



Research Article

Aseel Zibin, Abdulrahman Dheyab Abdullah*

The Conceptualization of Tolerance in the UAE Press Media: A Case Study of ‘The Year of Tolerance’

<https://doi.org/10.1515/olli-2019-0022>

Received May 17, 2019; accepted August 14, 2019

Abstract: This study investigates the conceptualisation of tolerance via metaphors in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) press media after proclaiming 2019 as the ‘Year of Tolerance’. The results revealed that various source domains are used to conceptualise tolerance, reflecting certain aspects of the Emirati culture and affecting the Emirati cultural model of tolerance. There are three types of experience working together to shape the formation of conceptual metaphors of tolerance: firstly, bodily experience which emerges from human cognitive embodiment. Secondly, this bodily experience mingles with cultural experience in the Emirati context, which suggests that embodiment is socioculturally grounded. Finally, there is linguistic experience which is inherited by its speakers as part of their cognitive and cultural heritage.

Keywords: Cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics, metaphor, media, corpus

1 Introduction

Meaning in cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics is generally viewed as conceptualisation (Lakoff and Johnson 2003). Cultural linguistics is built upon the major principles of cognitive linguistics, yet it is further grounded in the notion that cognition is both embodied and rooted in culture (Langacker 2014). Cultural cognition “embraces the cultural knowledge that emerges from the interactions between members of a cultural group across time and space” (Sharifian 2015: 476). In this way, language is the instrument by which cultural cognition is sorted and communicated. One of the cognitive devices used to reflect cultural linguistics is cultural metaphor which, in turn, interrelates with language. In other words, cultural metaphors are in fact culturally constructed conceptual metaphors which are shared in differing degrees between members of a cultural group (Sharifian 2007: 34). These metaphors are used in different cultures to conceptualise various target domains, e.g. MENTAL FACULTIES, EMOTIONS, CHARACTER TRAITS and CULTURAL VALUES, (see Maleej 2008, 2014; Sharifian 2017; Zibin and Hamdan 2019 among others). This study focuses on one cultural value, i.e. tolerance, which is the willingness or ability to tolerate the opinions or behaviours which one may dislike or disagree with; this ability also entails forgiveness and open-mindedness. The year 2019 has been proclaimed as “The Year of Tolerance” in the United Arab Emirates (henceforth UAE).¹ In the era of globalizations and openness to the cultures of others, His Highness Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al

¹ The UAE is a federation of seven emirates united in 1971. It is a coastal Arab and Muslim country located in Western Asia at the southeast end of the Arabian Peninsula. The terrain consists of mainly desert and oases and its people are originally Bedouin.

*Corresponding author: Abdulrahman Dheyab Abdullah, Al Ain University of Science and Technology, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates, E-mail: a.dheyab@googlemail.com

Aseel Zibin, School of Foreign Languages University of Jordan Amman, Jordan, email: a.zabin@ju.edu.jo

Nahyan, President of the UAE, has made this decision to emphasise the role of tolerance, coexistence, and dialogue, especially amongst the youth. The main ingredient of his vision is to respect differences, promote coexistence and reject extremism. Starting from December 15th 2018, several articles on tolerance have been published in various daily newspapers in the UAE such as *Al Bayan*, *Al Watan*, *Al-Ittihad* among others to promote the value of tolerance, forgiveness and openness. This study aims to examine the conceptual metaphors used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the UAE press media and to identify the most frequent source domains depicted in these metaphors. The investigation of the conceptualisation of TOLERANCE in the context of cultural linguistics provides the opportunity to examine the relationship between cultural cognition, cultural conceptualisations and language (see Sharifian 2015: 473).

The paper proceeds as follows: the following section provides an overview of the theoretical framework adopted in this study and reviews some research studies on the use of metaphor in media. Section 3 describes the methods used to collect and analyse data; it delineates the construction of the corpus and the keyword employed to locate the metaphors. Section 4 presents the results of the data analysis procedure and provides answers to the research questions. Section 5 provides a discussion of the results presented in Section 4 showing how the Emirati culture is reflected in the conceptualisation of TOLERANCE in the UAE press media. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper with recommendations for further research.

2 Literature review

2.1 Theoretical framework

Cultural linguistics is a multidisciplinary area of research that examines the relationship between language and cultural conceptualization (Sharifian 2017). It explores how language is culturally grounded with special focus on cultural conceptualisations as reflected in linguistic expressions and cultural artefacts which, at the cultural level, comprises a collective cognition called 'cultural cognition' (Sharifian 2017). The latter is linked to a specific cultural group and shared by its members (Yu 2017). A plethora of studies in this field (e.g. Palmer 1996; Bernárdez 2008; Frank 2015; Musolff 2017) explore how and why the various conceptual metaphors found in each language have arisen and spread across their communities. Being an analytical framework, cultural linguistics has drawn upon several disciplines in cognitive science, among which is cognitive linguistics, e.g. Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT). This study adopts CMT as its theoretical framework to analyse conceptual metaphors of TOLERANCE in the Emirati culture with special focus on how cultural cognition materialises in this analysis.

Within the framework of Cultural Linguistics, CMT metaphor constitutes three levels of phenomena. Firstly, at the linguistic level, there is what is known as linguistic metaphor which is at the surface and is, in turn, perceptible. This metaphor, as argued by Lakoff and Johnson (2003), contains a particular linguistic pattern that represents an underlying conceptual metaphor. The latter is grounded in a special experiential basis generally defined as the interaction between bodily experience and cultural experience (Maalej and Yu 2011). These three levels of phenomena are contained within the sphere of culture. To explain fully, metaphor involves a mapping from the source domain to the target domain at the conceptual level. For instance, Yu and Jia (2016) suggest that opera, namely Chinese Opera, gives rise to the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS AN OPERA in the Chinese culture. This conceptual metaphor is salient in Chinese culture and as such is widely and systematically reflected in the Chinese language. So, in this metaphor, the target domain is LIFE and the source domain is OPERA. The latter is the main element which dominates the PERFORMANCE ARTS frame as the source domain of the LIFE AS AN OPERA in the Chinese context. It follows that being shared by members of the same cultural group suggests that this conceptual metaphor is part of cultural conceptualisation (Yu 2017). Being a generic category, PERFORMANCE ARTS frame triggers in our conceptual system a rather complex conceptual frame containing three aspects, namely, PEOPLE, PERFORMANCE and VENUE (Yu 2017: 67). So, in the context of Chinese culture, these three elements could be PERFORMER, OPERA and STAGE as the most grounded conceptual elements. One may argue here that in all cultures in which performing arts are present, the two elements PERFORMER and STAGE are the two most essential

elements in the PERFORMING ARTS frame. Nonetheless, Yu (2017) explains that choosing OPERA in particular to be the prototype of different PERFORMING ARTS is unique to Chinese culture where the latter refers to “all the traditional varieties of Chinese folk opera, or “Chinese opera” (戏剧xìjù or 戏曲xìqǔ) as a cover term, with Beijing opera as its prototype” (Yu 2017: 67). Firstly, the aspect of PEOPLE consists of special role types in addition to their characteristic masks, makeups, costumes, decorations as well as the unique ways of interaction between the performers and audience during the whole performance. Secondly, the aspect of PERFORMANCE comprises the special ways of singing by different roles, speaking and performing with specific patterns of bodily moves and percussive and musical accompaniment done with particular instruments “as prelude to the opera and links between its acts and throughout the opera per se” (Yu 2017: 82). Finally, the third aspect VENUE includes the setting, unique use of lighting, and special decorations of the stage. This conceptual frame of BEIJING OPERA constitutes a part of the cultural knowledge of Chinese people. This knowledge has come from the frequent contacts with this type of opera in the process of growing up and being immersed in Chinese culture (Yu 2017: 82).

As suggested previously, conceptual metaphor cannot be viewed as random or arbitrary; it is grounded in experiential basis, which arises from the interaction between bodily and cultural experience. Different types of bodily experience exist, yet only some of them can emerge via the cultural filter and take part in metaphor mappings (Yu 2008: 2017). Bodily experience can be defined as the main lived experience and operating activity from the sensorimotor system of humans as an embodied entity acts in the physical world (Yu 2017: 82). Yet, this physical world is inseparable from culture, so physical environment is influenced and shaped by the changing culture. This suggests that cultural experience, as envisioned by Yu (2017), refers to the situation where individuals who live in a certain physical environment experience the culture linked to it simultaneously. In Yu's example, this cultural experience emerged from watching Beijing opera in a theatre, on TV, on an iPad or from listening to it on a radio or seeing it in a movie, or observing it on Chinese paintings, or reading about it in non-literary or literary texts, etc. (Yu 2017: 83).

A substantial part of the embodiment which our conceptual systems are based on is near-universal, yet cross-cultural differences can be portrayed based on the different historical and socio-cultural contexts (da Silva, Cuenca, and Romano 2017). In this regard, the concepts of image schemas, proposition schemas and event schemas (Johnson 1978; Palmer 1996; Sharifian 2011) are very useful for any analysis done from a cross-cultural perspective:

1. Image schemas are defined as those which provide structure for concepts. Image schemas add elements to the source domain which are used to reason about target domains, yet these elements are not elements of knowledge (non-propositional) but of image schemas involving space, motion, force, container, spiral among others (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 254; Gibbs, Lima, and Francozo 2004).
2. Propositional schemas are regarded as abstractions which operate as models of thought and behaviour specifying the relations found between them (Sharifian 2011: 10). These schemas map propositional structure from the source to the target domain (Lakoff 2006: 214). Examples are where, for instance, the economy is conceptualised as an organism, natural force, machine, etc. (see Zibin 2018).
3. Event schemas are viewed as abstractions from experiences of certain events which include “notions like states, changes, processes, actions, causes, purposes, and means”, which “are characterized cognitively via metaphor in terms of space, motion, and force” (Lakoff 2006: 214). Examples of the event structure difficulties are impediments to motion e.g. “we ran into a brick wall, he's carrying quite a load, and he's between a rock and a hard place” (Lakoff 2006: 204-205). These types of metaphors are discussed in relation to the conceptual metaphors found in the current study.

The next section provides an overview of near universal metaphors and culture-specific ones.

2.1.1 Near universal and culture-specific metaphors

Due to the extreme diversity of metaphorical expressions in different languages even those used to describe the same notions or ideas, determining whether these metaphorical expressions are universal, that is they

appear in each and every language, is almost impossible to do. This is because there are around 4000-6000 languages spoken globally (Kövecses 2010). However, if we look at the conceptual metaphors, rather than the linguistic expressions, we start to observe that several conceptual metaphors occur in a wide range of languages. In an attempt to investigate the issue of the (near) universality of metaphor, Kövecses (2002: 163) chose some conceptual metaphors in English and checked whether they exist in other unrelated languages. He discovered that the conceptual metaphor **THE ANGRY PERSON IS A PRESSURED CONTAINER** makes an appearance in English, Japanese, Chinese, Hungarian, Wolof, Zulu, Polish and Tahitian to different degrees. The claim was based on evidence from a number of linguists who are native speakers of those unrelated languages (Kövecses 2002: 177). In another study, Sweetser (1990) noted that many European languages have the conceptual metaphors **KNOWING IS SEEING** and the more general **THE MIND AS BODY**; hence, these metaphors can be regarded as (near-)universal metaphors. Examining these studies and many others (e.g. Emanatian 1995; Yu 1995; Boers 2003; Deignan 2003; Zibin and Hamdan 2019 among others) demonstrates that many conceptual metaphors can be considered near-universal or potentially universal. One may ask here: how did this happen? One answer could be that languages could have borrowed metaphors from other languages. Another answer could be many of these metaphors are based on a universal bodily experience (Kövecses 2010).

On the other hand, not all metaphors are based on bodily experience. As mentioned previously, some metaphors have a socio-cultural basis and others are related to different kinds of experience specific to certain cultures (cf. Yu 2017). Some social, regional, style, individual, and sub-cultural dimensions may give rise to variation in metaphorical conceptualization across cultures and even within cultures (Kövecses, 2010: 209). Specifically, this variation can be of different types: (1) generic-level metaphor and specific-level ones; (2) when a culture uses different source domains to conceptualise a certain target domain; (3) when a culture uses a certain source domain to conceptualize different target domains; (4) when two cultures share a set of conceptual metaphors yet one of them has a preference for only some of them; and (5) when some conceptual metaphors seem to be unique to a particular language/culture (Kövecses 2010: 207). Many studies have provided evidence of cultural variation in conceptual metaphors. For example, it is common for men in English speaking countries and other countries as well to use expressions such as *bunny*, *kitten*, *bird*, *chick*, *cookie*, *dish*, *sweetie pie*, etc. to describe women (Kövecses 2010: 209-210). These metaphorical expressions assume certain conceptual metaphors: **WOMEN ARE (SMALL) FURRY ANIMALS** (*bunny*, *kitten*), **WOMEN ARE BIRDS** (*bird*, *chick*, *hen-party*), and **WOMEN ARE SWEET FOOD** (*cookie*, *dish*, *sweetie pie*). However, when women talk about men, they do not usually use these metaphors to describe them. **LARGE FURRY ANIMALS** such as bears or tigers could be used to talk about men instead (Kövecses 2010: 209-210). In a nutshell, it may be argued that not all conceptual metaphors are near universal, rather some of them are culturally specific (Kövecses 2010).

Having discussed the theoretical framework of the current study, the next section reviews some papers on metaphor in media.

2.2 Metaphor in media

Several researchers within the cognitive linguistic framework (Lakoff and Johnson 2003) have explained that metaphors are not just a poetic ornament of the language or a mere series of rhetorical forms. On the contrary, they are indispensable cognitive devices of human communication and culture. These figurative devices are essential for understanding the world around us, and thus, have a fundamental role in media (Scolari 2012). Metaphors are rather crucial for providing meaning to new phenomena which are otherwise very difficult to interpret. Metaphors enable the production of categories and the organisation of processes. Thus, they are widely used in the media around the globe to provide descriptions of various phenomena, e.g. **CONSUMERS' ECONOMIC PERCEPTIONS** (Williams 2013), **SOCIAL CONFLICT** (Antonova 2014), **NUCLEAR POWER** (Renzi, Cotton, Napolitano, and Barkemeyer 2017), **AUSTERITY** (da Silva, Cuenca, and Romano 2017), and **SYRIAN REFUGEES** (Zibin in press) among others.

In a recent study, Renzi et al. (2017) examine the role metaphors play in the domain of policy. Specifically, they analyse how metaphors conceptualise NUCLEAR POWER focusing on language, social discourse and public choice. The data was collected from famous broadsheet and tabloid papers between April 2009 and March 2013, employing electronic bibliographic tools in order to extract the metaphors. A Type Hierarchy Analysis was used to explore the elements of the target domain, namely, energy technologies and policies, and their origin from various source domains. Data analysis reveals that three domains arise out of the investigated discourse, namely: REBIRTH which stands in opposition to the DEVASTATION metaphor. The latter was identified via negative-coloured metaphors emerging from the image of bombs and those extracted from Quranic and biblical mythology, e.g. INFERNO and APOCALYPSE. The final metaphor is SICKNESS arising from metaphors of health risk such as ADDICTION and SMOKING. The researchers suggest that culture is an important factor in the use of these metaphors to conceptualise the target domain (NUCLEAR POWER), e.g. the use of Old Testament cultural imagery in nuclear policy.

In another study, da Silva et al. (2017) examine and analyse the metaphors used to conceptualise AUSTERITY in three European cultures via exploring the metaphorical expressions used in Spanish, Irish and Portuguese press between 2011 and 2012. The study focused on this time period as it aimed to analyse the target domain in a context of global economic crises and austerity measures. Data was collected from a corpus containing news and opinion articles taken one month after the 2011 (Ireland and Portugal) and 2012 (Spain) elections and following the new governments announcing the first austerity measures. The researchers identified metaphors through searching for three keywords extracted from the field of economy and politics: *corte-recorte-cut*, *dívida-deuda-debt*, and *austeridade-austeridad-austerity*. Data was analysed following corpus-based and discourse-based approaches to identify conceptual metaphors. The general framework of cultural linguistics was also integrated into the analysis. Data analysis reveals that even though austerity measures were quite similar in all three European countries, different cultural and socio-historical conceptualisations generate different types and frequencies of metaphors in the three cultures, e.g. in Portugal there was “a deep conservative morality of self-discipline and punishment”, in Spain the metaphors reflected a sense of outrage against austerity creditors, and in Ireland it was found that the metaphors represented the notion that the crisis and its impacts were affecting the country but not as greatly as others (da Silva et al. 2017: 364). The researchers argue that metaphor is viewed as an influential discourse and conceptual strategy to describe social, political and economic issues and to achieve ideological and emotional purposes. Metaphor also makes the political and economic debate on austerity policies more persuasive and manipulative.

Adopting a Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) Approach for data analysis, Zibin (in press) investigated the metaphors employed to depict Syrian refugees in Jordanian politico-economic discourse. The data was collected from political and economic articles published in 2012, 2015 and 2016. These articles were extracted from two daily Jordanian newspapers (*Al Rai* and *Al Ghad*) and were put together in a corpus containing approximately 7 million words. *WordSmith Tools* (Scott 2012) which enables the processing of Arabic data was used to analyse the data. Data analysis revealed that numerous source domains were employed to describe Syrian refugees: UNIT, WATER, ORGANISM, CONTAINER, OBJECT, NATURAL DISASTER, and INVASION. Zibin (in press) argued that the majority of metaphors extracted have negative connotations, especially in the years 2015 and 2016 in comparison with 2012. She also suggested that the metaphors employed reflect the internal struggle of Jordanians pertaining to whether Syrian refugees should stay or leave. This struggle emerges from deeply entrenched Arab traditions and culture, which stipulates that hosting guests is a duty on the one hand, but the economic struggle of Jordanians coping with a weak economy, is on the other.

As demonstrated above, conceptual metaphors are ubiquitous in various types of media and are employed to conceptualise various phenomena. This study is situated within this line of research aiming to analyse conceptual metaphors used in the media to describe a specific phenomenon, i.e. TOLERANCE on the basis of CMT as exists within the general framework of cultural linguistics. This study aims to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the target UAE newspapers?
2. How does the Emirati culture affect the metaphors used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the target UAE newspapers?

The following section describes the methods used in the current study.

3 Corpus and methodology

Since several linguistic theories are developed at an abstract level, empirical evidence for these theories should be examined and validated employing suitable software (Semino 2008: 199-200). The corpus of analysis was built via collecting articles containing the keyword *(?a)ttasa:muḥ* '(the) tolerance' from the public archive of three daily governmental newspapers published in the UAE, namely, *Al Bayan*, *Al Watan*, and *Al-Ittihad* from December 2019 to March 2019. These newspapers were selected based on the judgements of 10 Emiratis who indicated that they are the most popular and highly distributed newspapers in the UAE (cf. Zibin 2018). The selected period corresponds to the moment when His Highness Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al Nahyan, President of the UAE, proclaimed the year 2019 as "The Year of Tolerance" in the UAE. All the collected 450 articles containing the keyword *(?a)ttasa:muḥ* '(the) tolerance' were copied and pasted in their entirety into text documents to facilitate their analysis using *WordSmith Tools version 6* (Scott 2012). This software was chosen as it enables the processing of Arabic data (see Zibin 2018; *in press*). In total, the collected corpus contained approximately 180,000 words.²

Due to the lack of literature on the conceptualisation of TOLERANCE in the Arab world in general and in the UAE in particular, a corpus-driven pilot study was conducted to identify metaphor candidates via manually analysing a manageable set of data, i.e. 50 articles (cf. Deignan 2008). Specifically, following Charteris-Black's (2004) approach, we filtered the corpus and then we manually applied Metaphor Identification Procedure MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007) on a manageable sample extracted from the corpus to identify metaphorical expressions used to conceptualise TOLERANCE. The purpose of adopting MIP was to determine if a word may be considered as expressing metaphorical meaning in the context in which it appears (see Ansah 2014: 46). Despite the fact that a modified version of MIP called MIPVU was developed by Steen et al. (2010) aiming at identifying directly expressed metaphors such as similes, many researchers (e.g. Ansah 2014, Zibin 2018, Zibin and Hamdan 2019 among other) still adopt MIP especially if they focus on indirectly expressed metaphors. A bottom-up approach was adopted to extract the underlying conceptual metaphors from the metaphorical expressions. In this approach, linguistic expressions form the basis for generating hypotheses on cross-domain mappings (Ansah 2014, Zibin and Hamdan 2019). Then, Steen's (2007: 16) five-step procedure was followed to extract these conceptual metaphors through finding the metaphorical focus, proposition, comparison, analogy and mapping. These steps are illustrated below:

1)	<i>fafukran li-qalb</i>	<i>t-tasa:muḥ</i>	<i>li-haqn</i>	<i>l-xila:fa:t³</i>
	thank.you to-heart	the-tolerance	for-stopping	the-conflicts
‘So thank you to the heart of tolerance [The UAE] for stopping conflicts.’				

(Al Ittihad Feb, 2019)

Using MIP, we identified words and expressions that consist of metaphors via making a distinction between basic senses and other senses. In example (1), it appears that *qalb* 'heart' has a non-basic meaning, since tolerance does not literally have a heart. Such an expression is employed to depict tolerance as a living organism. In step (1) via using the word *qalb*, 'heart', establishing cross-domain mappings between two domains is achievable, namely, ORGANISM and TOLERANCE. In step (2), the metaphorical/linguistic expression is realised as a conceptual metaphor via a series of propositions. In step (3), a single proposition

² The Arabic variety used in these newspapers is Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) which is the official variety of Arabic found in the media, formal speeches, religious contexts, etc. The spoken Arabic variety in the UAE is Emirati Arabic, which shares many lexical, syntactic and morphological (e.g. compounds) aspects with MSA but differs in other aspects such as the lack of a case marking system.

³ Note that there is a metonymy in this example, namely, heart stands for emotion, which makes this example a metaphtonymy or a metaphor with a built-in metonymy (see Goossens 1990). However, such cases are not discussed here any further.

is formulated and along with the two concepts, i.e. ORGANISM and TOLERANCE, is used to generate an open comparison between two propositions: $\text{SIM } \{\exists F \exists a [F \text{ (TOLERANCE)}]_t [\text{ORGANISM (a)}]_s\}$. The meaning of this open comparison suggests that there is some similarity between the value F (TOLERANCE) or the target domain and the entity a (ORGANISM) or the source domain. In step (4), a closed comparison can be produced based on the open one and the former shapes the analogy between TOLERANCE and ORGANISM. In step (5), the analogical structure can be transformed into a mapping structure between two cognitive domains (i.e. TOLERANCE and ORGANISM) entailing all the indirect similarities between them. This enables the generation of inferences such as TOLERANCE is an organism with a heart just like other ORGANISMS have hearts, TOLERANCE as a heart emanates emotions just like hearts are connected with emotions in other ORGANISMS, etc.

After identifying metaphor candidates in the pilot study, a corpus-based approach was adopted to determine the frequency of the identified conceptual metaphors in the entire corpus (cf. Charteris-Black 2004). The following section presents the data arrived at in the current study.

4 Results

Data analysis reveals that the keyword *(?a)ttasa:muḥ* ‘(the) tolerance’ was mentioned 3,403 times in the corpus. The 11 source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the three target newspapers together with the frequency and the percentage of the metaphorical expressions per 180,000 words are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE and the frequency and parentage of the metaphorical expressions representing them in the target newspapers

No.	Source domain	Frequency per 180,000 words	Percentage per 180,000 words
	ORGANISM	320	0.18
	PLANT	248	0.14
	MESSAGE	139	0.08
	RUG	92	0.05
	SHIP	63	0.04
	OASIS	55	0.03
	TENT	42	0.02
	BRIDGE	25	0.01
	Lighthouse	19	0.01
	BUILDING	18	0.01
	ROAD	9	0.005
Total		1030	0.6%

Table 1 demonstrates the most frequent source domain used to conceptualise TOLERANCE was ORGANISM followed by PLANT, MESSAGE, RUG, SHIP, OASIS, TENT, BRIDGE, Lighthouse, BUILDING and finally ROAD. The total number of metaphorical expressions found in the corpus was 1030 which constitutes 0.6% of the size of the whole corpus. Table 1 provides an answer to the first research question which is concerned with the source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the target UAE newspapers. Some illustrative examples of each source domain are provided below. These examples represent the main keywords used to conceptualise TOLERANCE found under each source domain.

TOLERANCE IS AN ORGANISM

2)

?inna l-?ima:ra:t yaḥris ʔala: ʔibra:z ru:ḥ t-tasa:muḥ
 that the-emirates insists on emphasising soul the-tolerance
 'The UAE intends to emphasise the soul of tolerance'.

(Al Ittihad Mar, 2019)

3)

fafukran li-qalb t-tasa:muḥ li-ḥaqn l-xila:fa:t
 thank.you to-heart the-tolerance for-stopping the-conflicts
 'So thank you to the heart of tolerance [The UAE] for stopping conflicts.'

(Al Ittihad Feb, 2019)

4)

qalb dawri:-na: yanbid bi-t-tasa:muḥ
 heart league-ours pulses with-the-tolerance
 'The heart of our league pulses with tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A PLANT

5)

fayars t-tasa:muḥ fi:-him badalan ʕan l-ʕunf
 planting the-tolerance in-them instead of the-violence
fala: fakka ʔanna-hum sayaku:n-u:n buna:ta mustaqbal muṣriq
 no doubt that-they will.be-they builders future bright
 'Planting the values of tolerance instead of violence will ensure that they [youth] will build a bright future.'

(Al Bayan Mar, 2019)

6)

l-?ima:ra:t tamnah ɬuyu:fa-ha: buðu:r t-tasa:muḥ
 the-emirates gives guests-her seeds the-tolerance
 'The UAE gives its guests the seeds of tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

7)

wa namat yarsat t-tasa:muḥ li-tusbiḥ
 and grew seedling the-tolerance to-become
watānan yaḥtadin ɬakbār min 200 dzinsiyya
 country embrace more than 200 nationality
 'The seedling of tolerance grew to become a country that hosts more than 200 nationalities'

(Al Bayan Feb 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A MESSAGE

8)

?inna-ha: risa:lat t-tasa:muḥ min l-?ima:ra:t
 it-is message the-tolerance from the-emirates
 li-l-?insa:niyya dʒamʕa:?
 to-the-humanity all

'It is the message of tolerance from the UAE to all humanity.'

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A RUG

9)

?aḥa:b l-himam ʕala bisa:t t-tasa:muḥ
 people the-determination on rug the-tolerance
 'People of determination [disabled] meet on the rug of tolerance.'

(Al Ittihad Mar, 2019)

10)

l-?ima:ra:t multaqa: ʔatfa:l l-ʕa:lam ʕala bisa:t
 The-emirates forum children the-world on rug
 t-tasa:muḥ
 the-tolerance

'The UAE is the forum for all children around the world to meet on the rug of tolerance'.

(Al Ittihad Mar, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A SHIP

11)

l-?ima:ra:t sabbaqa fi: ʔisrsa:? t-tasa:muḥ
 the-emirates pioneer in anchoring the-tolerance
 'The UAE is a pioneer in anchoring [as in ship] tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Mar, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS AN OASIS

12)

wa ʕazzaza t-tawa:sul l-maftu:ḥ li-l-?afka:r
 and enhanced the-communication the-open of-the-ideas
 wa:ḥat t-tasa:muḥ
 oasis the-tolerance

'Open communication of ideas enhanced the oasis of tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A ROAD

13)

wa min l-ʕawa:piq fi: tari:q t-tasa:muḥ s-sira:ʕa:t
 and from the-obstacles in road the-tolerance the-conflicts
l-fikriyya

the-ideological

'And ideological conflicts are obstacles on the road of tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Jan, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A BRIDGE

14)

l-ʔima:ra:t dawlah maddat dzusu:r t-tasa:muḥ
 the-emirates country expanded bridges the-tolerance

'The UAE is a country that expanded the bridges of tolerance.'

(Al Watan Mar, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A LIGHTHOUSE

15)

ziya:rat qada:sat l-ba:ba fransis ʔila abu: ɬabi:
 visit holiness the-pope Francis to Abu Dhabi
muṣtabiran ʔanaha: mana:rat t-tasa:muḥ
 considering that lighthouse the-tolerance

'His holiness the pope Francis considered Abu Dhabi the lighthouse of tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A BUILDING

16)

ma: yushim fi: tarsi:x qawa:ʃid t-tasa:muḥ
 what contributes in strengthening foundations the-tolerance

'This contributes to strengthening the foundations of tolerance.'

(Al Bayan Jan, 2019)

17)

taʕzi:z l-ʔamn wa s-silm l-ʕa:lamiyayn
 strengthen the-security and the-peace the-global
min bawwa:bat t-tasa:muḥ
 from gate the-tolerance

'...Aiming to strengthen global security and peace from the gate of tolerance [the UAE].'

(Al Bayan Jan, 2019)

18)

l-qawa:ni:n min na:fiðat t-tasa:muḥ¹
 the-legislations from window the-tolerance

'Looking at legislations from the window of tolerance.'

(Al Ittihad Mar, 2019)

TOLERANCE IS A TENT

19)

<i>xaymat</i>	<i>t-tasa:muḥ</i>	<i>tudżassid</i>	<i>sima:t</i>	<i>l-mudžtamaḥ</i>
tent	the-tolerance	incarnates	characteristics	the-community

l-ʔima:ra:ti:

the-emirati

‘The tent of tolerance incarnates the characteristics of the Emirati community.’

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

With regard to the types of the metaphors found in UAE press, the majority of conceptual metaphors found are propositional conceptual structures as they map propositional content from the source domains to the target domain, i.e. TOLERANCE. These are ORGANISM, PLANT, MESSAGE, RUG, SHIP, OASIS, TENT, LIGHTHOUSE, and BUILDING. For example, in the source domain PLANT, mappings between the two conceptual domains include: seeds of plants are mapped into the values of tolerance, the farmer is mapped into the inspirer of tolerance, planting a seed in the ground is mapped into inspiring tolerance in individuals, etc. By contrast, the metaphors TOLERANCE IS A BRIDGE and TOLERANCE IS A ROAD can be classified as event structures which are based on the image schema PATH. Mappings in these metaphors include *means (bridges, roads) are paths to destinations, purposes are destinations (achieving tolerance), and difficulties are impediments to motion* (see example 13). The image schema PATH that has a beginning and an end gives rise to the event structures that involve movement along a path heading towards a destination, which is in this context the achievement of tolerance (see Lakoff 2006: 204-205).

Having presented the metaphorical expressions that reflect the main source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in the UAE context, the next section discusses the ways in which Emirati culture shapes these metaphors.

5 Discussion

Data analysis has shown that TOLERANCE is conceptualised using various source domains in the UAE context, yet one may observe that the conceptual metaphors employed reflect certain aspects of Emirati culture, e.g. RUG, OASIS, TENT among others (cf. Renzi et al. 2017). Relying on the theoretical framework presented in section 2.1, here we discuss how cultural cognition materialises in the conceptualisation of TOLERANCE in the UAE context. To take an example elicited from the data collected in the current study, i.e. TOLERANCE IS A TENT, the target domain is TOLERANCE and the source domain is the conceptual frame of AN EMIRATI TENT. It has been argued that if a conceptual METAPHOR is shared by the individuals inside a culture group, then it is part of cultural conceptualization (Sharifian 2008, 2017; Yu 2017). At the linguistic level, linguistic metaphors represent underlying conceptual metaphors. In its own right, language is a mirror and conveyer of culture. Since language and culture are intertwined, the way conceptual metaphors are reflected in a certain language is greatly related to the culture with which the language is coupled (cf. Yu 2017). A linguistic metaphor which reflects the conceptual metaphor TOLERANCE IS A TENT is presented in (19) which is reproduced in (20) for the reader’s convenience:

20)

<i>xaymat</i>	<i>t-tasa:muḥ</i>	<i>tudżassid</i>	<i>sima:t</i>	<i>l-mudžtamaḥ</i>
tent	the-tolerance	incarnates	characteristics	the-community

l-ʔima:ra:ti:

the-emirati

‘The tent of tolerance incarnates the characteristics of the Emirati community.’

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

This conceptual frame of AN EMIRATI TENT is part of the cultural knowledge of members of the Emirati people. Going back to the origins of Emirati people, one can understand the use of this conceptual frame to perceive TOLERANCE in the UAE. The Bedouin people who originally resided in the UAE were mainly nomadic camel herders. They used camels for meat, milk, and transport. However, they were also fishermen who specialised in pearl diving. These Bedouins were very dynamic and worked in many trades which made them influential in contributing to the growth of industry and culture in the early days of the UAE. For example, the wooden dhow boats, which are now regarded as an artefact of the Emirati tradition, originated from the Bedouin people who constructed them for fishing and pearl diving off the coasts of Dubai and the other emirates. This early culture may also account for the use of the source domains SHIP, LIGHTHOUSE, and OASIS to conceptualise TOLERANCE, e.g. these Bedouins navigated the desert looking for oases to drink from. Despite the growing modernity of the UAE, Arish which is the traditional Bedouin housing in which goat's hair rugs are put inside is still surviving in the UAE. In fact, it is regarded as an integral part of the Emirati culture. Nowadays, in spite of the increasing number of skyscrapers, villas, palaces, and bridges (see HOUSE and BRIDGE in Table 1), the majority of Bedouin tribes have kept their traditional culture and heritage alive, including their tents. In fact, tourists and foreigners looking to live a true Emirati experience usually go on safaris and stay in tents in the middle of the desert. Thus, it can be argued that this conceptual metaphor being characteristic of Emirati culture can be used to conceptualise TOLERANCE. Specifically, the conceptual framework of AN EMIRATI TENT includes three aspects PEOPLE, VENUE and TRADITION. The aspect of PEOPLE includes the role of Arab people in general and Emirati in particular in being welcoming to their guests no matter who they are and where they come from. The aspect of venue i.e. AN EMIRATI TENT is in fact used to represent the original Bedouin houses in the Arabian Peninsula, which are simple, generous and welcoming. The aspect of TRADITION involves, for instance, putting a rug in their houses to greet their guests (cf. TOLERANCE IS A RUG). Here, the guests would have to take their shoes off and thus would feel more at home. This conceptual metaphor is exceptionally rich signalling hospitality, humility and tolerance given the fact that Bedouins relied and still rely on each other's kindness to survive the harsh climate of their country, particularly during travels. Hence, based on the above, it can be argued that the conceptual frame AN EMIRATI TENT is grounded in Emirati culture and as such is used to perceive concepts such as TOLERANCE. To use Kövecses's (2010) terms, it seems that this conceptual metaphor is unique to Emirati culture. Other studies could be conducted to confirm this conclusion.

Other conceptual frames include TOLERANCE IS A PLANT. Here, one may argue that planting is hardly culture specific since many cultures employ the source domain PLANT to conceptualise various notions, e.g. complex abstract systems such as BUSINESS (see Deignan 2005). However, data analysis has shown that conceiving of TOLERANCE as a plant in the UAE context was indeed culture specific since the type of plant chosen is *Prosopis (Al Ghaf)*. This tree is one of the most drought-tolerant wild trees growing in the UAE. Al Ghaf trees have a special place in the UAE heritage (Alkhaleej 2017). This was manifested by the great interest of the late Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan in this tree when he issued directives to prevent its cutting in all emirates (Alkhaleej 2017). So now the number of Al Ghaf trees is more than six million in Abu Dhabi. Al Ghaf played an influential role in the lives of Bedouins because it is the main source of food for wild animals that used to take refuge under its shades in the heat of the summer. The Supreme National Committee for the Year of Tolerance, chaired by His Highness Sheikh Abdullah bin Zayed Al Nahyan, affirmed that the selection of the Ghaf tree to be a major component of the slogan of the Year of Tolerance was because of its great significance as one of the original national trees in the country (Alkhaleej 2017). It is regarded as a symbol of steadfastness and coexistence in the desert (Al Bayan Feb, 2019). Thus, it can be seen that Al Ghaf tree has a great cultural value in the UAE and this was reflected in the linguistic manifestations of the source domain PLANT:

21)

<i>l-ya:f</i>	<i>Jadzarat-una</i>	<i>l-<u>asliyyah</u></i>	<i>nattaxið-uha:</i>
the-Ghaf	tree-ours	the-original	take.it-hers
<i>fiṣa:ran</i>	<i>li-nastaðil</i>	<i>bi-ðill</i>	<i>t-tasa:muḥ</i>

slogan to-shade with-shade the-tolerance

‘We [Sheikh Muhammad Bin Rashid] consider Al Ghaf our national tree to take refuge under the shade of tolerance.’

(Al Bayan Feb, 2019)

As discussed previously in section 2.1, conceptual metaphor is grounded in experiential basis, which emerges from the interaction between bodily and cultural experience. Data analysis shows that the most frequent source domain is ORGANISM whereby body parts and bodily experience are employed to conceptualise abstract concepts, character traits, and cultural values among others. Mapping elements from the source domain ORGANISM is in fact expected since many studies (e.g. Kövecses 2003; Maalej 2004, 2007; Crawford 2009; Ansah 2014; Zibin and Hamdan 2019) have shown that people understand different abstract concepts via this source domain where it is referred to as ‘embodied cognition’. The latter is defined as “the idea that the properties of certain categories are a consequence of the nature of the human biological capacities and of the experience of functioning in a physical and social environment” (Lakoff 1987: 12). Yet, in cultural linguistics, it is argued that various types of bodily experience could be found but only some of them can pass through the cultural filter and participate in metaphor mappings (Yu 2008; 2017). In this study, conceptual mappings from the source domain ORGANISM involved *ruh* ‘soul’, *qalb* ‘heart’, and *damm na:bid* ‘pulsing blood’. These elements extracted from the source domain ORGANISM are grounded in Arab culture in general and Emirati culture in particular to conceptualise emotions such as FEAR [*qalb* ‘heart’] (cf. Zibin and Hamdan 2019) and character traits such as SENSE OF HUMOUR [*dam* ‘blood’] (cf. Zibin and Altakhaineh 2018). No wonder that these elements are also employed in the UAE context to conceptualise cultural values such as TOLERANCE. This reinforces the notion that embodied cognition is indeed influenced and shaped by the culture in which the conceptual metaphor is used. In sum, the discussion demonstrates that the Emirati culture indeed plays an essential role in conceptualising TOLERANCE in the UAE context.

At the linguistic level, it should be noted that the majority of the metaphorical expressions are conveyed via compounds which are defined as:

A complex word that consists of at least two adjacent elements, where the non-head is normally non-referential. Each of these elements is either a word, combining form, or a phrase, so that the whole compound is a combination of these elements.

(Altakhaineh 2016b: 81)

In Arabic, compounds take the form of a *Synthetic Genitive Construction* (SGC) which consists of two elements: the first or the left is the head of the compound, usually indefinite, while the second or the right is the non-head, usually definite (Altakhaineh 2016a), e.g. *qalb t-tasa:muḥ* ‘lit. heart the tolerance [heart of tolerance]’. It can be observed that the metaphor emerges from the head or the left element of the compound, e.g. *bisa:t ttasa:muḥ* ‘rug of tolerance’, *ru:h ttasa:muḥ* ‘soul of tolerance’, *buðu:r t-tasa:muḥ* ‘seeds of tolerance’, etc. and modifies the non-head *ttasa:muḥ* ‘the tolerance’ (cf. Zibin and Altakhaineh 2018). These compounds reflect the conceptual metaphors extracted from Emirati culture and as such they form a part of the linguistic experience inherited by speakers of Emirati Arabic as part of their cultural and cognitive heritage.

6 Conclusion and recommendations

In this study, we set out to explore the metaphors used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in three daily newspapers in the UAE after proclaiming 2019 as 'The Year of Tolerance'. Data analysis revealed that TOLERANCE is conceptualised in the UAE context via various source domains influenced by Emirati culture. These source domains employed to conceptualise TOLERANCE included: ORGANISM, PLANT, MESSAGE, RUG, SHIP, OASIS, TENT, BRIDGE, LIGHTHOUSE, BUILDING and finally ROAD. It was argued that the early culture of Emirati Bedouins who navigated the desert, drank from its oases, lived in tents, slept on rugs, and used boats for fishing and pearl diving, gave rise to the source domains used to conceptualise TOLERANCE in UAE press. Adopting the theoretical framework of Cultural Linguistics together with Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), the role of culture in influencing and shaping the conceptual metaphors of TOLERANCE was examined. It was shown that there are three types of experience involved in this analysis: bodily experience, cultural experience and linguistic experience. The former two represent the experiential basis that gives rise to conceptual metaphors generated from human cognition as embodied in a particular sociocultural context. The third element, i.e. linguistic experience, reflects the underlying conceptual metaphors used in daily interaction as part of the cognitive and cultural heritage of the Emirati community. In this way, linguistic experience supports underlying conceptual metaphors. Being inherited by the speakers of Emirati Arabic as their cognitive and cultural heritage, this linguistic experience yields conceptual metaphors in the minds of new generations. Based on this analysis, it is recommended that more studies need to be conducted to study the effect of culture on the conceptualisation of other cultural values to obtain a better understanding of how human embodied cognition is shaped by culture. Finally, this type of analysis can help to push critical metaphor analysis forward as it reveals the relations between detailed textual linguistic analyses and different levels of socio-political and cultural contexts.

References

- [1] Al Bayan. 2019. Sheikh Muhammad Bin Rashid: We consider Al Ghaf as our national tree to take refuge under the shade of tolerance. Retrieved from <https://www.albayan.ae/across-the-uae/news-and-reports/2019-02-08-1.3481925> on 15th April 2019.
- [2] Al Ittihad. 2019. Retrieved from <https://www.alittihad.ae/> on 16th December 2019.
- [3] Al Watan. 2019. Retrieved from <http://alwatannewspaper.ae/> on 20th December 2019.
- [4] Alkhaleej. 2017. Al Ghaf Tree: A national heritage with unique place in the UAE. Retrieved from <http://www.alkhaleej.ae/alkhaleej/page/38f7a5bf-ef88-4123-9b87-6baa15584e38> on 20th April 2019.
- [5] Altakhineh, Abdel Rahman M. 2016a. Headedness in Arabic compounds within the synthetic genitive construction. *SAGE Open* 6 (4). 1-16.
- [6] Altakhineh, Abdel Rahman M. 2016b. What is a compound? The main criteria for compoundhood. *ExELL* 4 (1). 58-86.
- [7] Ansah, Gladys Nyarko 2014. Culture in embodied cognition: Metaphorical/metonymic conceptualizations of fear in Akan and English. *Metaphor and Symbol* 29 (1). 44-58.
- [8] Antonova, Tatiana G. 2014. Social conflict through conceptual metaphor in media discourse. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 154. 368-373.
- [9] Bernárdez, Enrique. 2008. Collective cognition and individual activity: Variation, language and culture. In Frank, Roslyn M., René Dirven, Tom Ziemke, and Enrique Bernárdez (eds.), *Body, Language, and Mind. Vol. 2. Sociocultural Situatedness*, 137-166. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [10] Boers, Frank. 2003. Applied linguistics perspectives on cross cultural variation in conceptual metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 18. 231-238.
- [11] Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [12] Crawford, L. Elizabeth. (2009). Conceptual metaphors of affect. *Emotion Review* 1 (2). 129-139.
- [13] da Silva, Augusto Soares, Maria Josep Cuenca, and Manuela Romano. 2017. The conceptualisation of austerity in the Portuguese, Spanish and Irish Press. In Sharifian, Farzad (ed.), *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*, 345-368. London: Springer.
- [14] Deignan, Alice. 2003. Metaphorical expressions and culture: An indirect link. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 18. 255-271.

[15] Deignan, Alice. 2005. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

[16] Deignan, Alice. 2008. Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In Gibbs Raymond W. (ed.), *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, 280-294. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[17] Emanatian, Michele. 1995. Metaphor and the expression of emotion: The value of cross-cultural perspectives. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10. 163-182.

[18] Frank, Roslyn M. 2015. Cultural linguistics and the future agenda for research on language and culture. In Sharifian, Farzad (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*. 493-512. London: Routledge.

[19] Goossens, Louis. 1990. Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1 (3). 323-442.

[20] Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[21] Kövecses, Zoltán. 2003. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor and Culture. Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 2(2), 197-220.

[23] Lakoff, George. 2006. Conceptual metaphor: The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Geeraerts, Dirk (ed.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, 185-283. Berlin: De Gruyter.

[24] Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[25] Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

[26] Langacker, Ronald W. 2014. Culture and cognition, lexicon and grammar. In Yamaguchi, Masataka, Dennis Tay, and Benjamin Blount, (eds.), *Approaches to Language, Culture and Cognition: The Intersection of Cognitive Linguistics and Linguistic Anthropology*, 27-49. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

[27] Maalej, Zouhair. 2004. Figurative language in anger expression in Tunis-Arabic: An extended view of embodiment. *Metaphor and Symbol* 19 (1). 51-75.

[28] Maalej, Zouhair. 2007. The embodiment of fear expressions in Tunisian Arabic. In Sharifian, Farzad, and Gary B. Palmer, (eds.), *Applied Cultural Linguistics: Implications for Second Language Learning and Intercultural Communication*, 87-104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[29] Maalej, Zouhair. 2008. The heart and cultural embodiment in Tunisian Arabic. Culture, body and language. In Sharifian, Farzad, René Dirven, Ning Yu, and Susanne Niemeier (eds.), *Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, 395-428. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

[30] Maalej, Zouhair. 2014. Body parts we live by in language and culture: The raaS 'head' and yidd 'hand' in Tunisian Arabic. In Brenzinger, Matthias, and Iwona Kraska-Szlenk (eds.), *The Body in Language: Comparative Studies of Linguistic Embodiment*, 224-259. Boston: Brill.

[31] Maalej, Zouhair A., and Ning Yu (eds.). 2011. *Embodiment via Body Parts: Studies from Various Languages and Cultures* (Vol. 31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

[32] Musolff, Andreas. 2017. Metaphor in cultural cognition. In Sharifian, Farzad (ed.), *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*, 325-344. London: Springer.

[33] Palmer, Gary B. 1996. *Towards a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas.

[34] Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1). 1-39.

[35] Renzi, Barbara Gabriella, Matthew Cotton, Giulio Napolitano, and Ralf Barkemeyer. 2017. Rebirth, devastation and sickness: Analyzing the role of metaphor in media discourses of nuclear power. *Environmental Communication* 11 (5). 624-640.

[36] Scolari, Carlos A. 2012. Media ecology: Exploring the metaphor to expand the theory. *Communication Theory* 22 (2). 204-225.

[37] Scott, Mike. 2012. *WordSmith Tools Version 6*. Stroud: Lexical Analysis Software.

[38] Semino, Elena. 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[39] Sharifian, Farzad. 2007. L1 cultural conceptualisations in L2 learning: The case of Persian-speaking learners of English. In Sharifian Farzad and Palmer Gary B. (ed.), *Applied Cultural Linguistics: Implications for Second Language Learning and Intercultural Communication, Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research*, 33-51. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[40] Sharifian, Farzad. 2008. Distributed, emergent cultural cognition, conceptualisation, and language. In Frank, Roslyn M., René Dirven, Tom Ziemke, and Enrique Bernárdez (eds.), *Body, Language, and Mind (vol. 2): Sociocultural Situatedness*, 109-136. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

[41] Sharifian, Farzad. 2011. *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[42] Sharifian, Farzad. 2015. Cultural linguistics. In Sharifian Farzad (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*, 473-493. New York: Routledge.

[43] Sharifian, Farzad. 2017. *Cultural Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[44] Steen, Gerard. 2007. Finding metaphor in discourse: Pragglejaz and beyond. *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación/Culture, Language and Representation* 5. 9-25.

- [45] Steen, Gerard, Aletta Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and Trijntje Pasma. 2010. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [46] Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [47] Williams, Ann E. (2013). Metaphor, media, and the market. *International Journal of Communication* 7. 1404-1417.
- [48] Yu, Ning. 1995. Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10. 59-92.
- [49] Yu, Ning. (2017). life as opera: A cultural metaphor in Chinese. In Sharifian, Farzad (ed.), *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*, 65-87. London: Springer.
- [50] Yu, Ning and Dingding Jia. (2016). Metaphor in culture: life is a show in Chinese. *Cognitive Linguistics* 27 (2). 146-179.
- [51] Zibin, Aseel. (2018). The effect of the Arab Spring on the use of metaphor and metonymy in Jordanian economic discourse: A cognitive approach. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 16 (1). 254-298.
- [52] Zibin, Aseel. (in press). A corpus-based study of metaphors used to describe Syrian refugees in Jordanian politico-economic discourse: A critical metaphor analysis approach. *Pragmatics and Society*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [53] Zibin, Aseel and Abdel Rahman M. S. Altakhineh. 2018. An analysis of Arabic metaphorical and/or metonymical compounds: A cognitive linguistic approach. *Metaphor and the Social World* 8 (1). 100-133.
- [54] Zibin, Aseel and Jihad Hamdan. 2019. The conceptualisation of FEAR through conceptual metonymy and metaphor in Jordanian Arabic. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 19 (2). 239-262.