International Journal of English Language and Literature Research

Vol.2,No.3, pp.56-82, December 2014

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

TOWARDS RAISING CONCEPTUAL AWARENESS: ENGLISH-ARABIC IDIOMS OF EQUIVALENT LINGUISTIC FORM AND DIFFERENT CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Mohamed Mazen Galal, Ph.D

English Department, Faculty of Arts

Suez University, Suez, Egypt

ABSTRACT: *According to many studies on idioms, the most difficult ones are those that are linguistically equivalent but conceptually different. The researcher has collected a number of idioms from English and Arabic that belong to this type with a view to detecting the sources of this conceptual difference based on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff, 1980, 2003) and the subsequent cognitive literature. The source of difficulty is proven to emanate from cultural encoding, including cultural experience, perspective, range, and gesture. The differences in the connotative load of the idiomatic words can also be a reason for the conceptual variance. The study stresses the need for raising conceptual awareness to support language learning.*

KEYWORDS: Arabic, Conceptual Metaphor, English, Idioms.

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

The figurative language is known to be an essential part of everyday language. One very important component of the figurative language is the idiom which is defined as "a group of words that occur in a more or less fixed phrase whose overall meaning cannot be predicted by analyzing the meaning of its constituent parts" (Simpson and Mendis, 2003, p. 423). The opacity of idiomatic structure is stressed by Cruse (1986, p. 40) who affirmed that idioms lack transparency and hence lack 'semantic cohesion'. Opacity is seen as emanating from idioms being indivisible units, where meaning is difficult to arrive at based on the individual words from which the phraseme is built, as well as the cultural element fused into it. For example, in the idiom *this action will have the butterfly effect*, the meaning of *butterfly effect* (local change that can have wide consequences) is hard to explain without cultural and meta-linguistic explanation. In view of the opacity of idiomatic meaning, an idiom is seen to be of arbitrary nature. While native speakers certainly readily grasp the meaning of idiomatic expression without dividing it into sub-units, non-natives sometimes face the problem of whether to interpret the phraseme word by word, or take it as a whole.

Despite the difficulty of idioms, they are part of everyday language and are quite central to language learning (Charteris-Black, 2002). According to Fernando (1996), Wray (1999) and Schmitt (2000), successful language learning is hard to achieve without having considerable command of idioms. Based on the rigidity of their structure, unpredictable meaning and extensive uses as maintained by some scholars (e.g. Liu (2003, p. 671) settling on a suitable pedagogical method to tackle idioms has always been a controversial issue. What makes this task even harder is the fact that the term 'idiom' itself is seen to be "an ambiguous term, used in conflicting ways" (Moon 1998, p. 3).

The traditional view of presenting idioms has been that those items are better accounted for via explicit and direct interpretations. Translation has traditionally been seen as the most common

and direct way of handling idiomatic expressions (Chen and Lai, 2013). However, it has been suggested by Cognitive Semantics ever since its early beginnings with Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We live By* (1980, 2003) and many subsequent works (e.g., Johnson, 1987, Lakoff, 1987; Gibbs, 1994) that the long considered opaque language of idioms can be analyzed in less random and less arbitrary terms, which can be of much benefit to language instruction and pedagogy. This has been made possible with the introduction of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), basically established on the notion that metaphors are mainly conceptual rather than linguistic. Idioms came to be seen as motivated rather than arbitrary. As suggested by Lakoff (1986), the notion of conceptual metaphor was instrumental in connecting two concepts, the source domain, and the target domain. This is of great importance for studying idioms since it became possible to relate the metaphoric connection between idioms and what they stand for. By applying CMT and related literature, it became possible to present target terms such as *anger* in terms of source domains as *fire* or *a hot fluid in a container*, as displayed by the following examples from Boers (2000 a, p. 555):

anger as fire: *an inflammatory remark*; *adding fuel to the fire*; *he kept smoldering for days; she was breathing fire*; *she exploded*; *he's hot under the collar.*
anger as a hot fluid in a container*: anger welled up inside me; I was boiling with anger; she was all steamed up; she erupted; simmer down!; she flipped her lid; I was fuming; she blew up at me.*

Kövecses (2001) believes that the theory of cognitive linguistics is very useful in foreign language teaching (FLT). What makes it specifically helpful is its ability to motivate figurative/idiomatic meaning (bodily or conceptual motivation); motivation always facilitates learning and makes it more accessible. He suggests that cognitive linguistic assumptions can help a lot with idiom presentation whether in terms of idiom arrangement in an idiom dictionary, idiom teaching, or cross-linguistic comparisons between languages. To practice what he preached, Kövecses examined English and Hungarian idioms. He explained that in case of similarity in conceptual metaphors between L1 and L2, ontological mappings are useful in linking distinct linguistic expressions of the two languages. This is exemplified by the correspondence between the English *spit fire* and the Hungarian *tüzet hány* 'vomit fire', both guided by the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. However, if two languages have anomalous conceptual metaphors, or if one conceptual metaphor is not attested in the other language, epistemic mappings are influential in bridging the knowledge gap.

Organizing figurative expressions via CMT-based methods was proven to facilitate learning compared to conventional random techniques. Based on three EFL experiments, Boers (2000a, p. 563) found that lexical grouping of L2 figurative phrases in distinct sets along source domains can make it easy for students to retain unfamiliar conventionalized expressions. According to Charteris-Black (2002), explaining the concepts behind figurative idioms and other forms of figurative language plays an important role in cutting down the amount of time language learners might need to master those phrasemes. He points out that a conceptual metaphor such as ARGUMENT IS WAR is likely to be the key to understanding idioms such as *defend an argument, launch an assault on*, etc, and that enhanced metaphor awareness played a key role in promoting learners' lexical resources.

One of the big advantages of the conceptual/cognitive treatment of idioms is that it has shown how idioms may vary cross-linguistically. According to Deignan et al. (1997) comparison of

metaphorical expressions, including idioms, between two languages can be categorized into four possible types of variation. The first type includes those expression that are identical in terms of the underlying conceptual metaphor and linguistic expression. For example, Both English and Polish share the conceptual metaphor RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS, as illustrated by the expression *cement a personal/business relationship* which is almost verbatim in the two languages; the word *cement* in English is calqued into *cementować* in Polish. The second type represents those phrases with the same conceptual metaphor but different linguistic expressions. Based on data from English and Polish, although both languages share the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE FOOD, Polish uses the expression *niedojrzale* "unripe" to describe ideas, while English employs the same concept using the expression *half-baked*. The third one includes expressions with different conceptual metaphors. While the conceptual metaphor RATIONAL IS UP is attested in English via expressions such as *sweep off one's feet*, Polish might find LOVE IS MAGIC conceptually equivalent to the metaphor above without referring to any directional aspects. The fourth type is a little bit complicated in that it includes words and expressions conveying the same literal sense but different metaphorical meaning. The expression *maglowac* "mangle" in Polish conveys the meaning of squeezing someone for information, while the word 'mangle' in English has the sense of 'not speaking or writing clearly'.

The potential offered by cognitive and conceptual theories calls for the need to do a conceptual contrastive analysis that can unravel the mysteries of conceptual non-equivalence across languages particularly in cases where the surface linguistic composition is identical or similar. Danesi (1994, p. 461) calls for the importance of identifying how and to what extent the conceptual domains of the native and target cultures overlap and contrast, and the source of conceptual interference that might arise from native conceptual system (interconceptual interference) or target language system (interconceptual interference). Danesi also highlights the significance of developing 'conceptual fluency', the knowledge that learners need to have about how figurative concepts are formed. If every language has its own methods of conceptualizing figurative language, Danesi argues, then there is always a need for incorporating this into language syllabi.

Charteris-Black's study on university students (2002, p. 104) maintains that the easiest metaphoric expressions for students to grasp are the ones with equal conceptual foundation and linguistic forms in both native and target languages. The most difficult ones, however, are those with different conceptual foundations but equal linguistic forms. As Charteris-Black (2002) maintains, when there are differences between conceptual systems and cultural meanings in the native and target languages, it is inevitable that difficulties would be experienced in understanding metaphoric expressions in the target language. This kind of contrast between the surface equality in linguistic form and the difference in underlying cognitive meaning has been observed to require special scrutiny by researchers.

In view of the body of research above that shows the value of treating idioms under cognitive linguistics and stresses the need for doing cross-linguistic comparisons, this current study focuses on the conceptual basis of figurative idioms in contrastive terms. It specifically tackles one type of idioms which has been found to be of particular difficulty, namely the idioms of equal linguistic form, yet different conceptual basis ((cf. Deignan et al. (1997), Charteris-Black, (2002)).

This study attempts to detect, within the framework of CMT and related literature, the sources of conceptual differences between English idioms and their Arabic counterparts, and specifically focuses on idioms of identical/similar linguistic form and different conceptual foundation. This type of idiom pairs is specifically misleading since it takes a listener to a direction of meaning not intended by the speaker. The fact that no previous study, to my knowledge , has been conducted on English/ Arabic comparison involving such a type of idioms gives validity to embarking on this project. The study is based on a corpus of idioms from English that are found to differ categorically conceptually from Arabic and are expected to raise many problems for language learners and are likely to cause a communication snap.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

To carry out a systematic analysis of the targeted idioms, I followed the descriptive-analytic approach in addition to the principles and methods of the Conceptual Metaphors Theory (CMT).

I started out by selecting English idioms, which I found to be problematic for Arabic speakers based on their surface (linguistic) similarity and conceptual difference, from two monolingual lexicographical works, *NTC's Thematic Dictionary of American Idioms* by Richard A. Spears (1999), and *Dictionary of idioms and their origins* by Linda and Roger Flavell (1992). *NTC's Thematic Dictionary of American Idioms* is a great collection of idiomatic expressions totalling more than 5500 of the most common idioms covering 900 themes, which provides a detailed description and examples of the American idioms. The panoramic range and coverage of this reference work makes it a good representation of the current idiomatic situation in (American) English. The other reference work, *Dictionary of idioms and their origins*, ordered by the key word of the idiom, unravels the cultural (or experiential) sources of the idioms used in the study. The etymology, or etymologies, of the idioms given in the work has been verified by editorial authorities who traced the earliest origins. The dictionary draws upon quotations from the well known idiom computer corpus 'Cobuild Corpus' as well as modern and live quotation from the current press.

The methodology of drawing on the use of such conventionalized sources as thesauri and dictionaries can help with the semantic investigation of a particular field. As Deignan (1999, p. 197) points out: "the investigation of a particular semantic field can be made more systematic with the use of a comprehensive thesaurus"; since expressions drawn from dictionaries and thesauri reflect, to a great extent, the conventionalized language expressions and people's spontaneous use of daily language, use of such sources can be of much help particularly regarding the study of conceptual metaphors, as stressed by Kövecses (1991, p. 30) in his study of the conceptual metaphor of happiness:"…in order to be able to arrive at [the] metaphors, metonymies, and inherent concepts, and, eventually, [the] prototypical cognitive models, one needs to study the conventionalized linguistic expressions that are related to a given notion".

In regard to the Arabic data I started out by picking idioms from standard and dialectal Arabic (Cairene Arabic) that show contrast in conceptual and cultural grounding and were found to be linguistically similar to and conceptually different from English. The researcher had to build his own Arabic pool of data from various sources including the live and vivid language of online newspapers, forums, blogs and facebook (see Appendix I). Standard Arabic "SA" covers both Classical Arabic "CLA", and Modern Standard Arabic "MSA", two prestigious versions of spoken and written Arabic; references to dialectal or vernacular Arabic should be understood

to mean Cairene Arabic "CA", a widely-used dialect of Arabic employed in this study as a representative of Arabic dialects. Some people prefer to use the term Egyptian Arabic to refer to this dialect; however the study will follow the more common approach of referring to the dialect as Cairene Arabic (CA).The data is checked by the researcher's intuition as a native speaker, and is crossed-checked informally by other natives of Arabic. It should be noted here that because of the diglossic situation in Arabic, some examples can be a mix of both dialectal and standard Arabic.

The study utilizes the tenets and methods of the Conceptual Metaphors Theory (CMT) as set forth by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 2003), based on the notion that one conceptual domain (Target) is understood in terms of another (Source). The crux of CMT is that our conceptual system is based on a group of mental metaphorical images that determine our way of thinking and influence our experience of the world. The target domain of LOVE, for example, is understood in terms of JOURNEY; ARGUMENT is understood in terms of WAR, and ANGER is in terms of FIRE as attested by multiple everyday expressions. Conceptual metaphors are, thus, seen as part of everyday language rather than ornamental or rhetorical instrument.

Towards the purpose of comparing conceptual metaphors in English and Arabic the methodology proposed for the study follows some of the parameters set forth by Barcelona (2001) regarding the identification and description of the conceptual metaphor. As for the existence or absence of metaphorical projection, we follow Barcelona's parameter that "The same metaphor may be said to exist in both languages if approximately the same conceptual source and the target can be metaphorically associated in the two languages" (2001, p. 137). We also keep to his definition of metaphorical contrast as being: "differences between both languages owning to the existence of a version of the metaphor in one language and its absence, or limited use, in the other"(p. 137).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The following section deals with 10 pairs of idioms that are linguistically similar but conceptually different. The analysis detects the sources of conceptual variance. Every subsection tackles a single pair of idioms. The introductory English examples of the idioms are based on Spears (1999). The analysis goes as follows. The title of each subsection is based on one of the 10 English idioms. The English meaning is put forward with examples followed by a little explanation of how it contrasts with its linguistically Arabic counterpart, then, the conceptual foundation of Arabic and English idioms is explained in the light of CMT and related literature. The final part of each subsection summarizes in capitals how the Arabic and English idioms conceptually differ.

My heart is in my mouth

The idiom *my heart is in my mouth* carries the sense of feeling strongly emotional (about someone or something), as the following examples show:

1. *Gosh, Mary," said John, "my heart is in my mouth whenever I see you.*
2. *My heart is in my mouth whenever I hear the national anthem.*

This idiom is found to be almost linguistically equivalent but conceptually in striking contrast to the SA idiom *wa balaɣat il-quluubu l-7anaajir* (The hearts gaped up to the throats, Quran, Surat 33:10; translated by Ali) which expresses utmost fear, and the CA idiom *?illi fi ?albi 3ala l-saani* (Lit. What is in my heart is on my tongue) indicating frankness and openness. This section elucidates the foundation of the observed conceptual difference.

It is known that the heart means a lot to human existence and experience. It is generally considered by many cultures as the seat of emotions, e.g. Chinese (Yu, 1995, 1998, 2003), English (Niemeier, 1997, 2000), Hungarian (Kövecses, 2000, 2002), hence the prevalence of HEART IS A CONTAINER metaphor. This three-dimensional in-out metaphor is reflected by the English idiom above; heart is depicted as the container of all types of emotions, which one can physically experience (in the mouth) while undergoing emotional strain of some kind.

In addition to expressing the three-dimensional in-out metaphor, the idiom above touches on the one-dimensional UP-DOWN verticality schema (Maalej, 2008) since the heart is seen as a MOVABLE OBJECT (Maalej, 2008). The heart is depicted as moving in a bottom- up direction reaching the mouth.

The same conceptual metaphors above almost hold for the cases of standard and dialectal Arabic. As indicated above, Arabic has two idioms linguistically equivalent to the English one. The first is the Classical Quranic Arabic idiom *wa balaɣat il-quluubu l-7anaajir*, which carries the meaning of the heart reaching up to the throat out of utmost fear. This idiom reflects the HEART IS A CONTAINER metaphor since fear contained in the heart is represented as the heart itself; in this metaphor, it is not the fear that reaches up to the throat, but the fear-containing organ, the heart itself. However, Arabic differs in regard to depicting the nature of the contained material represented in this image; while in English the contained material is the excessive emotions of excitement and joy, the contained material in Arabic is fear, which accounts for the contrast in semantic interpretation between the two idioms.

The Arabic idiom also replicates the UP-DOWN verticality idiom HEART IS A MOVABLE OBJECT, where the heart is portrayed as rising in position. However, both languages differ as to the range which the heart might reach. While it reaches the mouth in English, it rises only a little lower in Arabic, just to the throat.

The linguistically equivalent but conceptually different Cairene Arabic idiom is *?illi fi ?albii 3ala l-saani* (Lit. What is in my heart is on my tongue/ one's heart is in one's tongue). This idiom signifies frankness and openness. It is usually said by someone who considers himself/herself guileless, candid and outspoken, as the following example shows (based on a pool of forums, blogs, and other websites; see Appendix I):

3.?illi fi ?albii 3ala lsaan-i wuDuu7 Saraa7a ʃafafiya
What in heart-my on tongue-my clarity frankness transparency
(Lit. What is in my heart is on my tongue: clarity, frankness and transparency).

This idiom, similar to the Classical Arabic and English counterparts, echoes the HEART IS A CONTAINER metaphor, and the preposition *fi* "in" in the idiom *?illi fi ?albi 3ala l-saani* carries the sense of containment, the heart as a container of all feelings, emotions, secrets, etc. It also exploits THE HEART IS A MOVABLE OBJECT metaphor. However, what moves this time is not exactly the heart, but the heart's content, the contained material; the target is a little bit different from English and Classical Arabic, it is to the tongue right away.

It is plainly evident, based on the comparison above, that the source of conceptual difference between the two languages emanates from the cultural connotations of the heart. While both cultures conceptualize the heart as being a container and as being a movable object, the heart-contained material in Arabic for this particular figurative expression is fear/frankness, while in English it is the general excessive emotions and joy. The difference also stems from the range each culture assigns to the heart movement. While it is the mouth 'level' in English, it is only lower than that in Arabic, the throat level. The conceptual difference then can be explained in terms of cultural encoding and perspective.

The conceptual contrast between the two idioms, therefore, can be represented as: **HAVING ONE'S HEART IN ONE'S MOUTH IS BEING TOO EMOTIONAL (English) vs. HAVING ONE'S HEART IN ONE'S MOUTH IS FEAR/FRANKNESS (Arabic).**

Have /Keep one's ear to the ground

This idiom has the meaning of listening carefully so that you may get an in-advance warning:
4. *John had his ear to the ground, hoping to find out about new ideas in computers.*
5. *His boss told him to keep his ear to the ground so that he'd be the first to know of a new idea.*

The idiom above is found to be linguistically similar to but conceptually contrasting the CA idiom *daldil widaanu* (Lit. hung down one's ear to the ground). This section detects the source of conceptual variance.

The English idiom reflects a culture-specific gesture signifying how people in a certain culture cognize a certain act. According to Bengelsdorf (2012), keeping one's ear to the ground is an ancient way of listening to the movement of animals to be aware of possible danger or just to protect oneself; the main focus of the idiom is to keep your ears to the source of many things according to the western conception which is earth. In Arabic, however, the expression takes us into a different cultural gesture where the implication is relevant not to the ear per se, but to the downward movement of the organ that includes the ear, namely the head.

It is known that the head stands for many positive features in the human character. It stands for thoughts, and mental abilities and faculties, e.g., *to have a head/no head for, to have a good head* (Aransaez, 1999, p. 116). It is also held in respect based on the grounds that it is a 'container' of ideas, e.g., *to fill sb's head, in sb's head, inside sb's head* (Aransaez, 1999, pp. 118-119). Moreover, the head may stand for the whole person, personality, being the most salient human organ, e.g., *to have a thick head* (pp.118-119).

Most importantly, the head plays a significant role for the scale UP-DOWN schema. In accordance with Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphors HAVING CONTROL/ FORCE IS UP, BEING SUBJECT TO CONTRO/ FORCE IS DOWN (1980), pride is represented by the head being held in an UP position (PRIDE IS UP) while shame is represented as the down position (SHAME IS DOWN) (Aransaez, 1999). This is manifested in very clear terms in English, e.g., *hold your head high,* and also in French, e.g., *porter haute la tete,* and German, e.g., *Kopf hoch tragen*; all three expressions convey the same meaning and show that UP position represents pride and self-esteem.

It seems that for the English idiom under study the ear is evidently conceptualized away from the social stature of the head so that having one's ear to the ground has nothing to do with shame or humiliation. This is not the case in Arabic where ears are conceptualized as part of

the head which has to be held high as a gesture of self-esteem and honor. The head, as well all its contents, represents pride and respect in Arabic, so having one's ears down to the ground is a representation of shame. In the Arab culture, leaning downwards is thought of as a degrading act and having one's ear to the ground is a sign of humiliation and shame, as examples (6-7) from CA show:

6. T<u>a</u>b3<u>a</u>n ?ir-r<u>aa</u>gil ba3d ma wagih-tu-h ?izbahal wi daldil widaan-u
of course the-man after that faced-I-him he-confused and bent down ears-his
(Lit. Of course, the man hung down his ears and got confused after I faced him.)

7. kaan rad fi3l il-?awalaani daldil widaan-u wi miʃi
was reaction the-first bent-down ears-his and went
(Lit. The first man's reaction was that he bent down his ears and went off.)

The examples above indicate that *daldil widaan*-u (bent down his ears) is an expression of extreme shame felt by somebody.

It can be gleaned from the discussion above that the English idiom *keep one's ear to the ground* is merely a culture-specific gesture indicating an act of anticipation. In Arabic, however, the expression carries the symbolic gesture of humiliation since the downward movement of the head, the ear-containing organ, implies shame and dishonor. The conceptual contrast between the English and Arabic idioms, then, can be read as: **HAVING ONE'S EAR TO THE GROUND IS LISTENING CAREFULLY (English) vs. HAVING ONE'S EAR TO THE GROUND IS HUMILIATION (Arabic)**.

Have rocks in one's head

This idiom means to be silly or crazy:

8. *John is a real nut. He has rocks in his head.*

9. *I don't have rocks in my head—I'm just different.*

The idiom is linguistically equivalent to the Arabic idiom *dimaaʏu 7agar* (Lit. His head is a rock), yet the Arabic idiom carries the meaning of obstinacy. The conceptual basis of difference is elucidated in this section.

Niemeier (2011) maintains that the mind and emotions are conceptualized in world languages in terms of three categorizations: (1) abdominocentrism, the predominant approach in Southern Asia, Polynesia and other disparate cultures, which reflects the mind as being located in or around the abdomen; (2) cardiocentrism, the traditional view of China, Korea and Japan, which locates the mind in the heart region; and (3) cerebrocentrism, the view held by Greek-based West Asian, European and North-African cultures, the prototypical example of which being the major Indo-European languages, where the mind is located in the head or more precisely in the brain region.

English, then, falls within the last category and it, like many other European languages, distinguishes between the heart, the seat of emotion, and the reason, conceptualized as being located in the brain. This dichotomy, as viewed by Niemeier, disagrees with modern scientific theory of modern neural science (Maalej, 2008). The head as reflected in this idiom is seen as the seat of intellect and rational thinking; in fact it is envisaged as a container, hence the idiom follows the HEAD IS A CONTAINER metaphor.

In the CONTAINER schema, the head is metaphorically pictured as "a three-dimensional entity that can hold things inside" (Díez-Velasco, 2001, p. 53); the container metaphor necessitates

some stored content, which is sometimes believed to be the most important thing. Kövecses (2002, p. 156) claims that "[a]s a rule, we are more interested in the content of a container than in the mere container so that we commonly find metonymies that target the content via the container rather than the reverse metonymic relationship". Niemeier (2008, p. 358) observes that the head is often used "to refer to the head's presumed content that is the brain, the mind, human ratio, intelligence". As for this idiom, the content filling the head is not the locus of reasoning, the brain, but something else, a solid inanimate material that lacks flexibility, namely rocks. The lack of brain and the existence of something else refers to the lack of rationality and reasoning.

This idiom is also partly based on the primary metaphor DIFFICULTY IS HARDNESS, which is experientially motivated by the correlation between the hardness of objects and the discomfort we experience when we try to manipulate them (Grady, p. 291*)*.This fits the idiom quite well since a crazy person is hard to deal with.

The same expression is attested in CA in set phrases such as dimaaɣu zay l-7agar (Lit. His head is like a rock), or dimaaɣu 7agar (Lit. His head is a rock), which refers to being obstinate, as the following examples show:

10. dimaaɣ-u 7agar wi- saqaft-u yadoob 3ayyil min sana rab4a btidaa?i
head-his rock and- knowledge-his barely child from grade fourth primary
(Lit. His head is a rock and his knowledge is barely equal to that of a fourth grader.)

11. dimaaɣ-u 7agar Sawwaan wi Soot-u 3aali wi 3aSabii giddan
head-his rock flint and voice-his loud and irritable very
(Lit. His head is a flint rock; he speaks too loudly, and is very irritable.)

The Arabic idiom is apparently motivated by the metaphor above, HEAD IS A CONTAINER. Although the content for the Arabic idiom is rocks, too, what makes the cross-cultural difference is what the rocks are associated with in each culture. While it is craziness for English, it is obstinacy for Arabic. The conceptual difference in meaning observed here is the product of the differential connotations of the word *rock* for the two idioms. While hardness of the rock is read in Arabic as reflecting hardness, solidity, and capacity of resistance, the focus in English is on hardness of manipulation.

The conceptual difference for the idiomatic pair above can be phrased as: **HAVING ROCKS IN ONE'S HEAD IS CRAZINESS (English) vs. HAVING ROCKS IN ONE'S HEAD IS OBSTINACY (Arabic).**

It'll never fly

This idiom means it will never work or be approved, as the following examples show:

12. *I have read your report and studied your proposal. It'll never fly.*
13. *Your design for a new electric automobile is interesting, but it'll never fly!*

The idiom refers to failure and is based on an observed experience of the world where going up is mainly associated with success. The linguistically equivalent Arabic idiom is the CA one *?idduniya miʃ hatTiir* (Lit. It 'the world' will never fly) which indicates that there is no need to be in a hurry to do something.

The meaning of the idiom in English is based on a general evaluation process associated with success, progress and failure in the world of sports. It has been maintained by Langlotz (2006,

p. 162) that "The evaluation of processes, things and actions with reference to up/down orientation applies to sports, progress and failure idioms [spf-idioms] in terms of two metaphorical models: SUCCESS IS UP, FAILURE IS DOWN and HIGH STATUS IS UP, LOW STATUS IS DOWN". The verb 'fly' in the English idiom represents the spatial orientation UP; since the negation is stated here, 'never fly', the association is clear between failure and the spatial orientation DOWN. There are many other expressions in English that put successful development and high expectations in terms of upward movement as indicated in (14) and (15) based on Langlotz (2006, p. 162):

14. move up in the world, move up the greasy pole, get in on the ground floor, be on the up (and up), up and coming.

15. the top of the tree, hitch your wagon to a star, reach for the stars/sky/ moon, the sky's the limit.

However, it has also been maintained that the high-up conceptualization of success also entails the idea of latently lurking failure as understood from such expressions as *be up a gum tree, the dizzy/dizzying heights, be heading for a fall, fall flat (on your face* (Langlotz, p. 162). English, however, maintains the positive meaning of *fly* indicating success for this particular idiom.

Arabic, too, has mixed connotations for the verb *'fly'*. In SA and CA, the verb *yaTiir* 'fly' seems to carry positive and negative connotations. *?aTiiru farahan*, and *?aTTiir min il-fara7* are common standard and colloquial Arabic expressions that equate flying with happiness and pleasure. *yaTiir* also carries the sense of danger; upward movement is not without the risk of falling; *maa Taara Tayrun w-artafa3 ?ilaa kamaa Taara waqa3* (Lit. No bird ever flies too high but falls as it rises) is a famous SA figurative expression. However, the linguistically equivalent CA idiom under comparison ?*idduniya miʃ hatTTiir* (Lit. It 'the world' will never fly) only denotes the negative sense of hastiness and rashness in this connection, as the following set of data indicates:

16.?id-dunya miʃ ha-tTiir laa yuugad maa yamna3 mina S-Sabr 3ala n-naadi
the-world not will-fly no found not prevent from patience on the-club
(Lit. The world will never fly; there is no reason not to be show patience for the club).

17. birraa7a wa7da wa7da ?iddunya miʃ ha-tTiir
easy one(step) one (step) the-world not will-fly
(Lit. Take it easy! step by step, the world will never fly).

18. ?il-mawDuu3 Sa3b wi miʃ wa?tu-h ?id-dunya miʃ ha-tTiir
the -issue difficult and not time-its the-world not will-fly.
(Lit. This issue is difficult; this is not the right time, the world will never fly).

The verb *ha-tTiir* in the three instances above carries the sense of hastiness; it is physically interpreted in this sense in Arabic since the rapid movement of flying is associated with hastiness.

The anomaly created between the two idioms is based on how the act of 'flying' is interpreted for the particular idioms. The positive connotations of 'flying' are conceptualized for the

interpreting 'fly' in the English idiom while what is conceptualized in Arabic is the negative association of this act with rapid and hasty movement.

The difference between the two idioms can be verbalized as **FLYING IS SUCCESS (English) vs. FLYING IS HASTINESS(Arabic).**

Break a leg!

This expression is a wish for good luck, usually said to actors before starting a theatrical performance:

19. *Before the play, John said to Mary, "Break a leg!"*

This idiom diverges semantically from its Arabic linguistic equivalent *titkisir riglu* in that while the English idiom carries a good wish, the Arabic idiom conveys the meaning of invoking harm upon somebody.

The word 'leg' in the English idiom relates to a particular cultural factual/ mythical experience. According to some superstitions, the phrase is actually a wish for good luck. The theory goes that people out of firm belief in ghosts believed that they would play havoc and do the reverse of what people wish. So if people wished good luck, the ghost would try to do mischief and turn it into bad luck; you have to say something bad, such as 'break a leg' in order to trick ghosts, and make the opposite happen (Partridge, 2005, p. 56.). "Break a Leg" is actually a theatrical tradition of wishing an actor a good performance on theatre. It is a wide-spread tradition in some other countries including Germany that people may wish an actor to suffer a *Hals- und Beinbruch* "neck and bone break" (Partridge, 2005, p. 56). This kind of wish may apply in some fields outside the theater. Partridge has it, based on German sources, that in WW1 and WW2 *Hals- und Beinbruch* 'Break your neck and leg!' was also used as 'Happy landings!', a wish for German pilots when they were about to fly their planes.

The story of 'break a leg' may also be linked up with a real *leg* somehow. The phrase has been in currency since mid-April 1865. When the actor John Wilkes Booth, on 14 April 1865, assassinated Abraham Lincoln at Ford's Theatre, Washington. D.C., he tried to escape but he tripped over the theater and broke his leg (Partridge, 2005, p. 56). However, Partridge (2005) believes that the connection between Booth's leg breaking and having good luck seems to be far-fetched, which makes it sensible for some people to dismiss the story.

The English 'leg', then, is quite cultural being linked to either superstitions and mythical stories, or to a particular incident that actually happened.

As for CA, the use of the word *rigl* 'leg' is relevant to the generic symbolic and connotative meaning of the leg as a body organ. It is an instrument of movement and a symbol of progress and success, as Langlotz, 2006 , p. 159) maintains:

> For human beings walking is the most natural form of movement. A considerable number of somatic idioms make reference to this source domain by profiling concepts of the leg-domain and its sub-domains (leg, foot, heel). More specifically, these idioms are based on the metonymy LEG/FOOT FOR ABILITY TO WALK. In combination with the PROGRESS IS WALKING FORWARD metaphor, idioms that incorporate the resulting metaphtonymy conceptualize an agent's ability to progress and be successful by describing the constitution of the limbs (20) or coordinated movement (21). Accordingly,

failing is understood as stumbling, falling or uncoordinated movement (22):

(20) have legs, not have a leg to stand on, shoot yourself in the foot
(21) start off on the right/wrong foot, (not) put a foot wrong, hit your stride
(22) put NP off their stride, fall flat (on your face), drag your feet/heels, run before you can walk" (Langlotz, 159)

The CA idiom *titkisir riglak* conveys invocation for preventing somebody from moving forward or stopping his/her progress towards something unwanted; it is an invocation for losing one's ability to do anything, as is evident from (23) and (24):

23. Titkisir rigl-ak ?abl ma taakul 7a?i-na
break leg-your before that eat right-our
"Lit. break a leg before you take our rights" (i.e. May your leg be broken, you who take our rights !).

24. ?ilaah-ii titkisir rigla-k …yalli bit3aakis il-banaat
My God break leg-your who bother the-girls
(Lit. My Lord, break the leg of those who bother girls)

As the examples above indicate, the leg does not only stand for ABILITY TO WALK, but also for the person himself/herself. LEG FOR THE PERSON metaphor holds true for this idiom since the invocation intended for (24) is not to stop the leg from moving literally but to bar the person from committing a rejected act.

In the light of the discussion above, it seems reasonable to conclude that the cultural-specific element in English makes converse meaning from what is intended in Arabic. The difference between the relevant English and Arabic idioms lies in the differential cultural experience. While the English idiom focuses mainly on a particular mythical/ factual incident, the Arabic idiom is generically conceptualized in terms of the symbolic and connotative value of the walking organ.

The difference between the two idioms can be summed up as: **BREAK A LEG IS WISHING (English) vs. BREAK A LEG IS BARRING (Arabic).**

Eat out of someone's hands

The idiom *eat out of someone's hands* carries the meaning of obedience. It means to obey someone eagerly and do what he/she wants, as (25-27) show:

25.*You just wait! I'll have everyone eating out of my hands. They'll do whatever I ask.*

26.*The president has Congress eating out of his hands.*

27. *A lot of people are eating out of his hands.*

This idiom contrasts sharply with the linguistically similar CA idiom *biyaakul min diraa3 fulaan* (Lit. eat out of someone's arm) which refers to earning money out of someone's efforts, or sponging on someone.

It is taken for granted that the hand is a very significant human organ. Physically, it is the "grasping organ at the end of the forelimb of certain vertebrates that exhibits great mobility and flexibility in the digits and in the whole organ" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 2014).

Metaphorically and metonymically, THE HAND IS A CONTAINER is the main ontological metaphor, which subsumes the following metaphors (Ahn and Kwon, 2007, p. 207):

28 a. HOLDING IN THE HAND IS POSSESSION.
b. HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL.
c. HOLDING IN THE HAND IS COOPERATION.
d. HOLDING IN THE HAND IS ATTENTION

The current data seems to fit in with the metaphor HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL. This metaphor is body-based since it is known that the hand is a great manifestation of power; if something is held in hand, it is under the holder's control. The examples in (29) show the relation between hand and power/ control (YU, 2003, pp. 169-170):

29. a. He's got the matter in hand.
b. We have the situation well in hand.
c. His life was in my hand.
d. The meeting is getting out of hand.

The data also seems to assert HOLDING IN THE HAND IS POSSESSION metaphor. The influence exercised by the holder necessitates that he/she must 'possess' something (e.g., money or any other attractions) by which he/she can control the other party.

Metonymically, The hand also stands for many things that the English idiom under study agrees with. Ahn and Kwon (2007, p. 201) maintain that the hand stands for PERSON, PERSONALITY and GIVING among other things. As our data shows, in *I'll have everyone eating out of my hands*, 'my hand' stands for the person himself/herself; it also stands for the control or influence that somebody exercises over someone else. Moreover, it can be taken to represent the act of giving, one of the possible means by which one can wield influence over somebody else. Thus, the meaning of the English idiom is understandable in view of the metaphors and metonymies that English culture and language associate it with. The CA word *diraa3* 'arm' has connotations similar to the those associated with *hand* in English; for instance, *diraa3* can stand for the person:

30. ma7addi-ʃ yi?dar yilwi draa3-i
nobody-not can twist arm-my
(Lit. Nobody can twist my arm).

The word *diraa3* 'arm' refers to the person /personality/influence; a free translation of the sentence above would be "nobody can force me (to do something)". However, the main difference between the Arabic and English idioms is that *hand* in the English idiom is conceptualized to denote influence, a meaning which Arabic generally shares with English but not in the case of the current CA idiom. The CA sense of this idiom associates *diraa*? with self-reliance and self-independence. So, *biyaakul min diraa3 ?axuuh* (Lit. He eats out of his brother's arm) means that he lives off his brother.

What would probably make the English idiom *eat out of someone's hands* problematic for Arabic speakers, then, is that its CA linguistic equivalent *baakul min diraa3 fulaan* has got nothing to do with influence. *bitaakul min diraa3 fulaan* does not mean to fall under the influence of somebody, but it actually means to live on somebody else's effort (i.e. to sponge off somebody else). Thus, the difference is not in the primary conceptualization of the idiom, but in the connotative sense each language/culture assigns to the similar words in each idiom.

The difference, then, can be summarized as follows: **EAT OUT OF SOMEONE'S HANDS IS OBEYING/BEING UNDER INFLUENCE (English) vs. EAT OUT OF SOMEONE'S HAND IS LIVING OFF SOMEBODY'S MONEY/RESOURCES (Arabic).**

***Every dog has its day/ Every dog has his day*.**

This idiomatic expression means that everyone will get a chance.

31. *Don't worry, you'll get chosen for the team. Every dog has its day. You may become famous someday.*

The equivalent idiom in CA *kul kalb wiluh yoom* (Lit. Every dog has his day) is understood to mean retribution. It means that wrongdoers will face their destiny and justice will be done someday.

Animals and humans have been together probably since the beginning of man's life on earth; this kind of neighbor relationship makes people aware of the habits of animals, and "gradually, people begin to associate some characters on some animals with someone's characters in human lives, and map them on the cognitions and expressions to other things" (song, 2009, p. 58). No wonder, then, that we find the domain of animals to be a rich and productive source for humans (Kövecses 2002, p. 17). As Kövecses maintains, "Human beings are especially frequently understood in terms of (assumed) properties of animals. Thus, we talk about someone being a brute, a tiger, a dog, a sly fox, a bitch, a cow, a snake, and so on".

How have the animal-related words acquired their metaphorical meanings? According to Kövecses (2002, p. 125), this process takes place in a reciprocal manner:

> "…humans attributed human characteristics to animals and then reapplied these characteristics to humans. That is, animals were personified first, and, then, the 'human-based animal characteristics' were used to understand human behavior. But it is not only human behavior that is metaphorically understood in terms of animal behavior; people themselves are also often described as animals of some kind"

It has also been asserted by Kövecses (2002) that the domain of animals is an extremely productive source domain for conceptual metaphors. It has been the case that human beings are frequently understood in terms of properties of animals and this can be displayed, as the examples in (32) show, by the observed mapping of human behavior onto animal behavior (p. 124):

32.a. His mother was *catty* and *loud*.
b. Good friends don't *rat* on each other.
c. They had been eating standing up, *wolfing* the cold food from dirty tin plates.
d. He is sure as hell going to go *ape* that you didn't see Rocky yesterday.
e. Not a day goes by without him getting in and *monkeying* with something.

The conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS is very prevalent across cultures. This metaphor involves "a semantic transfer of the attributes that are associated with the animal to refer to the behavior of humans" (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 182).This means that this particular metaphor involves a mapping process between animal attributes (source domain) and people's attributes (target domain). Almost associated with the metaphor above is the metaphor

HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR, both of which are focused on the notions of 'objectionability' or 'undesirability' (Kövecses, 2002). Indeed, as Kövecses (2002) explains, "we have in our conceptual system the highly general metaphor HUMAN IS ANIMAL that consists of at least the following conceptual metaphors: HUMAN IS ANIMAL, OBJECTIONABLE HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR, OBJECTIONABLE PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, DIFFICULT-TO-HANDLE THINGS ARE DOGS, SEXUALLY ATTRACTIVE WOMEN ARE KITTENS" (p. 125).

Animals are perceived differently depending on culture. According to Song (2009, p. 58), Chinese associates cowardice with "rat", while in English the chicken is the target. Also, 'dog' in Chinese stands for "beggarliness" and all human body-part words about the dog carry belittling sense, while in English or close cultures dog is man's loyal companion, and so many human body-part words about dogs such as "dog-eared", "dogsbody", "dogface" and "dog fall" carry neutral sense. In addition, in Chinese, "Long (dragon)" is deeply-rooted in the Chinese culture as the icon of "luck", and its spirit is the "vigorous spirit". In the west, however, the dragon represents evil and is depicted as the fierce and cruel monster. The same can be observed also in Persian and English (Talebinejad & Dastjerdi, 2005, p.139). While cowardice is represented by chicken in English, goat stands for it in Persian, and while a turkey is a stupid person in English, in Persian, it stands for a hypocrite.

It has been found cross-linguistically that dog-related metaphors may carry negative as well as positive senses. As Talebinejad & Dastjerdi (2005, p. 137) explain "Dog metaphors, for instance, which are usually related with the negative aspects of the animal behavior in everyday life in Persian, may be positively used as well. Dogs will not be the untouchable, difficult to handle animals, but loyal creatures that sacrifice their lives for their owner". In English, 'dogs' are captured in both negative and positive senses, too; however, when people refer to dog life or "barking dogs" they refer to a negative thing about dogs (Talebinejad & Dastjerdi, 2005, p. 139) and the metaphorically motivated English dog terms in business (e.g. *Dogs of the Dow, go to the dogs, dog-eat-dog, cats and dogs*, etc.) usually refer to negative aspects of a dog's behavior (Šilaski, 2009, p. 572).

The English expression under study carries some sort of 'neutral' connotations. It does not bear negative or positive connotations. 'Every dog has its day' refers to a generic sense, meaning everyone; the negative connotations of dogs do not seem to be show up here. However, the linguistically equivalent sense in Arabic takes only negative implications despite the fact that 'dogs' are sometimes seen to be a symbol of loyalty, and guardianship in the Arab culture. *kul kalb wiluh yoom* (Lit. Every dog has his day) can be understood to mean retribution is close and the unjust will surely meet his/her doomed end, as the following CA examples indicate:

33.kul kalb wi-lu-h yoom yit7aasib fii-h
every dog and-it-has day held accountable in-it
(Lit. Every dog has his day when he is held accountable).

34. kul kalb wiluh yoom wi-kul Zaalim wi-luh yoom
every dog it-has day and-every unjust and-he has day
(Lit. Every dog has its day, and every unjust has his day)

The examples above associate the Arabic idiom with retribution. In (33) the word *yit7aasib* 'to be held accountable' shows clearly the punitive side of the idiom. Similarly, in (34) the repetition of *kul* 'every' clearly indicates the retaliatory sense of the idiom. The association

between a dog and a bad person is very clear in the sense that *kalb* 'dog' in the examples above is the target of despise and contempt and refers to the negative aspect of this animal as a despised creature that is hated and untouchable. This has got nothing to do with getting a chance in Arabic. Although the dog may, somehow, symbolize loyalty in the Arab culture, likening someone to a dog or calling somebody a dog is a grave insult.

The difference observed here can be ascribed to differences in cultural models. The idioms are differently conceptualized due to people's beliefs and value systems; the interpretation of the animal concerned here is highly culture-dependent. Indeed, as Talebinejad and Dastjerdi (2005, p. 146) maintain "People seem to understand animal metaphors from their own experience constrained by their own cultural schema, not as how they are used by, say, the native speakers of another language". The conceptual difference between the two linguistically equivalent idioms can then be verbalized as **EVERY DOG HAS ITS DAY IS GETTING A CHANCE (English) vs. EVERY DOG HAS ITS DAY IS DOING JUSTICE (Arabic).**

Lay an egg

This idiomatic expression means to give a bad performance, as represented by the following examples:

35.*The cast of the play really laid an egg last night*

36. *I hope I don't lay an egg when it's my turn to sing.*

The English idiom above deviates conceptually from its linguistically identical CA counterpart *lamma yibiiD (even if he laid an egg)*, which conveys the meaning of trying (often in vain) to do the impossible.

In English, *laying an egg* is, generally, a sign of high productivity and performance. This is in keeping with the oft-quoted idioms *don't put all your eggs in one basket*, *don't count your chickens before they hatch*, and *killing the goose that laid the golden egg.*

It is taken for granted that the animal kingdom has a close relation to our life, which makes people quite familiar with animal life aspects. This is fleshed out in people's association of animal properties with their corresponding human characteristics, as well as in the animal metaphors prevalent in various languages (Song, 2009). This has been found to be in conformity with the conceptual metaphor HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR (cf. section 3.7); comparing humans to animals goes metaphorically even beyond that, as people themselves are sometimes seen as animals, hence employing the metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, as manifested by the following examples (Kövecses, p. 125):

37.a. That man was a brute, he spent the little he earned on drink.
b. . . . a bunch of fat cats with fast cars and too many cigars.
c. All I could hear was the producer screaming "What the hell does the silly cow think she is doing?"
d. "I've had my eye on her. Stupid cow, she thinks I don't know what goes on."

In the light of the English examples above, it can be said that 'laying an egg' is based on HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR and PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS metaphors which are apparently based on 'objectionability' or 'undesirability, as suggested by Kövecses (2002) (cf. section 3.7). Evidently, comparing humans to animals in this case seems to capture the negative characteristics of human beings. Although 'laying an egg' is generally a productive activity, what this idiom focuses on is the negative aspect of failure. This is only partial explanation for what the idiom refers to.

The English idiom above seems to be mainly culturally-based, specific-domain idiom, in the sense that it is related to a particular sphere of action, namely sports. An egg resembles the number 'zero', so 'laying an egg' means to produce nothing (zero). Moreover, in the British cricket game, when you fail to score you get a zero which looks like an egg. Also, this term relates to baseball practice, where a zero is a "goose egg". During the mid-1800's failing to score became known as getting a duck's egg, based on the resemblance observed between the duck's egg and a zero (Bengelsdorf, 2012). The idiom is still so current in English that numerous references are made to it in the press very recently:

38. *In the biggest game of Jay Cutler's life, he laid an egg big enough to feed most of the people at Soldier Field. —Chicago Tribune (6/13/2011) (quoted in Bengelsdorf, 2012).*

39. *It's embarrassing," defensive end Dave Tollefson said. "As good as we've been playing the last couple of weeks, to come out here and lay an egg, embarrassing is the only way I can think of it.* —Newsday (10/9/2011) (quoted in Bengelsdorf, 2012).

The English idiom, then, seems to be motivated on generic and culture -specific grounds. The generic motivation is ascribed to universal conceptualizations such as HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR and PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, while the cultural motivation is based on how the idiom relates to an exclusive sports jargon or act.

The linguistically equivalent expression in Arabic conceptualizes the egg-laying act *lamma tbiiD* (Lit. Not even if you laid an egg) differently, equating it with trying to do the impossible (often in vain), as the following example shows:

40. lamma tbiiD miʃ ha-ddihaa-lak
when you lay an egg not will-give-it-you
(Lit. Even when you lay an egg, I won't give t to you).

The egg-laying animal, chicken, is one of those animals epitomized in the Arab culture in negative terms. It is a symbol of cowardice; *ʔajbanu min dajaaja* (more cowardly than a chicken) is a famous SA simile, which is also attested in CA. In CA, for example, it is quite common to have expressions such as *ʒaamil zay l-farxa* (as cowardly as a chicken). A chicken, thus, stands for a negative aspect of behavior. One cannot compare himself to a chicken or none of its properties (including egg-laying) and it is not appropriate in the Arab culture to be likened to a chicken or acquiring any of its features. The expression *lamma tbiiD*, thus, is a sarcastic phrase indicating that a certain action will not be fulfilled even if the intender does the impossible by turning himself/herself into an animal or acquiring one of its properties (i.e. egg-laying , objectionable and undesirable for humans in an Arab culture), which is quite inappropriate act and impossible to imagine in terms of the Arab cultural assumptions.

Based on the discussion above, it seems apparent that the difference between the Arabic and English idioms resides in the differential cultural practices and experiences leading to contrasting conceptualization of reality. The English idiom is culturally motivated, based on a particular physical event and sports practices, and generically motivated based on universal conceptualization of animals. Since the Arab culture lacks the practices available in the English setting, the idiom is conceptualized differently; the Arab conceptualization of the egg-laying event is based on different cultural assumptions and beliefs about this act. To sum up, the difference can be set in the following terms: **LAYING AN EGG IS FAILURE (English) vs. LAYING AN EGG IS TRYING TO DO THE IMPOSSIBLE (Arabic)**.

Jump out of one's skin

This idiom indicates reacting strongly to shock or surprise, as the following examples show:

41. *Oh! You really scared me. I nearly jumped out of my skin.*

42. *Bill was so startled he almost jumped out of his skin.*

The linguistically equal Arabic idiom *yaxruju min jildih* (Lit. get out of his skin) does not bear the meaning of shock or surprise, but signifies changing one's ideas and convictions.

Skin is known to be the largest body organ being an envelope for the whole body and the outermost covering; it has the dual function of being the protective shield around the body and the border that sets the body apart from the surrounding environment (Payne and Barbera, 2010, pp. 649-650). Anzieu (1989, p. 3) adds a third and distinctive function of the skin as "a site and a primary means of communicating with others, of establishing signifying relations... an inscribing surface for the marks left by others".

The first two functions of the skin assert the classic BODY IS A CONTAINER metaphor and also reiterate the skin as reflection of what is going on inside the body. Benthien (2002, p. 40) maintains that one view of explaining the diseases on the skin was that they were not considered dermal illnesses but, based on the doctrine of humoral pathology, were taken to be manifestation of internal ailments.

The relation between the body and the skin transcends the physical connection. According to the third function of the skin cited above by Anzieu, the skin is also an expression of the "self". Anzieu (1989, p. 98) introduced the term 'the skin ego' and redefined the skin as "a containing, unifying envelope for the self; as a protective barrier for the psyche; and as a filter of exchanges and a surface of inscription for the first traces, a function which makes representation possible".

One of the ways by which the skin is an expression of identity is how the skin was manipulated over the ages through the tattoo which, according to Caplan (2000, p. xiv):

> has been taken to mark off entire 'civilizations' from their 'barbarian' or 'savage' neighbors; to declare a convict's criminality, whether by branding him as a punishment or because he has inverted this penal practice by acquiring voluntary tattoos (thereby, ironically, marking himself); and more generally to inscribe various kinds of group membership, often in opposition to a dominant culture.

The relation between the skin and the 'self' is also affirmed by referring to the Greek mythology, according to which Marsyas, half-man, half-goat, is defeated by Apollo, the Greek god of the muses after a musical contest and is punished for the sin of "hubris" or extreme pride by being flayed alive. His cry while being skinned off "Why do you tear me from myself?" asserts the relation between the skin and the "self" (Payne and Babera, 2010, p. 650).

This meaning is asserted again by Benthien who comments on the cultural significance of the human skin stipulating that "From the Renaissance onward [the skin] has been considered the mirror of the soul and the projecting surface of the invisible inside" (2002, p. ix).

In the light of the discussion above, the close relation between the skin and the self is clearly evident. This relates to both the English and Arabic idioms considered. The English idiom *jump out of one's skin* conveys the meaning of surprise or shock. A deeper implication is that the skin is a real protection of one's normal 'self'. It signifies that one is in his/her right self if he/she

is in their skin; jumping out of one's skin is a change of one's stable 'self'. A working metaphor here would be THE SKIN IS THE SELF. The skin here is associated with the 'self', representing one's 'neutral' stable nature. *Jumping out of one's skin* is an expression of not acting naturally of being vulnerable and out of your protective boundaries.

THE SKIN IS THE SELF applies to Arabic, too, though from a different perspective. The Arabic idiom *yaxruju min jildih* associates the skin with one's ideological rather than affective identity. It tackles the concept of changing one's ideas, convictions, beliefs, etc. This is evidenced by the following examples from MSA:

43. ʔinna ðaalika l-muθaqqafa qad xaraja min jildi-h il-ʔibdaa3ii l-qadiim
Verily this the-intellectual has gone from skin-his the-creative the-old
(Lit. This intellectual has gone out of his old creative skin.)

44. ʔar-rajulu llaðii xaraxa min jildi-hi l-markisii qabal θalaaθati ʔasabii3
the-man who went out from skin-his the-marxist before three weeks
(Lit. The man who went out of his Marxist skin three weeks ago).

45. xaraja min jildi-hi wa ɣayyara dama-hu
went out from skin-his and changed blood-his
(Lit. the man who went out of his skin and changed his blood).

It appears from the examples above that Arabic equates the skin with the 'ideological' self, one's beliefs and convictions. In (43) the creative skin calls direct attention to one's creative achievement. In (44) the Marxist skin reflects one's ideological stance and position. The idiom in (45) demonstrates a total change in one's personality as asserted by *ɣayyara dama-hu* (changed his blood) which emphasizes complete transformation.

The conceptual difference between the two idioms can be understood in terms of the differences in the connotative value of the word 'skin' in the two languages. While it refers to the 'ideological' self in Arabic, English focuses on the emotive side of the skin. The difference between the two idioms, then, can be put in the following words: **OUT OF ONE'S SKIN IS BEING SHOCKED (English) vs. OUT OF ONE'S SKIN IS UNDERGOING SELF-CHANGE (Arabic).**

In one's salad days

This idiom means *in one's youth*. It refers to the freshness or inexperience of young age, as evident from the following examples:

46. *I recall the joys I experienced in the warm summer air in my salad days.*

47. *In our salad days, we were apt to get into all sorts of mischief on the weekends.*

The linguistically equivalent CA expression involving *salad*, however, refers to the mess or confusion of a particular situation.

The English expression was originally used in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, written in 1606. Cleopatra remembers how she loved Caesar when she was in her *salad days*, meaning her blooming youth. The sentence is followed by "when I was green in my judgment" (Bengelsdorf, 2012). The greenness and freshness of salad seems to be associated in Shakespeare's days, and up till today, with young age and inexperience.

The English expression seems to be metaphorically motivated based on the Lakoffian conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE PLANTS (1992). A person at his/her young age is likened to a green plant and the correspondence is based on the observed similarity between young plants and youth (flexibility, malleability, vigor, freshness, growth, etc.). The correspondence between greenness and plant life can be seen in such expressions as *to have green fingers,* and *to have the rub of the green* (Phillip, 2006, p. 83).

The green color refers to the meaning of freshness and youth, yet it meanwhile asserts inexperience, e.g., *the new employee is still green*. The similarity is also straightforward, since green is known also to be 'unripe', not yet able to yield fruit. It has been asserted by Phillip (2006, p. 83) that the relation between greenness and inexperience is "derived from the metonymic link with *green wood* – young wood that is greenish in color and very supple and flexible – and the expression combines the characteristics of malleability with youth, with the additional factor of youth corresponding to inexperience".

The relationship between greenness, youth and immaturity is also attested in Arabic. This is manifested by SA expressions such as: *maa zaala ?axDara l-3uud* (Lit. His stalk is still green, i.e. He is still green), which is also echoed in the CA expression *lissa 3uudu ?axDar* which bears the same meaning. The word *?axDar* 'green' used in the expressions above relates youth to unsophistication.

The expression *Salad* (*SalaTa* in CA) seems to be a recent term and it is associated with "mess". *SalaTa* is a mix of many components usually served to whet an appetite; the connotation of the expression has to do with bizarre mixing and chaos. The Arabic expression is apparently based on the metaphor THE NATURE OF AN ENTITY IS ITS SHAPE (Grady, 1997a). However, the intended shape here is not the green color, but the random mixing of different ingredients. The following examples show the use of the word *SalaTa* in CA to denote a messy situation:

48. Ta3diil il-maʃruu3 laa yuɣayyiru qub7a-h wi huwwa xalla-ha SalaTa xaaliS
modifying the-project no change ugliness-its and he made-it salad very
(Lit. Modifying the project would not change its ugliness and he made it a total salad i.e. he made a mess of the whole thing).

49. maa 7adas laxbaTa ʃaxbaTa SalaTa
What happened mess scribble salad
(Lit. What happened is a mess, scribble, salad).

50. ?id-dunia ba?it SalaTa
The-world became salad
(Lit. The world became salad).

What creates anomaly between the two expressions (English and Arabic), then, is the connotative value of the word 'salad' for each idiom. The word *salad* is looked at from conflicting perspectives for both languages so that it has the connotations of a messy 'mix' of various ingredients in Arabic, unlike English which relates salad to callowness and naivety. The difference between English and Arabic also lies in how each culture conceptualizes a certain perspective of a component; while 'color' attracts the English attention, it is the random and messy 'mixture' of components that magnetizes the Arab culture. The difference can be

put in the following contrasting terms: **SALAD IS YOUNG AGE AND INEXPERIENCE (English) vs. SALAD IS MESS AND DISORDER (Arabic)**.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The main source of difference between idioms of equivalent linguistic form and different conceptual basis can be ascribed, to a great extent, as it appears from the data above, to culture encoding. Despite the existence of a lot of shared generic-level primary metaphors, the specific -level cultural metaphors make a wide gap between languages. Differences across linguistic and cultural boundaries are at rife. Idioms diverge conceptually based on cultural differences, including cultural experience, perspective, range, and gesture. There have been also differences in the connotative value of idiomatic key words. This paper, thus, was capable of showing, though on a small scale, how a language encodes concepts, and how conceptualizations might differ from one language to another.

As evident from the data above, although both Arabic and English conceptualize 'heart' as being a container and as being a movable object, for example, the heart-contained material is fear in Arabic, while it is extreme emotions and joy in English. There is also a discrepancy in range, the upward movement of heart content, conceptualized as higher for English than Arabic. We see the difference in culture-specific gestures as represented by the idiom *have one's ear to the ground.* The ear's downward movement differ in interpretation for the two cultures. The differences in terms of cultural experiences and practices is fleshed out by the *lay an egg* idiom; conceptualization of reality contrasts because such an event denotes some sort of sports practice in English which does not exist in Arabic. The same variance in cultural experience can be detected as in the case of *break a leg* idiom; English focuses mainly on a particular mythical/ factual cultural incident not available for Arabic which interprets the leg only in symbolic connotative terms. People's beliefs, value systems and cultural models can explain the differences in conceptualizing 'dog' in the *every dog has its day* idiom. This is very much in keeping with Kövecses' view (2003, p. 319) that "As the cultural factors change from culture to culture, so does the metaphor and its linguistic expression. In it, the cognitive and the cultural are fused into a single conceptual complex. In this sense, what we call conceptual metaphors are just as much cultural entities as they are cognitive ones".

We can detect differences in the connotative meaning of idiomatic words as mirrored in the idiom *have rocks in one's head*. While the hardness of rock is associated with stubbornness in Arabic, it is associated in English with foolishness and craziness. The same can be said about the connotations of *fly* in both languages. In English it denotes success whereas it refers to hasty movements in Arabic. This is also the case for the idiom *eat out of someone's hands*, where *hand* has the connotation of influence in English but has to do with self-dependence/independence in Arabic. Because figurative meanings, in general, and idiomatic expressions, in particular, are highly affective and expressive, word connotations, as this study shows, contribute greatly towards altering meaning conceptualization.

The study has shown the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) to be a practical and useful tool of detecting cross-linguistic similarities and differences. By applying the machinery of CMT and related literature, it was possible to see how the common primary metaphors morphed into culture-specific images. For example it was evident that both Arabic and English share metaphors such as HEART IS A CONTAINER , HEART IS A MOVABLE OBJECT, BODY

IS A CONTAINER, PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS, HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR, THE HAND STANDS FOR PERSON. However, those primary metaphors were differently manipulated by each respective culture along various cultural parameters. The CMT instrument has proven an adequate tool in explaining cross-cultural communication.

The study contributes towards detecting the sources of conceptual difference in idiomatic expressions, which is likely to have positive pedagogical implications. It stresses the importance of teaching the cultural aspects of language and illustrating how culture can alter conceptualizing language, from different perspectives, and consequently influence language learning. The explanations given in the analysis and discussion section, briefly summarized in capital letters in a 'versus' form at the end of each subsection in section 3, can raise cognitive/conceptual awareness and improve second/foreign language learners' proficiency. The culture-specific gestures and assumptions should be included in teaching idiomatic expressions. An explanation such as the one given in this study is likely to raise students' motivation and deepen their understanding of the target culture, besides attracting their attention and developing empathy for that culture (Callies and Zimmermann, 2002). One important pedagogical contribution of this study is that it could identify and describe the conceptual underpinnings of many idiomatic expressions, which is likely to "reduce the extended period of exposure normally necessary for a second language learner to acquire familiarity with figurative language" (Charteris-Black, p.109). The study can also help develop 'conceptual fluency', and build what has been termed by Danesi (1994, p. 454) as 'conceptual syllabus'. Furthermore, this work is expected to help build better cross-cultural communication. According to Johnson (1996, p. 236), one important aspect of successful communication is "the extent to which the L2 speaker has knowledge of the relevant L2 conceptual system". This study makes this knowledge available to language learners, at least Arabic/English L2 learners.

Finally, further research is probably needed to verify the results of the study by expanding the data cross-linguistically and on a wider scale to look further into figurative expressions, including idioms, of conceptual discord and misleading surface equivalence.

REFERENCES

Ahn, H. J. & Kwon, Y. (2007). *A study on metaphor and metonymy of Hand*, Journal of Language Sciences, 14:2, 195-215.

Ali, A. (Trans.) (1938). *The Holy Qur'an: Translation and Commentary*. (3rd ed.), Dar Arabia, Beirut.

Anzieu, D. (1989). *The Skin Ego*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Aransaez, C. (1999). *The Role of the Head in the Conceptualization of rational behavior: Across-linguistic study of the Metaphorical Expressions of the Folk Model of the Head*, RESLA, 13, 113-124.

Badawi, E.& Hinds, M. (1986). *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*, Librairie du Liban, Beirut.

Barcelona, A. (2001.) *On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors: case studies and proposed methodology*, In Applied Cognitive Linguistics II: Language

Pedagogy. (Eds. M. Pütz, S. Niemeier and R. Dirven) Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 117-146.

Bengelsdorf, P. (2012). *Idioms in the News - 1,000 phrases, real examples*. [Online] Available: http://www.pdfbooksplanet.org/cultures-and-languages/15614-idioms-in-the-news-1000-phrases-real-examples.html. (Accessed on 10-02-2014).

Benthien, C. (2002) *Skin: On the Cultural Border between Self and the World*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Boers, F. (2000a). *Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention*, Applied Linguistics, 21, 553-571.

Callies, M. & Zimmermann, R.(2002). *Cross-cultural Metaphors: Investigating Domain Mappings Across Cultures*, Philipps-Universitat, Marburg.

Caplan, J., (ed.)(2000). *Written on the Body: the Tatoo in European and American History*, Reaktion Books, London.

Charteris-Black, J. (2002). *Second language figurative proficiency: a comparative study of Malay and English*, Applied Linguistics, 23, 104-133.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York.

Chen, Y. & Lai, H. (2013). *Teaching English Idioms as Metaphors through Cognitive-Oriented Methods: A Case in an EFL Writing Class*, English Language Teaching, 6 (6), 13– 20.

Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Danesi, M. (1994). *Recent research on metaphor and teaching of Italian*, Italica, 71, 453-464.

Deignan, A., Gabryś, D., & Solska, A. (1997). *Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities*, ELT Journal, 51(4), 352- 360.

Díez-Velasco, O. I. (2001). *Metaphor, Metonymy and Image Schemas: An Analysis of Conceptual Interaction Patterns*, Journal of English Studies (3), 47-63.

Encyclopedia Britannica. (2014). Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. [Online] Available: http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/254068/hand (Accessed on May 12, 2014).

Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and Idiomaticity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Flavell, L. & and Flavell, R. *Dictionary of idioms and their origins*, Kyle Cathie, London.

Gibbs, R. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Grady, J. (1997a). *Foundation of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation), University of California, Berkeley.

Johnson, J. M. (1996). *Metaphor interpretations by second language learners: children and adults*, The Canadian Modern Language Review 53, 219-41.

Kövecses, Z. (1991). *Happiness: A definitional effort*, Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 6(1), 29-46.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: language, culture, and body in human feeling*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Kövecses, Z. (2001). *A cognitive linguistic view of learning idioms in an FLT context*, In Applied Cognitive Linguistics II: Language Pedagogy. (Eds, M. Pulz, S, Niemeier, & R. Dirven) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 87-115.

Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor and linguistic expressions*. In Metaphor in Culture Universality and Variation (Ed. Kovecses, Z.) Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 130-140

Lakoff, G. (1986). *Classifiers as a reflection of mind*, In Noun Classes and Categorization (7). (Ed. Craig, C.) John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia. pp. 13-52.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M (1980, 2003). *Metaphors we live by* . The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, [Online] Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470993.001.0001

Lakoff, G. (1992). *Metaphors and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf*, In Thirty years of linguistic evolution. (Ed. Putz, M.) John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Langlotz, A. (2006). *Idiomatic Creativity: A Cognitive Linguistic Model of Idiom Representation and Idiom-Variation in English*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: the Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Liu, D. (2003). *The most frequently used spoken American English idioms: a corpus analysis and its implications*, Tesol Quarterly, 37, 671-700.

Maalej, Z. (2008). *The heart and cultural embodiment in Tunisian Arabic*. In Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages. (Eds, Sharifian, F., Dirven, R., Yu, N. and Niemeier, S.). Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp. 395-428.

Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Niemeier, S. (1997). *To have one's heart in the right place – metaphorical and metonymic evidence for the folk model of the heart as the site of emotions in English*. In Human Contact through Language and Linguistics. (Eds, Smieja, B. and. Tasch, M), Peter Lang, Frankfurt, pp. 87–106.

Niemeier, S. (2000). *Straight from the heart – Metonymic and metaphorical explorations*. In Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A cognitive perspective. (Ed. Barcelona, A.),195–213. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gryuter.

Niemeier, S. (2008) *To be in control: kind-hearted and cool-headed. The head-heart dichotomy in English*, In Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages.(Eds, Sharifian, F, Dirven, R. Yu, N. and Niemeier, S.), Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 349–372.

Partridge, E. (2005). *Dictionary of Catch Phrases*, [Revised and Updated Edition]. (Ed, Beale, P.). Routledge, London.

Payne, M. & Barbera, J. (Eds.) (2010). *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. [Second Edition], Blackwell Publishing, London.

Phillip, G. (2006).*Connotative meaning in English and Italian color-word metaphor*. [Online] Available: http: //metaphoric.de/10/Philip.pdf (accessed 25.03.2013).

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Šilaski, N .(2009). *Animal metaphors in some business-related terms in English*. Paper presented at the International Conference Across Languages and Cultures, Herceg Novi, Montenegro, 4-6 June 2009.

Simpson, R. & Mendis, D. (2003). *A corpus-based study of idioms in academic Speech*. TESOL Quarterly, 37(3), 419-441.

Song, M. (2009). *Cognitive Analysis of Chinese-English Metaphors of Animal and Human Body Part Words*. International Education Studies 2/3, 57–59.

Spears, R. A. (1999). *NTC's Thematic Dictionary of American Idiom*s, NTC Publishing, Illinois.

Talebinejad, M. R. & Dastjerdi, H. V.(2005). *A Cross-Cultural Study of Animal Metaphors: When Owls Are Not Wise!*, Metaphor and Symbol 20(2),133-150.

Wang, F. (2009). *The Metaphorical and Metonymical Expressions including Face and Eye in Everyday Language,* (Unpublished manuscript), Kristianstad University College .

Wray, A. (1999). *Formulaic language in second language teaching: Principle and practice*. Applied Linguistics, *32*, 213-231.

Yu, N. (1995). *Metaphorical expression of anger and happiness in English and Chinese*. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 10, 59-92.

Yu, N. (1998). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: A Perspective from Chinese*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

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

LIST OF THE CAIRENE ARABIC SYMBOLS USED IN THE STUDY

The following list represents the symbols used in this study. The description given is adapted from Hinds and Badawy (1986). The phonemic script used in the study, however, differs slightly from that used in Hinds and Badawy's dictionary.

1. Consonants

Symbol	Description	Symbol	Description
?	glottal stop	D	voiceless denti-alveolar plosive (emphatic)
b	voiced bilabial stop	T	voiceless-dent-alveolar plosive (emphatic)
t	voiced denti-alveolar stop	3	voiced pharyngeal fricative
g	voiced velar plosive	ɣ	voiced uvular fricativ
7	voiceless pharyngeal fricative	f	voiceless labio-dental fricative
x	voiceless uvular fricative	q	voiceless uvular plosive
d	voiced denti-alveolar plosive	k	voiceless velar plosive
r	voiced alveolar trill	l	voiced denti-alveolar lateral
z	voiced denti-alveolar fricative	m	voiced bilabial nasal
Z	voiced denti-alveolar fricative (emphatic)	n	voiced denti-alveolar nasal
s	voiceless denti-alveolar fricative	h	voiceless glottal fricative
ʃ	voiceless palato-alveolar fricative	w	voiced bilabial glide
S	voiceless denti-alveolar fricative (emphatic)	y	voiced palatal glide

2- Vowels

A. Short Vowels

Symbol	Description	Symbol	Description
a	low/open and back vowel.	e	middle/ half-close and front vowel
a	low/open and front vowel	u	high/close and back vowel
i	high/close and front vowel	o	middle half-close and back vowel

B. Long vowels

Symbol	Description	Symbol	Description
aa	low/open and back long vowel.	ee	middle/ half-close and front long vowel
aa	low/open and front long vowel	uu	high/close and back long vowel
ii	high/close and front long vowel	oo	middle half-close and back long vowel

LIST OF THE STANDARD ARABIC SYMBOLS USED IN THE STUDY I. CONSONANTS

Symbol	Description	Symbol	Description
b	voiced bilabial stop	ð	voiced (emphatic) inter-dental fricative
t	voiceless dental stop	s	voiceless dental fricative
T	voiceless (emphatic) dental stop	S	voiceless (emphatic) dental fricative
d	voiced dental stop	z	voiced dental fricative
D	voiced (emphatic) dental stop	j	voiceless palatal fricative
k	voiceless velar stop	x	voiceless uvular fricative
q	voiceless uvular stop	7	voiceless pharyngeal fricative
?	voiceless glottal stop	h	voiceless laryngeal fricative
j	voiced palatal affricate	r	voiced dental trill
3	voiced pharyngeal fricative	l	voiced lateral dental
ɣ	voiced velar fricative	m	voiced bilabial nasal
f	voiceless labio-dental fricative	n	voiced dental nasal
ɵ	voiceless inter-dental fricative	w	voiced bilabial glide
ð	voiced inter-dental fricative	y	voiced palatal glide

II. VOWELS

symbol	description	symbol	description
i	short high front unrounded vowel	aa	long low central unrounded vowel
ii	long high front unrounded vowel	u	short high back rounded vowel
a	short central unrounded vowel	uu	long high back rounded vowel

APPENDIX I

Sources of the Arabic data: websites, blogs, forums, newspapers, etc.

No. in the data	Example	Source
3.	?illi fi ?albii 3ala lsaan-i wiDuu7 Saraa7a ʃafafiya	https://quran.maktoob.com/vb/quran74797/

6.	Tab3an ?ir-raagil ba3d ma wagih-tu-h ?izbahal wi daldil widaan-u	(http://www.ansarportsaid.net/Visitors/885/Details.aspx
7.	kaan rad fi3l il-?awalaani daldil widaan-u wi miʃi	http://forums.fatakat.com/thread150420-8
10.	dimaaɣ-u 7agar wi- saqaft-u yadoob 3ayyil min sana rab4a btidaa?i	http://almogaz.com/news/opinion/2013/11/13/1183959
11.	dimaaɣu 7agar Sawwaan wi Soot-u 3aali wi 3aSabii giddan	http://forums.fatakat.com/thread3557478-33
16.	?id-dunya miʃ ha-tTiir laa yuugad maa yamna3 mina S-Sabr 3ala n-naadi	http://goalfmradio.com/News/Details/47801
17.	birra7a wa7da wa7da ?iddunya miʃ ha-tTiir	http://elbaba.yoo7.com/t55-topic
18.	?il-mawDuu3 Sa3b wi miʃ wa?tu-h ?iddunya miʃ ha-tTiir	http://www.artonline.tv/OSDForums/replys.aspx?SubID=50A109A103B101C119D113E53
24.	?ilaah-ii titkisir rigla-k …yalli bit3aakis il-banaat	https://www.facebook.com/Ba7Lm.A3iSh/posts/590551770974995
33.	kul kalb wiluh yoom yit7aasib fii-h	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AyiXvroZLSk&list=PL0C278397C42390A6
34.	kul kalb wiluh yoom wi-kul Zaalim wi-luh yoom	https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?id=304380822905681&story_fbid=538683902808704
43.	?inna ðaalika l-muɵaqqaf in qad xaraja min jildi-h il-?ibda3ii l-qadiim	http://www.alsabaah.iq/ArticlePrint.aspx?ID=68504
44.	?ar-rajulu llaði xaraxa min jildi-hi l-markisii qabala ɵalaaɵati ?asabii3	http://www.voltairenet.org/article137157.html
45.	xaraxa min jildi-hi wa ɣayyara dama-hu	http://albadee.net/news/9159/
48.	Ta3diil il-maʃruu3 laa yuɣayyiru qub7a-h wi huwwa xalla-ha SalaTa xaaliS	http://today.almasryalyoum.com/article2.aspx?ArticleID=84373 27-11-2007.
49.	maa 7adas laxbaTa ʃaxbaTa SalaTa	new.el-ahly.com/mobile/ Story .aspx ?newsid = 43562 accessed 17-04-2014)
50.	?id-dunia ba?it Salata	https://www.facebook.com/ asahbe.99)