Cross-linguistic Analysis of Body Part Metaphor Conceptualization from a Cognitive Semiosis Perspective

Sara Atef-Vahid
Department of Foreign Languages, Iran University of Science and Technology, Iran
E-mail: saraatefvahid@yahoo.com

Keivan Zahedi
Department of Foreign Languages, Iran University of Science and Technology, Iran

Abstract

In accordance with Lakovian cognitive linguistics in metaphoric analysis, this paper aims to explore the human cognitive capacity of metaphoric conceptualization of body parts. A contrastive analysis on the cognitive features of metaphorical expressions utilizing various body parts pertaining to the 'head' domain, e.g., face and tongue in the English and Farsi languages is carried out. After a cross-linguistic comparison of metaphors in both languages, five main linguistic categories emerge. Similarities and differences of metaphor construction, mappings and mechanisms in both languages used to convey common concepts are highlighted using these categories. While corroborating Lakoff's approach whereby metaphors constitute an inherent part of language itself, it is shown that there is a universal cognitive grid from which different languages externalize the world differently through semiosis. Therefore, the main aim is to show how language invariance and variation may be explained within a cognitive framework. These universals are due to cognitive constraints, whereas languages owe their variation to the options they have out of the cognitively available pool. They are limited to their selections which are restrained by cultural and perhaps religious factors of semiotic mechanisms which are cognitively accessible to them.

Keywords: Cognitive linguistics; Lakovian approach; 'head' domain metaphors; language invariance and variation

1. Introduction

The study of language use from a cognitive linguistic viewpoint attempts to recognize human cognition in order to identify underlying conceptual systems which allow for meaning construction. As Fauconnier (2006) points out, 'when we engage in any language activity, we draw unconsciously on vast cognitive and cultural resources, call up models and frames, set up multiple connections, coordinate large arrays of information, and engage in creative mappings, transfers, and elaborations' p.1. For years, researchers studying language description from a cognitive point of view have been interested in characterizing the way in which people think and reason in terms of abstract propositions. This paper is a comprehensive study of an initial brief report presented by Author 2 (2012). In this study, the process of cognitive semiosis which is termed 'languaging' is viewed with regards to body parts. The dictionary of Webster defines semiosis as 'a process in which something functions as a sign to an organism,' and in this circumstance, the organism is the human being. It is asserted that in every language, body parts comprise an indivisible facet of human cognitive semiosis. This inquiry is analyzed based on

Lakoff's 'conceptual metaphors'. In accordance with this framework, this paper aims to make a contrastive study on the cognitive features of metaphorical expressions utilizing various body parts pertaining to the head domain in English and Farsi (i.e., Modern Persian). It has been attempted to explore one of the foundations of linguistic semiosis which is the human cognitive capacity of metaphoric conceptualization by examining the similarities and differences in the metaphorical structuring and mechanisms used to convey common concepts in both languages, and to identify the extent that these differences are manifested in the their linguistic expressions. To elaborate, at a more general, namely macro-level, of analysis, this paper attempts to contribute to the resolution of the old but still heated debate on language invariance and variation, which has proven to be the Gordian knot of linguistics today. As Langacker (2002) notes:

> Among the fascinations of natural language is its amenability to being characterized by two apparently contradictory statements: (i) that all languages are basically alike; and (ii) that languages may be fundamentally different from one another and can vary without essential limit. Linguistic theorists face the challenge of accommodating the observations and insights that support these opposing positions. Ideally, an overall account of language structure should specify both the nature of its universality and the extent of its diversity, as well as the source of each (p. 138).

In such pursuit, it claims that invariance in language, also known as language universals are not domain-specific, i.e. language internal. They are due to constraints imposed on language by human cognitive systems, especially the semantic-conceptual system. Whereas linguistic variation is more domain-specific and relates to what a particular language chooses to opt from the cognitively available grid of semantic grid and how to manifest it linguistically. At a more descriptive, namely micro-level, of analysis, this research aims to demonstrate the similarities and differences of metaphor construction and mappings in Farsi and English. It will be attempted to address the following inquires: How do the linguistically distant languages of Farsi and English conceptualize common ideas metaphorically using body parts? Can the reason for opting for the usage of different body parts in English and Farsi be culturally related? What are the different linguistic apparatuses used in English and Farsi for the construction of body-part metaphors? How different are the underlying concepts which are referred to metaphorically using a common body part in English and Persian? Subsequently, lexical and syntactic repercussions and their implications and applications will be discussed.

2. Review of the Related Literature

In 1980, Lakoff and Johnson proposed a theory in which it was claimed that people's conceptual system is responsible for storing their perceptions, thoughts and actions, and also that everyday language is compiled of metaphorical expressions used to express that conceptual system. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) noted:

> ". .. metaphor pervades our normal conceptual system. Because so many of the concepts that are important to us are either abstract or not clearly delineated in our experience (the emotions, ideas, time, etc.), we need to get

a grasp on them by means of other concepts that we understand in clearer terms . .." (p. 115).

Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson argue that 'metaphor is a natural phenomenon' (p.247), 'it is beyond language as it is found primarily in thought and action' (p.153). Furthermore, many research within the cognitive linguistic framework have provided satisfying data that language and metaphorical thought and the understanding of different linguistic expressions are grounded in embodiment (Gibbs, Costa Lima & Francozo, 2004). That is, metaphoric expression arise from people's normal and ordinary experiences of their bodies in action, and this serves as the source domain in conceptual metaphors (e.g., "I hunger for your sleek laugh" Gibbs Jr., et al., 2004). 'According to the cognitive approach, both metaphorical language and thought rise from the basic bodily (sensori-motor) experience of human beings, and it is a key instrument in organizing human thought.' (Kövecses, 2002, preface).

Over the years, the existence of conceptual metaphors has been empirically supported. Research in this vein has given a much clearer picture of how metaphors structure thought. For example, a number of studies showed that systems which were used to show different types of metaphors across languages and cultures (e.g. anger) grew out of the physiology of the underlying concept of metaphors itself (Lakoff, 1987; Kovecses, 1986). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that how we describe a situation indicates how we are viewing, storing and linking it, relevant to the knowledge we already have. On the same note, Langacker (1999, p. 208) argues that the ability to conceive one situation is dependent on the background provided by another situation. In understanding new information, previous discourse will provide the background to the current expression. Similarly, in metaphor comprehension, background information is provided by the source domain for understanding and structuring the target domain. Perrin (1987) also concludes that the concepts which are already known can influence what is noticed in a situation.

Therefore, metaphor is not seen just as a figurative expression which is chosen after perceiving or thinking about a situation, but as a specific mental and neural mapping which to a great extent, influences how people think, reason, and imagine in everyday life (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Furthermore, implicit belief systems are revealed by the metaphors which are chosen (Marshall, 1990; Schon, 1993). Following this interpretation, Perrin (1987) describes metaphors as a "mnemonic vestige of prior experiences"; in effect, more a "figure of experience" than a figure of speech (p. 255).

Currently, metaphors are seen in the light of the Metaphor Conceptual Theory which realizes metaphors in two domains: the target and source domains (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Metaphor in contemporary thinking refers to a 'cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system' (Lakoff, 1993, p.203). It is "a structural mapping from one domain of a subject matter (the source domain) to another (the target domain)" (p. 294). The current theory of metaphor attempts to characterize a large number of cross-domain mappings of even the most abstract concepts like time, change, and causation. The general consensus is that these cross-domain mappings are pivotal to ordinary natural language semantics. Therefore, developments in metaphor theory have proven metaphor to be 'basic and constitutive for all the thinking that we do, and that in the scheme of evolution, metaphor, based on source domains of human experience and neural connections to our embodied sensations, actions, and emotions, is what creates the possibility of 'abstract' reasoning, scientific and mathematical thought, philosophical speculation, in other words language and culture quite generally' (Fauconnier, 2006, p. 5).

As was stated before, in recent years a main area of interest for cognitive linguists is related to the study of metaphor which is recognized as central to a theory of knowledge (Ruiz de Mendoza, 1997). From a cognitive linguistics standpoint, our ways of understanding is determined by our embodiment in and with the physical and cultural world (Johnson, 1987). As Yu (2004) points out 'In cognitive linguistics, a central concern is the role of the body, and its interaction with culture, in human meaning and understanding'. Different languages employ a common technique of metaphorizing body parts to form and express concepts which could have been otherwise difficult to express. Studying the metaphorization of lexical items pertaining to the body parts in various languages can be extremely significant in understanding how people in different cultures think in abstract terms. Furthermore, their method of conceptualization and their mode of perceiving the world can be studied and compared to identify cross-linguistic differentiation in forming various linguistics expressions.

It should be noted that many body metaphors use body parts and organs to denote other concepts such as cities, nations, groups, etc., that is, these body parts are used as source domains to describe other things (e.g., Britain may be advised that it can't be at the *heart* of Europe if it is detached from its *arteries,* Musolff 2004). However, as Goschler (2005) point out, there are another set of metaphors which 'uses different domains (like people, machines, plants, manufactures) to describe the body or bodily functions and body organs. Thus, the body is target domain, being metaphorized in terms of technology or other domains' p. 36 (e.g., in describing foot-and-mouth-disease, '...a powerful *enemy* ... (whose) *foot soldiers* are beyond number and its capacity for harm beyond imagination' (Stibbe, 2001).

Research within the cognitive linguistic framework on metaphors is abundant. There has been significant amount of psychological research showing the influence of metaphors in gesture, problem solving, decision making, categorization, learning, memory, and scientific reasoning (e.g., Fernandez-Duque & Johnson, 2002) . These empirical studies illuminate that learning, remembering, problem solving and decision making are affected by the way people metaphorically construct ideas or situations.

In reviewing related research we come across two main domains. The first relates to the use of the body as an important tool in the linguistic manifestations of metaphors. Gibbs (2003) has argued that the primary way in which people construct and understand metaphorical meaning is the use of their embodied knowledge, that is their subjective experiences of their bodies in action. To this end, embodiment can explain to a certain extent why meanings are expressed through certain words and linguistics expressions by providing the foundation to more abstract concepts. Conceptual metaphor theory claims to illuminate various processes of thought and as a result cannot be language-specific, and thus can be used in cross-linguistic research. However, an unresolved issue remains which is the extent to which cognitive universals are prompts for conceptualization and in return, are drawn upon in the creation of shared metaphorical expressions. Therefore, it might be expected that certain metaphors are shared by different languages; however, the complex nature of this process and cognitive aspects can result in the manifestation of different metaphoric expressions form a cross-linguistic point of view for various linguistic and cultural reasons.

Various research within the cognitive linguistics framework have suggested that the domain of body parts is pivotal in metahporising bodily experiences (Goosens, 1990; Sweetser, 1990; Deignan & Potter, 2004). Heine (1997, p. 40) emphasizes that one of the most important models for expressing concepts is the human body. Human categories are used to describe and understand many non-human concepts. The human body tends to be the most important model

because is the most accessible to us. In a time-space study conducted by Nunez & Freeman (1999), the primacy of bodily orientation and real-time bodily action was shown to be 'at the very core of the cognitive mechanisms that make the concept of time flow possible' p.58. They concluded that 'one needs to understand cognition and the mind as *fully embodied* phenomena'.

The second central domain in reviewing the related literature relates to research which is directly or indirectly related to the scope of this study. Cross-linguistic research specifically aimed at analyzing body parts in metaphor construction can reveal how different languages attempt to convey certain ideas through the metaphorical mapping of body parts. For example, in Seeger's (1975) research on Suya Indians from Brazil, it was found that "when the Suya have learned something—even something visual such as a weaving pattern—they say, 'it is in my ear' (p. 214). Another research by Devereux (2003) showed that Sedang Moi from Indochina use the 'ear' as the source domain to conceptualize the concept of 'the seat of reason'. They use expressions like *tlek* 'deaf' and *oh ta ay tue(n)* 'has no ear' to signify lack of intelligence. Mayer (1982) explains that in Ommura (Paua New Guinea) the auditory sense is used to conceptualized all intellectual process (e.g., motives, thoughts, intentions), as seen by the use of verbs such as *iero* which means both 'to hear (auditory)' and 'to know, to understand'. Mberi's (2003) study has shown that body parts are very pervasive in metaphorical expressions of the Shona (a Bantu language spkoken by about 75% of Zimbabwe;s population) language. For example, the equivalent word for 'eye' is *ziso* which used to conceptualize an array of different meanings (i.e., *ndiri ziso renyu* 'I am your eye' "*I am you informer*"; *pane ziso rake* 'where his/her eye is' "*where his/her hope is*"). The Shona equivalent of the word 'head' is *musoro* which is used in various linguistic expressions to show the top or main part of various objects or phenomenon (e.g., *musoro wechitima* "head of train" i.e *"train engine"; musoro wechipikiri* "the head of a nail" i.e. *"the top part of the nail". Matama,* meaning 'cheeks' in English is used to denote the term 'edges' (e.g., *matama enzira* "the cheeks of the path" i.e *"edges of the path).* The term *huma* meaning 'forehead' is used to express the front part of an object (e..g, *huma yechitima* "the forehead of a train" i.e. *"the front face of the engine"* (All example are extracted from Mberi, 2003). Yu (2004) explains that in the Chinese language, the body part 'eye' is not only considered an important organ for sight in particular, but it is used in a vast amount of metaphorical expressions to signify a variety of cognitive understandings. In the metaphorical expression *Ta zhengzhi mian-mu bu quing,* 'he political face-eye not clear', "he is of dubious political background", the importance of the face and eyes are denoted in that they can be used to judge the political appearance of a person. Other concepts manifested through the application of the eye in linguistics expressions in Chinese include, eyes being 'light sources' that can extend a ray of light to the target, seeing is 'reaching out and touching', attracting one's attention, using the eyes as a description of emotion, etc. (Yu, 2004). In a study by Perekhvalskaya (n.d.), it is shown that in Mwan (a South Mande language), *wɪ̰̄* 'hair on the head of a person' denotes 'roof of a house' and top of any object that has a <head>' such as *gɔ̰̄ ɛ̰̄ ẃɪ̰́ŋ̰̀* 'on the top of a mountain'. *lɛ̀* (lit. 'lip') denotes 'antenna (of insects)'; 'edge (of a cutting instrument)'. *líí* (lit. 'mouth') has the following meanings: 2. 'door', 'entrance'; 3. 'in, inside (a part is seen outside)', 'on (only a part of the object is on something.)', e.g. *zī é líí* 'on the road' (lit. 'mouth of the road') (Perekhvalskaya, n.d., p. 60). In the Mwan language, different body parts are used to conceptualize various feelings, mental activity and emotions. For example, *Kpéé* 'belly' is considered a container for thoughts or the place of mental activity (e.g., *jɑ̄ é níàŋ́ kpéé* 'I forgot this story' (lit. 'the story left my belly'). Interestingly enough, Perekhvalskaya observed that although in European languages metaphoric expressions using body parts only use a few of the

parts of the corresponding metaphor; however, in Mwan it is the opposite as the conceptual metaphor of A THING IS THE HUMAN BODY is used. She points out that in the example A HOUSE IS THE HUMAN BODY, there are various parts of the human body which are used in expressing the different parts of a house (e.g., a house in the Mwan language has HAIR (roof), MONUTH (door), BELLY (inside part), FORHEAD (front part), and BUTTOKS (backside) (p.60). Perekhvalskaya concluded that 'conceptual metaphoric basis in the languages of West Africa (of which Mwan and other South Mande languages are typical examples) include an extensive anthropomorphous view of reality'(p. 61). As can be seen, during the process of cognitive semiosis, human beings cognize the world through and by means of their own physique. Different languages are impacted by cultural variety and are manifested in the linguistic variations of such semiosis.

3. Method

The qualitative and quantitative approach used for the analysis of the Farsi and English body metaphors in the present study is based on Lakovian cognitive linguistics. The underlying theoretical framework which is used for the metaphor analysis will include identifying and comparing the target and source domains of the metaphors in the aforementioned languages. Also, since the use of body part metaphors is quite extensive in both languages both in number and types, this study has limited itself to the head metaphors and also among head organs to six parts, namely *hair, forehead, nose, lips, tongue,* and *face*, and their Persian equivalents پیشانی, مو, دماغ, لب, زبان, ر. The data collected for this study consists of two different sets: core data and peripheral (complementary) data. In order to collect relevant core data, three instruments were used: an open-ended questionnaire, various dictionaries, and books related to idioms and metaphors. The questionnaire was administered to fifteen native English speakers and fifteen native Persian speakers and was designed to elicit the most salient metaphorical expressions related to the mentioned six body parts. General Persian and English dictionaries and idiom/metaphor books were used to collect metaphorical entries related to the head domain as well. After metaphors from both languages were collected, they were contrasted with one another to see which expressions were used identically or similarly using a body part. If not, it was attempted to discover if equivalents existed, regardless of the use of body parts in the related metaphor. Ultimately, the corpus of this study constituted a total of one-hundred English and Farsi metaphors (41 and 59 metaphors respectively) of which eighty-one utilized the target body part (Table 1). A linguistic analysis was carried out to determine how metaphors differ in syntactic structuring and semantic organization, and to discover emergent linguistic categories. Finally, each metaphor was grouped into the relevant linguistic categories.

Table 1: The Number of English and Persian Metaphors Which Contain Each Relevant Body Part

	English	**Persian**
Hair	8	12
Forehead	0	2
Nose	10	6
Lips	7	6
Face	8	10
Tongue	5	7
Total	38	43
Total= 81		

The main focus of this study is to illustrate how the relationship between body and cognition is manifested through the vehicle of metaphorical expressions incorporating body parts. Furthermore, it is aimed to show how human cognition and the use of various body parts are modified by cultural factors and possibly religious beliefs. Accordingly, this study is not based on quantitative corpus linguistics, rather it attempts to find the relationship between culture, cognition and language using body parts as an apparatus.

Certain variables were not aimed to be controlled in this study. For example, the population to which the questionnaire was distributed was not controlled in terms of certain factors such as: age, gender, education, social status. Also, since this analysis is a synchronic study, hence diachronic analysis and implications were not intended. Since, only metaphors related to the parts of the body were used for analysis, consequently, the style of the metaphorical expressions was controlled as well. Finally, participants who filled out the questionnaire were randomly chosen.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

As indicated in Lakoff (1993), metaphors play a very important role in ordinary language and do not necessarily signify aspects of literature. As the analyzed data show (Appendix A), there is an extensive use of metaphor in everyday language in the English and Farsi languages; however, their linguistic renderings are not necessarily always the same across the languages. From the collected data, it can be seen that the use of the metaphors are not literary and in fact quite common in both languages. However, the range of the underlying concepts (target domain) that the body part metaphors in both languages convey are varied. For example, hair is used in English to convey concepts such as frustration, relaxation, making small unimportant distinctions between things, showing the smallest possible margin, shock/fright, incapability to inflict physical harm, extreme cleanliness and neatness, and behaving informally/relaxation. From this list, the concepts of making small unimportant distinctions between things, showing the smallest possible margin, shock/fright, making small unimportant distinctions between things have exact Farsi equivalents, whereas, 'frustration' is shown by the use of the body part hands and feet, and 'incapability to inflict physical harm' is shown by the use of the body part hands in Farsi. Furthermore, the Farsi language uses the body part hair to convey other concepts such as precision/paying close attention, old age, talking too much, improbability, immaturity, being inexperienced even with old age, arriving just at the right moment, and dreadfulness. In fact, Farsi utilizes three different metaphors containing the body part hair to denote precision.

The English language uses the body part nose to covey a variety of different concepts, such as involvement in affairs that does not concern one (Farsi uses 'head' to denote same concept), inability to see something right in front of you (Farsi uses eyes), annoyance (Farsi uses nose hair), cause oneself to lose ones opportunities (Farsi uses hands), paying much more than something is worth (Farsi uses blood), etc. Most of these expressions are employed using a different body part in Farsi, while this language uses the nose to identify concepts such as being baffled in one's plans/to look foolish or blank, impetuosity of youth, and weakness, and not allowing someone enjoy something for which the English language has no equivalent.

Likewise, the lips are used rather equally in both languages to denote similar concepts, while the forehead is used only in Farsi to show concepts such as being famous/easily recognized and to show luck. The face is also used in both languages equivalently to show similar concepts such as loss of respect, to speak in person, being straightforward, that ability to speak freely

without thinking about the consequences. However, the English language uses the face to denote the concept of embarrassment for which the English language uses the body part eyes. Furthermore, Farsi also uses the body part face to express the concept of cheekiness and success, while the English language uses the body part cheek to denote the same concept. The body part tongue is used with almost a similar frequency in both languages and denotes similar concepts such as power of words to cause pain, remorse, inability to speak, etc. However, other concepts such as people talking about something, creating problems by talking, not being a match against someone's ability to speak and reply to anything (i.e., repartee) are used in the Farsi language using the body part tongue, while there exists no equivalent in English. (For a complete list of underlying concepts represented by the aforementioned body parts in both languages, refer to Appendix B).

It can be seen that, although both languages make use of body metaphors, neither the conceptual metaphors nor their linguistic renderings will necessarily always be the same. Deignan, Gabrys and Solska (1997) propose the following possible relationships between any two languages:

1- Same conceptual metaphor and equivalent linguistic expression
2- Same conceptual metaphor but different linguistic expression
3- Different conceptual metaphors used
4- Words and expressions with similar literal meanings but different metaphorical meanings

This study proposes a more detailed classification of possible relationships between the linguistics expressions of two different languages. After a cross-linguistic comparison of metaphors in English and Farsi, five different linguistic categories emerged which are as follows (see Appendix A for a complete list of the metaphorical expressions and their analysis used in this study):

Category 1: Absence vs. Presence- A linguistic expression using a certain body part is used in one language but no linguistic expression representing that concept exists in the other language. For example, "piʃani" in Farsi which literally means "forehead" is metaphorically utilized to signify luck or recognition. There is no such equivalent in English (Table 2). Also, there is no Farsi equivalent for the English metaphor 'He's giving her lip service' which metaphorically denotes surface agreement with someone or something with no supporting action (Table 3).

Table 2. Example of a body part metaphor present in Farsi but absent in English

English	**Farsi**
Linguistic analysis: In English, no metaphorical expression related to forehead are used; however, in Persian, since the forehead is at the top of the face, it is used to show different concepts such as luck and recognition. Linguistic category: 1	پیشانی اش بلنده - piʃæni-æʃ bolænd-e. forehead-his/her long. 'She/he has a long forehead'. Source domain: Forehead Target domain: To show luck

Table 3. Example of a body part metaphor present in English but absent in Farsi

English	**Farsi**
He's giving her lip service. Source domain: Lips Target domain: Only words but no action. Denotes	**?**

only surface agreement with someone or something with no action to support it. Linguistic analysis: There is no Persian equivalent for this expression. Linguistic category: 1	

Category 2: Alternative selection- A linguistic expression using a certain body part is used in one language, while in the other languages, the linguistic expression representing the same concept uses a different body part (i.e., different lexical items used/semantic equivalent). (Table 4)

Table 4. Example of alternative selection of body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**
It happened right under your <u>nose</u>. Source domain: Nose Target domain: The inability to see something right in front of you Linguistic analysis: In English 'nose' is used as the source domain and the preposition 'under' is used, but in Persian 'eyes' are used and the preposition 'in front of' is used which is closer to the target domain. Linguistic category: 2	جلو چشات اتفاق افتاد. dʒolo ʧeʃat ettefaq oftad. In front eyes-your happened-it 'It happened in front of your <u>eyes</u>'. Source Domain: Eyes Target Domain: The inability to see something right in front of one's eyes

2.1- The two languages have alternative selections but similar syntactic structuring (i.e., use of similar preposition and/or verb). (Table 5)

Table 5. Example of alternative selection with similar syntactic structuring of body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**
He sticks his nose <u>in</u> other people's business. Source Domain: Nose Target domain: Involvement in something that does not concern you Linguistic analysis: In English the body part 'nose' is used as the source domain but in Farsi the 'head' is used. However both use the same preposition 'in' to show involvement in something. Linguistic category: 2	تو همه کار سرک میکشه. Tu hæmeye kar særæk mikeʃe. in all work peeps/sticks-he/she 'He/she peeps/sticks his/her head <u>in</u> everything'. Source Domain: Head Target Domain: Involvement in something that does not concern one

Category 3: Different selection- A linguistic expression denoting the same underlying concept is used in both languages; however, the source domain in only one of the languages is a body part. (Table 6).

Table 6. Example of different selection of body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**

He made us pay through our noses. Source domain: Nose Target domain: Paying much more than something is worth Linguistic analysis: In English the concept of 'paying more than something's worth' is shown by using the expression 'through the nose', however in Farsi, it is shown by 'having to pay the worth of someone's father's blood. Linguistic category: 3	***قد خون باباش ازمون پول گرفت.*** Qædde xun-e babaʃ æz ma pul gereft. In the amount blood father-his/her us money took 'He took money from us in the amount of his/her father's blood'. Source Domain: Father's blood Target Domain: Paying much more than something is worth

3.1- The two languages utilize different selection; however, have similar syntactic structuring (i.e., similar use of preposition and/or verb). (Table 7)

Table 7. Example of different selection with similar syntactic structuring of body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**
Keep your hair on. Source Domain: Hair Target Domain: Relaxation Linguistic analysis: English uses 'hair' as the source domain while Farsi uses 'cold-bloodedness' which itself it metaphorically used to show 'coolness'. However both use the same verb 'keep'. Comparing the English metaphor 'keep you cool' with the English metaphor 'to lose one's cool' which signifies losing one's temper or nerves also shows the strategic use of the prepositions 'keep' and 'loose' in signifying emotions related to temper and relaxation. Temper and anger generate heat, so when one is relaxed, one is cool. Linguistic category: 3.1	***خونسردی خودت حفظ کن.*** xunsærd-i-ye xodeto hefz kon. Cold-blood-your keep 'Keep your cold-bloodedness (coolness)'. Source Domain: Cold-bloodedness Target Domain: Relaxation

Category 4: Similarity- A linguistic expression denoting the same concept and using the same body part is used in both languages; however, the linguistic apparatus varies in terms of their syntactic structuring and/or use of prepositions or verbs (Table 8).

Table 8. Example of similar body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**
I bit my tongue off. Source Domain: Tongue Target Domain: To feel remorse after saying something to somebody which may have upset them Linguistic analysis: The English and Farsi versions are almost identical, except for the addition of the preposition 'off' in the English	***زبونمو گاز گرفتم.*** zæbunæmo gaz gereftæm. tongue-my bit-me. 'I bit my tongue' Source Domain: Tongue Target Domain: To feel remorse after saying something to somebody which may have upset them

version. Linguistic category: 4

Category 5: Identicality- A linguistic expression denoting the same underlying concept is used in both languages and serves an almost semantically and syntactically equivalent purpose. For example, both languages employ the phrase ‘face to ‘face’ in the same manner (Table 9).

Table 9. Example of identical body part metaphors in Farsi and English

English	**Farsi**
We need to discuss the matter face to face. Source Domain: Face/face Target Domain: To speak in person Linguistic analysis: The source domain in both languages is identical Linguistic category: 5	ما باید رو در رو راجب این مسئله صحبت کنیم. ma bayæd ru dær ru radʒebe in mæsæle sohbæt konim. we have to face to face about this problem/matter speak-us ‘We have to talk about/discuss this problem/matter face to face’. Source Domain: Face/face Target Domain: To speak in person

After comparing the number of body part metaphorical expressions used in the English and Farsi languages, it can be seen that only the body part ‘forehead’ has no related metaphorical expressions in English and it seems that the body part ‘nose’ is more salient in the English language, and the body part ‘hair’ is more salient in the Farsi language. The body parts lips, face, and tongue seem to have an almost equivalent semantic range in the English and Farsi languages.

When analyzing the frequency of each emerged linguistic category (Table 10) it can be seen that about 45% of the metaphors fall into linguistic category 1. Around 16% fall into linguistic category 2, 9% fall into linguistic category 2.1, 6% fall into linguistic category 3. 1.5% fall into linguistic category 3.1., 14% fall into linguistic category 4, and about 8% fall into linguistic category 5 (Table 10). Based on these frequencies, it can be seen that although there exists many body metaphors in English and Farsi that denote various similar concepts; however, most metaphorical expressions seem to be unique with respect to a particular language. That is, there exists no equivalent in its corresponding language. Furthermore, the rate of metaphorical expressions employing different body parts in each language and expressions using the same body parts but with different syntactic structuring are almost equivalent and have the second highest occurrence among the emerged linguistic expressions. This finding could be due to the fact that the English and Farsi languages are not only very linguistically distant, but also, the languages are used by people who are very distant cultural-wise. Cultural aspects of metaphor although faced with disagreements have been given great momentum in cognitive-based language studies (Kövecses, 2005; Yu, 2008). The impact of cultural factors on the way we conceptualize the world is so great that “it is hard to distinguish the physical from the cultural basis of a metaphor” (Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 19). Many cross-linguistic research in this vein has dealt with socio-cultural aspects, and have found variation in the metaphorisation process (Al-Zoubi et al, 2006, Kövecses, 2005). However, Cognitive Linguistics has only roughly addressed the issues of socio-cultural factors, giving preference to the theory of

embodiment, universal primitives, and focusing on the sensory aspects of thought. Quinn (1991) asserts that culture should be given a more important role, since "metaphors, far from constituting understanding, are ordinarily selected to fit a preexisting and culturally shared model". Furthermore, Kövecses (2005) argues that physiological process and bodily states that were assumed to have universal conceptualization among speakers of different languages are influenced by socio-cultural constraints. He states that "there can be differences in the range of conceptual metaphors (or, more precisely, the range of source domains) that languages and cultures have available for the conceptualization of particular target domains" (p.70). As Ureña Gómez Moreno (2011) concludes, "people exhibit a culturalised embodied behavior, since the model of thought and the way of structuring *realia* in a specific community of speakers is not dissociated from their linguistic manifestation, and therefore, from metaphorical patterns of thought"(p.)

Table 10: Frequency of Emerged Linguistic Categories by Body Parts

Linguistics Categories / Body Parts	1	2	2.1	3	3.1	4	5
Hair	10	0	2	1	1	0	3
Forehead	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nose	5	3	2	2	0	2	0
Lips	7	4	1	0	0	1	0
Face	3	3	1	1	0	2	2
Tongue	2	0	0	0	0	4	0
Total	29	10	6	4	1	9	5
Percent	45%	16%	9%	6%	5%	14%	8%

The findings of this research also suggest that each language codifies concepts employing body parts based on the significance of a body part in a related culture. Each language associates a particular concept to a body part focusing on a specific feature of that body part. For example, the Farsi language has three different metaphorical expressions using the body part 'hair' to denote the concept of precision (e.g., مو را از ماست می کشد, mu ra æz mast mikeʃe , hair from yogurt pulls '(He/she) pulls out a hair from the yogurt'). The relationship between a 'thin' hair strand and precision can easily be perceived. However, in the English language, one of the concepts which is represented by the body part hair is 'frustration' (e.g., Y*ou are getting into my hair*.) The English language has another metaphorical expression using the body part hair to denote 'relaxation' (e.g., *I let my hair down*.) As it can be seen, this language sees the hair as the center of 'peace'. Entering or disturbing this domain can cause frustration. This fact can be seen by the bodily expression in the English culture of literally 'pulling out one's hair' when a person is frustrated.

The findings also propose that the linguistic manifestations of underlying concepts employ body parts as the source domain based on the logical relationship that the body part can have with the underlying concept. For example, the concepts of the ability to be trusted with a secret is shared in the English and Farsi languages; however, the English language uses the body

part lips (*My lips are sealed)* while the Farsi language uses the body part mouth (دهنم قرصه , dæhænæm qorse, mouth-my firm/strong-is, 'My mouth is firm/strong') to denote this concept. However, both seem to share the conceptual metaphor THE MOUTH IS A CONTAINER to emphasize the need to keep the 'container (mouth)' closed in order to refrain from letting someone's secret out. Another example of the application of this conceptual metaphor is the use of the expression دهنتو ببند , dæhænet-o bebænd , mouth-your close, 'Close your mouth', to express the concept of being quiet in Farsi, English uses the linguistic expression *Zip your lips*. Deignan, Gabrys and Solska's (1997) and Deignan's (2003) studies conclude that the importance that a speech community assigns to certain domains determines which metaphors become conventional in that community. That is why culture-specific metaphors are only found in a particular linguistic community.

Ibarretxe-Antunnano (2008) has proposed a flexible motivation schema that attempts to explain the relationship between conceptual mappings, perception and culture. Prototypical properties are universal; however, the distribution of the properties in each sense and the attached values of the properties depending on the sense vary. Since distribution, values, and interpretation and use of senses are culture-dependent, they will be different according to the culture in which people are embedded in. Therefore, the properties that one culture assigns to a particular sense might be assigned to another sense in a different culture, that is, 'there is a shift of prototypical properties and values based on the cultural background' (p. 28). This can be seen by the use of the body part eyes in the Farsi language to denote the concept of the inability to see something right in front of your eyes, ʤolo ʧeʃat ettefaq oftad, In front eyes-your happened-it, 'It happened in front of your eyes', while the English language uses the body part nose to show the same concept, *It happened right under your nose.* Likewise, the concept of looking for something is denoted in the English expression Let me have a nose around, while in the Farsi form, the phrase 'looking around (with the eyes)' is used, بگذار یک براندازی بکنم You let one looking around-me, 'Let me have a look around'. It seems that the English language uses the body part nose as a sensory organ which can act like the eyes. Sharifian (nd) points out that 'conceptualizations of "body" may be culture-specific and in general body takes part and acts as a conceptual resource for our cultural experience. Even the number of senses that we assign to our bodies may vary across different cultures'. Yu (2004) explains that the interaction of the body and culture leads to the creation of metaphors. That is, the human body acts as the universal source domain which structure the abstract concepts. Bu it is the cultural setting which determine which aspects of bodily experience or which body parts are more salient and meaningful to assist in the understanding of the abstract concepts. For this reason, Stienstra (1993) argues that because human experiences are universal, conceptual metaphors are not cultural-dependent, rather their linguistic realization is.

To continue on a relevant but different note, most research studies have focused on the relationship between religion and metaphor, focusing on metaphors used in the three creeds of the Books of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Less attention has been devoted to the analysis of prevalent metaphors used in the everyday language of speakers with a common religious background. Analysis of a few of the Farsi body part metaphors used in this study reveals the possible role of religious beliefs in forming certain metaphorical expressions which are used in everyday language. As an example, the 'loss of reputation' or 'respect' in the Farsi language is denoted by the use of metaphors such as ʔaberu-m ræft, water face-my went, 'The water on my face went', having the English equivalent of *I lost face*. In the religion of Islam, is necessary to wash the face in an attempt to be purified before prayer. 'Loss' of this purified water on the face

could be paralleled to the loss of respect/reputation. The inclusion of the lexical item 'water' in the Farsi metaphor may be rooted in religious beliefs which has with passage of time found its way into everyday language use. Also, the Farsi metaphor Muye ezraeel bær tæn-eʃ hæst, 'Hair Israel on body-his/her is', Israel's hair is on his/her body, is associating the human emotion 'fear' to the angle of death-Israel, which is basically a religious figure. Although most English language cultures share this religious figure; however, they do not use the conceptual metaphor ISRAEL MEANS FEAR in the formation of any linguistic expression. Therefore it can be proposed that having a common religious concept is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the linguistic realization of a religious-bound metaphor. Therefore, this cross-linguistic study suggests that while universal bodily experience may motivate many figurative expressions, the process is sometimes complex, and will not necessarily result in equivalent expressions in different languages, for linguistic, cultural and possibly religious reasons.

5. Conclusion

A powerful claim of conceptual metaphor theory is that the most central metaphors are grounded in bodily experience. Therefore, it might be expected that these metaphors would be shared by different languages. From the analysis it is apparent that both the English and Farsi languages use body parts to express various concepts; however, their use, availability, and range of their semantic domains are quite different. This difference can be attributed to the way in which each body part is viewed in each language and their significance in each culture. Furthermore, different cultures may motivate different embodiment of the senses, therefore yielding different linguistic manifestations of concepts. Different anthropologists have drawn various conclusions in an attempt to explain the underlying reason why particular cultures make certain choices. For example, Classen (1993) suggests social factors, while Gell (1995) underscores environmental factors. We add another dimension and propose that aside from these factors which impact conceptualization in their own right, religious factors may also be a major determinant which influences the metahporization process.

In sum, the basis of human cognition is the physical world which contains a pool of various features which are available for selection limited to their cultural choices of semiotic mechanisms cognitively available to speakers of a particular semiotic system. This paper corroborates the Lakovian claim that metaphor is an intrinsic part and parcel of linguistic codification. Such codification in turn was demonstrated to point to a universally cognitive grid of human conceptualization, which is basically domain-general, i.e. not specific to language-internal processes. However, each linguistic code, that is each language, has the luxury of opting, and even not opting, for a certain collection or set of such cognitively available features, on the one hand, and at the same time employing and deploying different domain-specific, i.e. language-internal, mechanisms such as lexical or syntactic formulations to manifest them, on the other hand. In simpler terms, all members of the *homo sapiens* species can cognitively interact whereas all members of the *homo grammaticus* sub-species may not cross-codify their cognitive interactions. As a consequence, cognitive translatability is possible due to its universal cognitive availability whereas linguistic translatability is not owing to variable codification possibilities. One way to look at this phenomenon for example is to say that human cognition and the use of various body parts in the formation of metaphors are modified by cultural factors and manifested in language use. An inverse view would be to claim that since the specific choices of different cognitive packages can also be used to identify common cultural beliefs, practices, or views, therefore, it can be hypothesized that language can identify a culture through a universal array of

cognitive features used in its linguistics semiosis which can be termed the *Language Cultural Identification Hypothesis.*

To conclude, the main focus of this study was to delineate the intrinsic relationship between human physique and human cognition, and show how it is manifested by the use of metaphorical expressions. It attempted to approach finding a solution to the Gordian knot, and according to Langacker, to reconcile linguistic universalism and language variation and diversity, hence the relationship among language, cognition, culture and perhaps religion using body parts as the apparatus. The findings indicate that limitations in terms of availability, semantic domain and range, and linguistic manifestation of metaphors and the accuracy and appropriateness of their application vary from one language to another. This is because, metaphorical expressions are profoundly embedded and intertwined in our cognitive abilities of semiotic representations. However, semiotic systems such as language are limited and bound by cultural and possibly religious choices of semiotic mechanisms which are cognitively available to them, Also, metaphorizing is a type of constrained semiotic superimposition which results from re-experiencing bodily experiences. Since body parts are commonly utilized metaphorically, in various extents by different languages, this suggests a universal cognitive framework for humanizing the external world through semiosis. Finally, the shared cognitive pool may be selected and externalized differently by different languages, being influenced by culture and possibly religion.

6. References

Al-Zoubi, M.Q., Al-Ali, M.N., & Al-Hasnawib, A.R. (2007): Cogno-cultural issues in translating metaphors. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology,* 14, (3), 230–239

Classen, C. (1993). *Worlds of Sense. Exploring the Senses in History and across Cultures*. London: Longman.

Devereux, G. (2003). Ethnopsychological aspects of the terms 'Deaf' and 'Dumb'. In D. Howes (Ed.), *Sensual Relations: Engaging the senses in culture and social theory* (pp. 43-46). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Deignan, A. (2003). Metaphorical expressions and culture: An indirect link. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 255–272.

Deignan, A., Gabrys, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *English Language Teaching Journal, 51*, 352–360.

Deignan, A., & Potter, L. (2004). A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in English and Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *36*(7), 1231-1252.

Fauconnier, G. (2006). Cognitive Linguistics. *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*.

Fernandez-Duque, D., & Johnson, M. L. (2002). Cause and effect theories of attention: The role of conceptual metaphors. *Review of general psychology*, *6*(2), 153.

Gell, A. (1995). The language of the forest: Landscape and phonological iconism in Umeda. In E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space* (pp. 232-254). Oxford: Clarendon.

Gibbs, R. W. (2003). Embodied experience and linguistic meaning. *Brain and Language*, *84*(1), 1-15.

Gibbs, R. W., Costa Lima, P. L., & Francozo, E. (2004). Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 1189–1211.

Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics, 1*, 323-340.
Goschler, J. (2005). *Embodiment and body metaphors*. Metaphorik.de 09: 33-52.
Heine, B. (1997). *Cognitive foundations of grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2008). Vision Metaphors for the Intellect: Are they Really Cross-Linguistic? *Atlantis*, 15-33.
Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
Ureña Gómez Moreno, J. M. (2011). *Metaphor in Specialised Language: an English-Spanish comparative study in Marine Biology*. PhD Thesis. University of Granada.
Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Study of Concepts.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Kövesces, Z**.** (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed), *Metaphor and Thought (2nd ed., pp. 202-250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.*
Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: 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.
Lakoff G, Johnson M. (2003). Afterword. In: Lakoff, G and Johnson M, (Eds.), *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 19802003.
Langacker, R. W. (2002). A study in unified diversity: English and Mixtec locatives. In N. J. Enfield (Ed.), *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in grammar and culture* (pp. 138-161). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Langacker, R. W. (1999). Reference point constructions. *Grammar and conceptualization.* 171-202. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Marshall, H. H. (1990). Metaphor as an instructional tool in encouraging student teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, *29*, 128-132.
Mayer, J. (1982). Body, Psyche and Society: Conceptions of Illness in Ommura, Eastern Highlands, Papua New Guinea. *Oceania* 52: 240-59.
Mberi, E. (2003). Metaphors in Shona: A cognitive approach. *Zambezia, xxx*(i), 72-88.
Musolff, A. (2004): "Metaphor and conceptual evolution", in: *metaphorik.de* 7, http://www.metaphorik.de/07/musolff.pdf.
Nunez, R., & Freeman, W. J. (Eds). (1999). *Reclaiming cognition: The primacy of action, intention and emotion*. Thorverton: Imprint Academic.
Perekhvalskaya, E. (n.d). Body parts and their metaphoric meanings in Mwan and other South Mande languages. Retrieved from http://mandelang.kunstkamera.ru/files/mandelang/perexval_metaph.pdf on 04/12/2011.
Perrin, S. G. (1987). Metaphorical revelations: A description of metaphor as the reciprocal engagement of abstract perspectives and concrete phenomena in experience. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, *2*, 251-280.

Quinn, N. (1991). The culture basis of metaphor. In J.W. Fernández (Ed.), *Beyond metaphor: The theory of tropes in anthropology*, (pp. 56–93). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. (1997). Cognitive and pragmatic aspects of metonymy. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, *6*(2), 161–178.

Seeger, A. (1975). The meaning of body ornaments: A suya example. *Ethnology, 14*, 211-224.

Schon, D. A. (1993). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 137-166). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sharifian, F. (forthcoming). Distributed, emergent cultural cognition, conceptualisation, and language. In Roslyn M. Frank, René Dirven, Tom Ziemke and Enrique Bernárdez (eds.). *Body, Language, and Mind (Vol. 2): Sociocultural Situatedness*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stibbe, A. (2001). From flu-like virus to deadly disease: Ideology and the media. *Journal of Media Psychology*. 6. http://www.calstatela.edu/faculty/sfischo/reporting_of_contagious-diseases1.htm

Stienstra, N. (1993). YHWH is the Husband of His People. Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation. Kok Pharos, Kampen.

Sweester, E. V. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: The mind-body metaphor in semantic structure and semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webster Dictionary. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/semiosis?show=0&t=1319093812

Yu, N. (2003a). Metaphor, body, and culture: The Chinese understanding of gallbladder and courage. *Metaphor and Symbol, 18*(1), 13–31.

Yu, N. (2004).The eyes for sight and mind. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*, 663–686.

Yu, N. (2008). The relationship between metaphor, body, and culture. In. J. Zlatev, T.Ziemke, R. Frank, & R. Dirven, *Body, language and mind (vol. II). Interrelations between biology, linguistics and culture* (pp. 387–408). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Author 2 (2012).