S. (Eds.) (2008). *Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Soler, J. T. (2021). Variation in embodied metaphors: A contrastive analysis of taste metaphors in Spanish and English. *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, 29, 21–33.
- Steen, G. (2007). Finding metaphor in discourse: Pragglejaz and beyond. *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación/ Culture, Language and Representation*, 5, 9–25.
- Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Younes, A. S., & Altakhaineh, A. R. M. (2022). Metaphors and metonymies used in memes to depict COVID-19 in Jordanian social media websites. *Ampersand*, 9, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2022.100087>.
- Yu, N. (2011). Speech organs and linguistic activity/function in Chinese. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures* (pp. 117–148). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Zibin, A. (2021). Blood metaphor and metonymies in Jordanian Arabic and English. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 19(1), 26–50.
- Zibin, A. (2022). The type and function of metaphors in Jordanian economic discourse: A critical metaphor analysis approach. *Language Sciences*, 93, 101488.
- Zibin, A., & Altakhaineh, A. R. M. (2023). A blending analysis of metaphors and metonymies used to depict the deal of the century by Jordanian cartoonists. *Language and Cognition*, 15(2), 377–404.
- Zibin, A., Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Hamdan, H. J. (2022). Love and beloved metaphors in Jordanian Arabic and English songs: A cognitive linguistic study. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 12(2), 318–339.

- Zibin, A., Daoud, S., & Altakhaineh, A. R. M. (2024). Indexical meanings of the realization of /s/ ص as [s] in spoken and written Jordanian Arabic: A language change in progress? *Folia Linguistica*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2024-2003>.
- Zibin, A., & Hamdan, J. (2019). The conceptualisation of FEAR through conceptual metonymy and metaphor in Jordanian Arabic. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES)*, 19(2), 243–266.
- Zou, M. (2020). Extended conceptual metaphor theory. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, 16(4), 637–649.

---

**Cite this article:** Zibin, A., Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Musmar, O. (2024). Head metonymies and metaphors in Jordanian and Tunisian Arabic: an extended conceptual metaphor theory perspective, *Language and Cognition*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2024.31>