

Research paper
Year (Vol.), ...-, Season, 2025

A Cognitive Study of Sorrow Metaphors in Arabic and English Languages: A Comparative Study

Elham Sobati¹ | Nuha Mahmood Raheem Dawood² | Tahereh Afshar³

- ¹ Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran. (Corresponding Author) E-mail: e.sobati@ilam.ac.ir
- ² Nuha Mahmood Raheem Dawood, M.A. Candidate, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran Email: mahmoodnuha1@gmail.com
- ³ Tahereh Afshar, Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran Email: t.afshar@ilam.ac.ir

Article Info

Article type:
Research article

Article history:

Received:
Accepted:

Keywords:

conceptual metaphor,
sorrow,
Arabic,
English,
comparative study,
Lakoff and Johnson

ABSTRACT

Metaphorical expressions, especially emotional metaphors, are widely used in daily language. This study aimed to show how “sorrow,” an emotional concept, is metaphorised in Arabic compared to English from the cognitive perspective theories of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kovecses (2000; 2002). To accomplish this goal, similarities and differences between the two languages in using metaphorical expressions when conceptualizing sorrow were drawn. 80 common sorrow phrases were collected in the Arabic language. Then, these expressions were categorized based on their metaphorical mapping to compare them with English expressions. The findings of this study showed that both languages (Arabic and English) had several basic levels in conceptualizing feelings of sorrow based on common bodily experiences. However, a cultural gap between Arabic and English leads to differences in some of the metaphorical expressions. Some of these cultural-specific differences could be the result of some cultural properties of each culture like climate, customs, natural elements, and lifestyle.

Cite this article: Sobati, E., Mahmood Raheem Dawood, N., Afshar, T. (2025). “A Cognitive Study of Sorrow Metaphors in Arabic and English Languages: A Comparative Study”. *Journal of Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, Year (Vol.), ...-.....



The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Kurdistan.

DOI: [10.22034/jls.2025.143454.1235](https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2025.143454.1235)

1. Introduction

The idea of metaphor goes back to ancient. Aristotle made the first attempt to give a scientific account of metaphor. He refers to metaphorical language as only 'decorative and ornamental' that does not add any extra information to the discourse (Gibbs, 1994:74). Linguists have found proof that convinced them that metaphor is present in language and thought; hence, it may be central to human cognition. Such observation has led to evidence that could not be accounted for in the traditional theories. Thereby, the need to create a new theory that would satisfy and explain the issue became necessary (Gibbs, 2003).

Metaphor is a kind of figurative language, and it refers to phrases or expressions in which the intended meaning is independent of the surface meaning of the sentence, and this meaning, typically, is not directly derived from the literal meaning of the relevant elements. In other words, metaphor is a figure of speech in which a term is transferred from the object it ordinarily designates to an object it may only be by implicit comparison or analogy (Morris, 1975).

Lakoff (1993) defines metaphor by resorting to the term cross-domain mapping. By this term, he means figurative language, including metaphor, is seen as a cognitive device that allows us to make analogies between different conceptual domains of experience (like emotions or states) or within the same one. He states "the word metaphor has come to mean in the conceptual system, then the term metaphorical expression can be used to refer to a linguistic expression (a word, phrase, or sentence) that is the surface realization of such a cross-domain mapping" (Lakoff, 1993). Accordingly, metaphor is defined as a cross-domain mapping from a source (or giver) domain of experience onto a target (or recipient) domain. In simple words, the latter (the target domain) is, to some degree, understood in terms of the former (the source domain) (Koller and et al., 2008).

The models of conceptualization represented in figurative language are inspired by embodied experience, and the study of emotion metaphors in different languages have shown extensive similarity in such metaphors cross culturally (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, 1999; Yu 1996; Kövecses 2005). Though, we can also anticipate a large degree of variation in the models of organization and use of metaphor across different languages and individuals (Lakoff 1987:336, Kövecses 2008).

This study is grounded in the conceptual metaphor theory as established by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2000, 2002). Employing a descriptive-analytical approach, the research utilizes qualitative content analysis focusing on literary metaphors, thus precluding quantitative description of the data set. Data analysis involved a detailed examination of Arabic expressions in isolation, guided by the principles of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Initially, expressions were categorized into broad source domains such as FIRE, UP, LIGHT, ANIMAL, and PLANT. Subsequently, specific source and target domains were identified within each category through metonymic representations that characterize the underlying metaphors.

In this study, the metaphors associated with the English term "sorrow" and the Arabic term "حزن" (hazen) were examined to show the universality and/or disparities in metaphorical concepts of

“sorrow” in Arabic and English. To find out the universality and disparities, we should answer these questions: How do metaphors used to conceptualize sorrow differ in Arabic and English? Additionally, to what extent do the conceptual metaphors employed in both languages exhibit similarities? Furthermore, are there any metaphorical representations of sorrow in Arabic that can be regarded as specific to the culture?

2. A brief note of previous works

Several recent studies have been done to examine different manifestations of metaphorical language and its existence in everyday discourse. As well, many studies have been conducted on the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions in English (Lakoff, 1987; Kövecses, 1991, 2000, 2008, 2005; Lakoff and Kövecses, 1983; Yu, 1995; Bao, 2003; Fabiszak, 2000). A crucial claim of such studies is that human emotions that are naturally abstract will be understood and expressed through the metaphorical terms.

Nevertheless, many other studies have looked for intercultural linguistic varieties of metaphor, and perhaps focused on different domains, for instance: in Japanese (Matsuki, 1995, Hiraga, 1991); in Persian (Kalantari Khandani, & et al., 2021; Sobati, 2022 & 2024; Saghafi and et al., 2022; Talei, & et al., 2024; Aliakbari & Mohammadi, 2024; Asadi & Khodabakhsh, 2025; Sadri & Mokhtari, 2025); in Chinese (Bao, 2003) in Spanish (Barcelona & Soriano, 2004).

In Arabic, Ahmad Khair Allah Al Sharif (2007) aimed to present a comparative analysis for metaphorical expressions of happiness and anger used in English and Arabic. So its main purpose was to seek the similarities and differences between the two languages in respect to the use of metaphorical expressions when conceptualizing the two emotions. For this reason, the researcher collected 345 expressions from the two languages, English and Arabic, which were conventionally used for describing the emotions of happiness and anger. Then, the researchers regrouped these expressions and classified them according to their metaphorical mappings, where they were compared to the English expressions following the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. The comparison of the expressions and metaphorical mappings between the two languages showed that they shared several basic level metaphors in conceptualizing the emotions of happiness and anger. Although the two cultures were very different and there was a cultural gap between them, there was a kind of common ground between the two cultures when describing the emotional states like happiness and anger. As this researcher recommended that this area of study stills needs more extensive research by Arab researchers who are involved in the researches in cognitive linguistics and psycholinguistics. Since Arabic involves a great number of metaphorical exploitations which have to be investigated from different perspectives, not only literary and rhetoric ones. The current study based on its own data find different emotional metaphors of sorrow compared to the Al Sharif (2007). Because, Al Sharif (2007) just draw the Arabic expressions which were only written in Standard Arabic (SA) for happiness and anger, and they excluded any colloquial expressions, but in this study, we consider the presence of sorrow metaphors in colloquial expressions, too.

In the realm of cross-cultural investigations into emotional metaphors, it becomes evident that numerous comparative studies have been undertaken to explore the similarities and differences between various languages and English. Regrettably, Arabic has largely been overlooked in this area of research. While early Arab scholars devoted significant attention to metaphor from a rhetorical standpoint, there exists a crucial necessity to examine Arabic emotional metaphors through a cognitive lens. Therefore, this study seeks to position Arabic as a focal point for comparative analysis, aiming to align its metaphorical framework with that of English, particularly in the conceptualization of the emotion of sorrow. We want to understand to what extent this variety of metaphor can be applied to Arabic.

3. Theoretical framework

The framework of this research is grounded in the conceptual metaphor theory proposed by Lakoff and Johnson in 1980. This theory posits that one conceptual domain is understood through the lens of another, whereby the characteristics of the source domain inform the destination domain, resulting in what is termed a conceptual metaphor. According to Kövecses (2000: 4), metaphorical expressions serve as tangible representations of these conceptual metaphors as defined by Lakoff and Johnson.

3.1. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

The conceptual metaphor was first proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) in their seminal work "*Metaphors We Live By*". This theory involves a two-domain model to conceptualize metaphors; a mapping (transfer) of conceptual structure from one semantic domain (SOURCE) to another (TARGET). They rely strongly on the claim that the perception—that human's conceptual structure—is organized into domains of experiential knowledge (e.g., physical objects, living things, space, etc). The Conceptual Metaphor Theory considers that the linguistic meaning is based on embodied experience (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). In this theory, embodied experience "*seeing our body as a container*" shapes language and thought and, through conceptual metaphors, meanings of words and phrases are constrained, which allows for the immediate understanding of linguistic expressions (Gibbs, 2003). In this view, it seems that our mind draws a conceptual system that depends on the common features of our bodies and the surrounding environments where we live, and in the case of emotion, an embodiment can be considered as the outcome of the relationship between some emotional states (like sorrow) and mental state and its immediate bodily reflection (Lancer, 2014).

To give a more explanatory scheme about this view, Lakoff called the basic contexts and situations based on cultural experience SOURCE domains. These are clear, simply structured, and concrete (e.g. WAR), whereas he called the more abstract and complex contexts, to which the words are applied TARGET domains (e.g. ARGUMENT). Then, this systematic identification of source and target domain is expressed by the term Metaphorical Mapping. It links two different domains, thus structuring our experience, reasoning, and everyday language (Callis and Zimmemann, 2002).

As part of cognitive and metaphorical processes, such mappings arise more or less automatically and unconsciously, and thus affect the way we experience, think, and interact within our environment. We

see that the correspondence between the domains "ARGUMENT" and "WAR" is very common in many expressions, we can say that this mapping "*arises from a correlation in our normal experiences*" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Accordingly, in this conceptual metaphor "ARGUMENT IS WAR", our knowledge about war is mapped onto the knowledge about arguments. In this mapping process, the source domain "WAR" reconceptualizes the abstract meaning of the target domain "ARGUMENT" (Callis and Zimmemann, 2002). For example, many everyday metaphorical expressions exist which are derived from this conceptual metaphor. Thus, we talk about *winning* and *losing* an argument, about *defending*, *attacking*, or *giving up* a position. A line of reasoning can *defeat* one or one *surrender*. People may have a certain *strategy*, *tactic*, or *plan*, which might be *indefensible*. Moreover, arguments can be *shot down* or *demolished* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

In Lakoff and Johnson's point of view, conceptual metaphors can generally be divided into three main types: orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor, and structural metaphor.

3.2. Orientational Metaphor

Orientational metaphors are also called spatialization since most of them result from our perception of space. Spatial orientations, derived from our constant interaction with our environment and experiences in the physical world, are the basic concepts by which we live, including up and down, in and out, front and back, deep and shallow, central and peripheral. These spatial orientations are directly grounded in the most basic experience of human beings and the experience in sensing orientations can be acquired in the early stage of human growth. This phenomenon has been proved to be correct in psychological studies. So it is natural that we use basic orientation concepts derived from these basic experiences of this kind to understand more abstract concepts such as emotions, health conditions, quantity, social status, etc (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Orientational metaphors give a concept a spatial orientation, for example, in the sentences "spirit rose and I'm feeling down", the italic words rose and down are the application of orientational metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

3.3. Ontological Metaphor

As human's primary way of existence is substantial, our experience of physical objects and substances allows us to understand the world and ourselves beyond mere orientation. Thanks to those experiences, we can pick out parts of those experiences and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. Just as the basic experiences of human spatial orientations promote orientational metaphors, our experiences with physical objects (especially our bodies) provide the basis for an extraordinarily wide variety of ontological metaphors, that is, ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances. Ontological metaphor is generated when our experience with physical objects and substances makes it possible to conceive of abstract intangible concepts such as emotions, ideas, psychological activities, and states as concrete tangible entities and substances (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

3.4. Structural Metaphor

In addition to orientational metaphor and ontological metaphor, structural metaphor is another important form of conceptual metaphor. When orientational metaphor and ontological metaphor are elaborated in many specific terms, or when some aspects of a concept are highlighted, we turn to a structural metaphor for help. Structural metaphors allow us to use one highly structured and delineated concept to structure another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Structural metaphor is the case where one structured domain is metaphorically restructured and redefined in terms of another, that is to say, by the structure of a more familiar and concrete domain, we understand the abstract domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

4. Research methodology

4.1. Research design

The method of this research is the descriptive-analytical approach due to the quality and method of content analysis of texts with the approach of literary metaphors, in this study, the statistical population is not explained quantitatively. The statistical community is qualitative and includes words and metaphors in the Arabic language and books that do not fit into inferential statistics.

4.2. Data Collection

In the first phase of this research, the researchers collected the maximum number of metaphorical expressions used to describe sorrow in Arabic (eloquent Arabic). As a result, the collected data forms a language set that will include several phrases from that language. Among the 80 Arabic expressions identified to describe sorrow, only one representative term—chosen from overlapping or semantically similar phrases—has been proposed due to space limitations. The metaphorical expressions in Arabic were also derived from the rich tapestry of Arabic culture. The primary source of this data consisted of written literature, including dictionaries like *Al-Mahit*, thesauri, and various literary forms such as poetry and prose.

The expressions in English that convey the concept of sorrow were derived from the research conducted by Kövecses (2003). In his analysis, the author presents a substantial array of phrases that reflect the conceptualization of sorrow within the English language. Kövecses (2003) asserts that these expressions are rooted in English culture, encompassing both everyday conversation and various forms of written literature, such as proverbs and poems, and traditional works.

4.3. Procedures of Data Analysis

Upon gathering a comprehensive array of metaphorical expressions that depict sorrow, the researchers proceeded to categorize and examine these Arabic expressions based on the various mappings utilized in the conceptualization of sorrow, ultimately leading to a straightforward classification. The data analysis was conducted by scrutinizing the Arabic language in isolation, adhering to the principles of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Initially, the collected expressions were organized into broad source domains (FIRE, UP, LIGHT, ANIMAL, plant, etc). Then, the specific source and target domains within each group were subsequently identified through the use of metonymic representations, which serve to characterize the

metaphor. In this stage the researchers looked for different parameters (suggested by Soriano (2013)) in carrying out the comparison like:

A) Searching for other linguistic examples.

B) Looking for additional semantic or pragmatic evidence.

C) Checking whether there was a more general mapping.

(i.e. Was this an elaboration or specification of another metaphor?)

D) Describing the expression's functioning in its context.

(i.e. What sub-mappings are highlighted? Is there a combination with other metaphors/ metonymies?)

5. Findings and Discussions

5.1. General Explanation of the Metaphor of Sorrow

In relation to the metaphor of sorrow, we will undertake a comprehensive analysis of all elements contributing to this emotion. This includes, for instance, sorrow stemming from events that evoke sadness and grief, as well as irrational behaviors that may emerge from individuals' internal anguish. While the instances of such cases may be numerous, it is essential to recognize that metaphors cannot be fully understood without considering the underlying factors. Each factor that contributes to a specific behavior, such as sorrow, arises from distinct circumstances or events. Consequently, a deeper understanding of behaviors expressed through metaphors within a particular culture and language will be attainable.

5.2. Metaphorical Conceptualization of Sorrow

The analysis of the collected expressions identified two main types of metaphors that enhance our understanding of sorrow in both languages. The first type is referred to as "generic-level metaphors" (Kövecses, 2000: 38-39). These metaphors extend beyond the realm of sorrow and other emotions, encompassing broader concepts such as "MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN," "INTENSITY IS HEAT," and "THE BODY IS A CONTAINER."

The second category of metaphors, which are predominantly associated with emotions in general and specifically with sorrow, is referred to by Lakoff and Kövecses (1983) as "basic-level metaphors". Researchers in this domain assert that these levels constitute the primary framework for understanding sorrow, being more closely connected to personal experience (Soriano, 2013: 110).

The examination of the gathered data indicates that the metaphorical understanding of sorrow in both English and Arabic includes various types of "generic-level" metaphors, such as "THE BODY IS THE CONTAINER OF EMOTIONS," as well as "basic-level" metaphors. The subsequent sentences provide examples of the basic-level metaphors utilized in this research:

1. *Sorrow is the heat of a fluid in a container,*

2. *Sorrow is fire,*

3. *Sorrow is a sorrowful animal,*

4. *Sorrow is insanity.*

5.2.1. Sorrow as a Fluid in a Container

The concept of sorrow has a long history of recognition as an emotion experienced as a result of a loss. Lewis, Haviland-Jones, and Barrett (2010) claim that “the feeling of sorrow involves sensations of loss”. Other words associated with sorrow are grief and depression.

The idea of sorrow as a content metaphor is indicated by Kovecses (1990). He introduced the idea that sorrow is an emotion that can be conceptualized as fluid and encompassed in a container. Containers in describing sorrow are body parts such as the eyes, heart, and soul. First, in the case of sorrow is a container, Arabic includes many expressions to illustrate sadness as a container:

الْحَزَنُ تَمَلَّكَهَا

5. ‘Sorrow owned her’ or sorrow contained and gripped her’

Secondly, Sadness as a content; there are several expressions that indicate such a thought as sorrow is a fluid in a container:

مَلَأَ عَيْنَيْهَا الْحَزَنَ

6. “Sorrow has filled her eyes”

مَلَأَ قَلْبَهُ الْحَزَنَ

7. “Sorrow has filled his heart”

5.2.2. Color as a Metaphor

Colors are a big part of the culture; they do not only express the colors themselves but also are mixed and used with the cultural characteristics of each nation. The relationship between culture and language renders great effects on the connotations of color words (Wang, 2007). In English, sorrow is represented in the color blue. When someone is sorrowful, they use expressions such as ‘Feeling blue’, and ‘Get the blues’, In Arabic however; such an expression does not exist. Therefore misunderstandings are created between speakers of Arabic and speakers of English and are common in the case of learning English as a foreign language. These kinds of metaphorical expressions must be rendered into metaphorical meaning to avoid misunderstanding. They are different because of the absence of blue as a color of sorrow. *Sorrow is indicated by the color black.*

5.2.2.1. Sorrow is Dark

In the case of sorrow being dark, it is believed that the color black is a good representative of sorrow. Therefore, sad people prefer dark to light places (Kovecses, 2000). In an experience conducted in 2010 on people to choose a color to represent their mood when shown an array of colors; sad people picked darker shades from black to different sorrow of gray; whereas happier people chose brighter colors. In Arabic, the state of being happy is marked by wearing colorful clothes whereas people that are in the morning wear black. Therefore, black is the common color of sorrow. According to data, dark color as a metaphor is common in English and Arabic and the concept is shared in the two cultures. English expressions, such as ‘Someone is in a dark mood’, ‘the situation looks bleak’, and “He lives in a gloomy city”. These are a clear representation of the loss of hope which is a leading cause of sorrow.

تَحْوِيلُ لَوْنِهِ إِلَى اللَّوْنِ الْأَسْوَدِ مِنْ شِدَّةِ حَزَنِهِ

8. "S/he turned black with sorrow"

5.2.3. Sorrow is an Opponent

Another concept personified by sorrow is the embodiment of sorrow as an enemy whereas happiness is represented as a friend. Such a personification is presented by data in English and Arabic. In the following expressions in English, they reveal this kind of metaphor such as; 'She was overcome by sorrow' in these examples, sorrow is represented as an opponent to fight. Either it will overcome you or you will overcome it. Similarly, Arabic speakers use the opponent metaphor in describing someone's sorrow. In English sorrow can attack the person and score victory upon him/her. Similarly in Arabic sorrow is considered an enemy that could cause pain and inflict harm on the person.

كسر الحزن ضميرها

9. "Sorrow has broken her back"

5.2.4. Orientational Metaphor

Orientational metaphor as the first group of tangible metaphors gives sorrow a downward orientation (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987). Barcelona (1986) also studied sorrow metaphors and found that the conceptual metaphor "Sorrow is Down" is very common and usual in English language usage. This is due to its experiential basis.

Sad people often exhibit a slouching posture, drooping shoulders, corners of the mouth turning down, etc. This correlation between the state of sad and expressive and behavioral responses motivates the metaphors "Sorrow is down" and "Sorrow is Low". The metaphor "Sorrow is down" is closely linked to our physical experience while feeling this emotion.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) state that a "drooping posture typically goes along with sorrow". For example "I am feeling kind of low right now.", "I have decided not to contact my ex because that gets me down as well.", "However, and she's been getting quite depressed lately." The examples hint that an increase of SORROW is experienced as being physically nearer to the ground. Additionally, the second example shows that another person can evoke feelings of SORROW, which is conceptualized as pushing someone physically downward. In the last example, the lowest possible physical state is mapped onto the most intense feeling of SORROW. Being depressed means being pressed down to the ground, which implies the impossibility of being in any lower position. The words down and low directly bring into play by English speakers to express their feeling of sorrow, such as, "I am feeling down", "He brought me down with his remarks", "Down in the mouth", and "He is really low these days", "I am feeling kind of low". Opposing English, Arabic does not apply the words low/ down directly. The down/low posture can be inferred from Persian metaphorical expressions such as:

غرقفت سفينته

10. (Lit. his ships were drowned)

لقد دمر العالم

11. (Lit. The world has ruined on him)

كانت شفتيها تتدلى من الحزن

12. (Lit. his lips were hanging down)

لا يضحك و هو حزين

13. (Lit. s/he is not laughing)

In this category, all the metaphorical expressions are partially the same, which means, they represent the conceptual metaphor “SORROW IS DOWN/LOW” but their linguistic manifestations are not the same.

The only utterly the sameness here can be seen in the English expression “I am in low spirits” which in Arabic means “معنوياتي منخفضة” when the words down and low collocate with the word spirits in Arabic mean sorrow and depression.

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) stated that metaphors are rooted in physical and cultural experience and they are not randomly assigned one of the significant cultural differences between Arabic and English was revealed in this category. When someone is in severe sorrow and sorrow is very depressed, English expresses it with the word “depth” for instance, “in the depth of sorrow” but the word “اوج” /odʒ/ is used in Arabic “اوج” /odʒ/ (lit. Climax) which literary means “climax” the opposite of depth and leads to the metaphorical mapping “INTENSE SORROW IS BEING AT CLIMAX” in Arabic:

كان في ذروة الحزن

14. (Lit. be at the climax of sorrow and sorrow).

5.2.5 Mobile Entity/Being Metaphor

The second-highest number of metaphorical expressions detected in the present research language data of English and Arabic can be assigned to the metaphor of personified sorrow as a mobile entity which gives rise to the metaphorical mapping “SORROW IS MOBILE ENTITY” and “SORROW IS BEING” metaphor. These metaphors consider sorrow as something which can move, come, go, return, and can be put aside. It is evident in the following English examples: “When sorrow comes, we need to allow ourselves to feel it fully.”, “So it is okay for her to wish her sorrow will return..”, “When sorrow comes”, “sorrow came out”, “Put it aside”. “SORROW IS A LIVING ORGANISM” metaphor is another conceptual metaphor identified by Barcelona (1986) in English.

This metaphor personifies sorrow as a living being that can come back or return to someone, or can be removed, and killed and take its life as no one would like as a host. English expressions such as, “He drowned his sorrow in drink”. Arabic, similarly, employs these metaphors which are revealed by the examples:

ضع الحزن جانبا

15. (Lit. put sorrow aside)

جاءه الحزن

16. (Lit. Sorrow came to him)

أبعد الحزن عنك

17. (Lit. Away sorrow from yourself)

These examples in both English and Arabic point out that SORROW is personified as actively moving and coming to us human beings whenever it wants to. When SORROW is present, we feel sad. In general, this metaphor suggests that a person does not have much influence on the emotion SORROW. One can wish that SORROW may come or go and even invite the emotion, but in the end, the decision is made by SORROW itself.” All the above English metaphorical expressions in this category can be rendered into Arabic serving the same metaphorical meaning and are utterly the same.

5.2.6. Container Metaphor

Container metaphor as a highly productive metaphor in the case of emotions identified by Kovecses (1990) is shared within all emotions and is considered as a general source domain for them. Emotions can be a container or a fluid in a container. In the case of sorrow both “SORROW IS A CONTAINER” and “SORROW IS FLUID IN A CONTAINER” (Kovecses, 2000) with lack of heat leads to metaphorical mapping “BEING SAD IS BEING lacked OF HEAT” were recognized with research data. They are regular in both English and Arabic. Containers in describing sorrow are body parts including the eyes, heart, chest, and body itself. So the metaphorical mappings “EYES ARE CONTAINER FOR SORROW”, “HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR SORROW”, “CHEST IS A CONTAINER FOR SORROW” and “BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR SORROW” is depicted from research data in Arabic and English. Following English terminologies express this kind of container metaphor “heart filled with sorrow”, “There was a sorrow in Alina's eyes”, “May have sorrow ingrained in them”, “Losing his father put his fire out”, and “he was filled with sorrow” and Arabic expressions such as:

18. (Lit. Sorrow can be seen in her eyes)

تستطيع أن ترى طعم الحزن

19. (Lit. chest full of sorrow)

صدرها مليء بالألم والحزن

20. (Lit. heart filled with sorrow and sorrow)

بقلب مليء بالحزن

21. (Lit. he is lack of excitement)

لقد فقد شغفه وإثارته

22. (Lit. He is like the dead cold with no spirit)

برد و بلا حياة مثل الموتى

The two last examples in Arabic represent another kind of metonymical mapping “LACK OF VITALITY STANDS FOR SORROW” which leads to metaphorical mapping “SORROW IS LACK OF VITALITY”, similarly, the English expression “it was a disheartening news” represents it. One of the cultural differences which exist between English and Arabic lies in the fact that sorrow is considered as a bird in Arabic that nests in the body parts of a sad person including the eyes and heart: “EYES ARE NESTS FOR SORROW” and “HEART IS A NEST FOR SORROW”:

انت حزين في عينيك

23. (Lit. Sorrow nest in his eyes)

ذاب حزن ركن قلبه

24. (Lit. Sorrow nest in his heart)

Another difference that is illustrated with Arabic metaphorical expressions is in fluid in a container metaphor for sorrow. Arabic expressions such as:

قلب مليء بالدم

25. (Lit. heart full of blood)

أكل الدم

26. (Lit. Drinking heart blood)

قلبي دم من هذا العالم

27. (Lit. my heart is blood)

Represent blood as sorrow fluid in sad person heart and leads to metonymic mapping “*DRINKING HEART BLOOD STANDS FOR SORROW*” and “*HEAR IS FULL OF BLOOD STANDS FOR SADNESS*” in Arabic. The first metonymical mapping represents sorrow as an edible substance that can be drunk or eaten. Metaphorical example “*محمزون*” (Lit. *eating sorrow or sorrow*) illustrates sorrow as an eatable substance and constructs another conceptual metaphor “*SORROW IS EDIBLE*” which is highly conventional in Arabic.

6. Conclusion

Regarding metaphorical conceptualization of sorrow in both English and Arabic, our initial conclusion arises from examining whether a specific metaphor exists within one culture and its corresponding presence or absence in the other. As previously discussed, English and Arabic exhibit some shared general or fundamental conceptual metaphors when interpreting these two concepts. In addition to that, many of the minor metaphors can be rendered into Arabic from English and vice-versa. And the following figure illustrates the most **Sorrow as a Fluid in a Container**:

1. *Sorrow is dark.*
2. *Sorrow is down.*
3. *Insane behavior stands for insanity sorrow is an opponent (in struggle).*
4. *Sorrow is a sorrowful animal.*
5. *Sorrow is a natural force.*
6. *Sorrow is edible.*

These metaphors are universally applicable to a large extent. For example, comparing Chinese (Yu, 1995; King's, 1989), Japanese (Matsuki, 1995), and Spanish (Barcelona & Soriano, 2004) with English metaphorical expressions shows the existence of these basic-level metaphors in conceptualizing sorrow in the three languages.

Despite the great similarity between the two languages in conceptualizing sorrow, it's still worth mentioning that some metaphorical mappings are not shared between the two languages:

1. To get all steamed up.
2. To let off steam.

Another difference between the two languages is that Arabic makes use of the metaphorical sub-mapping "SORROW IS THE HEAT OF THE GAS in A CONTAINER" this metaphorical use doesn't exist in English, even though it is not common in Arabic too.

Another important sub-mapping in Arabic that's not present in English is what involves the depiction of sorrow or rage as a drinkable liquid that the sorrowful person is forced to swallow without appreciating its terrible taste. Such a conceptualization goes under the "FLUID" metaphor but it shows to what degree Arabs appreciate those people who could restrain their Sorrow inside them.

We found another example of English-Arabic contrast due to different degrees of linguistic conventionalization in the metaphor "SORROW IS INSANITY". The linguistic instantiations of this mapping in English are extremely conventionalized, to the extent that some of them have become polysemic, meaning both "crazy" and "angry". For example:

1. He got mad.
2. He is mad as a hatter.
3. That stupid attitude would madden anyone.
4. Her son's death maddened her.

The equivalent expressions in Arabic, the adjective "magnum" and the verb "yujnu", are conventional too, but they are not polysemic in the same way as the English ones. In Arabic, "magnum" and "juju" refer both to insanity and a general lack of control and judgment, but one would always have to specify what emotion the person is "mad with" (unlike in English, where "mad" univocally (i.e. unambiguous, or having only one meaning) refers to Sorrow).

The realizations of "SORROW IS INSANITY" in Arabic are thus less conventionalized for Sorrow than the English ones. Finally, we find one such case in the metaphorical sub-mapping "THE EXPRESSION OF SORROW IS AN EXPLOSION", an entailment elaboration of "SORROW IS A (HOT) FLUID IN A CONTAINER". The following are examples given by Lakoff and Kövecses of the different special-case elaborations of this mapping in American English (in Lakoff, 1987):

1. Pistons: *he blew a gasket.*
2. Volcanoes: *she erupted.*
3. Electricity: *I blew a fuse.*
4. Explosives: *she's on a short fuse.*
5. Bombs: *that set me off.*

Arabic does not elaborate on the "EXPLOSION" metaphor so much and it only has two special-case sub-mappings: volcanoes and bombs. Finally, it's noticed that both languages, English and Arabic, share

to some extent a few metaphorical conceptualizations used in describing Sorrow in the same manner. This is the case of the following metaphors:

1. *Sorrow is a fluid in a container*
2. *Sorrow is insanity.*

For this reason, the researcher believes that these metaphors can be used universally to describe any sort of emotional feeling sorrow and sadness. To summarize what kinds of results we obtained, we have seen that English and Arabic share several basic-level metaphors in conceptualizing the emotions of sorrow. Although the two cultures are very different and there's a big cultural gap between them, there's some common ground between the two cultures when describing the emotional states like sorrow. This reality can be attributed to the very fact that we deal with universal human emotions. Sorrow is not a culture-specific state, in contrast to that, they are a response to some sort of universal situations like festival occasions and ceremonies or annoyance and stress.

Our result can be supported by the fact that other cross-cultural studies between two far distinct cultures Chinese (Yu, 1995) and Japanese (Matsuki, 1995) show the same implications when they are compared to English in terms of conceptualizing emotions. On the other hand, there are some differences in describing the degree of each emotional state between the two cultures.

Some of these cultural-specific mappings could be attributed to some cultural properties of each culture like climate, natural elements, and mode of life. Finally, the researcher believes that the results of this study have an important implication.

Lakoff (1993) claims that *"as soon as one gets away from the concrete physical experience and starts talking about abstractions or emotions, metaphorical understanding is the norm"*. In addition, he inquires whether all abstract human reasoning is a metaphorical version of imagistic reasoning (Lakoff, 1990).

Consequently, this study is a response to Lakoff's proposal, and it shows that evidence from Arabic culture empirically supports this claim from an emotional viewpoint. Subsequently, metaphor in Arabic, as in many other cultures, is pervasive and irreducible in the expression of such abstract emotional concepts as Sorrow. From this fact, it appears that metaphor plays an essential and indispensable role in our understanding and speaking about our emotional states apart from our linguistic differences.

It should be said that the point of intersection of the two languages, Arabic and English, regarding the conceptual metaphors of sorrow, is in the field of cultural values, anthropological values, and their specific geography and vice versa for the metaphorical meanings of sorrow. Thus, the difference in conceptual metaphors in the field of cultural values can be interpreted. Therefore, the researchers argue that this area still requires further investigation by Arab scholars specializing in cognitive linguistics and psychology, as the Arabic language encompasses a wide range of metaphorical expressions that should be analyzed from multiple perspectives—not solely from literary and rhetorical viewpoints.

References

- Aliakbari, M. & Mohammadi, Kh. (2024). A Socio-dialectological Study to Revitalize Kurdish Culture: A Case Study on Kurdish Calendars based on Conceptual Metaphor. *Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, 3(3), [Doi: 10.22034/jls.2024.141938.1145](https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2024.141938.1145)
- Al-Sharif, A. (2007). *Metaphorical Conceptualization of Happiness and Anger in English and Arabic: A Comparative Study* [Doctoral dissertation, MA Thesis], Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan).
- Asadi, F. & khodabakhsh pirkalani, R. (2025). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Representation of Emotions in Persian-Language Social Media: A Sociolinguistic Approach. *Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, (), -. [Doi: 10.22034/jls.2025.144207.1274](https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2025.144207.1274). [In Persian]
- Bao, Z. (2003). *A contrastive study of the linguistic expression of emotions between English and Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fudan University.
- Barcelona, A., & Soriano, C. (2004). Metaphorical conceptualization in English and Spanish. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8(3), 295-307. [Doi: 10.1080/1382557042000277403](https://doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277403)
- Barcelona, Antonio. (1986). on the concept of depression in American English: A cognitive approach. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 12, 7–33. <https://riull.ull.es/xmlui/handle/915/34176?show=full>
- Callies, M. & Zimmermann, R. (2002). *Cross-Cultural Metaphors: Investigating Domain Mappings across Cultures. A project report on the seminar "Metaphor in Communication and Foreign Language Teaching"*. Philipps-Universität: Marburg.
- Fabiszak, M. (2000). The concept of “joy” in Middle English: A semantic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the Polish Association for the study of English*, pp. 105–114, Wrocław: Poland.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1994). *The poetics of mind: figurative thought, language, and Understanding*. Cambridge, England Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr., (2003). Embodied Experience and Linguistic Meaning. *Brain and Language*, 84, 1-15. [Doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(02\)00517-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(02)00517-5)
- Hiraga, M.K. (1991). *Metaphors Japanese women live by*. In D. Bower, A. Pauwels, & J. Winter (Eds.), *Working Papers on Language, Gender and Sexism*, Vol. 1, pp. 38-57, Publication of the Scientific Commission of Language, Gender, International Association of Applied Linguistics, Monash University Printing Service.
- Kalantari Khandani, E., Mohammadi Nia, M. and Akbarizadeh, M. (2021). Investigating Quranic anger conceptual metaphors based on basic emotion and conceptual act theories. *ZABANPAZHUI (Journal of Language Research)*, 13(38), 35-64. [Doi:10.22051/jlr.2019.25458.1681](https://doi.org/10.22051/jlr.2019.25458.1681) [In Persian]

- Koller, Veronika, Andrew Hardie, Paul Rayson & Elena Semino. (2008). Using a semantic annotation tool for the analysis of metaphor in discourse. *metaphorik.de*, 15, 141-160. https://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/15_2008_koller.pdf
- Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion Concepts*. Berlin and New York: Springer Verlag.
- Kövecses, Z. (1991). Happiness: A definitional effort. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6(1), 29-46. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/ZoltanKovecses/publication/375279577_Happiness_1_991/links/65455f06b1398a779d59f653/Happiness-1991.pdf
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2008). *Metaphor and emotion*. In R. W. Gibbs Jr (Ed.), *the Cambridge Handbook of metaphor and thought*, pp. 380-396, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1983). *The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent In American English*. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge. UK: Cambridge University Press, 195-221.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd Ed., ed A. Ortony, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. H. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its Challenges to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. L. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Lancer, D. (2014). *Conquering Shame and Codependency: 8 Steps to Freeing the True You*. Hazelden Foundation, Center City, Minnesota, USA
- Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J. M., & Barrett, L. F. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of emotions*. Guilford Press.
- Matsuki, K. (1995). Metaphors of anger in Japanese. In J. Taylor & R.E. Maclaury (Eds.), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, pp. 137-151, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Morris, C. (1938). *Signs, language, and behavior*. Nova York: George Braziller.
- Sadri, M. & Mokhtari, Q. (2025). The method of translating culture-rooted Arabic-Persian conceptual metaphors (with emphasis on translating proverbs) based on Harvey's model. *Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, DOI: [10.22034/jls.2025.143794.1258](https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2025.143794.1258). [In Persian]
- Saghafi, E., Afrashi, A., Assi, M., & Farzad, A. (2022). Metaphorical Conceptualization of Bravery in Contemporary Persian and English Prose. *Language Related Research*, 13 (2) :691-716. [Doi:10.52547/LRR.13.2.22](https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.2.22). [In Persian]

- Sobati, E. (2022). Cognitive Comparison of the Components of Conceptual Metaphor of FEAR between the Blind and the Sighted Individuals of the Linguocultural Geography of Ilam. *Journal of Linguistics & Khorasan Dialects*, 14(3), 141-170. [Doi: 10.22067/jlkd.2022.78234.1117](https://doi.org/10.22067/jlkd.2022.78234.1117) [In Persian]
- Sobati, E. (2024). Cognitive Analysis of Conceptual Metaphors of Love in the Daily Language of Blind and Sighted Adults. *Language Science*, 10 (18), 213-244. [Doi: 10.22054/lj.2023.69862.1556](https://doi.org/10.22054/lj.2023.69862.1556) [In Persian]
- Soriano, C. (2013). Some Anger Metaphors in Spanish and English: A Contrastive Review. *International Journal of English Studies*, 3 (2), 107-122. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1072177.pdf>
- Talei, M. H., Hekmat, S., Izadyar, M. and Ghahramani, F. (In Press). The metaphor of love in Divan Foroughi Bastami and Tabib Esfahani based on cognitive linguistics. *Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, [Doi: 10.22034/jls.2024.142228.1168](https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2024.142228.1168). [In Persian]
- Wang, Y. (2007). On the cognitive processes of human perception with emotions, motivations, and attitudes. *International Journal of Cognitive Informatics and Natural Intelligence (IJCINI)*, 1(4), 1-13. [DOI: 10.4018/jcini.2007100101](https://doi.org/10.4018/jcini.2007100101)
- Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical Expressions of Anger and Happiness in Chinese and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 10(2), 59–92. DOI: [10.1207/s15327868ms1002_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1002_1)
- Yu, N. (1996). *The contemporary theory of metaphor: A perspective from Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona.