

## Cutting and breaking metaphors of the self in Jordanian Arabic on social media: An exploratory study

Hani Abumathkour <sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

*This study aimed at exploring how speakers of Jordanian Arabic describe the affected self using a certain type of verbs in a metaphorical way. It attempted to mainly answer three questions: What are the cutting and breaking verbs/events that are used to talk about the self in Jordanian Arabic? What are the most frequently used cutting and breaking verbs/events to describe intangible aspects of the affected self by Jordanian Arabic speakers? And what are the intangible self-dimensions described by cutting and breaking expressions as being affected? To answer all these questions, qualitative and quantitative analyses based on the structural model by Devylder and Zlatev (2020) as an alternative approach to investigate the metaphors of the self in a Facebook corpus where native speakers of Jordanian Arabic provide narration of their experiences was conducted to pinpoint cutting and breaking metaphors to talk about the self. This study is an attempt to investigate metaphor from a structural perspective away from the traditional idea-content aspect of metaphors. The analysis showed that the speakers of JA usually use cutting and breaking expressions to describe four affected dimensions of the self, i.e., emotional, mental, social, and interpersonal.*

### **Keywords**

*Cutting, Breaking, Metaphors, The self, Jordanian Arabic, Facebook*

### **1. Introduction**

Noticeably, when people try to communicate or narrate their experiences, whether these experiences are pleasant or unpleasant, they resort to the use of a kind of language that can appropriately reveal how these experiences have been (Radden and Dirven, 2007, p. xi). Language is a vital medium to communicate these experiences. Thus, people use available linguistic devices just to let others understand these experiences adequately. One way to communicate the experiences is by metaphor as a figurative device, which is not only “in language but in thought and action” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p 3). Thus, metaphor is no longer considered as a merely poetic device. It is regarded as “integral to the way people speak and think about a wide variety of human events and abstract concepts” (Gibbs and Macedo, 2010, p. 680). Furthermore, metaphor is a tool for people to persuade the others depending on the shared knowledge or experiences due to the “persuasive power of metaphors” (Moser, 2007, p.170).

According to Kövecses (2010, p. 4), “metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain.” Metaphor is composed of two domains. One is physical, that is the source domain, and the other is more abstract, that is the target domain (Kövecses, 2015, p. 20). The conceptual knowledge of the metaphorical links

---

<sup>1</sup> Hani Abumathkour, Ph.D. Student, Doctoral Program in Intercultural Linguistics, ELTE Doctoral School of Linguistics, Budapest, Hungary. madkor79@yahoo.com

between these two domains can constitute the common ground for the proper use and interpretation of the metaphors in various contexts (Nayak and Gibbs, 1990, p. 328).

Metaphorical language derives meaning the same way as the non-metaphorical one does. Meaning is determined by linguistic and extralinguistic contexts (Allwood, 1999, p. 1). Consequently, meaning is not always dependent on language structures or senses. There are other areas that contribute to the meaning beyond language such as culture, experience, and shared knowledge. These extralinguistic variables can derive meanings from our bodies, as a large portion of metaphorical meaning derives from our experiences of our own body (Kövecses, 2010, p. 18). Thus, meaning is “a crucial aspect of mind, language, and culture” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 3). The interaction between mind and language, where the former shapes the concepts, and the latter makes these abstract concepts utterances, can be attributed to the need to understand the world and to build a view of it (ibid, p. 27). This need to express ourselves can make our thoughts embodied where linguistic units are formed and combined out of our bodily experience (Lakoff, 1987, p. xiv) as metaphors emerge from some essential types of experience (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999). One specific kind of experience that language users attempt to describe using metaphors is portraying the things that can affect the self (Moser 2007, p. 168).

One of the metaphor sources is the forces that physically affect us such as gravitational, magnetic, electric, and mechanical forces (Kövecses, 2010, pp. 18-22). These forces can include various processes of change of state or location. The change of state includes breaking and cutting events that can affect us – our bodies – as well as other objects around us. The current paper will limit itself to the cutting and breaking events/verbs as sources of metaphors as these metaphors “rely on experienced *resemblance* between the bodily sensation and the physical act of (violent) separation” (Devlyder and Zlatev, 2020, p. 254). The criteria of the target verbs/events of cutting and breaking will be depicted in this paper. Furthermore, the current study will limit the analysis to one variety of Arabic, namely, Jordanian Arabic (JA, henceforth). Thus, the study aims at exploring the metaphorical use of cutting and breaking verbs/events to talk about the self in Jordanian Arabic as well as finding out the intangible dimensions of the affected self by using target expressions.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 The Self in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)

One of the ways to conceptualize the self is what Lakoff (1996, p. 102) portrayed as that “we are conceptualizing ourselves as split in two, as if we were made up of an ensemble of at least two parts”. Thus, the self is one of the two which is that part of us as subjects. This part is our bodies, social roles, experiences, and actions in our lives (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999, p. 272). This part motivates the emergence of the metaphors in people’s speech when “individuals in interaction choose and adapt their language resources to express and understand particular meanings” (Cameron and Deignan, 2006, p. 680). This adaptation of language is governed by conceptual understanding of the context which provides various sources of these metaphors such as human body, health, animals...etc.

There have been numerous studies that focused on the conceptualization of feelings that affect some aspects of the self (e.g., Kövecses, 1990; Maalej, 2004). The current paper is concerned with the use of one variety of Arabic, namely, Jordanian. Thus, in what follows I will present some studies conducted in the Jordanian context concerning the affected aspects of the self. There have been some attempts to study how native speakers of JA metaphorically describe affected tangible and intangible aspects of the self. These studies focused on certain

feelings or experiences that speakers in Jordan try to communicate using the figurative language.

Al-Abdullah (2019) conducted a study that aimed at analysing metaphors of pain in JA in instances that were collected by the researcher from 150 Pharmacology students during a practicum course of Pharmacy Practice Counselling. The students were asked to list the expressions that they themselves or the clients at the pharmacies usually use to describe their experience of pain. The conceptual metaphors of the affected physical aspects of the self concerned the researcher in her attempt to study the intangible aspects of the affected self. Al-Abdullah did not stress the use of the change of state verbs in her analysis although some examples in her data included the use of cutting and breaking verbs to conceptualise the physical pain e.g. "*rukbiti fag 'a*" (Lit. My knee is bursting. This is the pain resulting from deficiency in the knee fluid; knee osteoarthritis), and "*rasi bidu eytug*" (Lit. My head is going to crack. This is the pain of severe headache which is categorised as PAIN A SHARP OBJECT and PAIN IS PRESSURE IN A CONTAINER, respectively). This may tempt other linguists to explore the use of cutting and breaking verbs/events to conceptualise the affected tangible aspects of the self in JA.

Al Sharif (2007) compared some metaphorical expressions of happiness and anger between Arabic and English based on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. He collected data for both languages from various sources such as previous research, literary works, dictionaries, etc. The Arabic data was limited to modern standard Arabic and the colloquial expressions were excluded. He concluded that both languages relatively share some metaphorical conceptualizations to describe the above-mentioned feelings. The author did not stress the affected self in this study, and he did not concentrate on the use of any structures such as cutting and breaking verbs to describe these feelings in the analysis. Nevertheless, there was a duplicate attempt by the same author, i.e., Al Sharif (2007) which was with another co-author (see Al-Haq & Al Sharif, 2008).

Another attempt to describe the conceptualization of feelings and experiences in Jordanian Arabic was by Zibin and Hamdan (2019) who explored the conceptual metonymies, metaphors and metaphonymies used in JA to conceptualise FEAR and compare the conceptualisation of FEAR in JA and English. The authors collected data from two main sources. The first one was the Facebook pages of cinemas showing comments on horror and thriller movies. The other was 12 JA native speaker informants who were asked to provide the researchers with the metonymical and metaphorical expressions they use to express fear. They concluded that "FEAR is conceptualised in JA through three figurative devices: conceptual metonymy, conceptual metaphor and conceptual metaphonymy." (p. 258). Also, there were similarities and differences between JA and English in the conceptualisation of FEAR. The differences are attributed to some cultural beliefs within the Jordanian society. Whereas similarities stem from "universal physiological and/or behavioural states or reactions resulting from FEAR." Zibin and Hamdan (2019) stressed the use of figurative language to describe an intangible aspect of the self. They limited the study to an analysis of the conceptual metaphors and metonymies of fear in JA and the use of cutting and breaking verbs/events by the JA speakers was not within the domain of the analysis. This applies to other attempts to explore the metaphorcity in JA. These attempts were within the CMT, and they did not stress the affected self. The current paper will be an endeavour to explore the metaphorcity of cutting and breaking in JA when native speakers of JA talk about the self. The analysis will not be within the framework of CMT.

## 2.2 Cutting and Breaking Verbs

The semantics of the tangible aspects of the cutting and breaking events has been investigated from different perspectives (see Bowerman, 2007, a special issue of *Cognitive Linguistics* journal on the semantics of cutting and breaking verbs). Some linguists investigated the distribution and the structure of these events which are expressed using the cutting and breaking verbs (Devylder, 2016 2017; Fillmore, 1970; Levin, 1993). Other studies focused on the cross linguistic dimension of the cutting and breaking events by exploring the speakers' categorization of these events in different languages: Majid *et al.*, (2007) in four Germanic languages and Majid *et al.*, (2008) in 28 diverse languages. Some studies were limited to the comparison of these events between two languages: for instance, Narasimhan's (2007) comparison between Hindi and Tamil. Some studies focused on one language in the analysis of cutting and breaking events, for example Gharib's (2012) with Kurdish and Brown's (2007) with Tzeltal. Other studies focused on the breaking events rather than the cutting events, for instance, Gejo's (2015) Breaking and Entering in English and Hassan's (2015) hitting and breaking in Arabic. All these attempts were concerned with tangible or literal reference of the cutting and breaking events.

Fillmore (1970) explored how speakers of English use and understand the two commonly used verbs 'hit and break' through studying the grammatical and semantic attributes of these verbs. He focused on the change of state verbs in English as (*break, bend, fold, shatter, and crack*) and surface contact verbs as (hit, slap, strike, bump, stroke). Fillmore (1970, p. 129) reported that the breaking verbs are semantically used to show state-change either in the form of a verb or as a stative adjective that can depict an object.

As far as Arabic is concerned, Hassan (2015) explored the hitting and breaking verbs in Modern Standard Arabic. Her attempt was based on the grammatical relevance between these two classes of verbs according to certain grammatical and semantic properties in Arabic and English. This study was limited to the literal use of these two classes of verbs. The metaphorical use of breaking verbs was beyond the scope of her study. Furthermore, she did not discuss the cutting class of the verbs. The study was also limited to Modern Standard Arabic. Hassan listed some Arabic verbs which she considered them 'break verbs' such as *thana* bend, *Tawa* fold, and *ja<sup>c c</sup> ada* wrinkle. These Arabic verbs are certainly 'change of state' verbs. Nevertheless, they can be classified as break verbs as they do not disrupt the integrity of the object (Levin, 1993, p. 243). These verbs should be classified as 'bend verbs' as they show reversibility attribute unlike break verbs. Also, she considered the verb *ba<sup>c</sup> thra* scatter as a break verb which it should be classified as spray/load verb as *ba<sup>c</sup> thra* is related to covering a surface or putting things in a container (Mousser, 2013, p. 422).

Levin (1993) made a distinction between break and cut verbs. First, she listed the verbs (*chip, clip, cut, hack, hew, saw, scrape, scratch, slash, snip*) as cutting verbs and the verbs (*break, chip, crack, crash, crush, fracture, rip, shatter, smash, snap, splinter, split, tear*) as breaking verbs. Then, she considered the cutting verbs as involving a change in the "material integrity", however, they are not as purely 'change of state' verbs as break verbs because they do not provide information about the source of the state-change (p. 157). As per the syntactic distinction between these two classes of verbs i.e., *cutting and breaking*, break verbs are different from the cut verbs in the ability to turn up in the causative/inchoative alternation. (p.242). This categorization and distinction of the *cutting and breaking* verbs by Levin (1993) will be adopted in the analysis of the Arabic data in the current study.

Devylder (2017) examined the cutting and breaking events affecting the tangible aspects of the self, i.e., the body and its parts. He aimed at understanding the conceptualization of the personal domain and providing additional distinction between cut-

verbs and break-verbs. He used corpora composed of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), the British National Corpus (BNCweb) and Google. He found that cut-verbs can be distinguished from break-verbs based on the level of synthesis of the affected theme they encode. The tangible aspects of the self that are affected by the cutting and breaking events concerned the author although he concluded that “analysing cutting and breaking events affecting the self constitute a very fertile domain of investigation to learn more about the metaphorical extensions of cutting and breaking verbs” (p.40).

Bouveret and Sweetser (2009) studied three French verbs (i.e., *casser*, *briser* and *romper*) that are usually translated as the English verb *break*. They studied different literal breaking frames that are associated with these three verbs in French and English corpora. The researchers were concerned with both the physical and metaphoric use of these three verbs. They reported that these three verbs reflect a sort of different profiles in addition to the differences concerning mappings from the literal senses (p. 54). They concluded that “metaphoric mappings may sometimes fail to map aspects of frame structure from the source domain, when they lack a counterpart in the frame of the target domain” (p. 55).

Devylder (2016) explored the part-whole conceptualization of both tangible and intangible aspects of the self. He attempted to find out how the English language encodes the segmentation of our self into parts. Also, he investigated the linguistic dimension that can contribute to the conceptualization of our self through part-whole expressions of the self as well as the sensorimotor origin of the conceptual patterns. He analysed certain expressions in corpora from various sources and genres. These expressions were body-part terms as well as cutting and breaking expressions. He concluded that for both tangible and intangible aspects of the self, “the schema is a pervasive recurring pattern of our PART-WHOLE sensorimotor experience that we live through, and that this complex conceptual system is precisely encoded in language” (p. 26).

Nevertheless, Taylor (2007, p. 335) noticed that the area of metaphorical use of the cutting and breaking verbs is tempting for researchers to investigate where or not it is possible to study the use of these verbs beyond “the domain of material separation” in addition to the cross linguistic dimension of these expressions. The current paper will be devoted to the investigation of the metaphorical use of *cutting and breaking* verbs/events and the domain of material separation of these two events will be beyond the scope of the current study. Moreover, this study will not adopt the CMT in the analysis as the focus will be on the use of a certain type or class of verbs/events i.e. cutting and breaking. It seems that the CMT is “insufficient to offer a rigorous and complete analysis of cross-reference mapping” (Glynn, 2002, p. 541; see also Kövecses, 2008). The analysis will adopt the framework proposed by Devylder and Zlatev (2020). The categorization of the verbs/events as well as the dimensions of the affected aspects of the self in the JA data will rely on this framework.

Devylder and Zlatev (2020) conducted a study that aimed at identifying and classifying procedures based on ‘reliable intuitions’ and applying these procedures to the use of language that possibly reflects the speakers’ experiences. Also, they built a framework that constitutes a general model of meaning which so called The Motivation and Sedimentation Model. This model is employed in metaphors analysis and applied to their empirical phenomenon. They used CNSTTD (Client Narratives, Sessions Transcripts, Trauma Diaries) corpus extracted from Devylder (2016). The corpus consisted of discussion threads from a PTSD forum, narratives of psychotherapy clients, and transcriptions of Psychotherapy sessions. They randomly selected a sample of 150 texts (50 per genre) from the CNSTTD corpus for their study of cutting and breaking metaphors of the self. The authors depicted five

criteria that are capable of qualifying expressions about self to be irreversible non-actual separation (INAS) expressions (Devylder & Zlatev, 2020, p. 262):

- A. *“The sentence with INAS does not express actual separation.*
- B. *Substitution of the figure expression in an INAS expression can lead to a sentence describing actual separation.*
- C. *INAS expressions typically involve verbs, but they may include nominalizations*
- D. *The actual separation use of the core phrase (verb or noun) in an INAS expression implies irreversibility.*
- E. *The expression of the figure denotes the whole self, part of the self, or the extended self.”*

Based on these criteria, they found the ten most frequently used *cutting and breaking* expressions in the corpus: *break, burst, crack, cut, fall apart, rip, shatter, snap, split, tear*. The same criteria will be used in the current paper to identify the instances of *cutting and breaking* verbs/events that can yield Arabic INAS expressions in the data.

Four main types of self-dimensions are portrayed by the researchers as being affected by INAS expressions, i.e. emotional, mental, social, and interpersonal self-dimensions (p. 268). In this cognitive-semiotic model, there are three levels of meaning based on Embodied Self literature which are as follows (p. 272): First, the embodied level which consists of non-linguistic, cognitive, and experiential processes and structures such as the body-schema and body image, bodily mimesis, emotions, categorization and analogy-making. Second, the sedimented level which comprises the social and linguistic norms, culture-specific gestures, writing systems and symbolic notations, which are all relatively stable, and the socio-cognitive structures that serve as “tools” for thought and communication. Finally, the situated level which consists of live social interaction, spontaneous language use, and improvisation, or “cognition in the wild” (ibid, p. 272).

According to the authors of the study, these three levels are not working independently “as they stand in constant interaction through the two main operations”. First, the motivation operation stems from the person’s structure of experience and consciousness which connects both the embodied and situated levels upwardly. In addition, the sedimentation process includes situational expressions that go downwardly or become sedimented by a frequent use into the sedimented level. As a result, this triggers off further innovative instances (p. 272). The researchers believe that the relation between this model and metaphors, particularly those which are relevant to the cutting and breaking events, lies in the semiotic and iconic nature of metaphors. Also, this model can be devised to analyse the metaphoricity as long as it has become hard to distinguish between the literal and metaphorical meanings.

It seems that the use of cutting and breaking expressions to speak about the self and its aspects has not attracted a lot of researchers, yet. The metaphoricity of these expressions concerned Devylder and Zlatev (2020) which resulted in developing intuitive applicable classification procedures to the use of INAS expressions which unveil the users’ experiences. These expressions were found as conventionalized and not regarded as metaphors due to sedimented and cultural beliefs. Thus, the researchers outlined a meaning making a model for metaphor analysis to apply to their corpus where INAS expressions are metaphorically used in specific situations to depict the self and/or its aspects. They proved that both ambiguity and resemblance relations between various meanings of the *cutting and breaking* can qualify these expressions as instances of metaphor.

Devylder and Zlatev (2020) attempted to investigate these expressions in one language i.e. English. Also, they focused in their corpus on INAS expressions that are used by English

language speakers to talk about self and its aspects. Nevertheless, it can constitute a starting point for further cross-linguistic research on INAS expressions as being used metaphorically to speak about the self and its aspects. Consequently, a study of INAS expressions to talk about the self can be conducted to explore them in other languages because “there has been surprisingly little attention devoted to such expressions” (Devylder & Zlatev, 2020, p. 276). Furthermore, the dimensions of the self and its aspects that are affected by the INAS expression as used in English language can be investigated in another language to find out if this language has the same, different, or more affected dimensions of the self.

Based on the model which was devised by Devylder and Zlatev (2020), the current paper is intended to answer the following research questions:

1. *To what extent do speakers of Jordanian Arabic employ the cutting and breaking verbs/events to talk about the intangible aspects of the self?*
2. *What are the intangible self-dimensions described as affected by INAS expressions in Jordanian Arabic?*

### **3 Method**

This section of the paper will address the data collection and the validation process of the analysis.

#### **3.1 Data**

The data is a corpus built by the author to be analysed according to a set of research questions because “corpus analysis can reveal many linguistic details that could be passed over in the examination of single texts and might not be observed at all when data are elicited rather than gathered from language in use.” (Deignan, 2008, p. 293). The corpus is a collection of narrations that represent personal experiences. Zibin and Hamdan (2019, p. 243) reported that the collected corpus of Jordanian Arabic is not sufficiently available online using tools such as Sketch Engine (see also Jarrah *et al.*, 2019 and 2020, on the lack of written or online corpus of Jordanian Arabic). Thus, in their research, they used data from Facebook pages. Due to the same reason, the corpus of the current paper is collected from the same source and it consists of Facebook posts between 2017 and 2021. The 110 posts are randomly copied from one Facebook page called “Confessions”. It is a Jordanian Facebook page to which people send the narrations of their experiences. These narrations are posted anonymously on the page. Mostly, people express their feelings concerning their experiences using Jordanian Arabic, and others leave comments. The data is limited to the narrations in the posts. Comments are not included in the analysis. In other words, the comments are excluded from the analysis as the focus is limited to the posted narratives. The corpus consists of around 32,000 words and it is in Jordanian Arabic.

#### **3.2 Acceptability Validation Process**

The instances of INAS expressions were classified to find out which affected intangible dimensions of the self JA speakers tried to describe when they talked about their experiences based on the Motivation and Sedimentation Model by Devylder and Zlatev (2020, p. 268). This categorization was verified by a group of native speakers of JA. A sample of 15 instances along with the category of the dimension of the affected self were presented to 41 informants who were native speakers of JA to find out if they agree with the author’s categorization for each instance. The respondents had to rate the suggested categorization on a four-point Likert scale of agreement (agree, strongly agree, disagree, and strongly disagree) (See Hamdan & Abu Rumman, 2020). The categorization which received the agreement of

60% was counted as an agreement with the current analysis. The upshot of this validation process was to verify the categories which were defined depending on intuition which “this does not make the analysis ‘subjective’” (Devylder & Zlatev, 2020, p. 267).

#### 4. Results

This part of the paper discusses the results of the analysis.

##### 4.1. Cutting and breaking verbs/events used in Jordanian Arabic for intangible aspects of the self

The first research question explored in this paper is “to What extent do speakers of Jordanian Arabic employ the cutting and breaking verbs/events to talk about the intangible aspects of the self?” After analysing the corpus, it was found that speakers of Jordanian Arabic used some cutting and breaking verbs/event metaphorically to describe certain aspect of the affected self when they want to talk about their experiences or feelings. The term INAS (suggested by Devylder & Zlatev, 2020) is used as covering one for the cutting and breaking verbs/events. Table 1 shows the frequency of INAS verbs/events that were employed by Jordanians in the corpus about the self.

**Table 1: Frequency of INAS verbs/events in the corpus about the self**

Arabic Verb		English	Frequency	Percentage
كسر	kasara	Break	39.0	41.5
جرح	jaraha	Cut	13.0	13.8
فجر	fajjara	Burst	8.0	8.5
انهار	ʔinha:ra	Fall apart	7.0	7.4
قطع	qata <sup>ʕ</sup> a	Cut	5.0	5.3
فقع	faqa <sup>ʕ</sup> a	Burst	5.0	5.3
فصل	fasala	Split	5.0	5.3
شرخ	sharakha	Crack	3.0	3.2
حطم	hattama	Shatter	3.0	3.2
خدش	khadasha	Scratch	2.0	2.1
مزق	mazzaqa	Tear	1.0	1.1
مزع	maza <sup>ʕ</sup> a	Tear	1.0	1.1
فلق	falaqa	Split	1.0	1.1
فتت	fatata	Shatter	1.0	1.1
Total			94.0	100.0

The INAS expressions to talk about intangible aspects of the self in the corpus are identified using the five above mentioned criteria defined by Devylder and Zlatev (2020, p. 262). Based on these criteria, there are 94 instances of INAS expressions of the self. The most common verbs to talk about the self metaphorically are kasara “break”, jaraha “cut” and fajjara “burst”. The high frequency of the verb *break* in the current paper coincides with Devylder and Zlatev’s (2020, p. 269) findings concerning the same verb. It seems that the verb *break* is highly employed cross-culturally to talk about the affected self which reflects universal experiences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 270). This could be attributed to the literal meaning of the verb or the breaking event which is very common in daily life. Another feature of the



use of the INAS expressions used to talk about the self in the current corpus is the use of some body-part terms like heart, back and gallbladder, as in the following examples (1-3).

- (1)     altni:n           kasar-u           qalb-i  
           both           broke-they       heart-my  
           Lit. The two broke my heart  
           “Both broke my heart”
- (2)     faga<sup>c</sup>t-i                           marart-i  
           burst-you.FEM                   gallbladder-my  
           “You’ve burst my gallbladder.”
- (3)     min   b<sup>c</sup>dik           inkasar           Thahr-i  
           after you                   broke           back-my  
           Lit. After you, my back broke  
           “Your death broke my back”

#### 4.2. Dimensions or aspects of the self affected by INAS expressions

The second aim of the current paper is to uncover the dimensions or aspects of the self that are described as affected by using INAS expressions. Most of INAS expressions in the corpus are used to describe the emotional aspect of the self. Table 2 shows that the speakers use INAS mainly to talk about the emotional dimension of the self in about 46% of the instances. The mental integrity of the self is described by using INAS expressions in 32 instances of the data i.e. 34%. The interpersonal and social integrities of the self are about 14% and 6%, respectively.

**Table 2 Dimensions of the self affected by using INAS expressions in JA**

Dimensions of the self	Number of instances	Percentage
Emotional integrity	43.0	45.7
Mental integrity	32.0	34.0
Interpersonal integrity	13.0	13.8
Social integrity	6.0	6.4
Total	94.0	100.0

This categorization of the 94 instances of INAS in the JA data has been verified through a 15-item sample by JA native speakers. They agreed with the author’s categorization of the instances in with more than 60%. The rationale of this procedure was to validate the intuition-based analysis of the expressions hinging in the author’s linguistic knowledge of this variety of Arabic. The systematic intuition-based analysis combined with validation process can yield a less subjective view of these aspects of the self.

The emotional integrity according to Devylder and Zlatev (2020, p. 267) is “the continuity of an emotional state of wholeness”. This aspect of the self was the most common among the other categories. This can be attributed to the nature of the corpus as narrations where people can freely communicate their feelings. The corpus showed people were trying to exhibit their feelings and emotions heavily when they talked about their experiences. These narrations were rich of metaphors as persuasive devices speakers used when they were communicating their own experiences. In the following example the speaker tries to describe her emotional aspect of the self by referring to her heart as being fragmented or shattered The

use of the verb *fatata* in past participle form *mufatat* (example 4) was to show that the speaker is emotionally down.

- (4) Matfiy-ih o qalb-i mufatat  
unllit-FEM and heart-my shattered  
Lit. I'm unlit and my heart is shattered.  
"I'm down and my heart is broken."

The mental integrity is the ability of individuals to master their states and the data of the brain without any interventions from others to know or change these states or data without the individual's consent (Lavazza, 2018, p.: 4). There are 32 instances in the current corpus where the people tried to say that the mental dimension of the self was affected using INAS expressions. The speaker in (5), tries to describe a mental breakdown by using an adjective that is derived from the cutting and breaking verb *?inha:ra* 'fall apart':

- (5) O kont afkir kol yu:m ini antahir o arayeh hali li?ani munhara  
Lit. I was thinking every day to commit suicide and rest my self because I am falling apart  
"I was always thinking to commit suicide and rest in peace because I was falling apart."

Social integrity on the other hand has to do with less discrepancy between the ought self and the actual self (Devylder & Zlatev, 2020, p. 265; Higgins, 1987). In the following example (6), the speaker describes such discrepancy between the ought self and the actual self by using the INAS expression *sharakha* 'crack'.

- (6) hay shakalat sharkh kbi:r fi shakhsyt-i  
This formed crack big in personality-my  
Lit. This has formed a crack in my personality.

Finally, the interpersonal integrity of the self is related to the relationships with other selves such as family, partners, friends, etc. In the following example, the speaker uses the the INAS expression *infasala* 'split' to describe that the interpersonal aspect of the self has been affected.

- (7) zatat il-mashakil bi:n-a o infasal-na  
increased the-problems between-us and split-we  
Lit. The problems increased between us and we split.  
"troubles between us had increased and we broke up"

The 94 instances of INAS expressions in the confessions data are qualified as possible metaphors for the disrupted Self. These expressions are then analysed for the self-dimensions. The distribution of possibly metaphorical INAS expression types over self-dimension types is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Distribution of INAS expressions applied to the self over self-dimension types in the data**

Verb in Jordanian Arabic	English equivalence	mental	emotional	social	interpersonal	Total
كسر   kasara	Break	13.0	23.0	3.0	0.0	39.0

جرح	jaraha	Cut	0.0	12.0	0.0	2.0	13.0
فجر	fajjara	Burst	4.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	8.0
انهار	?inha:ra	Fall apart	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0
فصل	fasala	Split	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
فقع	faqa <sup>ca</sup>	Burst	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
قطع	qata <sup>ca</sup>	Cut	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	5.0
حطم	hattama	Shatter	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
شرخ	sharakha	Crack	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
خدش	khadasha	Scratch	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
فتت	fatatta	Shatter	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
فلق	falaqa	Split	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
مزق	maza <sup>ca</sup>	Tear	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
مزق	mazzaqa	Tear	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Total			32.0	43.0	6.0	13.0	94.0

The INAS expressions inherent in the verb *kasara* “break” can be seen in all the self-dimension types except for the interpersonal one. Also, it can be noticed that the INAS expressions based on the verb *?inha:ra* ‘fall apart’ are all related to one dimension of the disrupted self, i.e. mental integrity. In all the instances, speakers attempted to describe the state of mental breakdown by using this verb. Nevertheless, the number of instances i.e., 94 do not seem representative enough to draw conclusions about the correlation between the dimensions of the self and the INAS expressions. A future study with a larger number of instances may uncover a sort of correlation between INAS expressions and the various aspects of the self in the Arabic data (see Devylder & Zlatev, 2020, p. 270).

## 5 Conclusions

The current study sought to explore the metaphorical use of some change of state verbs/events in Jordanian Arabic. The Motivation and Sedimentation Model by Devylder and Zlatev (2020) as an alternative approach to investigate the metaphors of the self was adopted in this study. The analysis of the data indicated that the Jordanians use INAS expressions to talk about experiences or feelings that have affected the self as in English. There was a frequent use of the verbs *kasara* ‘break’ in the data, which agrees with Devylder and Zlatev’s (2020, p. 269) findings concerning the same verb.

Moreover, this paper was an attempt to identify the dimensions of the self as being described by Jordanian Arabic speakers as affected. The speakers of JA usually use INAS expressions to describe four affected dimensions of the self, i.e., emotional, mental, social and interpersonal. The most common aspect of the self in the data was the emotional one whereas Devylder and Zlatev (2020, p. 269) reported that the most common dimension in their data is the mental aspect of the self. This can be attributed to the difference between the two corpora.

The correlation between each dimension of the self and the frequency of each of the INAS expressions for this dimension is beyond the scope of this study as this sort of correlation requires a larger and more representative corpus to reach to confirmed conclusions. This may tempt other researchers to study this area in cutting and breaking metaphors of the self in Arabic. Also, the study limits itself to one variety of Arabic i.e., JA. A future study may explore the metaphorical use of INAS in other Arabic varieties. The current study limits itself to one variety of Arabic i.e. JA. A future study may explore the metaphorical use of INAS in other Arabic varieties. Finally, a corpus from different sources or genres could yield different results.

**Transliteration symbols for Arabic vowels and some consonants**

Arabic alphabet	Symbol	Example	Meaning
ء	ʔ	ʔamal	hope
ث	th	tha <sup>c</sup> lab	fox
ج	j	jamal	camel
ح	h	h ub	love
خ	kh	khubz	bread
ذ	dh	dhahab	gold
ز	z	zayt	oil
ش	sh	shams	sun
ص	s	s ayf	summer
ض	d	d ayf	guest
ط	t	t i:n	mud
ظ	TH	THuhr	noon
ع	°	° abd	slave
غ	gh	gharb	west
ق	q	qalam	pencil
و	w	ward	rose
ي	y	yawm	day
◌ِ (فتحة)	a	kataba	he wrote
◌ُ (ضمة)	u	kutub	books
◌ِ (كسرة)	i	sin	tooth
مد طويل / اى	a:	ka:tib	writer
ضمة طويلة و	u:	fu:l	beans
كسرة طويلة ي	i:	fi:l	elephant
Diphthongs	aw	mawt	death
(أصوات علة مركبة)	ay	bayt	house

**References**

- [1] Al Sharif, A. (2007). *Metaphorical conceptualization of happiness and anger in English and Arabic: A comparative study*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan
- [2] Al-Abdullah, M. (2019). Cognitive linguistic perspectives of metaphoric conceptualization of pain in Jordanian Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature* 11(3), 341-360.
- [3] Allwood, J. (1999). Semantics as meaning determination with semantic epistemic operation. In J. Allwood & P. Gärdenfors (Eds.) *Cognitive Semantics*, (pp. 1-18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [4] Bouveret, M. & Sweetser, E. (2009). Multi-frame semantics, metaphoric extensions and grammar (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society). *BLS*, 35(1) 49-59.
- [5] Bowerman, M. (Ed). (2007). *Cognitive Linguistics*, 18(2) (special issue on the semantics of cutting and breaking verbs).

- [6] Brown, P. (2007). 'She had just cut/broken off her head': Cutting and breaking verbs in Tzeltal. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 18(2), 319–330.
- [7] Cameron, L. & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 671–690 <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml032>
- [8] Deignan, A. (2008). Corpus linguistics and metaphor. In Gibbs, R.W. (Ed.) *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. (pp. 280-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Devylder, S. & Zlatev, J. (2020). Cutting and breaking metaphors of the self and the Motivation & Sedimentation Model. In A. Baicchi (Ed.), *Figurative meaning construction in thought and language*, (pp. 253–282). Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- [10] Devylder, S. (2016). *The PART-WHOLE schema we live through: A cognitive linguistic analysis of part-whole expressions of the self*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Lyon 3 University, Lyon, France.
- [11] Devylder, Simon. (2017). Cutting and breaking the embodied self. *Cognitextes* 16, 1-49. <https://doi.org/10.4000/cognitextes.886>
- [12] Fillmore, Charles. 1970. The grammar of hitting and breaking. In Jacobs, R. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.). *Readings in English transformational grammar*, (pp. 120–33). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- [13] Geojo, A. C. (2015). *Breaking and entering: verb semantics and event structure*. (Doctoral dissertation). Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University.
- [14] Gharib, H. (2012). *A semantic analysis of cut and break verbs in Sorani Kurdish*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kansas, Kansas, USA.
- [15] Gibbs Jr, R. W. & Macedo, A. C. P. S. (2010). Metaphor and embodied cognition. *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 26(spe), 679-700. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502010000300014>
- [16] Glynn, D. (2002). Love and anger: The grammatical structure of conceptual metaphors. *Style* 36(3). 541-559.
- [17] Hamdan, J. M. and Abu Rumman, R. (2020). The Pragmatic functions of yahummalali in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, 12(3). 327-345.
- [18] Hassan, W. (2015). The interface between verbal semantics and clause structure in Arabic hitting and breaking verbs. *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 15, 181-198.
- [19] Higgins, E. T. (1989). Self-discrepancy theory: What patterns of self-beliefs cause people to suffer. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 22, 93–136.
- [20] Jarrah, M., Alghazo, S., & Al Salem, M. N. (2019). Discourse functions of the wh-word Su: in Jordanian Arabic. *Lingue e linguaggio*, 18(2), 291-318.
- [21] Jarrah, M., Al-Marayat, S., & Salem, E. (2020). The discourse use of ?ilʔa:n 'now' in Jordanian Arabic. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 17(1). 144-156
- [22] Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer
- [23] Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind and culture: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [24] Kövecses, Z. (2008). Conceptual metaphor theory: Some criticisms and alternative proposals. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 6. 168–184. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.08kov>
- [25] Kövecses, Z. (2010). A new look at metaphorical creativity in cognitive linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21(4). 663–697
- [26] Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [27] Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York, NY: Basic books.
- [28] Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [29] Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- [30] Lakoff, G. (1996) Sorry, I'm not myself today: The metaphor system for conceptualizing the self. In G. Fauconnier & E. Sweetser, (Eds.) *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*, (pp. 91–123) Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press
- [31] Lavazza, A. (2018). Freedom of thought and mental integrity: The moral requirements for any neural prosthesis. *Frontiers in neuroscience* 12, 1-10 doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00082
- [32] Levin, B. (1993). *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- [33] Maalej, Z. (2004). Figurative language in anger expression in Tunisian Arabic: An extended view of embodiment. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 19(1). 51–75.
- [34] Majid, A., Gullberg, M., van Staden, M. & Bowerman, M. (2007). How similar are the semantic categories in four closely related languages. A comparison of cutting and breaking in four Germanic languages. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18(2), 179–194.
- [35] Majid, A., Boster, J. S. & Bowerman M. (2008). The cross-linguistic categorization of everyday events: A study of cutting and breaking. *Cognition* 109(2). 235-250.
- [36] Moser, K. S. (2007). Metaphors as symbolic environment of the self: How self-knowledge is expressed verbally. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 12(12). 151-178.
- [37] Mousser, J. (2013). *A large coverage verb lexicon for Arabic*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Konstanz: University of Konstanz .
- [38] Narasimhan, B. (2007). Cutting, breaking, and tearing verbs in Hindi and Tamil. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18(2), 195-205. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2007.008>
- [39] Nayak, N. & Gibbs, R. W. (1990). Conceptual knowledge in the interpretation of idioms. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 119 (3), 315–330.
- [40] Radden, G. & Dirven, R. (2007). *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [41] Taylor, J. R. (2007). Semantic categories of cutting and breaking: Some final thoughts. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18(2), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2007.020>
- [42] Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 10, 59-92.
- [43] Zibin, A. & Hamdan, J (2019). The conceptualisation of FEAR through conceptual metonymy and metaphor in Jordanian Arabic. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 19(2), 239-262.