

## Body Part Idioms in Egyptian Arabic

**Omnia Mohammed Mostafa Hamed <sup>(\*)</sup>**

---

### Introduction

This Study explores the meaning of Egyptian idioms concerning parts of the human body. It uses the theoretical perspective of cognitive semantics and tests the cognitive linguistic hypothesis that idiomatic expressions are motivated by conceptual mechanisms of the native speakers of a language. These mechanisms are conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymies, and conventional knowledge of the speakers of a language.

The study also explores how far our conceptual system results from the kind of beings we are and the way we interrelate with our physical and cultural environments. These figurative meanings were classified and then translated, both literally and figuratively, into English. Using the Conceptual Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy, developed mainly by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), and Kövecses (2002), the analysis demonstrates that: Egyptian Arabic speakers' conceptual system is metaphorical; that there are four main cognitive mechanisms used as motivators for the meanings of these idioms; that the overall idiomatic meaning of these EA body-part idioms is motivated through one or more of these strategies and is never arbitrary; and that some of EA body-part idioms are culture-specific.

---

(\*) This paper is part of an MA. thesis entitled: "Body Part Idioms in Egyptian Arabic: A Linguistic Field Study". Supervised by Prof. Bahaa-eddin M. Mazid- Professor of Linguistics & Translation, Head of the Department of English Language and Vice-Dean for Post-Graduate Studies, Faculty of Languages, Sohag University & Ass. Prof. Samir Ahmed Abdelnaim- Assistant Professor of Literary Criticism and Head of the Department of English Language, Faculty of Arts, Sohag University.

### **Statement of the research problem :**

This study focuses on body-part idioms in EA from a cognitive semantic perspective. The study adopts a qualitative linguistic analysis method of research. Data were collected by using observation sheet.

### **Objectives of the study:**

The present study aims to investigate idioms for different parts of the human body in EA. These idioms will be used to test five of the strongest claims of the cognitive linguistic framework of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987) , and Kövecses (2002) among others:

- that our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical (i.e. conceptually structured through three cognitive strategies);
- that Egyptian body-part idioms are motivated through three cognitive mechanisms. These are conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy, and the conventional knowledge of the native speakers of a language;
- that the meanings of these idioms are not arbitrary but motivated by these strategies;
- that the basic claim of embodiment according to which our bodily experience is dominant in human meaning and understanding is present in EA body-part idioms; and
- that culture has a role in EA body-part idiomatic structure and comprehension.

It will also aim to discover whether these strategies motivate the overall figurative meaning of these idioms and whether embodiment or culture has any part in their structure and comprehension.

### **Research questions :**

1. What are the Egyptian Arabic idioms involving words of the body-parts?
- 2- how people understand the figurative meanings of EA body-part idioms?

### **Significance of the study:**

This research is done in order to examine the use of body-part idioms in Egyptian social life as a way of communication. body-part idioms offer useful data for the cognitive linguistic framework because of their extensive daily use. The human body is an ideal source domain for the metaphorical understanding of abstract concepts because it is visibly delineated and well known to us. By providing the linguistic structure of Egyptian Arabic body-part idioms based on the cognitive linguistic framework, along with the Egyptian cultural background and bodily experiences, this thesis offers help to second language Learners and their teachers dealing with EA body-part idioms.

### **Delimitation of the study:**

This study is limited to apply the cognitive linguistic framework of metaphor and metonymy analysis developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), and Kövecses (2002). This is an analytical study, in the sense that a detailed cognitive Linguistic examination is made of the idioms in order to determine whether our conceptual system is metaphorical and motivated by conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymies, and Egyptian speakers' conventional knowledge.

### **Literature review :**

There are a considerable number of previous Arabic studies which studied CA, MSA, and other Arabic dialects in relation to the Western framework of cognitive linguistics ,which applied the cognitive linguistic framework to the Qur'anic verses, Shokr (2006) tackles the conceptual metaphor of LIFE IS A JOURNEY in Qur'anic verses, and supported the theory that life is conceptually structured and comprehended by means of a journey through various verses in the Holy Qur'an. This shared conceptual metaphor in English and Arabic is attributed to a religious teaching in both Christianity (English) and Islam (Arabic). In a similar vein, Berrada (2006) applied the cognitive linguistic framework to Qur'anic verses in relation to the conceptual metaphors of light and darkness, and finds that metaphors of light structure

## Body Part Idioms in Egyptian Arabic

---

verses in relation to faith, truth, conviction, and so on. In contrast, metaphors of darkness structure verses in relation to disbelief, falsehood, and hesitation. These findings demonstrate that these metaphors are structured and comprehended based on the underlying human experience of Light/Darkness in relation to Faith/Disbelief grounded through religion teachings. Other cognitive linguists have compared different forms of Arabic. These include Berrada (2007), who made a comparative comparison between food metaphors in Qur'anic verses and the Moroccan Dialect of Arabic. His study provides further evidence of the existence of these metaphors, with minor differences, in the two discourses. Although, Berrada expected that these metaphors would be seen in many unrelated cultures, due to the experiential basis of food to humans, his study actually found that many of these metaphors are culture-specific and untranslatable. His study adds additional evidence for the influence of culture on the structure and comprehension of conceptual metaphors and metonymies. Other cognitive studies focus on comparisons between Arabic and other languages in relation to pedagogy. Working on empirical ground of general business writing by Arab students, AlJumah's (2007) study foregrounds the difficulties that Arab students have in expressing themselves metaphorically in English as well as in understanding English metaphors. This is a result of lack of mastery of the non-literal possibilities of the English language as well as the presence of cultural differences related to their metaphorical thinking. He recommends pedagogical programs on English metaphors and culture for non-native learners as a possible solution. The Event Structure Metaphor is another pervasive system seen in conceptual metaphors such as changes are movements, states are locations in expressions like He went crazy and They are in love (Kövecses 2002: 135). Checking the presence or absence of ESM in Arabic and whether Arabic has the same mapping, AlDokhayel (2008) argues that ESM is central to the comprehension of abstract and complex concepts in Arabic. He further demonstrates that speakers of different languages have similar cognitive structures at generic level, but there are also culture-specific models which can set

English and Arabic apart. His study however supports the claim of universality in relation to ESM. Maalej (2004) contributed to the field of cognitive linguistics through extending two more dimensions of embodiment in relation to meaning. His study of anger expressions in the Tunisian dialect of Arabic. used the cognitive linguistic framework with reference to embodiment and culture. He raised two further embodiment dimensions in addition to physiological embodiment distinguished by Lakoff and Kövecses (1987) and Kövecses (2000, 2002), which yields expressions of anger where the part of the body part used for conceptualization is also physiologically affected. An English example is She was blind with rage. He proposed that there was also culturally specific embodiment, which refers to parts of the body that are culturally correlated with the emotion of anger. Maalej also proposed culturally tainted embodiment which refers to the use of animal behaviours and cultural ecological features to taint physiologically embodied anger expressions. An example is the TA expression /lqayt-u yahdar ki-j-jmall/, „I found him growling like a camel“. Maalej (2004: 56) argues that embodiment is an essential motivation for the metaphoric conceptualization, but recommends that the conception of embodiment be broadened to embrace more than just physiology. Embodiment is also a function of cultural correlation between a given emotion and its cultural bearing. He argues that these culturally based embodiments are not meant to create dichotomies, because even physiological embodiment is cultural in nature.

Many experiments by cognitive psycholinguists offer support to the cognitive linguistic analysis of figurative expressions. These studies range from investigations of mental images associated with English idiomatic phrases (Gibbs and O'Brien 1990) to proverb meaning (Gibbs et al. 1997). They demonstrate through various examples the existence of the conceptual metaphors and conceptual metonymies in the human conceptual system. Gibbs (1990) also demonstrates that people appear to have tacit knowledge of the metaphorical basis of idioms and that they have mental images for these idioms. This proves the existence of conceptual metaphors and metonymies in the conceptual system that motivates the

## Body Part Idioms in Egyptian Arabic

---

meaning of these idioms. In another study, Gibbs (1999: 148) further asserts that human embodied experiences give rise to their metaphorical structuring of abstract concepts which limits speakers' use and understanding of language and thus finds support for embodiment experiences. Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 81-87) go further in claiming that the existence of these cognitive mechanisms is not only proved by psychological experiments but also through evidence from novel utterances, historical data, sign language, gesture and language acquisition . Studies of Body-part Idioms from a Cognitive Linguistic Point of View Bílková 2000; Charteris-Black 2003; Yu 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, are among studies which dealt with internal and external body-part idioms. Only two of the numerous studies of body- part idioms are considered in detail here. Kövecses and Szabó's (1996) study of hand idioms sought to identify the main cognitive mechanisms motivating the meanings of these idiomatic expressions .They found that conventional knowledge was joined with conceptual metonymies in hand idioms. Arguing that it is a matter of an individual taste, they felt that conceptual metonymy is "the dominant force and cognitive source" (Kövecses and Szabó 1996: 340). An example they provide is the expression have one's hand full which means "to be busy" ,which arises from our general conventional knowledge that when we are holding things in the hand we cannot pick up other things with that hand at the same time. We are already busy with what we are holding and this prevents us from engaging in another activity at the same time. This knowledge underlies the idiom and motivates its meaning alongside other cognitive tools, such as THE HAND STANDS FOR THE ACTIVITY/ACTION. Kövecses and Szabó (1996: 340) describe this conventional knowledge and conceptual metonymy as working together jointly to produce a large part of the motivation of the figurative meaning of idioms such as sit on one's hands and put one's hands in one's pockets. Kövecses and Szabó (1996: 341) claim that THE HAND STANDS FOR THE PERSON seems to be based on the metonymy THE HAND STANDS FOR THE ACTIVITY/ACTION and their justification is that the

prototypical person is an ACTIVE person. In his comparative study of eye idioms in Chinese and English using CTMM, Yu (2004) concluded that there are similarities as well as differences between the two languages, and that this results in similar expressions with similar meanings, similar expressions with different meanings, and different expressions with similar meanings. He suggests that similarities arise from common bodily experiences, while differences arise from the interaction between culture and body.

### **Theoretical framework :**

#### **Metaphor and Metonymy**

In some expressions, the conceptual metaphor and the conceptual metonymy blend with each other in a single expression that makes it difficult to determine which is involved. This phenomenon is discussed by Goossens (1990), who calls it metaphonymy. Kövecses (2002: 160) provides many examples of such cases, such as to be closed-lipped. Here there are two explanations according to each meaning: If the meaning is understood as “to be silent”, then the expression is metonymic because the closure of lips results in silence. However, if the meaning is “to say little”, then the expression is metaphoric because we are describing a person who is usually talkative but now is silent because he does not want to say what we would like to hear from him.

Metaphor and metonymy are two kinds of figurative language that have traditionally been thought of as poetic: as fanciful and imaginative devices in the language used by poets and literary writers. They have been studied for centuries under the aegis of rhetoric in both Arabic and English. In English, however, this traditional perspective started to change because of developments in fields such as pragmatics, psychology, cognitive linguistics, and physiology (Richards 1936). These fields have provided new perspectives, various angles of study and novel theories. However, metaphor and metonymy have continued to be the domain of rhetoric in Arabic research to the present day (Abdul-Raof 2006). In other words, Arabs still regard metaphor as a

literary tool, while scholars in the West take part in cognitive and linguistic discussions about metaphor.

### **Idioms**

Lewis (1993) defined an idiom as a particular kind of lexical in which the meaning of the whole is not immediately apparent from the meanings of the constituent parts. She emphasizes that the transparency of idiomatic expressions is a matter of degree as there is a spectrum of idiomaticity. In that sense, according to Cacciari (1993), the task of defining what an idiomatic expressions is, and how it is acquired and understood is still a difficult and controversial issue. It is the border that differentiates between literal and idiomatic expressions on one hand, and the metaphorical and idiomatic expressions on the other hand. The Cambridge International Dictionary of English (2002) provides a simple definition of an idiom, stating that an idiom is a group of words in a fixed order having a specific meaning, different from the meanings of each word understood on its own. Makkai (1972, p. 122) reserves the term 'idiom' for multiword expressions whose meaning is not predictable from their component parts. A definition offered by Fraser (1970) as quoted by Fernando (1996) is fairly similar, as he defines an idiom as a "constituent or a series of constituents for which the semantic interpretation is not a compositional function of the formatives of which it is composed" (1996, p. 8). The fact that the meaning of an idiom cannot be deduced from the meanings of its individual components is therefore in central place in both Fernando and Makkai's and Fraser's definitions of an idiom. Strässler's (1982) definition of an idiom is different from various other definitions in respect of its exclusion of expressions which consist of 'a verb plus an adverbial particle or preposition. 'According to Strässler, an idiom is "a concatenation of more than one lexeme whose meaning is not derived from the meanings of its constituents and which does not consist of a verb plus adverbial particle or preposition" (1982, p.79). Strässler decided in defining an idiom not to include phrasal verbs as idioms on the fact that the second parts of these phrases are semantically empty. Actually, to get a broad idea about the definition of an idiom we will need to understand its features and functions. In an attempt to find a



criterion for re-defining idioms, Grant and Bauer (2004) have rejected the previous definitions and classifications of idioms and concentrated on the point that idioms are non-compositional. To them, to avoid ambiguity because of the various and general definitions of idioms, they tend to present a more restrictive definition of idioms by forming a test that divides multi-word expressions into 'core idiom' and 'figurative idiom'. Then they define idioms as an approach based on the semantic opaqueness (or transparency) of idioms. They are settled on defining idioms as an important group of expressions which have figurative meanings but also keep a current literal interpretation. Hence, there is some disagreement over defining and classifying idioms among scholars.

### **Conceptual Motivation for Idioms in the Cognitive Linguistic View**

Motivation, the explanation of how meaning is achieved, is central to cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguists argue that the relationship between the form and its meaning is primarily motivated. Kövecses (2002: 248) explains that "...the meaning of many idioms seems natural, or "transparent," to us because either metaphor, metonymy, or conventional knowledge links the non idiomatic meaning of the constituent words to the idiomatic meaning of these words taken together". We can, for example, understand what life is because it is motivated by the conceptual metaphor Life is journey. Thus we have coherently organized knowledge about journeys that we rely on in understanding life (Kövecses 2002: 4). Experience therefore plays an important role in the structure (i.e. journey) and understanding of abstract concepts (i.e. life). In other words, conceptual metaphors are motivated by this human experience of journey and life. As a result, an English speaker will have a good reason for creating and using the conceptual metaphor life is a journey. Also, we can comprehend what the idiom feel down means because of the conceptual metaphor sad is down, which is related to the human experience of the downward orientation image schema as a Kövecses (2002: 36) negative evaluation. Ultimately, cognitive linguists stress the fundamental role of experience in

constructing meanings, and emphasize that meanings are not arbitrary but are derived from these experiences (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Lakoff 1987). These cognitive mechanisms are not only responsible for connecting domains of knowledge to the idiomatic meaning, but also provide motivation for the occurrence of particular words in several idioms.

### **Conceptualization:**

The present research is mainly based on the assumptions of the theory of Conceptual metaphors. The Cognitive theory of Metaphor, or the theory of Conceptual Metaphors, or “experiential realism” (Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003) emphasizes an extensive role of metaphors in humans’ life. Metaphors are formed due to the ability of people to categorize and structure the surrounding world into the system of categories which range from general to specific ones, with cognitively basic categories in the middle of this hierarchy:”The basis for concepts is categorization” (Feldman, 2006, p. 96).

### **Traditional Arabic and Western Rhetoricians 'Work on Figurative Language**

Arabic and Western writers agree on the basic definition of figurative language: "figurative language ... involves the transfer of the figurative meaning of a lexical item to another item in order to form a figurative expression. The associated word (verbalized or estimated) helps the reader/hearer to interpret the expression figuratively not literally" (Khojah 1999: 1). According to Arabic scholars, figurative language is opposed to literal language, and figurative expressions have attracted the attention of Arabic scholars because they are associated with implicitness and stylistic deviation and are seen as more effective than explicit literal expressions. In contrast, many Western scholars see literal and figurative language as the poles on a continuum, not as two different categories. For instance, Cantor (1982: 72) writes that "All language is a mixture of literal and figurative, since every linguistic utterance has some elements of customary in it and some elements of the novel." The major difference between the two views lies in their classification of figurative

language into different tropes. Arabic rhetoricians recognize four major types (metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy and simile), while Western rhetoricians recognize numerous figures of speech, including metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy, simile, conceit, personification, proverb, cliché, oxymoron, idioms, indirect requests, and many others (Glucksberg 2001; Katz et al. 1998). Arabic rhetoricians analyze various examples of figurative expressions and categorize them as similes, metaphors, metonymies, or synecdoches. These linguistic figures of speech, as they are termed in Arabic rhetoric, have their own classifications, elements, and conditions which are detached from the conceptual system and refer only to language (Lakoff 1993: 208).

### **A Cognitive Approach to Metaphor**

Cognitive linguistics maintains that the human conceptual system is structured partly by conceptual metaphors and metonymies (see Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999; Gibbs 1994; Kövecses 2002) but it also goes further than this and treats metaphor as a cognitive tool central to human thought and reasoning. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) consider metaphor as a property of concepts, including words used by ordinary people, and not confined to poets or literary writers. Its main function is to provide a better understanding of certain concepts, and as a result it is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning. Cognitive linguists disagree with the traditional view and maintain that the selection of the source domain depends on human factors that mirror non-objective, non-literal, and non-preexisting similarities between the source and target domains. These are referred to as the experiential basis or motivation of conceptual metaphors. In other words, metaphorical language and thought are not arbitrary, as the traditional view believes, but motivated through the basic bodily experience of being human. This idea of what Lakoff and Johnson (1980) call embodiment positions the cognitive linguistic view against the traditional view. Language, as the means of communication and the reflection of patterns of thought, provides Lakoff and Johnson's (1980: 3) main evidence that "[o]ur ordinary

## Body Part Idioms in Egyptian Arabic

---

conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is metaphorical in nature". Their claim is that our conceptual system plays an important role in defining the realities we experience every day. They also claim that the way we think as humans, what we experience, and what we do every day, is very much a matter of metaphor. In other words, metaphor functions at a conceptual level without us being aware of this system. Metaphor is a cognitive tool by which we conceive the world around us. It can be said that we communicate these metaphorical conceptual understandings in linguistic expressions that reflect the metaphoric nature of the concept. Cognitive linguists argue that metaphor creates schematic images in the language-user's mind and thus structures their modes of thought, Lakoff (1987: 113-114) calls these conventional images image schemas and gives examples such as our knowledge of candles includes "a long, thin object schema". Lakoff and Turner (1989: xi) assert that metaphor is a matter of experience of everyday life rather than just a matter of language and the lexicon: "Metaphor is a tool so ordinary that we use it unconsciously and automatically ... it is irreplaceable: metaphor allows us to understand ourselves and our world in ways that no other modes of thought can." Following the conventions of cognitive linguistics, this is called conceptual metaphor. Conceptual metaphors consist of two conceptual domains in which one domain is understood in terms of the other. The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called the source domain, the conceptual domain that we understand through the source domain is the target domain (Kövecses 2002: 4). The traditional rhetorical terms tenor and vehicle approximate the terms used in cognitive linguistics: Tenor is target while vehicle is source (Machakanja 2006: 10). Since this study relies on the cognitive linguistic framework, the terms target and source are preferred here. A conceptual domain is any coherent organization of experience (Kövecses 2002: 4). The source domain holds physical or concrete concepts, while the target domain holds abstract ones. The target domain is understood in terms of the source domain, as in the conceptual metaphor Love

is a journey, according to which we could say Our relationship has hit a dead-end street (Lakoff 1993: 206). The metaphorical process typically goes from the more concrete to the more abstract. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) call this kind of process mapping: a systematic set of correspondences that exist between the elements of the source and the target language. In the example above, love is understood by means of the elements of the source domain which is journey.

### **Classification of Metaphors:**

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) further classify metaphors according to their conventionality, function, nature, and level of generality. Metaphors can be conventional when they are deeply entrenched and used by everyone in a community for everyday purposes, such as the highly conventionalized conceptual metaphor LIFE IS JOURNEY: Conventionalized linguistic expressions, including He had a head start in life, are based on this metaphor, while a less conventionalized linguistic expression is found in Frost's I took [the road] less traveled by (Kövecses 2002: 31). According to their function, metaphors can be structural, ontological, or orientational. Lakoff and Johnson define structural metaphors "as cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another... such as ARGUMENT IS WAR... Orientational metaphors give a spatial orientation to a concept; for example, Happy is up... Ontological metaphors ... [the] ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc. as entities and substance, such as The mind is machine" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14-27). Metaphors can also be classified according to their nature; there are image-schema metaphors. These have no rich conceptual knowledge that can be mapped from the source to the target: little knowledge can be mapped between the two sources. They have skeletal image-schemas such as the one associated with in as in He fell in love, or out as in I am out of money, etc. They derive from our interactions and experiences with the world, seeing ourselves and other objects as containers. Their importance lies in the fact that they structure many abstract concepts metaphorically. They can be the basis of many structural metaphors, such as the conceptual metaphor

LIFE IS A JOURNEY. Here the motion schema underlies the concept of journey, in that journeys have an initial point, movement and then an end point. Consequently, we can say that the domain of LIFE is image-schematically structured by the domain of JOURNEY. Metaphors can be either at the specific-level or generic-level. The MOTION schema presents an example of conceptual metaphors that are at the generic-level because they have scarce details: initial location, movement along a path, and final destination. This generic-level schema is filled in with more details from the source domain of JOURNEY: travelers, a point of departure, a means of travelling, etc. So we can say that JOURNEY schema is more detailed than the MOTION schema outlined above. This occurs when the motion schema is realized not only as a journey but also a run, walk, mountain ascent, etc. These are examples of the specific-level of the generic motion schema. Most conceptual metaphors are at the specific-level. Consequently, it is apparent that the central area of investigation for cognitive linguists is the relationship that exists between the conceptual metaphor and its linguistic expression. For those cognitive linguists, metaphor is not only a tool for poetry, but also a tool for the ordinary layman. For Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphor is not primarily a linguistic phenomenon; rather it is a mode of conceptual representation.

### **Metaphor and Embodiment**

Figurative uses of body-part words in the languages of the world have long attracted the attention of linguists (cf. Brugman 1983; Lakoff and Kövecses 1987, MacLaury 1989; Allan 1995; Svorou 1994, Walsh 1994; Levinson 1994; Heine 1995; Matsumoto 1999; Yu 2000; Ahn and Kwon 2007, Frank et al (2008), Maalej and Yu 2011, to mention only a few). Within the embodiment perspective, it is not uncommon to find statements that point out that, in everyday language, we often see a direct reflection of embodiment onto object names. Thus, in English, we speak of the “hands of a clock”, “the mouth of a river”, “the foot of a hill”, “the leg of a table” and “the nose of an airplane”. Especially, English uses plenty of body-related concepts in metaphors, e.g. “swallow one’s idea”; “sink their teeth into the

theory”; “keep an eye on something”, and the same happens in many other languages. Investigation of idioms, metaphors and metonymies which include body part terms are therefore assumed to offer first hand data for validating the thesis that embodiment is the pivotal notion underlying the conceptualization of human experiences. As analyses of cross-cultural data have increased, however, the necessity to think of embodiment not in the restricted sense of “humanly corporeal” but as cultural embodiment has come to the fore. The need for a view that stresses the interaction between mind, body and culture as advocated by Gibbs (1999), and further stressed by Sinha and Jensen de López (2000), has been repeatedly underscored by Gibbs (2006:13): “bodies are not culture-free objects, because all aspects of embodied experience are shaped by cultural processes”. This means that, even if the physiology is the same, the way languages interpret and represent bodily experiences may be “shaped by cultural practices that resist simple biological explanation” (Gibbs 2006:39). The fact that Italian has *lancette dell’orologio* for “hands of the clock” and *foce del fiume* for “mouth of the river” may therefore be imputed to different cultural habits in anthropomorphisation patterns and should not call the theory into question. Different cultural models may interpret the same experiences differently, either by mapping different body parts onto the same abstract concept or by selecting the same body parts to map onto and structure different abstract concepts (Kövecses 2005, 2006). As Maalej and Yu (2011:9) point out, “The complex relation between body and culture in embodiment, cast as the interactions between metonymy and metaphor, often leave traces in language”. Below we shall look into some of these traces.

### **Methodology :**

This section is subdivided into three parts , as follows: data collection and procedures, tools, and sample analysis .

### **Data collection and procedures:**

The observation sheet method tests a purposive sample of EA speakers by asking them to write body part idioms in Egyptian society. 10 EA speakers are selected. This study is concerned with adults and not children, because children could

not be expected to understand certain idiomatic expressions. The study adopts a qualitative linguistic analysis method of research.

### **Tools:**

I chose the observation sheet, a data collection instrument used in the survey method, as my method of collecting body-part idioms from a large number of representative participants of the target population. This tool is an efficient way of collecting data from a large number of Egyptian people. Body Part idioms are used on a daily basis in Egypt, and as a result, it can be claimed that the conceptual metaphors and metonymies motivating these idioms are popular and frequent too. After the idioms are transcribed phonetically and translated both literally and figuratively, they are ready to be analyzed according to the cognitive linguistic framework of metaphor and metonymy analysis developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), and Kövecses (2002).

### **procedures of data analysis:**

Idioms in the Egyptian conversations are the only ones that have been included in the study. The second step is a deeper analysis to determine the cognitive linguistic framework of metaphor and metonymy analysis developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), and Kövecses (2002).

### **Analysis:**

The hand:

The word / ʔiid ايدي/in Egyptian Arabic literally means a hand . Possessive pronouns are attached to the noun / ʔiid ايدي/to make it ,for example, feminine singular / ʔiidha ايدها/ ,,her hand“ or masculine/ʔiidu/ ,his hand , masculine plural / ʔiidehum ايديهم/ ,,their hands“. This is in contrast to Arabic which uses different forms for each number and gender as in/ ايديهم/ ,,their hands“ for masculine plural /ʔiidehum /. Almost all of EA hand idioms in the database are based on the metonymy of action since the hands are our bodily tool for associating in manual activities (The part of the body for function). Our daily experiences with our hands provide the cognitive basis for our understanding of the following abstract concepts:

- The Conceptual Category of (Being ethical)



- The Conceptual Category of (physical hurt)
- The Conceptual Category of (skill and expertise)
- The Conceptual Category of (Help)
- The Conceptual Category of (Generosity)
- The Conceptual Category of (Cooperation)
- The Conceptual Category of (Control)
- The Conceptual Category of (possession)
- The Conceptual Category of (scrimp)
- The hand stands for the person

Example of the conceptual category of (scrimp)

ʔiidu maska

ايدده ماسكة

His hand is tight

He is tight-fisted

The meaning: He is stingy

This idiom describes a person who is always stingy financially.

The hand is used in this idiom because it is the body part associated with giving, motivated by The hand stands for the person. This expression indicates that a person is reluctant to spend

money or share resources, reflecting a parochial or miserly nature.

### Results

There is significant relationship between the use of body parts idioms in Egyptian Arabic and the cultural, historical, and social influences that shape the Egyptian mindset.

There is significant relationship between the frequency of use of idioms for body parts in Egyptian Arabic and the historical novels and traditions that characterise Egyptian society.

There is significant relationship between the semantic differences in idioms for body parts in Egyptian Arabic and the subtle cultural differences that shape the Egyptian mentality.

### Conclusion

The study emphasises the cultural and symbolic importance of body parts expressions in Egyptian Arabic, and reveal the complex interaction between literal anatomical meanings and

deeper cultural connotations. Idioms are linguistic manifestations of cultural nuances, providing insight into the symbolic meanings associated with specific body parts within Egyptian society. Moreover, the study emphasises the role of intergenerational transmission and cultural continuity in preserving the wisdom and experiences contained in these idiomatic expressions. Language is a living repository of cultural heritage, and the transfer of idiomatic expressions related to body parts ensures the continuity of this rich cultural heritage.

### References

- Abdul-Raof, H. (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric: A Pragmatic Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Ahn H.J., Y.J. Kwon, (2007), "A study on metaphor and metonymy of *hand*", *Journal of Language Sciences*, 14, pp. 195-215.
- AlDokhayel, R. (2008). *The Event Structure Metaphor: The Case of Arabic*. PhD dissertation. Ball State University, USA.
- AlJumah, F. (2007). *A Comparative Study of Metaphor in Arabic and English General Business Writing With Teaching Implications*. PhD dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA.
- Allan K, (1995), "The anthropocentricity of the English word(s) *back*", *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6, pp. 11-31
- Berrada, K. (2006). „Metaphors of Light and Darkness in the Holy Qur'an. A Conceptual Approach.
- Berrada, K. (2007). „Food Metaphors: A Contrastive Approach“
- Bílková, I. (2000). *Czech and English Idioms of Body Parts: A View from Cognitive Semantics*. M Phil dissertation. University of Glasgow, UK.
- Cacciari, C. (1993). The place of idioms in a literal and metaphorical world. *Idioms: Processing, structure, and interpretation*, 27-55.
- Cantor, P. (1982). Friedrich Nietzsche: The use and Abuse of Metaphor. In *Metaphor: Problems and Perspectives*. (ed.) D. S. Mial. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, p. 71-88.

- Charteris-Black, J. (2003) „Speaking with Forked Tongue: A Comparative Study of Metaphor and Metonymy in English and Malay phraseology“. *Metaphor and Symbol*
- Feldman, J.A. (2006). *From Molecule to Metaphor: A neural theory of language*. Cambridge, MA & London, UK: The MIT Press.
- Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and Idiomaticity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frank R.M., Dirven R., Ziemke T. , Bernàrdez E., (eds.), (2008), *Body, language and mind: Sociocultural situatedness*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Fraser, B. (1970). Idioms within a transformational grammar. *Foundations of language*, 22-42.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (1990). „Psycholinguistic studies on the conceptual basis of idiomaticity“. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1 (4): 417-452.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr. (1999). „Taking Metaphor out of our Heads and Putting it into the Cultural World“. In: R.W. Gibbs, Jr., & G.J. Steen (eds.). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. p. 144–166.
- Gibbs R.W.,(2006), *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr., and O'Brien, J. (1990). „Idioms and Mental Imagery: The Metaphorical Motivation for Idiomatic Meaning“. *Cognition* 36 (1): 35-68.
- Gibbs, R.W., Jr., Lise K. Storm, & Michael J. Spivey-Knowlton. (1997). „Conceptual Metaphors in Mental Imagery for Proverbs“. *Journal of Mental Imagery* 21: 83-110.
- Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goossens, L. (1990). „Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions of linguistic action“. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 323-340.

- Grant, L., & Bauer, L. (2004). Criteria for re-defining idioms: Are we barking up the wrong tree? *Applied Linguistics*, 25(1), 38-61. doi: 10.1093/applin/25.1.38
- Heine B., (1995), "Conceptual grammaticalization and prediction", in J.R. Taylor, R.E.W.
- Katz, A.; Cacciari, C.; Gibbs, R.W. Jr., and Turner, M. (1998). *Figurative Language and Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khojah, A. (1999). A Lexico-Semantic Study of Arabic Figurative Language Used in Children and Adult Literature. M.A dissertation. King Abdul Aziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). The scope of metaphor. In: Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroad*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 79-92.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses Z.,(2005), *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kövecses, Z. and Szabó, P. (1996). „Idioms: A View from Cognitive Linguistics“, *Applied Linguistics* 17(3): 326-355.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor in: A Ortony (ed.) 1993 *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By* (2nd ed.). Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, G., and Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In: D. Holland and N. Quinn (eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 195-221.
- Levinson S., (1994), "Vision, shape, and linguistic description: Tzeltal body-part terminology and object description", *Linguistics*, 32, pp. 791-855
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach*.
- 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.A. ,Yu N. (eds), (2011), *Embodiment via body parts*, Benjamins, Amsterdam/. Philadelphia.
- Machakanja, I. (2006). *Conceptual Metaphors in English and Shona: A CrossLinguistic and Cross-cultural Study*. Ph.D dissertation. University of South Africa, South Africa.
- MacLaury R.E., (1989), "Zapotec body-part locatives: Prototypes and metaphoric extensions", *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 55, pp. 119-154.
- Makkai, A. (1972). *Idiom structure in English*.
- Matsumoto Y., (1999), "On the extension of body-part nouns to object part nouns and spatial adpositions", in B. Fox, D. Jurafsky, L. Michaelis (eds), *Cognition and Function in Language*, CSLI, Stanford, CA.
- Richards, I.A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shokr, M. (2006). „The Metaphorical Concept „Life is a Journey“ in the Qur'an. A Cognitive-semantic Analysis“
- Sinha C., Jensen de López K., (2000), "Language, culture and the embodiment of spatial cognition", *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11, pp. 17-41.
- Strässler, J. (1982). *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis* (Vol. 183). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Svorou S., 1994, *The Grammar of Space*, Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

- Walsh M., (1994), "Body parts in Murrinh-Patha: Incorporation, grammar and metaphor", in H. Chapell, W. McGregor (eds), *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-whole Relation*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp. 327-380.
- Yu, N. (2000). „Figurative uses of finger and palm in Chinese and English“. *Metaphor and Symbol* 15 .PP. 159–175.
- Yu, N. (2001) „What does our face mean to us?“ *Pragmatics and Cognition* 9 (1): 1–36.
- Yu, N. (2002). „Body and emotion: Body parts in Chinese Expression of emotion“. In Nick Enfield and Anna Wierzbicka (eds.), special issue "The Body in Description of Emotion: Cross-Linguistic Studies," *Pragmatics and Cognition* 10 (1/2): 341–367.
- Yu, N. (2003a). „Metaphor, body, and culture: The Chinese Understanding of gallbladder and courage“. *Metaphor and Symbol* 18 (1): 13–31.
- Yu, N. (2003b). „The bodily dimension of meaning in Chinese: What do we do and mean with "hands"?" In: Casad, Eugene H., Palmer, Gary B. (Eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics and Non-Indo-European Languages*. Berlin: Gruyter, p. 337-362.
- Yu, N. (2003c). „Chinese metaphors of thinking“. *Cognitive Linguistics* 14 (2/3): 141–165.
- Yu, N. (2004). „The eyes for sight and mind“. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (4): 663–686.