

Cultural Filtering of Metaphor Translating: A Cognitive Science Perspective

Mohammed I. Alghbbanⁱ

Department of Modern Languages and Translation
College of Languages and Translation, King Saud University
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: malghbban@ksu.edu.sa

Zouheir Maalej

Independent Researcher
Retired Professor from King Saud University
Mail: 188, Al-Jareed Road, Sakiet Ezzit, 3032, Sfax, Tunisia

Received: 11/21/2022

Accepted: 01/22/2023

Published: 02/24/2023

Abstract

The driving force of the current research runs as follows: Since metaphor is a carrier of thought, culture will be argued to act as a filter in metaphor translating, precluding unexpected, unfamiliar, and shocking knowledge both linguistically and conceptually from being smuggled into the target language and culture. The study aims to show that metaphor translating can be best dealt with from a cultural perspective, isolating cultural knowledge as a guide for decision-making in translating. The significance of the study lies in the fact that metaphor translating should not be monitored by ready-made procedures but should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, with consequences for ready-made procedures and new paths followed in translating. The study will seek to address the following question: How does cultural filtering take affect metaphor translating? The article adopts a three-step framework: (i) measuring cultural knowledge's compatibility, or lack of it, carried by Source Language metaphor and its target language translation, (ii) triggering of cultural filtering in case of incompatibility, and (iii) comparing cultures based on Hiraga's four-scenario scheme to assess the position of the two cultures in presence. Cultural filtering will be illustrated through concrete examples in disciplines such as politics, economics, and advertising across English and Arabic and written and pictorial metaphors.

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, cultural filtering, metaphor translating, re-conceptualizing, smuggling knowledge

Cite as: Alghbban, M. I., & Maalej, Z. (2023). Cultural Filtering of Metaphor Translating: A Cognitive Science Perspective. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies* 7 (1). 70-100. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol7no1.6>

Introduction

Several studies of metaphor translating (e.g., Alvarez, 1993; Crofts, 1988; Larson, 1984) offered a prescriptive list of procedures à la Newmark (1980). Maalej (2008) levelled two criticisms against this view: (i) the usefulness of the classification of metaphors into dead, cliché, stock (or standard), adapted, recent, standard, original, etc. (Newmark, 1995), and (ii) the lack of correspondence between the procedures offered and the type of metaphor isolated, and the usefulness of such procedures, for instance, for professional translators or the pedagogy of translation teaching.

With the rise of cognitive linguistics, metaphor emerged as an instrument of thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Thibodeau, Matlock, & Flusberg, 2019). To pursue thought as carried by metaphor, cognitive linguists researched metaphor in the language (Gibbs, 1994; Kövecses, 2005; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), gesture (Chui, 2011; Cienki, 1998; Khatin-Zadeh, Farsani & Banaruee, 2022), and multimodal discourse (Forceville, 2009, 2016; Yu, 2009). Following the advances in cognitive linguistics and the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor (CTM)ⁱⁱ, many translation studies of metaphor turned cognitive (e.g., Burmakova & Marugina, 2014; Ghazala, 2012).

Metaphor translating has been dominated by translation procedures à la Newmark, which has proven its limitations because those who propose them do not say which procedure works with which type of metaphor. The current article will not offer procedures for metaphor translating. We believe that, notwithstanding the number of shared metaphors in intercultural communication, no recipe will work since culture-specific metaphors select their own corresponding metaphors or non-metaphors from within the Target Language Culture (TLC) independently of prescriptive translation procedures. Gibbs (1999a) calls the most cognitively accurate translation candidates "culturally appropriate metaphors" (p. 158).

The main purpose of the study is to show how culture as represented by cultural knowledge in metaphor acts as a determinant factor, thus filtering out unexpected, unfamiliar, and shocking knowledge both linguistically and conceptually from being smuggled into the target language and culture. Such cultural knowledge in TLC triggers the most culturally appropriate linguistic and conceptual metaphors. We hypothesize that the more two languages and cultures in presence are remotely related, the more the metaphors' Target Domain (TD) will be (partially) re-conceptualized, i.e., different Source Domains (SD) will be adopted to conceptualize the existing TDs in the TLC, or even abandoned as a metaphoric project in favor of a non-metaphor.

The significance of this study consists of the fact that metaphor translating should not be monitored by ready-made procedures but should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, addressing consequences for ready-made procedures and new paths followed in translating. A case-by-case treatment of metaphor translating allows, among other things, for previously unsuspected translation paths to emerge in metaphor translating. The study will seek to address the following question: How does cultural filtering take affect metaphor translating?

Before signalling the structure of the article, a terminological note will be made here concerning the two disciplines of metaphor and translation included in the title of the current

article. Shuttleworth (2014) aptly distinguished (i) "the translation of metaphor," (ii) "metaphor *and* translation," and (iii) "metaphor in translation" (p. 56). He rejected (i) as prescriptive, called (ii) neutral vis-à-vis the two disciplines, and preferred (iii) because it emphasizes metaphor. Instead, we have opted for "metaphor translating" to emphasize translation as a process as reflected by the *-ing* form in translating. Using "metaphor translating" to emphasize translation as a process, should not be understood as excluding metaphor as a product. Both the processes of metaphor (i.e. how metaphor is understood) and the products of metaphor (i.e., what metaphors mean) (Gibbs, 1999b) are equally important for metaphor translating.

The structure of the current article is as follows. The first section offers an overview of culture, metaphor, and cultural filtering along with an overview of cognitive studies of metaphor translating. The second section spells out the research methodology, including the framework of the article as a combination of three components, and the dataset. The third section, which makes up the bulk of the article, applies the framework to a select collection of metaphors from politics, economics, and promotional discourses. The last section offers a discussion of the research findings.

Literature Review

Overview of Culture, Metaphor, and Cultural Filtering

Humans are born into a culture, which has "an influence on the perception, thought patterns, judgment and action of all members of a given society" (Thomas, 2010, p. 19). Emphasizing the interrelation between metaphor and culture, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argued that "much of cultural change arises from the introduction of new metaphorical concepts and the loss of old ones" (p. 145). Feldman (2006) linked thought, language, experience, knowledge, and culture in the following fashion:

All of our thought and language arises from our genetic endowment and from our experience. Language and culture are, of course, carried by the family and the community. But each child has to rebuild it all in his or her own mind. From the child's internal perspective, all social and cultural interactions start as additional inputs that must somehow be understood and incorporated using existing knowledge. (p. 3)

This linkage ties in with the cognitive stage of the framework of the current article about metaphor translating, with a conceptual metaphor involving thought, language, experience, knowledge, and culture. Of particular interest to this study is Feldman's (2006) claim that "there are obviously also many packages of knowledge that are specific to a given culture, profession, or other entity" (p. 145).

Because cultures differ, Bender and Beller (2016) introduced the concept of "cultural diversity of cognition" (p. 2). As a result, metaphors differ cross-culturally in terms of "degree of linguistic elaboration" and "degree of specificity" (Kövecses, 2005, p. 151) of the SD category used to conceptualize the target domain (TD) category. Cultural neuroscience provides evidence for the nonnegotiable role of culture in humans. It is an interdisciplinary, bidirectional, and empirical discipline, according to which the existence of neurobiology in a given culture favors

cultural variation, and culture shapes neurobiological processes (Chiao 2010; Han et al., 2013). Cultural neuroscience seeks to show that "brain pathways are shaped by culture" (Kitayama & Park 2010, p. 112). Progress in neuroscience has made it possible "to observe neural processes underlying the psychological processes more rapidly and concurrently," and "to identify specific brain regions that are recruited in a variety of psychological operations" (p. 112).

A metaphor makes use of concrete and abstract concepts. Because concrete concepts are more delineated in experience, they do not need a metaphor to conceptualize them, and are, thus, semantically autonomous. Autonomous concepts include spaces, objects, substances, and containers (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), and are "grounded in the habitual and routine bodily and social patterns we experience, and in what we learn of the experience of others" (pp. 57-58), with metaphorical understanding as "grounded in semantically autonomous conceptual structure" (p. 113). Claiming that metaphor is culture-specific may be captured in the fact that different cultures conceptualize experience metaphorically in varying ways (Snell-Hornby 1988-95). Since metaphor cannot be understood outside its "experiential basis" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 19) and since different cultures have relatively different experiences, the encoding of this experience takes on different linguistic categories. Therefore, the linguistic categories in metaphor tend to differ cross-culturally. On the other hand, Tabakowska (1993) linked the cultural experiential basis of metaphor to the "often unsurmountable problems for translation" (p. 67).

In the non-cognitive tradition, many are those who have argued for the relevance of culture in metaphor translating (Catford 1965; Dagut 1975, 1987; Mason 1982; Nida 1964; Snell-Hornby 1988-95; Quinn 1991). Mason (1982), for instance, believes that the originality of metaphor is measured by its culture-specific features and that if it is de-culturalized in the Target Language (TL), the reader will be "deprived of much information of great value about the SL culture" (p. 144). Dagut (1987) argued that "what determines the translatability of an SL metaphor is not its 'boldness' or 'originality' ... but rather the extent to which the cultural experience and lexical matrices on which it draws are shared by speakers of the particular TL" (p. 82). Thus, for Dagut (1987) the untranslatability of metaphor is due to the absence of the cultural reference of an SL metaphor in the TL, the cultural and lexical specifics of the SL, or simply the compactness of lexical items. Van Den Broeck (1981) takes metaphor to be at the boundary of translatability and untranslatability, arguing that its translatability is inversely proportional to the amount of "information (specifically cultural) manifested by the metaphor and the degree to which this information is structured in a text" (p. 84).

Within the cognitive paradigm, culture and metaphor are inseparable. For instance, Gibbs (1999a) wrote that the relation between metaphor and thought is similar to "cognitive webs that extend beyond individual minds and are spread out into the cultural world" (p. 146). Gibbs explained his own statement as consisting of two parts: (i) "First, our understanding of what is conceptual about metaphor involves significant aspects of cultural experience" and (ii) "Second, public, cultural representations of conceptual metaphors have an indispensable cognitive function that allows people to carry less of a mental burden during everyday thought and language use." As applied to metaphor translating, pre-existing conceptual metaphors in individual minds and in the cultural world, which have been acquired and/or learned as part of the shared cultural heritage,

enable the translator to reach in long-term memory for the linguistic metaphor that best corresponds to the one in the TLC. Insisting on the inter-relation between conceptual systems and culture, Gibbs reiterated that "theories of human conceptual systems should be inherently cultural in that the cognition which occurs when the body meets the world in inextricably culturally-based" (p. 153). Another proponent within the cognitive paradigm that gave due importance to culture in metaphor studies is Kövecses (2005), who claimed that metaphor is "simultaneously shaped by both embodiment and culture" (p. 292).

Working on the persuasiveness of conceptual metaphors, Maalej (2014) showed how conscious awareness of the existence of a conceptual metaphor may cancel its persuasiveness if it carries with it frames that contradict, thwart, or insult the cognizer's knowledge (p. 342). Cultural filtering is not an arbitrary decision but a conscious decision based on the superimposition of cultural knowledge frames in both the SLC and TLC. As we will see in the analysis section, there are cases where metaphors show acceptable translations between Arabic and English. However, the superimposition (of both linguistic and conceptual structures) might be incomplete, which triggers cultural filtering.

The concept of cultural filtering seeks to fill a research gap, whereby metaphor translating is either dealt with using translation procedures identified as limited in scope or simply applying the basic tenets of the CTM to metaphor translating. Filling the gap is monitored by operationalizing and systematizing cultural knowledge while cultural filtering takes place, thus showing how the translation process not only identifies unaccepted linguistic and conceptual metaphors in metaphor translating but also goes a step further (partially) reconceptualizing in Arabic or English the metaphor to be translated.

Overview of Cognitive Studies of Metaphor Translating

Studies on metaphor translating from the cognitive perspective abound (Al-Sowaidi et al., 2021; Burmakova & Marugina, 2014; Ghazala, 2012; Hanić et al., 2016; Hong & Rossi, 2021; Jensen, 2005; Massey, 2021; Safarnejad et al. 2014; Samaniego Fernández, 2011). For lack of space here, only a few seminal publications will be addressed.

One of the earliest cognitive contributions to metaphor translating is Mandelblit (1995), who offered the Cognitive Translation Hypothesis (CTH) in two scenarios, namely, (i) a Similar Mapping Condition (SMC) and (ii) a Different Mapping Condition (DMC). The SMC will keep in the target language text (TLT) the source language text (SLT) conceptual metaphor (CM). The DMC, however, will operate a conceptual shift in translating metaphors into the TLT. Since Mandelblit was concerned with conceptual shift or constancy in translating metaphor, she (1995) used the time variable to establish the psychological reality of her CTH, concluding that "the difference in reaction time is due to a conceptual shift that the translator is required to make between the conceptual mapping systems of the source and target languages" (p. 493). However insightful Mandelblit's scheme is, it seems to ignore middle-ground data between the two components of the CTH, i.e., the fact that there may be cases of metaphor in translation where the linguistic dimension of metaphor could be the same but the concept is different in two cultures, or the concept is realized via different linguistic categories.

Schaffner (2004) aimed to discuss some implications for a cognitive theory of metaphor-to-metaphor translating without trying to offer a cognitive theory or a model for metaphor translating. Her approach to the translated examples is nothing but the main tenets of the CTM à la Lakoff and Johnson such as conceptual metaphor, epistemic correspondences, ontological correspondences, etc. Moreover, although Schaffner and Shuttleworth (2015) did not really aim to offer a cognitive theory of metaphor translating but proposed possible interactions of metaphor with translation studies, they showed a fascination with Al-Harrasi's (2001) CTM-based procedures for metaphor in translation as if metaphor translating is in dire need for procedures.

Maalej (2008) was critical of translation procedures in metaphor translating, arguing that giving a list of procedures to choose from does not seem to facilitate metaphor translating. Instead, he proposed a scheme in three steps, namely, (i) unpacking the SL/SC metaphor, setting side-by-side their linguistic and conceptual structures, (ii) comparing cultures, using a combination of frameworks from Hiraga (1991), Mandelblit (1995), and Kövecses (2005), and (iii) re-packing the metaphor into the TL (p. 65 onwards). One criticism of Maalej (2008) is that, although the study implicitly addressed metaphor translating from a process- and product-oriented perspective, the proposed three-step scheme shows some overlap between the three steps, which has been corrected in the current article.

Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow (2017) borrowed Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's (2010) concept of "re-conceptualization" but preferred to create their own concept of "re-mapping." As conceived by its author, re-conceptualization is not specific to metaphor translating but is a general phenomenon applied in the process of turning a mental concept into a linguistic expression. As applied to the translation of metaphor, Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow's "re-mapping" consists in changing the mapping of an SL metaphor when translating it into a TL because the two languages and cultures have incompatible images or "conceptual asymmetries" (p. 174). If this is true for some culture-specific metaphors, it may not apply when, for instance, two languages and cultures share the same linguistic expression and concept, i.e., use the same metaphoric mappings.

Another cognitive proposal for metaphor translating can be found in Kövecses (2005), who singled out a few conceptual metaphors and made his students translate between English and Hungarian the linguistic metaphors they govern. The translations were assessed according to four parameters, namely, word form, literal meaning, figurative meaning, and conceptual metaphor. The assessment led him to calculate and tabulate frequencies of occurrence of different types of possibilities, which will be reproduced here:

Table 1. *Five possibilities to translate the same figurative meaning from one language into another*ⁱⁱⁱ

	Word form	Literal meaning	Figurative meaning	Conceptual metaphor
Most frequent use	Different	Same	Same	Same
Less frequent use	Different	Different	Same	Same
Least frequent use	Different	Different	Same	Different
Literary works (everyday speech?)	Different	Different	Different	Different

Figurative meaning expressed by the literal meaning	Different	Different	Same [by means of the literal meaning]	[no metaphor]
---	-----------	-----------	--	---------------

Kövecses found a range of five patterns of metaphor translating between English and Hungarian. At one extreme, the most frequent use adopts the same literal meaning, figurative meaning, and conceptual metaphor. On the other, the metaphor was translated by non-metaphor, with different literal meanings, figurative meanings, and conceptual metaphors. There are at least two merits of these findings. First, Kövecses knew that committing himself to a list of procedures in metaphor translating was a futile and counter-productive tendency. Instead, he adopted at the same time a product-driven (what metaphors mean across-cultures) and a process-oriented (how metaphors are comprehended in their cultural context) approaches. Second, the results deriving from this approach may contribute to building a cross-cultural database as to how different languages and cultures express and conceptualize the same abstract concepts such as time, love, marriage, life, etc. Hong and Rossi, (2021) noted that "applying a cognitive approach to metaphor translation adds more flexibility to the analysis of real translation occurrences, as it allows for a macro-level conceptual shift" (p. 22)

Method

The current article is grounded mainly in cognitive science disciplines such as cognitive linguistics, psychology, neuroscience, and anthropology, and adopts cognitive scientific assumptions that have implications for metaphor translating. The rest of this section includes the framework and the dataset.

Framework

The main step of the framework is cognitive. Cognition, by which we understand and function in the world, is said to be embodied (Anderson, 2003; Atkinson, 2010; Semin & Smith, 2002), social (Fiske & Haslam, 1996; Frith & Frith, 2008; Gallese, Keysers & Rizzolatti, 2004), cultural (Bender, 2020; D'Andrade, 1981; Tomasello & Rakoczy, 2003), situated (Semin & Smith, 2002; Wilson, 2002), and distributed (Kirsh, 2006; Spurrett & Cowley, 2004). The cognitive step draws on the view that metaphor is an "indispensable structure of human understanding utilizing which we figuratively comprehend our world" (Johnson, 1987, p. xx). In this view, translation is "a mapping from one language to another language" (Lakoff, 1987, p. 312). The cognitive view of metaphor, known as the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, holds metaphor to have a binary linguistic-conceptual dimension (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), whereby "metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980, p. 6).

For the article, what is treated as "cognitive" is the cultural knowledge frames internalized through the apprenticeship of one's culture as a way of filling in concepts with cultural meanings. Turner (1991) pointed out that "when we understand an utterance, we in no sense are understanding 'just what the words say'; the words themselves say nothing independent of the richly detailed knowledge and powerful cognitive processes we bring to bear" (p. 206). Shore (1996) claimed that "both kinds of meaning, logical and psychological, are real and both are important aspects of cultural cognition" (p. 318). In the words of Lakoff and Johnson (1999), "cultural knowledge takes

the form of conventional images and knowledge about those images" (p. 69). The cognitive step aims to superimpose cultural knowledge frames conveyed by the metaphoric mappings in the two languages and cultures after attempting the translation of the Source Language Metaphor (SLM). The outcome of this step should enable us to say whether the knowledge conveyed by metaphoric mappings in the two cultures in presence is superimposable, i.e. whether it is strictly identical, near-identical, or utterly different.

Cultural knowledge is about the acquisition of "cognitive and interactional 'frames'" (Fillmore, 1976, p. 23), which are crucial to language comprehension and communication. Cognitive frames are important for translating at large and for metaphor in particular. Fillmore (1975) opted for the relevance of frames by showing that although the Japanese *kaku* and the English verb *write* are "acceptable translations of each other" (p. 125), they do not include the same scenes. To illustrate this from the Arabic-English pair of languages, the concepts of *karam alDiafa* in Arabic and *hospitality* in English will be used. They are translations of each other in dictionaries, yet their frames do not evoke the same constituents. The frame of *karam alDiafa* evokes in the mind of Arabs hosting guests (Arabs or non-Arabs), feeding them properly, and taking care of them as required by the culture. All this is done as a treat, i.e., guests are not at all expected to pay for their treat or stay. However, *hospitality* from the Western perspective is in general differently framed nowadays. Wikipedia talks about "the hospitality industry," which involves hotels, tourism agencies, restaurants, and bars, and, of course, paying for everything during one's vacation or stay.

Based on the outcome of the cognitive step, the second step consists in saying whether the outcome in the cognitive step will or will not trigger cultural filtering. Basically, "culturally defined frames (...) that are not shared" (Lakoff, 1987, p. 312) or "cognitive incompatibility" (Tabakowska, 1993, p. 69), are unexpected knowledge in the mind of outsiders to the source culture. Culture has been singled for the framework because metaphor includes an important amount of culture. In particular, the concept of culture as a filter, which has been introduced by Maalej (2001) in a discussion of metaphors in pictures or pictorial metaphors, will be implemented in metaphor translating. Maalej (2001) claimed that "cognition is constrained by cultural models we internalize as part of our knowledge of the world we live in" (p. 39). Later on in the publication, Maalej (2001) stated that "within our cultural models, the assumed cultural filters constrain our cognitive capacities, thus acting, so to speak, like customs officers vis-à-vis the smuggling from a source culture of PMs [pictorial metaphors] held to be illicit by our cultural standards" (p. 40). Drawing a "circular triangle" of the relation between metaphor, body, and culture, Yu (2003) argued that "cultural models ... filter bodily experiences for specific target domains of conceptual metaphors" (p. 29). Yu specifies the way culture as represented by cultural models filters target domains that are compatible with conceptual metaphors in a given culture, which is a more specific kind of filtering than the more general cognitive (knowledge-wise) filtering proposed by Maalej (2001). Predictably, utterly different knowledge in the cognitive step will trigger the cultural filter whose function is to calibrate the translation in conformity with cultural knowledge in the TLC.

The third and last step is called Hiraga (1991) *Comparative Cultures*, which consists in capturing linguistically and conceptually the similarity or difference between the two languages

and cultures in metaphor translating. Building on Lakoff and Johnson's binary view of metaphor as linguistic and conceptual, Hiraga (1991) isolated four scenarios that render an account of all the possible linguistic and conceptual combinations:

1. Similar metaphorical concepts and similar metaphorical expressions
2. Similar metaphorical concepts but different metaphorical expressions
3. Different metaphorical concepts but similar metaphorical expressions
4. Different metaphorical concepts and different metaphorical expressions

(pp. 151-161)

Although these scenarios have been spelt out to serve comparing cultures for their use of metaphor, they too may lend themselves to metaphor translating, and we will, therefore, adopt them for the current article. This step operates a linguistic-cum-conceptual assessment of the SL metaphor and the TL metaphor, showing whether, in light of the two previous steps, the languages and cultures in presence keep the same conceptualization of reality, change part of the conceptualization, or even re-conceptualize reality according to the requirements of the target culture.

Dataset

The dataset is very small, consisting of a dozen metaphors in the disciplines of politics, economics, and promotional discourse. The set has not been collected in conformity with known data collection techniques in the social sciences, the purpose not being to find (ir)regularities in the use of metaphors in the aforementioned disciplines but to test the hypothesis that remotely related cultures tend to share very few concepts. For instance, we believe that the European and Anglo-American cultures tend to share very little with remotely related cultures such as the Arab sub-cultures. It is with these things in mind that we set up to collect the dataset to prove this point, which is the fact that incompatible cross-cultural knowledge packaged in metaphor tends to trigger a cultural blockage during metaphor translating. For the current article, we are not interested in metaphoric concepts that are shared among cultures such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, MORE IS UP/LESS IS DOWN, TIME IS PRECIOUS COMMODITY, etc.

With this aim in mind and notwithstanding the possibility of shared concepts between the Anglo-American and the Arab cultures, which are occasioned by universal embodiment, the authors selected metaphors that perfectly illustrate their argument. For instance, the second author's familiarity with politics metaphors made it easy through readings to come up with. The economics metaphors are selected owing to the first author's acquaintance with the Saudi stock market and the second author's knowledge of metaphor in economics as part of his doctoral thesis. The discourse of advertising made its way to the first author owing to the popularity of restaurants in Saudi Arabia and Saudis' fondness for eating out or buying take-away food.

Analysis

Culture as a Filter in Metaphor Translating

We have taken our dataset from disciplines such as politics, economics, and advertising owing to the influence and impact of such disciplines on people's daily life. Indeed, while politics seems to determine economic policy and its repercussions on the daily life of humans in general, advertising seeks to persuade potential buyers by changing their buying habits.

Cultural Filtering of Metaphors in Politics

A lot of studies have been devoted to sensitizing translators between English and Arabic and other languages about the importance of mastering metaphor translating in political discourse (Al-Zou'bi & Kanakri, 2020; Feng & Wang, 2020; Ramadan, Abu Radwan & Shuqair, 2020). Although they all studied the pedagogic and communication functions of political metaphors, they fell short of explaining why special attention should be devoted to the translation of metaphors in political discourse. The rest of this sub-section will be devoted to the analysis of four conceptual metaphors in politics, divided equally into English-Arabic and Arabic-English directions.

English-Arabic Metaphors

The first political metaphor will be taken from current British politics. Reacting to the death of the late Queen Elisabeth, former Prime Minister Liz Truss called her "one of greatest leaders the world has known," and hailed her as the "rock on which modern Britain was built. Our country has grown and flourished under her reign. Britain is the great country it is today because of her" (*The Guardian*, 9 Sep. 2022, para. 1). The common knowledge that was drawn upon in this mapping between a monarch and a rock, comes from the physical characteristics of rocks, which are big size (vs. small size for stones), hardness, and resilience in time. These characteristics of the SD have been mapped onto the TD to produce the linguistic metaphor Liz Truss uttered. Lakoff and Johnson (1999) claimed that "the fundamental role of metaphor is to project inference patterns from the source domain to the target domain" (p. 128), the inference pattern being those characteristics of rocks. Since a monarch has been conceptualized as a rock, there is, in principle, no negativity conveyed by this conceptualization. The meaning of the metaphor is that the late Queen was a firm, resilient support that kept Great Britain together.

However, the rock metaphor cannot be accepted as a viable conceptualization of a monarch by Arabs if translated literally into Arabic. Indeed, كانت الملكة بمثابة الصخرة التي بنيت عليه بريطانيا is felt, besides being degrading in Arabic, to thwart existing knowledge about the halo with which monarchs should be talked about, and is, thus, culturally censored as unacceptable. It is like metaphoric mappings to highlight certain concepts associated with the SD and hide others (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: p. 10), which becomes clearer in cross-linguistic communication. In Arabic, صخرة (*saxra*: rock) connotes negatively as cumbersome and unfeeling if profiled of humans, especially to a Tunisian audience. Therefore, *rock* as an SD would not be chosen by Arabs to conceptualize and highlight humans. In terms of the Neural Theory of Metaphor, cultural filtering of metaphor is occasioned by the fact that the SD and the TD do not constitute neuronal nodes that fire together in the conceptual system of the target culture (TC). In other words, *rock* (SD) is not a potential candidate in the conceptual system of most Arabs to fire with *humans* (TD), especially *monarchs*.

For instance, *My job is a jail* exists in the conceptual system of Anglo-Americans but *My job is an aardvark* doesn't, since "an aardvark is an African animal with a long proboscis that eats ants by sticking its proboscis in anthills" (Lakoff, 2008, p. 27). *Rock* plays the same role as *aardvark* in being new, unexpected knowledge to Arabs and Westerners, respectively. Lakoff (2008) argued that "complex metaphors that are extensions of existing primary metaphors bound together should be easier to learn and understand than conceptual metaphors that are new – since they just involve new binding and other connecting circuitry over existing conceptual metaphors"

(p. 27). Therefore, if the English *rock* metaphor profiled humans in the Arab context, it would be, as a metaphor mourning a politician, highly insulting owing to its inexistence in the conceptual system of Arabs and the sensitivity of the relation between the governor and governed in the Arab world.

It should be noted, however, that there exist in the Middle East Arab tribes by the name of Banu Sakhr (literally, the sons of rock), which perhaps explains the familiarity and intelligibility of the rock metaphor to Gulf people if translated literally into Arabic. Their sub-culture does not seem to shun such a use. Moreover, some Arab tribes in the Gulf area still name their sons Sakhr (literally, rock), hoping that the boy would grow as strong, firm, and unbreakable as a rock. Furthermore, Saudis use sayings such as “He was a rock” in talking about the football and military contexts, whereby being a rock serves the defense of one's team or country. It should be noted, however, that, as used here, the rock metaphor about the British monarch is used to build the country not to defend it.

As a result of cultural filtering, the rock metaphor would be rendered by a more culturally acceptable tentative alternative such as a mountain metaphor as in كانت الملكة بمثابة الجبل الذي بنيت عليه بريطانيا (literally, the Queen was the mountain on which Britain was built). In Arabic, الجبل (mountain) is majestic and challenging because of its height. This linguistic metaphor is governed by a different conceptual metaphor, namely, A MONARCH IS A COSMIC CREATURE while the rock metaphor in English is governed by the conceptual metaphor, A MONARCH IS AN INANIMATE OBJECT. Thus, unless the English rock metaphor is rendered as the Arabic mountain (or other potential metaphor) metaphor, it does not seem to be transportable into the Arab world because it is still taboo in Arab politics for politicians to be conceptualized as a rock. To be acceptable, the Queen has been re-conceptualized in Arab culture as a *mountain* even though it is as inanimate as a rock.

To take another political metaphor now from American politics, former American President, Donald Trump, was quoted as announcing to his audience during his 2016 presidential campaign, “It is time to drain the swamp in Washington, D.C. This is why I'm proposing a package of ethics reforms to make our government honest once again” (Overby, NPR, 26 April, 2017, para. 2). This slogan was one of three slogans during his 2016 electoral campaign, namely, "Build the Wall" (to prevent illegal immigration from Mexico) and "Lock her up" (a reference to the neutralization of Hilary Clinton, his rival in the elections).

Draining the swamp metaphor is made of draining, swamp, and "Washington, D.C.". Draining is an agricultural technique which consists in getting rid of excess water from a plot of land so that it remains arable land. The swamp is what happens to a plot of land when it is not drained, thus becoming muddy and filthy. And obviously "Washington, D.C" is a place-for-institution metonymy, referring to the headquarters of American politics. According to the Collins Co-Build Dictionary, a swamp is "an area of very wet land with wild plants growing in it." Therefore, if you drain the swamp, the wild plants will be automatically exterminated. The swamp metaphor seems to map the characteristics of the swamp onto American politics to get rid of unethical lobbying on the part of appointees.

Although "swamp" has a direct translation in Arabic (المستنقع) in the political context, it does not occur without السياسي (political), literally "political swamp." Moreover, in Arabic, we do not deal with the swamp by draining it, which is attacking the causes of what is happening in the swamp in English. We deal with the swamp by purifying or disinfecting it. The likely translation of the swamp metaphor is, لقد حان الوقت لتطهير المستنقع السياسي في واشنطن whose back-translation is "It is high time for the political swamp in Washington to be disinfected/cleansed." So at these two linguistic levels, namely, "political swamp" and "disinfection," the swamp metaphor in English is sanctioned as not quite culturally acceptable in Arabic.

To take Hiraga's scenarios, the swamp metaphor in English is motivated by the conceptual metaphor AMERICAN POLITICS IS A WILD AGRICULTURAL LAND while its tentative translation in Arabic is governed by AMERICAN POLITICS IS A POLLUTED AGRICULTURAL LAND. As a result, the scenario that suits these two conceptual metaphors is the second scenario, namely, the same metaphorical concepts but different metaphorical expressions. The English metaphor has, thus, been re-conceptualized as *disinfection* instead of *draining*.

Arabic-English Metaphors

As in the previous sub-section, a couple of Arabic-English metaphors that defy easy transportability to the West will be studied. The first one conceptualizes Lebanese politicians and what they did to Lebanon as عهر السياسي (literally, political prostitution), which will be referred to as Lebanese political prostitution (or LPP, for short) (Khaled Barakat, 2021, para. 1). The article builds a comparison between العاهرة (literally, a prostitute, whore) and Lebanese politicians. The gist of the comparison shows العهر السياسي (political prostitution) as worse than a prostitute. This unfurls progressively throughout the article, packaging several meanings within العهر السياسي that "political prostitution" in English cannot accommodate, which will make it culturally unacceptable in English to render العهر السياسي as "political prostitution."

Throughout the article, the writer exculpated the prostitute of the social, economic, and political situations in Lebanon and inculpated political prostitutes as responsible for all the social, economic, and political ills of Lebanon. This pattern runs as a sort of leitmotiv as follows:

العاهرة التي تقف من جسدها، أعفّت من ملوث اليدين، وأشرف من حفنة سياسيين يقتلون الشعب، ويبيعون الوطن، ويتاجرون بعملته، ويستبيحون كرامة شعبه، ويدمرون الحياة، ويفسدون الوجود والاستقرار.

(The prostitute that feeds on her own body has more chastity than someone whose hands are dirty, and more honorable than a bunch of politicians that kill the people, sell the nation and trade up with its currency, desecrate the dignity of its people, destroy life, and corrupt existence and stability).

Several conceptual meanings are packaged within LPP, namely, Lebanese political prostitutes are criminals, traitors, and corrupt people. LPP is made wide and spacious enough by its writer to accommodate even more evil deeds committed by Lebanese politicians against the Lebanese people:

العاهرة أشرف ألف مرة من كل سياسي يصادر حقنا في العيش، ويعتاش على رواتبنا، وفقرنا، وبؤسنا، ودمنا، وموتنا، والقلق على المصير

(The prostitute is a million times more honorable than each politician that takes away our right to live, and lives on our salaries, poverty, misery, blood, death, and worry about the future). This packaging adds the following to the previous conceptual metaphor, namely, Lebanese political prostitutes are exclusionary and self-interested.

LPP is made responsible for many more social problems in Lebanese society as in the following excerpt:

العاهرة ليست هي من جعلت الأطفال ينتظرون مع أهلهم ساعات وساعات على محطات الوقود، وبنامون على الظلمة، ويحرمونهم من الحليب، والغذاء، والدواء، والطمأنينة وراحة البال... وعن موت مئات المرضى على باب المستشفيات...
وليس هي المسؤولة عن التهريب واستباحة الحدود، وتهريب الكبتاغون. وليس هي من وتّرت العلاقات مع الدول الشقيقة والصديقة...

(It is not the prostitute that made children wait for hours with their parents in petrol stations, sleep in darkness, deprived of milk, food, medicine, quietude, and peace of mind. She is not the one to blame for the death of hundreds of sick people at the hospital's door; neither is she responsible for smuggling, desecrating frontiers, smuggling captagon, and straining relations with sister and friendly countries).

Conceptually, LPP is constituted of criminals, smugglers, and sources of depravation and political tensions.

The text's writer seems to consider the LPP an inexhaustible metaphor, filling it with even more meanings:

العاهرة ليست هي التي وضعت نظاماً طائفياً عقيماً، وأبدعت فكرة الثلث المعطل، وتقف عثرةً بدرب تشكيل الحكومة بحجج... واهية وواهمة

(It is not the prostitute that set up a sterile sectarian system, created the idea of one-third blocking all, and stood as a stumbling block in the face of forming a government under flimsy and delusionary pretexts).

Conceptually, LPP is a source of sectarianism and political blockage. Judging by the quoted excerpts in Arabic, the amount of knowledge packaged within the LPP is enormous and far exceeds the English "political prostitution" metaphor. Indeed, "political prostitutes" in countries other than the Arab world could mean "turncoats, party switchers, any action by politicians done obviously for self-gain, fame and nothing else related to public service with favors or exchange perceived to be involved" (online urban dictionary). In the African political context, precisely in Kenya, "politicians who engage in selling their influence and power to secure personal achievements and gains can be considered Political Prostitutes."^{iv} In the Philippines, a political prostitute "shifts allegiance from one loyalty or idea to another — betraying or deserting an original cause by switching to the opposing side or party; selfish only unto oneself and family" (Lito Monico C. Lorenzana, *The Manila Times*, September 14, 2022, para. 1). Thus, two conceptions of political prostitution emerge: (i) rendering political services and powers as in Kenya, (ii) and shifting allegiance from one political party to another as in the Philippines. In both cases, political prostitution is different from the LPP. It should be noted that in the previous parliamentary session in Tunisia, the same phenomenon of switching between political parties occurred while members were in Parliament except that it has been conceptualized as *السياحة البرلمانية* (PARLIAMENTARY

TOURISM), which is a softer, ironical conceptualization of Members of Parliament arising from the Tunisian experience of tourism.

In terms of knowledge, the two metaphors do not seem to be culturally equivalent, and the "political prostitution" metaphor should, thus, be filtered out by the non-Arab culture and translator into English as incompatible with العهر السياسي on cognitive accounts. We cannot suggest to the translator into English to adopt the TOURISM metaphor instead of something else as the Lebanese context is far too sad and desolate than the Tunisian one. Conceptually, the LPP is governed by LEBANESE POLITICIANS who ARE WORSE THAN PROSTITUTES while non-Lebanese politicians are conceptualized as SWITCHING BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES AND RENDERING POLITICAL SERVICES IS PROSTITUTION. We are tempted, therefore, to say that although the two metaphors adopt the same dictionary meanings they stand as different in terms of cultural encyclopedias. In terms of Hiraga's scheme, we have "different metaphorical concepts but similar metaphorical expressions." The same metaphorical expression is the literal rendition of العهر السياسي as the English "political prostitution" metaphor. However, this similar linguistic expression is followed by different concepts in terms of content knowledge as exemplified throughout this sub-section.

Another Arabic-English metaphor is also taken from Lebanese politics. A Lebanese MP was reported to have said the following about Lebanese Parliamentary elections: (...) "In the current elections, in which we see the presence of money in bags in front of electoral centers publicly distributed, politics is prominently absent from these elections, and الدسم الإنتخابي [literally, the full-fat of the elections] became pecuniary but not دسما سياسيا [literally, full-fat politics]." (al-akhbar.com, 2022, para. 2). In the same vein of thought, it was reported through the Kuwaiti newspaper Al-rai that the inclinations of the engineers of former PM Hassan Diab's cabinet mean to make the cabinet منزوعة الدسم السياسي [literally, full-fat-free politics or skimmed politics] and more like a socio-economic council." (elnashra.com, 2020, para. 1). The article regrets the absence of "full-fat politics" and elections, which is caused by political money, whereby candidates to an election financially bribe voters to elect them. "Full-fat politics" is preferred over "full-fat-free politics" or "skimmed politics."

"Full-fat-free politics" derives directly from the practice nowadays to free milk from the fat it contains in line with dieting trends which exhort for skimmed milk. Notwithstanding the scientific foundations of the position of dietitians, skimmed milk is in disrepute in the Arab world, which boasts a variety of milk-producing livestock. The tribal origin of Arabs makes them familiar with raw goat, ewe, and she-camel milk, which they find naturally delicious. Some dishes in the Arab world are often strongly fatty, making use of ingredients such as ghee, fatty meat, and sun-dried fatty meat. It should be noted that in the Gulf area, تدسيم الشارب (literally, making the moustache fatty), which is reminiscent of English "greasing the paw," is nothing but bribery while in Tunisia people say "greasing the wheel" for the same meaning. In contrast to raw milk, skimmed is unnatural and tasteless. The characteristics of skimmed milk and ensuing reactions to it are mapped onto politics in Lebanon, producing "skimmed politics."

We googled "skimmed politics" in English in vain. Perhaps with a mixture of frowning and smiling will Anglo-Americans receive the "skimmed politics" metaphor if translated literally. The metaphor will likely make them feel astounded, looking in vain for it deep into their long-term memory. They will not manage to get hold of it since it is not part of their conceptual system even though they eventually manage to find it intelligible. But they do know that their own culture vetoes it as an unacceptable conceptualization of politics. Their politics is profiled in various ways such as POLITICS IS A TRAIN JOURNEY (for the Germans, with Britain as a reluctant passenger, POLITICS IS A COMMON EUROPEAN HOUSE (for the French and the Russians), POLITICS IS FOOTBALL (for the Italians), etc (Charteris-Black, 2004). As a result, we predict that even though Anglo-Americans will manage to make sense of the "skimmed politics" metaphor they will reject it as a cultural candidate in conceptualizing politics, politicians, and governments.

In terms of Hiraga's four scenarios, the "skimmed politics" metaphor in Arabic is governed by the conceptual metaphor, THE LEBANESE CABINET IS AN UNNATURAL SUBSTANCE. However, since in English the "skimmed politics" metaphor is likely to be translated non-metaphorically such as "Hassan Diab's cabinet will very likely have no powers," it, therefore, does not find itself in any of Hiraga's scenarios.

Cultural Filtering of Metaphor in Economics

Two important finance metaphors will be addressed in this sub-section, namely, Bull market and Bear market. A word of caution is in good order here. These two expressions that describe market trends in finance may not at all be perceived as metaphors by economists, students of economics, and even columnists in *The Economist* and *Financial Times*, and, therefore, do not process them as we do with other types of metaphor even though their meaning is not transparent and recoverable from the lexical items that make them up. Boyd (1993) called these "theory-constitutive metaphors" (p. 486) since they enable theory change. They constitute most of the root metaphors in economics (e.g., *cash flow*, *soft loan*, etc.), and make up a body of analytical or technical tools (e.g., *elasticity of demand/supply*, *galloping inflation*, etc.), which economics cannot do without. Such metaphors may also include *hot money*, *alligator spread*, *golden parachute*, *poison pill tactics*, *bed and breakfast*, *dead horse*, *crawling peg*, *featherbedding*, *pig on pork*, etc. (Gilpin, 1986). However, for the current article, we will treat them as if they were conceptual metaphors, and submit them to our framework for analysis and processing.

English-Arabic Metaphors

The characteristics of a *Bull market* and a *Bear market* will be displayed in the following table^v:

Table 2. *Characteristic features of bull market and bear market*

	Bull market	Bear market
Financial trend	A BULL MARKET is a period of generally rising prices.	A BEAR MARKET is a general decline in the stock market over a period of time.
Psychological state of investors	The start of a bull market is marked by widespread pessimism.	It is a transition from high investor optimism to widespread investor fear and pessimism.

Buying/selling assets	The bullish investor buys up lots of stock and is optimistic about the future.	The bearish investor sells lots of stock and tends to be pessimistic about the future.
-----------------------	--	--

The *raison-d'être* of the aforementioned theory-constitutive metaphors could be found in common knowledge about bulls and bears. A bull is held to be muscular and aggressive. We can also read that "the bull represents male fertility and potency above all else. Along with this, bulls are connected with energy, stamina, endurance, protection, and aggression."^{vi} The mapping in *bull market* maybe motivated by the bull's aggressiveness, which is mapped onto the behavior of investors who buy assets in a period of rising prices. However, "bears are one of the most intelligent land animals in North America. They have the largest and most complex brains compared to other land mammals' size and they rely on this brain for some behaviors."^{vii} Bears are also known for hibernating in the winter, which simply means they abstain from eating and drinking. The mapping in *bear market* maybe motivated by the bears' wisdom, as represented by their intelligence, not to trust the future scarcity of food in the winter, which may explain why bearish investors sell stock to keep their money safe from market hazards.

In translation, *bull market* can be found translated literally as سوق ثيراني^{viii} (literally, bull market) and سوق الثور^{ix} (literally, bull market). Such translations trigger cultural filtering to sanction them as unacceptable in the Arab culture, with only limited use among stock market investors. Resistance comes from the fact that describing a person as a bull in the Arab culture means, in most cases, that he is stupid and stubborn. However, the translation of *bear market* does not exist as literal in Arabic for at least two good reasons. First, the Arabic equivalent of *bear* is (دب). Translating *bear market* literally as (سوق الدب) would send the Arab reader or hearer automatically to a genuine marketplace for bears, which would make Arabs wonder whether a market for bears has been opened to sell this species. Second, in the Arab culture, humans may be conceptualized and addressed as a *bear* if you want to insult them. The insult consists in profiling overweight people as bears, be they, males or females.

As a result of cultural filtering, there should exist possible and acceptable translations into Arabic of *bull market* and *bear market* owing to the urgency of having theory-constitutive metaphors in Arab finance. Known *bull* and *bear* market metaphor translating include سوق صاعد (literally, rising market) and سوق هابط (literally, falling market), respectively.

In terms of Hiraga's scenarios, the two cultures at present do not seem to share the linguistic and conceptual dimensions as is clear in table three below:

Table 3. *Arabic and English contrasted for bull market*

Items	English	Arabic
Locus of metaphor	Bull	صاعد (literally, rising)
Linguistic metaphor	Bull market	سوق صاعد (literally, rising market)
Conceptual metaphor	MARKET IS A DOMESTIC ANIMAL	MARKET IS AN UPWARD MOVING ENTITY

Thus, the bull market metaphor illustrates Hiraga's fourth scenario, namely, "different metaphorical concepts and different metaphorical expressions." In English, the market is conceptualized as a domestic animal while in Arabic the conceptual metaphor market as A

DOMESTIC ANIMAL is re-conceptualized as an UPWARD MOVING ENTITY, which is part of the image schema of VERTICALITY. Johnson (1987) refers to this use as "the pervasive act of metaphorically extending a schema from the physical to the nonphysical." The physical emerges "in our bodily experiences, in our perception and movement" (p. 34). Here the physical is precisely the body's erect position and the up-and-down movements we can perform with our bodies. The cultural difference is, thus, enormous between the Anglo-American and Arab cultures in dealing with *bull market*.

Consider the following table, which will detail metaphor translating for *bear market* in Arabic:

Table 4. *Arabic and English contrasted for bear market*

Items	English	Arabic
Locus of metaphor	Bear	هابط (literally, falling)
Linguistic metaphor	Bear market	سوق هابط (literally, falling market)
Conceptual metaphor	MARKET IS A POLAR ANIMAL	MARKET IS A DOWNWARD MOVING ENTITY

As is clear from the linguistic-cum-conceptual difference in rendering *bear market* into Arabic, it is also a case of Hiraga's fourth scenario, namely, "different metaphorical concepts and different metaphorical expressions," whereby *bear market* is re-conceptualized as a DOWNWARD MOVING ENTITY.

In short, concerning *Bull market* and *Bear market* as SL metaphors in the Anglo-American culture, it is safe to state that both metaphors capitalize on animals, namely, *bull* and *bear*, respectively. However, the Arab culture seems to lean towards the image-schema of VERTICALITY to conceptualize the abstract concept, *market*. The difference testifies to the linguistic and cultural diversity in these financial metaphors. Thus, to embody *Bull market* and *Bear market*, English uses animals while Arabic uses the basic sensory-motor image-schematic structure of VERTICALITY borrowed from the human body's erect position.

Arabic-English Metaphors

There is a prevalent business metaphor related to the stock market in the Gulf area, which is هوامير البورصة^x (literally, the stock exchange greasy groupers). The following excerpt spells out the metaphor's meaning:

الهومير ومفرده هامور، هم المضاربين في البورصات، لكنهم مضاربين كبار يتمتعون بسيولة وحصص كبيرة في مختلف الشركات وهدفهم مثل بقية المستثمرين والمتداولين، هو الربح، لكن الربح على حساب المضاربين الصغار والمستثمرين الأقل حجماً

(The singular of Hawamir is Hamur, who are speculators in stock exchanges, but they are big speculators who enjoy liquidity and large stakes in various companies. Their objective, like the rest of investors and traders, is profit, but at the expense of smaller investors, that is why they are also sometimes called whales that eat small fish).

A quick look at *The Arabic Lexicon*^{xi} yielded no result for Hamur (greasy grouper). Therefore, the stock exchange Hawamir (greasy grouper) owes its name to the Gulf vernacular, with قرش (whale

shark) as its Modern Standard Arabic equivalent. With the emergence of bitcoins, the concept of "crypto whale" has entered the cryptocurrency community, whereby "whales hold enough cryptocurrency that they have the potential to manipulate currency valuations." However, a "crypto whale" is not so much about investing in the stock exchange as being a cryptocurrency holder. They are, therefore, called "crypto whales" because "whales are very large compared to the smaller fish in the cryptocurrency ocean" (Caroline Barton, 2022, para. 1-6).

Hamur (and its English equivalent greasy grouper, Arabian grouper, and greasy rockcod) is a type of large fish that grows and reproduces in the Red Sea and the Arabian Gulf. It is known to the Gulf people as one of the top predators on the reef. Their taste is delicious, and they are one of the most expensive in the fish markets. Greasy groupers are top fish predators that show no mercy for smaller fish. It is, therefore, its large size and its being a predator that made *hamur* a SD for the TD of speculators in the gulf stock market. Speculators are conceptualized metaphorically as *hawamir* when they detain so many shares in the stock market and constitute a threat to small investors. For that, they have their own ploys to get rid of these small investors and occupy the financial scene.

It is interesting to note, for instance, that the inspection of some studies of metaphor in the business discourse in English (Kheovichai, 2015; Kovács, n.d.; Rojo López & Orts Llopis, 2015), Spanish (Rojo López & Orts Llopis, 2015), and Romanian (Tomoni, 2012), do not address the way investors are conceptualized in their respective countries. Authors of such studies target the economic situation and the investment operation per se. One of the motivations for such avoidance or lack of focus on investors and speculators, is the pervasive use, among other things, of health metaphors in economics that discourse critically favor talk about causes and remedies rather than who caused what in the economic context. We all know that causality in the economic context of each country is inherent in economic policies adopted by an official in world governments.

The speculators as *hamur* metaphor borrow the SD of sea animals and select their predatory characteristics, which is governed by the conceptual metaphor, LARGE INVESTORS ARE PREDATORS TO SMALL INVESTORS. In terms of Hiraga's scenarios, this metaphor follows the fourth scenario, i.e. different linguistic and conceptual structures. The greasy grouper as a metaphor to designate speculators do not seem to exist in the Anglo-American business context. Therefore, their culture will resist it as a conventional metaphor. A greasy grouper does exist for them literally as a name for a category of fish; at the level of neurons, it is not paired with speculators, and it does not fire with it to create a metaphor. They do not conceptualize speculators using an SD as in Arabic but seem to be contented with simply designating speculators as *speculators*.

Another business metaphor to be studied is the famous conventional figurative proverb العقار ابن بار (literally, real estate is a dutiful son) in Saudi investment. Real estate is a long-term investment, which is not restricted to professionals since a large segment of Saudi society can obtain good income from real estate investment. The secret of this commitment to real estate investment lies in the fact that "the share of homeownership in Saudi Arabia amounted to 62 percent in 2020."^{xii} As a TD, real estate is present in the Saudi daily experience. In all

circumstances and amid any fluctuations, the real estate sector remains the winning horse and the main player in the growth of any national economy even though when speculators meddled with it in 2008 they brought the world economies to their knees.

The SD *ابن بار* (a dutiful son), however, is deeply rooted in the Arabo-Islamic culture, and sends us to a religious intertextuality, to be found in the Qur'an.^{xiii} Treating parents kindly was mentioned four times in the Qur'an.^{xiv} It carries with it a cultural frame including the following knowledge (i) a dutiful son is expected to be obedient to his parents all their lives, (ii) he is expected to cater for their needs and satisfy their wishes, (iii) he is expected to behave well with them in recognition of their parenting him. This SD is, thus, loaded with religious and cultural knowledge.

The real estate as a dutiful son is a personification of real estate. Personification enables us "to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with non-human entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 33). Saudis have singled out the characteristic of "dutifulness" from a human being to conceptualize real estate. They seem to draw their confidence in investing in real estate from the dutifulness of a genetic son.

At the heart of metaphor is whether a given culture feels the need to metaphorize a TD such as "real estate," and if the need is felt whether two cultures agree tacitly on the same SD such as "dutiful son" here. We hypothesize that the need to metaphorize may override the probability of selecting the same SD for a given TD. The Saudis focused on real estate in general while the Anglo-Americans seem to be keener on focusing on a different element of the real estate frame, namely, the real estate agent and his/her power to sell the property to potential buyers.

In terms of Hiraga's scenarios, the real estate as a dutiful son is governed by the conceptual metaphor, AN INANIMATE ENTITY IS A HUMAN BEING. Anglo-Americans can make sense of this metaphor, but they may be culturally shocked to find the extent to which real estate can be considered a dutiful son since such as the association between real estate and human beings is not part of their conceptual system. They may simply talk about it literally. For instance, "real estate is still/no longer (un)rewarding" can be one way of talking about it. However, two of the elements of the real estate frame seem to capture the attention more. For instance, six real estate metaphors have been mentioned for Toronto housing market: "Selling like hotcakes", "Riding the knife edge of record low mortgage rates", "Red hot housing market", and "Canadians have yet to lose their appetite for house shopping", "Homeowners across the country are frantically planting 'for sale' signs on their lawns this spring", and "Last gasp for housing."^{xv} Such linguistic metaphors are either property- or homeowner-oriented.

Cultural filtering of Metaphors in Advertising

Both verbal and pictorial metaphors in promotional discourse, have received due attention owing to their persuasive power to make potential buyers change their buying habits (Maalej, 2001, 2003, 2007, 2014; Messaris, 1997; Siltanen, 1981; Sopory & Dillard, 2002a-b). Therefore, if the translation of an ad fails for reasons of cultural reception, this may occasion a loss of profit for companies hiring a copy writer.

English-Arabic Metaphors

The automobile domain is a fertile TD ground for advertisers. The first ad in this sub-section is about a German car, namely, *Volkswagen: Relieves Gas Pains*^{xvi}. The ad builds on popular over-the-counter medication known for its pain relief effect. Pain relievers are obtained from pharmacists to ease discomfort brought about by chronic diseases, mild injuries, and post-surgery. Pain relievers are known for bringing about relief (i) cheaply, and (ii) promptly. The copy writer for *Volkswagen* capitalizes on such characteristics of pain relievers and maps them on the car ad, which yields *Relieves Gas Pains*. The pain is identified as "gas pain," which is the pain incurred by the driver for spending so much on petrol. As a result, inferentially *Volkswagen* (medication) offers less spending (relief) to the driver (affected patient) on his/her car's petrol.

If translated literally, the *Volkswagen* metaphor yields the following: سيارة فولكسواغن تخفف الام البنزين, whose back-translation is *Volkswagen lightens up petrol's pains*. This sounds very funny and unacceptable; petrol per se suffers no pain. For this reason, such a rendition is filtered out as un-cultural in Arabic. Arabs tend to render the meaning of the *Volkswagen* metaphor with a non-metaphor, tackling the fact that the car is economical on petrol directly as in سيارة فولكسواغن: توفير في سعر البنزين (literally, the *Volkswagen* car: saving in the price of petrol).

Concerning Hiraga's scenarios, the *Volkswagen* metaphor in English is governed by the conceptual metaphor, A CAR BRAND IS a MEDICATION. Since its possible rendition in Arabic is rather non-metaphor, this car ad has not been made provisions for in Hiraga's scenarios.

Another promotional metaphor to be analyzed here is the famous Skittles ad. Skittle in the singular is "a wooden object used as a target in the game of skittles," in which "players try to knock over as many skittles as they can out of a group of nine by rolling a ball at them" (online Collins Co-Build Dictionary, 2009). The Skittles as sweets is already a metaphor vis-à-vis the skittles in the game of skittles, but we will not pursue the aptness of the skittle metaphor for the sweets.

The Skittles ad is a multimodal metaphor, including image, sound, and language, and reads as *Skittles: Discover the Rainbow. Taste the Rainbow*. Our analysis will follow the think-aloud technique and will pursue the multimodal components in turn. The image shows a man sitting on a stool, and milking skittles out of a giraffe. How do we know about milking? Well, the man was performing milking gestures. Another imagistic detail is the fact that the giraffe was licking the rainbow on the rightmost side of the ad in preparation for the Skittles ad metaphor. The rainbow lent its multi-colored nature to the skittles, which gains them their conceptualization as a rainbow. But doesn't the use of *taste* create another mapping with *rainbow*? We can answer negatively since the skittles have become the rainbow through this conceptualization.

This said the Skittles ad metaphor triggers our cultural filters at many a level. It is fooling us around by milking the giraffe from the wrong place; the giraffe's breast must be positioned slightly to the left of the man feigning to milk the giraffe. Our knowledge about giraffes alerts us that the milking in the ad is fake. The choice of a black man as a milking man is received with shock. Is this choice motivated? Linguistically, the ad is both pretentious and self-defeating when

it exhorts the audience to discover the rainbow (which can also admit a non-metaphoric reading), and "just" taste the rainbow, i.e. the skittles.

In Arabic, the ad sounds culturally unacceptable as . سكتلز: اكتشف قوس قزح وتذوقه . When used in Arabic, the rainbow excites the eye, not the tongue. As a result, if translated as سكتلز: اكتشف قوس قزح ومتع ناظريك به (Skittles: Discover the Rainbow. Let your eyes contemplate it), the ad stops being about selling a product to be consumed and starts being about an object of beauty and admiration, i.e. the literal rainbow. One way out of this is to combine both perceptive organs as in سكتلز: متع ناظريك بقوس قزح وتمتع بلذته. In back-translation, it reads as: "Skittles: Let your eyes contemplate the rainbow. Enjoy its delicious taste."

Regarding Hiraga's scenarios, the Skittles ad metaphor is governed by the conceptual metaphor, A SWEET IS AN OBJECT FOR TASTING while the suggested Arabic translation is, A SWEET IS AN OBJECT OF ADMIRATION AND PLEASURABLE ENJOYMENT. Both linguistically and conceptually, the Skittles ad and its metaphor translating into Arabic seem to be different, which corresponds to Hiraga's fourth and last scenario. The initial ad has been re-conceptualized.

Arabic-English Metaphors

The following ad is a verbo-pictorial metaphor (Forceville, 1996; Maalej, 2001), initiated by the Lebanese Alfeniq Express restaurant in Dubai. The pictorial display contributes less than the verbal part to the import of the verbo-pictorial metaphor. Therefore, the analysis will focus on the verbal part of the metaphor.



Figure 1. Poultry as mass destruction (source: alfeniqexpress, accessed on 12/05/2021)

Curiously enough, this food ad builds on war intertextuality, which is that of "weapons of mass destruction" initiated as a pretext to wage the war against Iraq in 2003. These weapons were assumed to be chemical ones possessed by Iraq to build a nuclear arsenal. Needless to mention that in war terms such weapons and context are unequivocally negative. Therefore, it cannot be the case that Alfeniq Express restaurant is using this negative content to advertise for selling their chickens; nobody would ever buy them. Neither is it the restaurant's aim, for the sake of argumentation, to fight the chicken trade because chickens might, for instance, be injected with harmful hormones to fatten and sell them quickly to make profits. There is, thus, no suggestion in

the ad that Alfeniq Express restaurant is subsidizing this ad to offer an alternative dish to customers such as fish, beef, or lamb.

Alfeniq Express restaurant cannot be conveying a negative meaning through their ad. The conceptual metaphor POULTRY IS A LETHAL WEAPON means to hyperbolically exaggerate the uniqueness of Alfeniq's chickens. The ground between the metaphor in the ad and actual weapons of "mass destruction" is their impact on the consumer and the target of weaponry, respectively. This intensity of the impact of chicken and weaponry is capitalized upon to drive the metaphor home. Needless to say that the impact in the chicken metaphor is measured by its deliciousness while that of the actual weapon of "mass destruction" is by its striking force. In sum, the ad advertises the striking deliciousness of Alfeniq's chickens.

This ad presents a unique situation where the ad's TD (chicken) in Arabic borrows an SD from the Anglo-American culture (weapons of mass destruction), with "weapons" deleted from the original. The question is: Will an Anglo-American audience in Dubai accept re-packaging food with mass destruction in metaphor advertising chickens? This needs to be empirically tested, but since this is beyond the scope of the current article, we will not attempt to speculate about the issue of translatability of such a metaphor into the Anglo-American culture.

In the rest of this sub-section, another verbo-pictorial metaphor initiated by the Almakki restaurant chain in Saudi Arabia will be addressed. Like with the previous verbo-pictorial metaphor, the focus of interest will be on the verbal side of the metaphor. Consider the verbo-pictorial display.



Figure 2. Saudi dish as face-saving (source: almakki Saudi Arabia, accessed on 23/01/2020)

Despite the shortness of the ad, its text presents two layers of cultural embedding in Arab culture. The first is the name of the dish (مفطح , transliterally *mufaTTaH*) and the second is what benefits the dish reaps both to the restaurant's owner and the customer (يببيض الوجه whitens the face). The business owner may benefit when it flourishes and the customer when his/her guests enjoy the dish. *MufaTTaH* is the name of a famous dish, consisting of a whole lamb or goat with rice and spices. Owing to its size, *mufaTTaH* is presented at weddings and other social gatherings as a consistent dish.

In Arabic, *mufaTTaH* means having a broad head, almost flattened (ArabicLexicon, formerly Lisaan). Assuming that *mufaTTaH* owes its name to this meaning, we will attempt a tentative explanation of how *mufaTTaH* has come to mean what it does. As a dish, it might have

inherited its meaning from (i) extending the broadening of the head to the broadening of body metonymy, and (ii) the broadening metonymy thus applied to the whole body through the part-whole metonymy. The lamb is cut into large chunks and made to rest flattened in a large plate or container. Besides, this tentative explanation, it is a term that evokes in the Saudi mind the cultural value and practice of hospitality, which is embodied in slaughtering a sheep or goat to welcome guests.

The second part of the ad refers to another cultural attribute of Arabs and Saudi individuals in particular, who are expected by the community to behave and act following the enforcement of the Saudi face. Alenazi and Maalej^{xvii} quoted Nydell (2012) as saying that Arabs seek to create a good impression on others, have loyalty to family, and considerably value *3irD/šaraf* (honor), *karaama* (dignity), and *Sum3ah* (reputation) (p. 3). When these cultural constituents of Arab identity and other cultural values are respected by Arab individuals, they are said to have enforced the protection of their face and that of their community, which is conceptualized as (بييض الوجه), literally, whitens the face).

With these two cultural signposts, a translator into English will have a hard time trying to translate this ad. But why in the first place seek to translate such an untranslatable ad? Culinary matters are tourist-attracting. It is self-defeating to try to render it literally into English because the Anglo-American cultural mechanisms will fail to recognize what the ad intends to do despite the clear indication from the pictorial material that it is about a dish of some kind.

Discussion

The article has followed no pre-determined translation procedures as offered by Newmark (1980), Al-Harrasi (2001), and others. Instead, it let metaphor translating proceed naturally by asking whether cultural knowledge packaged into the metaphor in the SLC is compatible with that of the TLC. This led to answering the research question, which is: How does cultural filtering actually take effect in metaphor translating? Cultural filtering followed four different translation paths or processes across discourses, namely, (i) re-conceptualizing, (ii) partial re-conceptualizing, (iii) refraining from re-conceptualizing, and (iv) translating metaphor by non-metaphor.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk's (2010) re-conceptualizing accounts for two cases among the overall twelve metaphors making up the dataset. The rock metaphor was tentatively re-conceptualized as a mountain metaphor and the skittles metaphor from sweet for tasting too sweet for admiration and pleasurable enjoyment. Both cases abide by Hiraga's fourth scenario and Mandelblit's (1995) DMC, which are different linguistic and conceptual metaphors. However, partial re-conceptualizing consists in keeping the same linguistic expression as in swamp, political prostitution, and bull and bear markets but changing the conceptual part. This ties in perfectly with Hiraga's third scenario but is not made provisions for by Mandelblit's (1995) two scenarios.

Both re-conceptualizing and partial re-conceptualizing suggest the limits of universals in the language (Evans & Levinson, 2009) and culture (Chiao & Ambady, 2007; Kolstad, 2015; Kitayama & Salvador, 2017; Park & Huang, 2010), and the primacy of cultural diversity (Han, 2015; Han & Northoff, 2008) as exemplified through metaphor translating across Arabic and

English. Cultural models of understanding are presented as filters through which knowledge that is incompatible with the source culture is resisted and blocked.

Refraining from re-conceptualizing consists in finding no necessity to map an SD onto a TD, and simply being contented with thinking that a linguistic category is delineated enough in experience to require conceptualization. Two important cases are in good order such as speculators and real estate. While Saudis felt the need to conceptualize them as greasy grouper and dutiful sons, respectively, Anglo-Americans did not. Needless to say that such cases are made provisions for neither Hiraga's scenarios nor Mandelblit's scenarios.

Translating metaphor by non-metaphor is recognized by Al-Harrasi (2001), Kövecses (2005), and Newmark (1980). We do not treat this as a procedure, but as a possible translation path or process that is not imposed on data; it emerges from data. Such cases include the skimmed politics metaphor, the Volkswagon ad, the chicken ad, and the *mufaTTaH* dish.

No metaphor in this article belongs to Hiraga's first scenario, which is "similar metaphorical concepts and similar metaphorical expressions." Such cases have deliberately been evaded by the co-authors in data collection to prove the point of the article, which is filtering out unexpected metaphors by culture. However, we in no way mean to imply in having done so that metaphors of this kind do not exist between Arabic and English. There are certainly plenty of them as motivated by the universal embodiment of human cognition.

The current research has limitations. Owing to its exploratory nature, it focused on cases of metaphor that would trigger cultural filtering. However, the study cannot pretend to be a basis for the frequency of occurrence or statistics of each of the translation paths or processes isolated in this research, nor can the study say anything about the correlation of these paths with political, economic, and promotional discourses. Further corpus research on metaphor translating in these various discourse types is the only means to make scientifically safe pronouncements.

Conclusion

The current study aims to show that metaphor translating can be best done from a cultural perspective, isolating cultural knowledge as a guide for decision-making in translating. To do so, we analyzed twelve metaphors from politics, economics, and promotional discourses. The dataset included exclusively cultural metaphors.

In the current research, the cognitive approach to metaphor translating enabled us to arrive at three findings:

1. Though comparing cultures as initiated by Kövecses (2005) for English and Hungarian is a gigantic and time-consuming enterprise, its merit for metaphor translating has proved to be invaluable in practice.
2. Unlike prescriptive translation procedures, cultural knowledge can guide the translator in choosing the appropriate translation path or process.

3. Culturally inappropriate metaphors detected by cultural filtering follow a more diversified translation path or process than proposals made by Hiraga (1991), Kövecses (2005), and Mandelblit (1995).

As based on linguistics, anthropology (culture), psychology, and neuro-scientific knowledge, the cognitive perspective on metaphor translating may have professional and pedagogic implications as we believe that it scientifically guides translators to choose the best process-product translation that enables them to establish a dialogue between two languages and cultures. This perspective can benefit professionals in advertising (if they aim for an international audience), the tourist industry, international organizations, etc. It also may benefit translation students as it offers them more scientific guidance and more freedom for creativity in the translation task.

Acknowledgment:

This study was funded by the Literature, Publishing and Translation Commission, Ministry of Culture, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia under [37/2022] as part of the Arabic Observatory of Translation.

About the Authors:

Mohamed Alghbban is an associate professor of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures. His major is in Modern Hebrew Language and Translation. He currently teaches Modern Hebrew Language and Translation at King Saud University. He published in several international journals. His research interests include metaphor translating and cognitive linguistics.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0887-7419>

Zouheir A. Maalej is a professor of cognitive linguistics. He contributed many journal articles, and book chapters, and presented talks at many international conferences. He edited a volume that was published by the University of Manouba in 2005 on metaphor, cognition, and culture. He also co-edited (with Ning Yu) a volume on outer body parts and their role in embodiment.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4613-7606>

Notes:

ⁱ The authors are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments which made a difference to the article's form and content. However, responsibility for the contents are, of course, incumbent on the authors.

ⁱⁱ The following abbreviations will be used in the current article: Cognitive Translation Hypothesis (CTH), Contemporary Theory of Metaphor (CTM), similar mapping condition (SMC), different mapping condition (DMC), source domain (SD), target domain (TD), source language (SL), target language (TL), target language culture (TLC), source language metaphor (SLM), target language metaphor (TLM), source language text (SLT).

ⁱⁱⁱ Adopted from Kövecses (2005, p. 144)

^{iv} <https://www.facebook.com/MombasaCountyWatch/posts/a-political-prostitute-mombasa-kenyadefinition-of-prostitute-from-oxford-diction/907646522672462/>

- ^v Source: https://www.google.com/search?q=PDF+of+bull+market&client=firefox-b-d&sxsrf=ALiCzsapL2pvIEFOWK9BZG3p6930Pj8Dqg:1667724911026&ei=b3ZnY_mYAZGVkwXF54fYAw&start=10&sa=N&ved=2ahUKEwi5jJ6315n7AhWRYqQKHcXzATsQ8tMDegQIARAE&biw=1280&bih=567&dpr=1.5
- ^{vi} <https://worldbirds.com/bull-symbolism/#symbol>
- ^{vii} <https://www.worldanimalprotection.us/blogs/5-facts-about-bears>
- ^{viii} <https://www.almaany.com/en/dict/ar-en/bull-market/>
- ^{ix} <https://context.reverso.net/translation/english-arabic/bull+markets>
- ^x <https://www.avatrade.ae/education/trading-for-beginners/hawamer-alborsa>
- ^{xi} ArabicLexicon.Hawramani.com (formerly Lisaan.net) aims to be the world's largest and most comprehensive Arabic dictionary. It features 229437 entries taken from 51 dictionaries and references from the earliest authorities to Orientalist and contemporary sources. <http://arabiclexicon.hawramani.com/>
- ^{xii} <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=What+is+the+percentage+of+Saudis+owning+a+house>
- ^{xiii} وَبِرًّا بِوَالِدَيْهِ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ جَبَّارًا عَصِيًّا (And kind to his parents, and he was not overbearing or rebellious, Sura XIX, Maryam or Mary, Verse 14).
- ^{xiv} وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا (Treating parents kindly) occurs in (i) Sura II, Baqara, or the Heifer, Verse 83, (ii) Sura IV, Nisaa, or the Women, Verse 36, (iii) Sura VI, An'am, or Cattle, Verse 151, and (iv) Sura XVII, Bani Isra'il, Verse 23.
- ^{xv} Karon Liu, *Hotcakes and bubbles: Six real estate metaphors and what they mean for Toronto's housing market*. Toronto Life, April 17, 2010. <https://torontolife.com/real-estate/hotcakes-and-bubbles-six-real-estate-metaphors-and-what-they-mean-for-torontos-housing-market/>
- ^{xvi} <https://www.advergize.com/slogans-list/car-slogans/>
- ^{xvii} Oudah Alenazi and Zouheir Maalej (2021). *Face among Saudis: A social cognition perspective*. Draft available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357269699_Face_among_Saudis_A_social_cognition_perspective [accessed Oct 24 2022].

References

- Al-Harrasi, A. (2001). *Metaphor in (Arabic-into-English) translation with specific reference to metaphorical concepts and expressions in political discourse*, (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Aston University, Great Britain.
- Al-Sowaidi, B. T., & Banda, M. F. (2021). Translating conceptual Qur'anic metaphor: A congo-translational approach. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(1), 1-13.
- Alvarez, A. (1993). On translating metaphor. *Meta*, 38(3), 479-490.
- Al-Zou'bi, A. I., & M. Kanakri, M. (2020). The translatability of metaphor in political speeches from English into Arabic. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 7(3), 78-87. doi:10.30845/ijll.v7n3p7
- Ashuja'al, A. A., Almatari, S. M., & Alward, A. S. (2019). Exploring strategies of translating metaphor from English into Arabic concerning scientific texts. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies*, 26-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.7n.3p.26>

- Atkinson, D. (2010). Extended, embodied cognition and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(5), 599-622.
- Bender, A. (2020). What early Sapiens cognition can teach us: Untangling cultural influences on human cognition across time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(99), 1-6.
- Bender, A., & S. Beller, S. (2016). Current perspectives on cognitive diversity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, PERSPECTIVE, 7(509), 1-7.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boyd, R. (1993). Metaphor and theory change: What is 'metaphor' a metaphor for? In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 481-532). London/New York/ Melbourne: C.U.P.
- Burmakovaa, E. A., & Marugina, N. I. (2014). Cognitive approach to metaphor translation in literary discourse. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 527 – 533.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Chiao, J. Y. (2010). At the frontier of cultural neuroscience: Introduction to the special issue. *SCAN*, 5, 109-110. doi:10.1093/scan/nsq064
- Chiao, J. Y., & Ambady, N. (2007). Cultural neuroscience: Parsing universality and diversity across levels of analysis. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 237–54). New York/London: The Guilford Press.
- Chui, K. (2011). Conceptual metaphors in gestures. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 22(3), 437-458.
- Cienki, A. (1998). Metaphoric gestures and some of their relations to verbal metaphoric expressions. In: J-P Koenig (Ed.), *Discourse and cognition: Bridging the gap* (pp. 189-204). Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Crofts, M. (1988). Translating metaphors. *ARAL*, 11(1), 47-53.
- Dagut, M. B. (1987). More about the translatability of metaphor. *Babel*, 33(2).77-83.
- D'Andrade, R. G. (1981). The cultural part of cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 5, 179-195.
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(5), 429-448. DOI:10.1017/S0140525X0999094X
- Feldman, J. A. (2006). *From molecule to metaphor: A neural theory of language*. Cambridge, Mass./London: A Bradford Book/The MIT Press.
- Feng, T., & Wang, F. (2020). Translation strategies of metaphors in political texts – a case study of the report on the work of the government 2020. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 4(2), 1-8.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1975). An alternative to checklist theories of meaning. *Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 123-131.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1976). Frame semantics and the nature of language. *Annals New York Academy of Sciences*, 20-32.
- Fiske, A. P., & Haslam, N. (1996). Social cognition is thinking about relationships. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 5(5), 143-148.
- Forceville, C. (1996). *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. London: Routledge.

- Forceville, C. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework Agendas for research. In C. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), *Multimodal metaphor* (pp. 19-42). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Forceville, C. (2016). The FORCE and BALANCE schemas in journey metaphor animations. In: C. Fernandes (Ed.), *Multimodality and performance* (pp. 8-22). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Frith, C. D., & Frith, U. (2008). Implicit and explicit processes in social cognition. *Neuron Perspective*, 60, 1-8.
- Gallese, V., Keysers, C., & Rizzolatti, G. (2004). A unifying view of the basis of social cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(9), 1-8.
- Ghazala, H. S. (2012). Translating the metaphor: A cognitive stylistic conceptualization (English – Arabic). *World Journal of English Language*, 2(4), 1-12.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1999a). Taking metaphors out of our heads and putting them into the cultural world. In R. W. Gibbs Jr. & G. J. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 145-166). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1999b). Researching metaphor. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 29-47). Cambridge: CUP.
- Gilpin, A. (1986). *Dictionary of economics and financial markets*. London: Butterworths.
- Han, S. (2015). Understanding cultural differences in human behavior: A cultural neuroscience approach. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 68-72.
- Han, S., & Northoff, G. (2008). Culturesensitive neural substrates of human cognition: A transcultural neuroimaging approach. *Nature Reviews: Neuroscience Perspectives*, 9, 646-654.
- Han, S. et al. (2013). A cultural neuroscience approach to the biosocial nature of the human brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 335–59.
- Hanić, J., Pavlović, T., & Jahić, A. (2016). Translating emotion-related metaphors: A cognitive approach. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 4(2), 87-101. DOI: 10.1515/exell-2017-0008
- Hiraga, M. K. (1991). Metaphor and comparative cultures. In: P. G. Fendos, Jr. (Ed.), *Cross-cultural Communication: East and West* (vol. III) (pp. 149-166). Taiwan: T'ai Ch'eng Publishing in Tainan.
- Hong, W., & Rossi, C. (2021). The cognitive turn in metaphor translation studies: A critical overview. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 5(2), 83-115.
- Jensen, A. (2005). Coping with a metaphor: A cognitive approach to translating metaphor. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics*, 35, 183-209.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Khatin-Zadeh, O., Farsani, D., & Banaruee, H. (2022). A study of the use of iconic and metaphoric gestures with motion-based, static space-based, static object-based, and static event-based statements. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(239), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12070239>

- Kheovichai, B. (2015). Metaphor in business English. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, 15(1), 93-130.
- Kirsh, D. (2006). Distributed cognition: A methodological note. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 14(2), 249-262.
- Kitayama, S., & Park, J. (2010). Cultural neuroscience of the self: understanding the social grounding of the brain. *SCAN*, 5, 111-129. doi:10.1093/scan/nsq052
- Kitayama, S., & Salvador, C. E. (2017). Culture embrained: Going beyond the nature-nurture dichotomy. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(5) 841–854.
- Kolstad, A. (2015). How culture shapes mind, neurobiology and behaviour. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 6(4), 255-274.
- Kövecses, Z. (1999). Metaphor: Does it constitute or reflect cultural models? In R. W. Gibbs Jr. & G. J. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 167-188). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kovács, É. (n.d.). Conceptual metaphors in popular business discourse. *Digitalizálta: Miscolchi Egyetem Könyvtár Levéltár, Múzeum*, 69-80.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). The neural theory of metaphor. In R. W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 17-38). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. New York: University Press of America.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2010). Re-conceptualization and the emergence of discourse meaning as a theory of translation. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk & M. Thelen (Eds.), *Meaning in translation* (pp. 105-147). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Maalej, Z. (1990). *Metaphor in political and economic texts*, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Tunis, Tunisia.
- Maalej, Z. (2001). Processing pictorial metaphor in advertising: A cross-cultural perspective. *Academic Research*, 1(1), 19-42.
- Maalej, Z. (2003). Conceptual metaphor as persuasion, with special reference to consumer advertising: A cognitive semantics account. In M. Triki & A. Sellami-Baklouti (Eds.), *Pragmatic perspectives on persuasion* (pp. 121-147). Sfax, Tunisia: Faculty of Letters and Humanities.
- Maalej, Z. (2007). Doing critical discourse analysis with the contemporary theory of metaphor: Towards a discourse model of metaphor. In C. Hart & D. Lukeš (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse studies: Application and theory* (pp. 132-158). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Maalej, Z. (2008). Translating metaphor between unrelated cultures: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. *Sayyab Translation Journal*, 1, 60-82.

- Maalej, Z. (2014). Persuasion and counter-persuasion of visual metaphor in consumer advertising. In D. Yankova (Ed.), *Cross-linguistic interaction: Translation, contrastive and cognitive studies: Liber Amicorum in Honour of Prof. Bistra Alexieva* (pp. 329-347). Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. In *Translation and meaning PART 3* (pp. 483-495). Maastricht: Universitaire Press.
- Mason, K. (1982). Metaphor and translation. *Babel*, 28,140-149.
- Massey, G. (2021). Re-framing conceptual metaphor translation research in the age of neural machine translation: Investigating translators' added value with products and processes. *Training, Language and Culture*, 5(1), 37-56.
- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2017). Translating conceptual metaphor: The processes of managing interlingual asymmetry. *Research in Language*, 15(2), 173-189. DOI: 10.1515/rela-2017-0011
- Messaris, P. (1997). *Visual persuasion: The role of images in advertising*. London: Sage Publications.
- Newmark, P. (1980). The translation of metaphor. *Babel*, 16(2), 93-100.
- Newmark, P. (1995). *A textbook of translation*. New York/London: Phoenix ELT.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). Linguistics and ethnology in translation-problems. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 90-97). New York: Harper and Row.
- Nydell, M. K. (2012). *Understanding Arabs: A contemporary guide to Arab society*. Boston/London: Intercultural Press.
- Park, D. C., & Huang, C. M. (2010). Culture wires the brain: A cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 391-400. doi:10.1177/1745691610374591.
- Quinn, N. (1991). The cultural basis of metaphor. In J. W. Fernández (Ed.), *Beyond metaphor: The theory of tropes in anthropology* (pp. 57-93). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ramadan, S., Abu Radwan, S. A., & Shuqair, H. (2020). Problems in translating metaphors in political campaign speeches. *Translation Studies*, 17(2), 257-278.
- Rojo López, A. M., & Orts Llopis, M. A. (2015). The financial language used to communicate the same socio-economic events in English and Spanish press through metaphors and metonymies. *ESP Today*, 3(2), 216-237.
- Safarnejad, F., Ho-Abdullah, I., & Mat Awal, N. (2014). Cultural basis of metaphors translation: Case of emotions in Persian and English. *Asian Social Science*, 10(7), 107-118.
- Samaniego Fernández, E. (2011). Translation studies and the cognitive theory of metaphor. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 9(1), 262-279.
- Schaffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1253-1269.
- Schäffner, C., & Shuttleworth, M. (2015). Metaphor in translation: Possibilities for process research. In M. Ehrensberger-Dow, S. Göpferich, & S. O'Brien (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarity in translation and interpreting process research* (pp. 95-108). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in mind: Cognition, culture, and the problems of meaning*. New York/Oxford: OUP.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2014). Translation studies and metaphor studies: Possible paths of interaction between two well-established disciplines. In D. R. Miller & E. Monti (Eds.), *Tradurre figure / Translating figurative language* (pp. 53-65). Bologna: CeSLiC, 'Quaderni del CeSLiC, Atti di Convegni.'
- Semin, G. R., & E. R. Smith (2002). Interfaces of social psychology with situated and embodied cognition. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 3, 385-396.
- Siltanen, S. A. (1981). The persuasiveness of metaphor: A replication and extension. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 47, 67-83.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988/1995). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sopory, P., & Dillard, J. P. (2002a). Figurative language and persuasion. In: J. P. Dillard and M. Pfau (Eds.), *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice* (pp. 407-426). London: Sage Publications.
- Sopory, P., & Dillard, J. P. (2002b). The persuasive effects of metaphor: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research*, 28(3), 382-419.
- Spurrett, D., & Cowley, S. J. (2004). How to do things with words: Infants, utterance-activity and distributed cognition. *Language Sciences*, 26, 443-466.
- Tabakowska, E. (1993). *Cognitive linguistics and poetics of translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Thibodeau, P. H., Matlock, T., & Flusberg, S. J. (2019). The role of metaphor in communication and thought. *Compass*, 1-18.
- Thomas, A. (2010). Culture and cultural standards. In A. Thomas, E-U. Kinast, & S. Schroll-Machl (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural communication and cooperation: Vol. 1: Basics and areas of application* (2nd rev. ed., pp. 17-27). Göttingen and Oakville: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht GmbH and Co.
- Tomasello, M., & Rakoczy, H. (2003). What makes human cognition unique? From individual to shared to collective intentionality. *Mind & Language*, 18, 121-147.
- Tomoni, B. (2012). Conceptual metaphors in financial discourse: The 'Romanian Way' of thinking, speaking and writing finances. *Selected Papers from UK-CLA Meetings*, 1, 146 – 163. <http://uk-cla.org.uk/proceedings>
- Turner, M. (1991). *Reading minds: The study of English in the age of cognitive science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9(4), 625-636.
- Yu, N. (2003). Metaphor, body, and culture: The Chinese understanding of *gallbladder* and *courage*. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(1), 13-31.
- Yu, N. (2009). Nonverbal and multimodal manifestation of metaphors and metonymies: A case study. In C. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.), *Multimodal metaphor* (pp. 119-143). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.