Article:	**Argument is War Metaphor in the Qur'ān**
Author(s):	Sardaraz Khan Roslan bin Ali
Published:	Spring 2020
Article DOI:	https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.101.04
QR Code:	
To cite this article:	Khan, Sardaraz, and Roslan bin Ali. "Argument is war metaphor in the Qur'ān." *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization* 10, no. 1 (2020): 66–86. Crossref
Copyright Information:	This article is open access and is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution – Share Alike 4.0 International License
Publisher Information:	Department of Islamic Thought and Civilization, School of Social Science and Humanities, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.

Indexing Partners

INDEX ISLAMICUS

Crossref

ProQuest

Indexed by Scopus

aio

GENAMICS
...research from your desktop
Genamics JournalSeek

DRJI Directory of Research Journals Indexing

ROAD DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCESS SCHOLARLY RESOURCES

WorldCat

For more
please click
here

Argument is War Metaphor in the Qur'ān

Dr. Sardaraz Khan﹡
Director ORIC,
University of Science and Technology Bannu, Pakistan
Roslan bin Ali
Faculty for Language and Communication Studies,
Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS)

Abstract

This paper investigates the experiential basis of the concept of 'argument' in the language of the Holy Qur'ān in order to explore the cross-era dimensions of war as the source domain for argument. Conceptual metaphor approach has been applied to the data collected from the Holy Qur'ān through the technique of topical words to find out metaphor themes of argument. The findings reveal that ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is missing in classical Arabic of the Holy Qur'ān. However, the concept of argument is framed by other metaphors such as container schema, objects, and personification. It also serves as source domain for the invocation to Allah SWT. The findings also show that language has an intrinsic function in metaphor comprehension. The paper suggests further research of classical Arabic literature to make some definite theoretical conclusions on ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor, and to explore more basic conceptual schemas in cross-era languages.

Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor, conceptual schema, experiential gestalt, conceptual system, socio-interpersonal conflict

Introduction

The rhetorical literature of metaphor studies on the Qur'ān focuses extensively on resemblance-based metaphors in order to explore its aesthetic beauty but misses a huge bulk of conventional metaphors. The conceptual metaphor theory (hereafter CMT) has been adopted in a number of studies to investigate the conventional metaphors in the Qur'ān such as Al-Saggaf, Yasin and Abdullah[1], Berrada[2], Eldin[3], Sami and Ruma[4] and

---

﹡Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr Sardaraz Khan, Director ORIC, University of Science and Technology Bannu at sardarazsorani@gmail.com.

[1]Muhammad Ali Al-Saggaf, Muhammad Shakir Mohd Yasin, and Imran Ho Abdullah, "Dualism of Soul-Person in English Translated Texts of the Qur'an," *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118 (2014): 42-50.

[2]Khalid Berrada, "Food Metaphors: A Contrastive Approach," *Metaphorik. de* 13 (2007): 1-38.

[3]Ahmad Abdel Tawwab Sharaf Eldin, "A Cognitive Metaphorical Analysis of Selected Verses in the Glorius Qu'ran," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 4, no. 2 (2015): 193-198.

[4]Sani Iro, and Mustapha Bala Ruma, "Concretizing the Abstract: Conceptual Metaphors in the Holy Qur'an," *European Academic Research* 2, no. 8 (2014): 11000-11012.

Sardaraz and Ali.[5] But, none of these studies have investigated the concept of argument and its experiential basis in the Qur'ān. According to Lakoff and Johnson,[6] *ARGUMENT IS WAR* is one of the pervasive metaphors in human language and thought. Physical combat or conflict helps in understanding the abstract concept of rational argument. In the animal kingdom, physical fighting is widespread for the purpose of achieving various goals such as food, sex, control, etc. According to Kövecses[7] (2002), the origin and evolution of physical fighting as source domain for the verbal institution of verbal fighting are historical in nature. The reason for such evolution is that the experiential gestalt of the physical fight is well-structured, clearly delineated and more readily accessible, which makes it easy for human beings to conceptualize the abstract concepts of rational arguments. The tactics used in war such as attack, counter-attack, defense, plan, threat, retreat, surrender, and defeat are pervasively used in the rational argument. The reason is that the knowledge and experience of a physical fight, particularly war, is used in the grounding of verbal battles or rational arguments. It establishes that the institution of verbal conflict is structured in terms of the experiential gestalt of physical fight and war in the human conceptual system[8].

However, the conceptual metaphor (hereafter CM) *ARGUMENT IS WAR* has received both mild and strong responses in literature. Vervaeke and Kennedy[9] and Ritchie[10] suggests modification and correction to the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor, but Haser[11] and Howe[12] have criticized this CM. Vervaeke and Kennedy[13] doubt the conceptual unity of CM, arguing for an open interpretation of groups of metaphor and multiple levels of generality. They hold that the CM *ARGUMENT IS WAR* suggests that linguistic metaphoric expression, involving verbal fighting, are the instantiations of one implicit metaphor. But, keeping in view the linguistic patterns, such a position is open to doubt. Argument is war

---

[5]Sardaraz Khan, and Ali Roslan, "A Cognitive-Semantic Study of Death Metaphor Themes in the Quran," *Journal of Nusantara Studies* (JONUS) 2, no 4 (2019): 219-246.

[6]George Lakoff, and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 4-5.

[7]Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 6.

[8]Lakoff and Johnson. *Metaphors we Live by,* 5.

[9]John Vervaeke and Kennedy John, "Metaphors in Language and Thought: Falsification and Multiple Meanings," *Metaphor and Symbol* 11, no. 4 (1996): 273-284; John Vervaeke, and Kennedy John, "Conceptual Metaphor and Abstract Thought," *Metaphor and Symbol* 19, no. 3 (2004): 213-231.

[10]David Ritchie, "" ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors," *Metaphor and Symbol* 18, no. 2 (2003): 125-146.

[11]Verena Haser, *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Experientialist Philosophy: Challenging Cognitive Semantics* Vol. 49. (Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 54-59.

[12]James Howe, "Argument is Argument: An Essay on Conceptual Metaphor and Verbal Dispute," *Metaphor and Symbol* 23, no. 1 (2007): 1-23.

[13]Vervaeke and Kennedy, Metaphors in Language and Thought: Falsification and Multiple Meanings," 1996.

can be said to have been derived from the more basic metaphor of *ARGUMENT IS SPACE*. Still, Vervaeke and Kennedy[14] hold even this implicit metaphor cannot account for all linguistic metaphoric expressions as is the case with '*his argument is cooked up*". It means that the CM gives a coherent group of metaphoric linguistic expressions, yet the CM cannot restrict the options for the levels of generality or the association of words to the levels of abstractions. The 'argument' may be 'space' or 'dance' in space or verbal fighting, and even the concept 'dance' can be argument. Moreover, these associations may sometimes attain novel metaphoric nature which may provide for the further extension of the existing conceptual domains[15]. The relegation of CM to a single source domain faces the problem of reductionism[16] (Vervaeke & Kennedy, 2004). The target domain is not a blank slate, which is mechanically mapped by the source domain, but rather the target domain which has premetaphoric character. The premetaphoric character of the target domain determines why a particular source domain is selected and not others, as is the case with "Dick *is a pig*" but not '*a buffalo*'. Vervaeke and Kennedy observe that in metaphors, the target domain is active rather than passive. It helps not only in entailments, but also in a novel extension of metaphoric terms. The same criticism can also be found from psycholinguists on CMT, such as Glucksberg, McGlone, & Manfredi[17], and McGlone.[18]

Grady[19] emphasized that the more basic experiential domain for the conceptualization of arguments is physical combat and struggle rather than war. But Ritchie[20] questions physical conflict as the experiential basis of the CM *ARGUMENT IS WAR*, and holds that argument is not grounded in the experiential domain of physical fight or war, but rather located in the most basic experiences of physical, verbal, emotional and psychological conflicts. The physical, verbal, emotional and psychological conflicts rather than war map the arguments because war is not the immediate and direct experience of the English-speaking people. These responses led Lakoff and Johnson to admit in the afterword to the (2003) edition[21] that struggle takes precedence over war in light of the child's struggle against the physical constraints, but maintained that with growth in years, the struggle becomes more violent and takes the shape of war and physical fight. However, Vervaeke and Kennedy[22] hold that argument as an interpersonal conflict is, merely, a class insertion statement, and denies it the embodied metaphoric nature. But, all kinds of concepts are

---

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Vervaeke and Kennedy, "Conceptual Metaphor and Abstract Thought," 2004.

[17]Sam Glucksberg, Matthew McGlone, and Deanna Manfredi, "Property Attribution in Metaphor Comprehension," *Journal of memory and Language* 36, no. 1 (1997): 50-67.

[18]Matthew McGlone, c *Language & Communication* 27, no. 2 (2007): 109-126.

[19]Joseph Grady, *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Stress* (Berkeley: University of California, 1997).

[20]Ritchie, "" ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors," 2003.

[21]Lakoff and Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*, 239-242.

[22]Vervaeke and Kennedy, "Conceptual Metaphor and Abstract Thought," 2004.

embodied in perceptual and introspective brain states,[23] and physical conflict is also a type of social conflict, which may attain schematic conceptualization. Concepts are stored in analogue, incremental and schematic fashion in the human conceptual system, and language gives representational character to these concepts.[24].

Hasar[25] challenges the thesis of ARGUMENT IS WAR, and regards it as an arbitrary grouping of metaphors. The source domain of war for targets, such as shooting, may also have other source domains, such as hunting, sports and force. The supposition of war as the "clearly delineated" is unwarranted, as fighting would have been a more appropriate source domain for argument than war. Haser argues that the lexemes such as 'attack,' 'defend,' 'demolish,' and 'fortify' represent other source domains for argument than war. The CM classification on the linguistic data seems to be superimposed by the linguists, but the linguistic data defy such superimposition. Language does not need the CM of *ARGUMENT IS WAR* to regroup, categorize, analyze or interpret the linguistic metaphoric expressions. However, the CMT admits to mapping of one target domain by various source domains.[26] Haser has not taken into account the structural symmetry of CM, which allows all those lexemes to attain one conceptual structure. Haser seems to have overstated his criticism of CMT, which has otherwise factual, psychological and empirical reality of its omnipresence in language.[27]

Howe[28] questions the very experiential basis of argument like Haser, and holds that the English speakers do not have to use the metaphoric mechanism to understand arguments. Howe's main query is that if *ARGUMENT IS WAR* is derived from the more basic metaphor of *ARGUMENT IS STRUGGLE*, as Lakoff and Johnson[29] aver, why does juvenile language invoke the source domain of war? Howe claims that it is cultural shared understanding, which the metaphor invokes rather than experience, because war is more a complex domain, and is less directly experienced. His assertion, that English people's use of war metaphors in language is due to their cultural tendency to use aggressive words, draws

---

[23]Vyvyan Evans, "What is a Concept? Analogue versus Parametric Concepts in LCCM Theory," In E. Margolis and S. Laurence, (Eds.), *The Conceptual Mind: New Directions in the Study of Concepts* (London: MIT, Press, 2015): 251-290.

[24]Lawrence Barsalou, "Perceptions of Perceptual Symbols," *Behavioral and brain sciences* 22, no. 4 (1999): 637-660; Evans, What is a Concept? Analogue versus Parametric Concepts in LCCM Theory," 2015.

[25]Haser, *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Experientialist Philosophy,* 54-55.

[26]George Lakoff, "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor," In A. Ortony, (ed.,) *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993): 202-251.

[27]Vyvyan Evans, "Figurative Language Understanding in LCCM Theory," *Cognitive Linguistics* 21, no. 4 (2010): 601-662.

[28]Howe, "Argument is Argument: An Essay on Conceptual Metaphor and Verbal Dispute," 2007.

[29]Lakoff and Johnson. *Metaphors We Live by*.

upon Tannen.[30] But Tannen's approach is sociolinguistic, drawing important conclusions about the polarization of the American society, and the tendency of the American culture towards heated argument culture. Though cultural experiences might have effect on the perceptual schemas, Gibbs[31] and Kövecses[32] have attempted to resolve the dichotomy between culture and CM. Various challenges that the CMT faces may be resolved by an approach which locates the comprehension of metaphor in situated usage within the discourse.[33]

However, the experiential basis of metaphor cannot be ignored, nor the importance of CM in metaphor comprehension.[34] This study will explore the experiential basis of the concept of argument in the Qur'ān, which was revealed more than 1400 years ago in order to study the basis of metaphor beyond the limits of the cross-cultural tradition of the same epoch. Berrada[35] has found that some of the CMs, such as *IDEAS ARE FOOD* and *TEMPERAMENT IS FOOD*, are found in both modern Arabic and English, but they are not found in classical Arabic. Similarly, Eweida[36] has found that *TIME IS ADVERSARY* and *TIME IS MONEY* metaphors can be found only in English language, but are not present in the Arabic Qur'ān. It means that the people of that age had a set of experiences quite different from the people of the present age. It casts doubt on the universality of some of the CMs. Even so, the universality is itself against the tenets of CMT, because the CM is based on the experiential gestalts of people, which vary from age to age.

Semantic shift is a pervasive phenomenon in language. The change in the semantic value of language with the passage of time has been demonstrated by Evans[37] and Zinken.[38] The discourse metaphors in their first usage are novel, but when they become

---

[30]Deborah Tannen, *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words* (Ballantine Books, 1999).

[31]Raymond Gibbs W, "Taking Metaphor out of Our Heads and Putting it into the Cultural World," *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series* 4 (1999): 145-166.

[32]Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[33]Vyvyan Evans, "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction," *Cognitive Semiotics* 5, no. 1-2 (2013): 73-107; Sardaraz Khan, and Roslan Ali, "A Cognitive-Semantic Study of the Spatial Preposition Fī (فِي) in the Quran," *KEMANUSIAAN: The Asian Journal of Humanities* 24, no. 2 (2017): 89–122; Zinken Jörg, "Discourse Metaphors: The Link Between Figurative Language and Habitual Analogies," *Cognitive Linguistics* 18 no.3 (2007): 445-466.

[34]Evans, "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction," 2013.

[35]Berrada, "Food Metaphors: A Contrastive Approach," 2007.

[36]Sara Eweida, "The Realization of Time Metaphors and the Cultural Implications: An Analysis of the Qur'ān and English Qur'ānic Translations," (Stockholm University, 2007).

[37]Evans, "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction," 2013.

[38]Zinken, "Discourse Metaphors: The Link between Figurative Language and Habitual Analogies," 2007.

---

contextualized, they attain more general meanings. It is also the language use which results in language change and semantic shift. The use of a particular lexical item in a new context gives rise to a new conception, as mediated by the context through bridging contexts. This association of a lexical item with a different conception, through the recurring use of the lexical item in such contexts, gives rise to a new semantic value for that particular form.[39] However, concepts are the product of perceptual experiences, and language consists of stable concepts, which give representational character to such ad-hoc perceptual concepts.[40] Thus, language cannot be separated from experiential gestalts, as both are interrelated in the human conceptual system. Language and thought are both vital for metaphoric analysis of religious discourse.[41] The change in experiential gestalt may also lead to a corresponding change in the semantic value of words. Bisschops,[42] in his criticism of CMT, poses the question, whose experiences map a particular target domain? But this question itself supports CMT. The metaphors *GOD IS HUSBAND* and *GOD IS FATHER* in the Old Testament and New Testament respectively were because of the respective cultural and experiential gestalts of the people in those particular ages. The basic role of cognitive semantics is to investigate the relationship between experiences, conceptual system and language.[43]

It is also necessary to have a cursory purview of the society of the period of the Qur'ān. The pre-Islamic society of 6th century AD was wrought with strife between different tribes due to unequal distribution of wealth and absence of any central authority except that of a tribal chief. The change of trade routes due to the consistent armed conflict between Byzantine and Sassanid empires caused the reorientation of tribal alliances and further conflicts. The Bedouin life, wrought with conflict, vengeance and revenge, has been enrobed in the poetry of the period as Al-Harith depicts.[44]

> "Fearless, one who doth his vengeance swift on his wrongdoer,
> One who unassailed yet rendeth, he the first injurer…
> Yet, by thy life, not these the guilty. Clean was the steel of them,
> Pure of blood, Nahík's."

---

[39]Evans, "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction," 2013; Sardaraz Khan, Syed Naeem Badshah, and Irfan Ullah Khan, "Cognitive Semantic Study of the Preposition 'Min' in the Quran," *Journal of Islamic and Religious Studies* 4, no. 2 (2019): 83-109.

[40]Evans, "What is in a Concept? Analogue versus Parametric Concepts in LCCM Theory," 2015.

[41]Ahmad El-Sharif, "A Theoretical Account on the Study of Metaphor in Didactic Discourse," *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 7, no. 2 (2016): 100-112.

[42]Ralph Bisschops, "Are Religious Metaphors Rooted in Experience? On Ezekiel's Wedding Metaphors," In Feyaerts, Kurt (Edt.), *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation: A Cognitive Semantic Perspective* (Peter Lang Pub Inc 2003): 113-151.

[43]Vyvyan Evans, "Semantic Representation in LCCM Theory," In V. Evans, and S. Pourcel, (Eds.), *New Directions in Cognitive Linguistics* 24 (John Benjamins Publishing 2009): 27-56.

[44]Jonathan Brown, "The Social Context of Pre-Islamic Poetry: Poetic Imagery and Social Reality in the Muᶜallaqat," *Arab Studies Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (2003): 29-50.

It shows that physical conflict was one of the immediate experiences in the lives of the people of that time, and it was augmented by the public poetical conflicts known as *Hijā*. According to Smith,[45] "the whole law of the old Arabs really resolves itself into a law of war blood-feud, blood-wit, and booty are the points on which everything turns." Thus, physical conflict was a necessary part of the life experiences of the people during the time of revelation. In modern Arabic language, ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is extensively used both in spoken language and written language as Raii[46] has demonstrated in modern spoken Arabic. But, most of the present-day people do not have the actual physical and immediate experiences of war. If Ritchie's[47] Americans, and presumably Raii's Arabs, have only the indirect experience of physical conflict through media, the people of the time of the Qur'ān directly experienced the scars of physical fights. It may lead one to hypothesize that the language of the Qur'ān would have mapped the concept of argument through experiential gestalt of war or physical fighting, because they had the immediate and direct experiences of war. Hence, the investigation of ARGUMENT IS WAR in classical Arabic of the Qur'ān may give further implications on CMT.

2. Methodology

The data corpus is based on the Qur'ān in the Arabic language. For data collection, the study has used the technique of topical words and phrases suggested by Ryan and Bernard[48] for themes identification. All those words, which were relating to argument or war, were searched in the Qur'ān, and were retrieved from the website, The Qur'ān[49], which is a digital website with a Qur'ānic Arabic corpus search engine. If a certain lexical form is to be searched in the Qur'ān, its root search through the search engine can retrieve all such lexical forms along with all lexical constructions which are derived from that root and the number of each lexical form. In Arabic language, some prominent roots which enfold the concepts of war, physical fight, dispute and argument are '*ḥā rā bā*', '*qāf tā lām*', '*jīm dāl lām*', '*khā ṣād mīm*', '*nūn zāy ʿayn*', '*ḥā jīm jīm*' '*hā jīm mīm*', '*hā zāy mīm*' and '*dāl fā ʿayn*'. These roots were searched in the Qur'ān with the help of this website, and the data retrieved consisted of 254 verses. The repeated verses were removed, and after the data distillation, the refined corpus consisted of 208 verses.

The corpus was then broken down, and the data was labelled to extract the metaphor themes from the corpus on the basis of topical words and phrases, as suggested by Ryan

---

[45]William Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907): 61.

[46]Jalal Raii, "Metaphor in Day-To-Day Arabic Speech: A Conceptual Approach," *Tishreen University Journal for Research and Scientific Studies-Arts and Humanities Series* 31, no. 1 (2009): 175-193.

[47]Ritchie, "" ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors," 2003.

[48]Gery Ryan, and Russell Bernard, "Techniques to Identify Themes," *Field Methods* 15, no. 1 (2003): 85-109.

[49]http://corpus.quran.com/qurandictionary.jsp

and Bernard[50]. This paper followed metaphor identification procedure (MIP)[51] for identification of metaphoric lexical units, and consulted various dictionaries such as Ibn Fâris,[52] al-Isfahani[53] and Lane[54] in order to determine the meaning of the lexical units. If the contextual meaning differed from the more basic meaning of the lexical item, the lexical unit was marked as a metaphor.

This study used CMT to categorize and analyze the metaphoric linguistic expressions. On thorough examination of the data, the basic metaphor themes found in the corpus are explained in the analysis. The analysis has been designed on the basis of lexical roots. The lexical items, derived from each root, were grouped together and were analyzed to explore the metaphor themes. In other words, the lexical items derived from the roots were analyzed to explore the experiential source domains for the concept of argument.

3. Results

3.1. Lexical Items from the Roots '*Hā rā bā*' and '*Qāf tā lām*'

The analysis of the data revealed that none of the lexical items derived from the roots '*ḥā rā bā*' and '*qāf tā lām*' maps the abstract concept of argument in any instance in the Qur'ān. The lexical items derived from the root '*ḥā rā bā*' have been used 11 times. It has 6 instances of lexical items which denote the concept of 'war', while its 5 other instances connote the noun of 'elevated chamber'. Similarly, the lexical items, derived from the root '*qāf tā lām*', have 170 instances in the Qur'ān. In all the instances, it encapsulates the conception of killing, murder, physical fight and war. The number of lexical constructions derived from these roots is given in Table 1.

Table1. Lexical constructions of *'qāf tā lām'* and *'ḥā rā bā'*

Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No
Qatala	83	quttilu	04	Qātala	54
iq'tatala	04	Qitāl	13	Qatlā	01
Qatl	10	taqtīl	01	ḥāraba	02
ḥarb	04				

Such a large number of instances of these two terms in the Qur'ānic discourse points to two important conclusions. First, it points to the fact that war, battle and physical conflict were one of the most predominant and important activities of that period. It means that war and physical conflict were one of the immediate experiences of the people of that age.

---

[50]Ryan and Bernard, "Techniques to Identify Themes," 2003.

[51]Pragglejaz Group, "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse," *Metaphor and Symbol* 22, no 1, (2007): 1-39.

[52]Zakariyyā Ibn Fâris, *Maqâyyis Al-Lughah* (Beirut: Dâr al-Fikr, 1979).

[53]Raghib Al-Isfahani, *al-Mufradat fi Gharib al-Qur'an* (Beirut: Dar al Ma'rifah, 1961).

[54]Edward William Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Vol. 1-8) (1968). Retrieved From http://www.tyndalearchive.com/tabs/lane/

However, the Qurʾān has not used war or physical fighting as a source domain for rational argument. It means that though the society was wrought with physical conflict, the Qurʾān evaded the use of war or physical combat to express concepts of arguments. It points to one question whether the Qurʾān deliberately evaded the use of source domain of war in argument or not. Therefore, the two roots were also searched in the prophetic tradition, using the same website.[55] The root 'qāf tā lām' gave 700 instances of different lexical constructions with the same literal meaning of war, killing, and fighting. The root 'ḥā rā bā' displayed 1514 instances, which mostly contained the personal name of Ibn Harb or Abi Harb. Only 10 instances of lexical items carried the literal meaning of war. This shows that the *ARGUMENT IS WAR* metaphor was not present in classical Arabic.

The second is that the data do not support the premises of CMT that the immediate and direct experiences of war and physical conflict map the abstract concept of argument. These lexical items of war and physical conflict have not been used to map arguments in a single instance in the analyzed data from the Qurʾānic discourse. However, it may be argued that the lexical items have been used in the literal sense and not in the metaphorical sense, and that these instances just show the literal phenomenon of war and physical armed conflict. As a result, it can be averred that though the data reflects armed conflict or war as the immediate and direct experience of the people of that age, yet the instances cannot challenge the basic premise of the conceptual correlation between argument and war.

However, the Qurʾānic discourse reflects that the concept of war is itself conceptualized as target domain through personification. War has been personified in the following verse,

(1)   حَتَّىٰ تَضَعَ الْحَرْبُ أَوْزَارَهَا

'ḥattā taḍaʿa l-ḥarbu awzārahā'

"Until the war lays down its burdens." [56]

War is represented as a warrior who lays down the burden of arms after the war. It means that war can both serve as a source domain and a target domain. It means that the level of abstractedness is graded. If a lexical item can serve as source domain in one instance, it can be target domain in another.

3.2. The Root 'Hā jīm mīm', 'Hā zāy mīm' and 'Dāl fā ʿayn'

The roots 'hā jīm mīm', 'hā zāy mīm' and 'dāl fā ʿayn' were also searched in the Qurʾān. The roots mean 'attack', 'defeat' and 'defend' respectively. The lexical root 'hā jīm mīm' has been found neither in the Qurʾānic discourse nor in Hadith discourse. The lexical root 'hā zāy mīm' has three instances in three different chapters[57] with the literal meaning of defeat in war rather than argument. The root 'dāl fā ʿayn' has 10 instances in

---

[55]https://sunnah.com/
[56]Muḥammad 47:4.
[57]al-Baqarah 2:251, al-Qamar 54:43, Ṣād 38:11.

the Qur'ān with meaning of defend, deliver, and repel. It has also not been used to denote argument or dispute. This gives support to one of the hypotheses that the classical Arabic did not have the *ARGUMENT IS WAR* schema, though arguments have been mapped in other schemas as illustrated in previous sections.

3.3. Lexical Items Derived from the Root '*Jīm Dāl Lām*'

The lexical items derived from the root '*jīm dāl lām*' express the concept of argument in the Qur'ān. The root '*jīm dāl lām*' embodies the basic concept of 'twisting something to strengthen it', 'verbal dispute' and 'animosity'[58]. The lexical items derived from this root have 29 occurrences in the Qur'ān given in Table 2.

Table 2. Lexical constructions of *'jīm dāl lām'*

Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No
Jādalu	25	Jidāl	02	Jadal	2

The analysis of the lexical items in different contexts reveals various CMs. The metaphor *ENTITIES/ABSTRACT CONCEPTS ARE CONTAINERS FOR ARGUMENTS* and *SIGNS OF ALLAH ARE CONTAINERS FOR ARGUMENTS* can be illustrated each with two examples respectively,

يُجَادِلُونَكَ فِي الْحَقّ بَعْدَمَا تَبَيَّنَ   (2)

'*yujādilūnaka fī l-ḥaqi baʿdamā tabayyana*'

"Disputing with thee concerning the truth after it was made manifest"[59]

قَدْ سَمِعَ اللَّهُ قَوْلَ الَّتِي تُجَادِلُكَ فِي زَوْجِهَا   (3)

'*qad samiʿa l-lahu qawla allatī tujādiluka fī zawjihā*'

"Allah has indeed heard (and accepted) the statement of the woman who pleads with thee concerning her husband"[60] ()

مَا يُجَادِلُ فِي آيَاتِ اللَّهِ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا   (4)

'*mā yujādilu fī āyāti l-lahi illā alladhīna kafarū*'

"None can dispute about the Signs of Allah but the Unbelievers."[61]

In these examples, the spatial preposition '*fī*' instantiates the container schema. In (2), '*fī l-ḥaqi*' is generated by the CM *TRUTH IS CONTAINER FOR ARGUMENTS*; in (3), the

---

[58]Zakariyyā Ibn Fâris, *Maqâyyis al-Lughah*; Raghib Al-Isfahani, *al-Mufradat fi Gharib al-Qur'an*.

[59]al-Anfāl 8:6.

[60]al-Mujādilah 58:1.

[61]al-Ghāfir 40:4.

'*fī zawjihā*' is generated by the CM *THE PERSON IS CONTAINER FOR HIS ATTRIBUTES*; (4) shows the instantiation of *SIGNS OF ALLAH ARE CONTAINERS FOR ARGUMENT*. However, in the following examples, argument is mapped as an object, which can be increased or can be better in quality.

(5)   فَأَكْثَرْتَ جِدَالَنَا

'*fa-aktharta jidālanā*'

"and (much) hast thou prolonged the dispute with us:"[62]

(6)   وَجَادِلْهُم بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ

'*wajādil'hum bi-allatī hiya aḥsanu*'

"and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious:"[63]

These examples show the metaphoric character of the argument as an object, which can be increased "*aktharta*" as in (5), or may be best in quality "*aḥsanu*", as in (6). The examples also illustrate that argument has not been mapped as physical conflict or war, and that the same lexical item may have more options for generalization as found by Vervaeke and Kennedy.[64]

Keeping in view the claim of CMT that CM causes the online retrieval of meaning, this paper also analyzes the above lexical items semantically in their situational context to show the different informational characterization, which they achieve.

In all the examples, the lexical items are verbs derived from the root '*jīm dāl lām*'. All the verbs enfold the basic signification of dispute or arguing. In other words, the verbs signify active opposition. In all the examples, there is active antagonism except in (2), (3) and (6). In example (2), there is a mutual debate on the issue of mutual concern; (3) shows the pleading of a wife before the Prophet SAW for her husband, while the people of the Book are invited to Islam on the basis of argument in (6). In other words, example (2) shows active consultation on an issue of mutual interest, example (3) shows a legal debate, and example (6) denotes a simple call or invitation on the basis of arguments to the Islamic faith. However, in (4) and (5), there is actual opposition and hostility which the lexical items convey. These examples reveal that a lexical item may encode different conceptions, depending upon the situational context.

As stated, the lexical item depends upon its situational context for its meaning. Contrary to the aforementioned examples of the lexical item '*jadala'*, the same lexical item is also found in the corpus to mean praying, pleading or invoking. It means that verbal

---

[62]al-Hūd 11:32.

[63]al-Naḥl 16:125.

[64]Vervaeke and Kennedy, "Conceptual Metaphor and Abstract Thought," 2004.

dispute has been used as source domain to map the target domain of invocation as in the following examples.

يَوْمَ تَأْتِي كُلُّ نَفْسٍ تُجَادِلُ عَن نَّفْسِهَا   (7)

'*yawma tatī kullu nafsin tujādilu ʿan nafsihā*'

"One Day every soul <u>will come up struggling for itself</u>,"[65]

فَمَن يُجَادِلُ اللَّهَ عَنْهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ   (8)

'*faman yujādilu l-laha ʿanhum yawma l-qiyāmati*'

"but <u>who will contend with Allah</u> on their behalf on the Day of Judgment,"[66]

In these examples, the lexical items '*tujādilu*' and '*yujādilu*' literally mean 'will plead, argue, contend'. As verbs are combined relationally or inferentially with Allah, contextually, the verbs cannot be interpreted as contending, arguing or pleading. This is because no one can dare to contend or argue with Allah, as the Qur'ān[67] itself says. Contextually, the basic meaning becomes incongruent, and it needs further search. The context guides the way through the relational and referential aspect of lexical items to access the intended probable meaning of 'prayer or invocation before Allah for mercy'. Hence, it can be inferred that verbal dispute provides the source domain for repeated invocation to Allah. Thus, it gives the metaphoric theme of *INVOCATION IS PLEADING*.

3.4.   Lexical Item derived from the Root '*Khā Sād mīm*'

The lexical items derived from the root '*khā ṣād mīm*' are also used for animosity and dispute. The root '*khā ṣād mīm*' encapsulates the basic concept of 'contention', 'verbal dispute or verbal conflict'. The lexical items from this root have 17 occurrences, as in Table 3.

Table 3. Lexical constructions of '*khā ṣād mīm*'

Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No
ikh'taṣamu	08	*khaṣm*	03	*khaṣimūn*	01
khaṣīm	05	takhāṣum	01		

Most of these lexical items are literal in nature, but some of them also reflect the metaphors of *KNOWN ARGUMENT IS CLEAR ARGUMENT, ARGUMENT IS CONTAINER* and *SIGNS OF ALLAH ARE CONTAINERS FOR ARGUMENTS*. Each of these metaphoric expressions is illustrated with one example in the following verses.

---

[65]al-Naḥl 16:111.
[66]al-Nisāa 4:109.
[67]Ibid.

فَإِذَا هُوَ خَصِيمٌ مُّبِينٌ   (9)

"and behold this same (man) becomes an open disputer!"[68]

وَهُوَ فِي الْخِصَامِ غَيْرُ مُبِينٍ   (10)

and unable to give a clear account in a dispute (to be associated with Allah)?[69]

اخْتَصَمُوا فِي رَبِّهِمْ   (11)

"dispute with each other about their Lord"[70]

In (9), the root of the lexical item 'mubīnun' (clear or seen) gives metaphoric character to the abstract quality of argumentative or disputative, because it has no physical shape to be seen. The metaphor has been derived from primary metaphor *KNOWING IS SEEING*. In (13) and (14), the nouns 'l-khiṣāmi' and 'rabbi' are represented as container through the use of preposition 'fī' which are abstract concepts of dispute and the Lord. Argument is represented as the socio-interpersonal conflict in the following verses.

قَالُوا وَهُمْ فِيهَا يَخْتَصِمُونَ   (12)

'qālū wahum fīhā yakhtaṣimūna'

"They will say there in their mutual bickerings:"[71]

فَإِذَا هُمْ فَرِيقَانِ يَخْتَصِمُونَ   (13)

'fa-idhā hum farīqāni yakhtaṣimūna '

"But behold, they became two factions quarrelling with each other."[72]

In these examples, the lexical item 'yakhtaṣimūna' means verbal quarrel and fight among the disbelievers disputing one another. Contextually, in (12) the verbal quarrel among the disbelievers is regarding their accusation against one another, but (16) reflects quarrel or debate between the two parties regarding the truth of something. Hence, the verses show arguments as verbal fighting or quarrelling and not as war.

3.5. Lexical Items derived from the Root 'Nūn zāy ʿayn'

The root 'nūn zāy ʿayn' means displacement, inclination, stretching of something from its place. The lexical items from this root mean 'to displace something, uproot something, yearn for, contend, fight and dispute'. In the Qurʾān, the form III and form IV of the verbs have been used 8 times to denote the concept of contending, fighting, quarreling, or

---

[68]al-Naḥl 16:4.
[69]al-Zukh'ruf 43:18.
[70]al-Ḥajj 22:19.
[71]al-Shuʿarā 26:96.
[72]al- Naml 27:45.

disputing. The analysis reveals the metaphor of *ISSUE/DISPUTE IS CONTAINER FOR ARGUMENT* as in the following verses.

(14)   فَلَا يُنَازِعُنَّكَ فِي الْأَمْرِ

'*falā yunāziʿunnaka fī l-amri*'

"let them not then dispute with thee on the matter,"[73]

(15)   فَإِن تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ

'*fa-in tanāzaʿtum fī shayin*'

"If ye differ in anything among yourselves,"[74]

In the above examples, the lexical items '*yunāziʿunnaka*' and '*tanāzaʿtum*' express disagreement or dispute on some issue. The abstract noun *l-amri*' gets container schema through the use of spatial preposition '*fī*'. On the other hand, '*shayin*' is a concrete noun, denoting dispute as container through the same spatial preposition. But the former refers to active antagonism between the Prophet and the disbelievers, while the later refers to some issue among Muslims. It shows how the same lexical item attains different semantic values in different contexts. The examples also reveal that argument is expressed through container schema and not through war.

3.6. Lexical Items from the Root '*Hā jīm jīm*'

The root '*ḥā jīm jīm*' signifies 'to make an attempt, determination, to intend, to overcome someone in argument'. It has been found with the basic signification of 'contention, arguing' in 20 instances, given in Table 4.

Table 4. Lexical constructions of '*ḥā jīm jīm*'

Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No	Lexical form	No
ḥājja	12	yataḥājju	01	ḥujjat	7

The analysis reveals that the lexical items have been used literally, but in combination with other nouns through the spatial preposition '*fī*', the data shows the metaphor of *SIGNS OF ALLAH ARE CONTAINER FOR ARGUMENTS* as in the verses below.

(16)   قُلْ أَتُحَاجُّونَنَا فِي اللَّهِ

'*qul atuḥājjūnanā fī l-lahi*'

"Say: Will ye dispute with us about Allah,"[75]

---

[73]al-Ḥaj 22:67.
[74]al- Nisāa 4:59.
[75]al-Baqarah 2:139.

(17)   وَإِذْ يَتَحَاجُّونَ فِي النَّارِ

'wa-idh yatahājjūna fī l-nāri'

"Behold, they will dispute with each other in the Fire!"[76]

In (16), the spatial preposition '*fī*' gives metaphoric character to the abstract concept of Allah. It is generated by the container schema *ATTRIBUTES OF ENTITY IS CONTAINER FOR ARGUMENT*. Example (17) shows the literal use of the preposition '*fī*' in spatio-geometric sense. Example (21) shows that argument is treated literally as socio-interpersonal conflict, and not as war.

4. Discussions

The results of the data show that *ARGUMENT IS WAR* is not present in the Qur'ānic discourse. It might be due to the culture of that time. The present age is the era of cultural integration, having similar linguistic patterns because of multi-linguistic contacts. This is one of the factors which Berrada[77] considered for differences between modern Arabic and classical Arabic. The absence of such cross-linguistic contacts and subsequent influences might be considered as one of the reasons for the absence of CM *ARGUMENT IS WAR* in the language of the Qur'ān and Hadith. Though it supports the hypothesis that in classical Arabic the CM was not used, this paper does not make a concluding claim. Future research may focus on the poetry and literature of that period, before some definite conclusion is drawn on the issue.

Even so, Lakoff and Johnson[78] argued that immediate and direct experiences provide the source domain for the conceptualization of abstract concept. They argued that physical fighting is ubiquitous in the animal kingdom and, therefore, it structures the abstract concept of argument. The data reveals that this position is not supported in the language of the Qur'ān. It may be presumed, as Lakoff and Johnson themselves held, that it might have been due to the cultural influence of the society of that age. However, such a position is also not tenable, keeping in view the most predominant experiential gestalt of war and physical conflict in pre-Islamic society, as is manifest from the pre-Islamic poetry (Section 1.0). The pervasive use of lexical items, derived from the roots '*ḥā rā bā*' and '*qāf tā lām*', regarding physical conflict and war in the Qur'ānic discourse also provides such a testimony as shown in the analysis (Section 4.1).

The original thesis of *ARGUMENT IS WAR* has been revisited by Ritchie,[79] who claims that most Americans do not have actual experiences of war and that the metaphor needs to be restructured because it confronts with the main ground of CMT, that immediate and

---

[76]al-Ghāfir 40:47.

[77]Berrada, "Food Metaphors: A Contrastive Approach," 2007.

[78]Lakoff and Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. 5.

[79]Ritchie, "" ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors," 2003.

direct experiences of physical fight maps the abstract concepts of argument. Ritchie argues that socio-interpersonal conflict is the most immediate and direct experience of man since childhood. Therefore, such experiences provide the basic structure to the abstract concept of argument. However, the data of the present study show that the states are location metaphor is behind the conceptualization of arguments. Socio-interpersonal conflict is a socio-interpersonal state which is mapped as container through the preposition 'fī'. The key metaphor, the data reveals, is *THE GROUND OF SOCIO-INTERPERSONAL STATE IS CONTAINER FOR ARGUMENTS*. Moreover, this study argues that the people may have the immediate and direct experiences of war, but it is the most predominant and consistent experience of socio-interpersonal conflict which defines the literal treatment of argument.

However, *ARGUMENT IS WAR* has empirical evidence in literature which cannot be brushed aside because of either the problem of generality, or the importance of the target domain. The elusive question is the missing link between physical conflict and socio-interpersonal verbal conflict. If the lexical items in the data are scrutinized closely, there is a surprising connection between physical force and verbal arguments in socio-interpersonal context. The root 'jīm dāl lām' means 'twisting something to strengthen it' 'contend', 'nūn zāy ʿayn' means 'to displace or uproot something', 'verbal dispute' and 'animosity', 'khā ṣād mīm' means 'animosity' and 'ḥā jīm jīm' encapsulates 'intend or make an attempt or contend'. All these roots point towards the link between argument and force; verbal conflict and physical conflict and the coexistence of both conflicts in the socio-interpersonal conflict. Its coexistence ensues since childhood in shape of noise and weeping of a child accompanied by physical stretching of hands and limbs; the precedence of verbal conflict over physical conflict; the precedence of rational debate on some issue of mutual concern to physical conflict; the priority of hot debate and allegations to armed struggle or war. The close association of verbal and physical attacks or conflicts has well been illustrated in literature[80] but its evolution, manifestation and schematization in language need to be investigated in future research.

However, the data also reveal that the container schema generates metaphors, such as *SIGNS OF ALLAH ARE CONTAINRERS FOR ARGUMENTS / PERSONS OF ENTITIES ARE CONTAINERS FOR ATTRIBUTES* and *ARGUMENT IS CONTAINER*. Besides, personification, objects and argument are also used as source domains for *argument*. It shows that the Qur'ānic discourse employs a set of source domains other than war for mapping arguments.

---

[80]Murray Arnold Straus, Gelles Richard, and Steinmetz Suzanne, *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1980).

This study also supports the findings of Ritchie[81] and Howe,[82] that CM limits the generality of abstract concept to a single semantic domain. The data reveal that the lexical items '*yujādilu*' and '*tujādilu*' in (6) and (9) express different conceptualizations i.e. argument is dispute and *INVOCATION IS PLEADING,* respectively. But, the findings of this study also differ from the aforementioned studies. The present study shows that one abstract concept serving as target domain in one schema may serve as source domain for a more abstract concept. The source domain may take the position of target domain, such as *WAR IS PERSON* (Section 4.1); the target domain may attain structure as in *INVOCATION IS PLEADING* (Section 4.3). This paper suggests that the conceptual schemas depend upon a graded level of abstractions contrary to level of concreteness in image metaphors, because the level of abstractedness in two concepts is quite different from the level of concreteness. Praying to Allah and arguing with someone are both abstract concepts, but in (7) and (8), the repeated praying before Allah for mercy is relatively more abstract than disputing with someone. This degree of relative abstractedness is often mediated by the situational context which includes both linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts, refer to discussion on (2-8), (12-15) and (17). This supports the findings of the previous studies that CM may have a role in metaphor comprehension, but linguistic knowledge has its own role in meaning construction. For similar findings on the role of linguistic knowledge in metaphor comprehension, see the constructionist approach to cognitive linguistic,[83] and for function of target domains in metaphor please see the psycholinguistic approach.[84]

5. Conclusion

The findings reveal that socio-interpersonal conflict is a state which is mapped as container or space for arguments. The reason behind the literal treatment of argument or its metaphorical treatment through container schema was not that war was not the immediate or direct experience of people, but because the socio-interpersonal conflict, container schema and personification were the more basic experience of the people of that age. This might be the reason that *ARGUMENT IS WAR* metaphor is missing in the Qurʾān. However, keeping in view the analysis of the fragmentary set of data, the findings cannot be generalized, and it needs to be further researched in classical Arabic literature. The paper also demonstrates that the semantic value of a lexical item is determined by the situational context, and it is not merely online retrieval from semantic memory. Future studies should also concern a thorough analysis of the behaviour of lexical data and its patterns, which a

---

[81]Ritchie, ""ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors," 2003.

[82]Howe, "Argument is Argument: An Essay on Conceptual Metaphor and Verbal Dispute," 2007.

[83]Evans, "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction," 2013.

[84]McGlone, "What is the Explanatory Value of a Conceptual Metaphor?," *Language and Communication*, 2007.

human generation internalizes through socialization within a culture in order to have a broader view of the conceptualization of arguments through various experiential gestalts.

Bibliography

Ali, Abdullah Yousaf, *The Holy Qur-ān: English Translation and Commentary (with Arabic text)*. Lahore: Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf Publishers, 1934.

Al-Isfahani, Raghib, *al-Mufradat fi Gharib al-Qur'an*. Beirut: Dar al Ma'rifah, 1961.

Al-Saggaf, Muhammad Ali, Mohamad Subakir Mohd Yasin, Imran Ho Abdullah. Ho Dualism of Soul-Person in English Translated Texts of the Qur'an." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118 (2014): 42-50.

Barsalou, Lawrence W. "Perceptions of Perceptual Symbols." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22, no. 4 (1999): 637-660.

Berrada, Khalid. "Food Metaphors: A Contrastive Approach." *Metaphorik. de* 13, no. 1 (2007): 1-38.

Bisschops, Ralph. "Are Religious Metaphors Rooted in Experience? On Ezekiel's Wedding Metaphors." In Feyaerts, Kurt (Edt.), *The Bible Through Metaphor and Translation: A Cognitive Semantic Perspective*. 113-151., Peter Lang Pub Inc 2003.

Brown, Jonathan AC. "The Social Context of Pre-Islamic Poetry: Poetic Imagery and Social Reality in the Muᶜallaqat." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (2003): 29-50.

Eldin, Ahmad Abdel Tawwab Sharaf. "A Cognitive Metaphorical Analysis of Selected Verses in the Glorius Qu'ran." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 4, no. 2 (2015): 193-198.

El-Sharif, Ahmad. "A Theoretical Account on the Study of Metaphor in Didactic Discourse." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 7, no. 2 (2016): 100-112.

Evans, Vyvyan. "Semantic Representation in LCCM Theory." In Vyvyan Evans, and S. Pourcel, (Eds.), *New Directions in Cognitive Linguistics* 24, 27-56., John Benjamins Publishing, 2009.

Evans, Vyvyan. "Figurative Language Understanding in LCCM Theory." *Cognitive Linguistics* 21, no. 4 (2010): 601-662.

Evans, Vyvyan. "Metaphor, Lexical Concepts, and Figurative Meaning Construction." *Cognitive Semiotics* 5, no. 1-2 (2013): 73-107.

Evans, Vyvyan. "What is in a Concept? Analogue Versus Parametric Concepts in LCCM Theory." In E. Margolis and S. Laurence, (Eds.), *The Conceptual Mind: New Directions in the Study of Concepts*. 251-290., London: MIT, Press, 2015.

Eweida, Sara. *The Realization of Time Metaphors and the Cultural Implications: An Analysis of the Qur'ān and English Qur'ānic Translations*. Stockholm University 2007.

Gibbs, Raymond W. "Taking Metaphor out of our Heads and Putting it into the Cultural World." *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series* 4 (1999): 145-166.

Glucksberg, Sam., Matthew S. McGlone. and Deanna Manfredi. "Property Attribution in Metaphor Comprehension." *Journal of memory and language* 36, no. 1 (1997): 50-67.

Grady, Joseph. "Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Stress." PhD Dissertation, Berkeley: University of California, 1997. Retrieved from http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/3g9427m2.

Haser, Verena. *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Experientialist Philosophy: Challenging Cognitive Semantics* Vol. 49., Burlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

Howe, James. "Argument is Argument: An Essay on Conceptual Metaphor and Verbal Dispute." *Metaphor and Symbol* 23, no. 1 (2007): 1-23.

Ibn Fâris, Zakariyyā. *Maqâyyis al-lughah*. Beirut: Dâr al-Fikr, 1979.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Lakoff, G. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." In A. Ortony, (ed.,) *Metaphor and Thought*. 2020-251., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1980.

Lane, Edward William. *An Arabic-English Lexicon* (Vol. 1-8) (1968). Retrieved From http://www.tyndalearchive.com/tabs/lane/

McGlone, Matthew S. "What is the Explanatory Value of a Conceptual Metaphor?" *Language and Communication* 27, no. 2 (2007): 109-126.

Pragglejaz Group. "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse." *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22, no 1, (2007): 1-39.

Raii, Jalal. "Metaphor in Day-to-Day Arabic Speech: A Conceptual Approach." *Journal for Research and Scientific Studies-Arts and Humanities Series* 31, no. 1 (2009): 175-193.

Ritchie, David. ""ARGUMENT IS WAR"-Or is it a Game of Chess? Multiple Meanings in the Analysis of Implicit Metaphors." *Metaphor and Symbol* 18, no. 2 (2003): 125-146.

Ryan, Gery., and Russell Bernard. "Techniques to Identify Themes." *Field Methods* 15, no. 1 (2003): 85-109.

Sani, I., and Mustapha Bala Ruma. "Concretizing the Abstract: Conceptual Metaphors in the Holy Qurʾān." *European Academic Research* 2, no. 8 (2014): 11000-11012.

Sardaraz, Khan., and Roslan Ali. "A Cognitive-Semantic Study of the Spatial Preposition Fī (فِي) in the Qurʾān." *KEMANUSIAAN: The Asian Journal of Humanities* 24, no. 2 (2017): 89–122.

Sardaraz, Khan., and Roslan Ali. "A Cognitive-Semantic Study of Death Metaphor Themes in the Qurʾān." *Journal of Nusantara Studies* 2, no 4 (2019): 219-246.

Sardaraz, Khan., Syed Naeem Badshah, and Irfan Ullah Khan. "Cognitive Semantic Study of the Preposition 'Min' in the Qurʾān." *Journal of Islamic and Religious Studies* 4, no. 2 (2019): 83-109.

Smith, William Robertson. *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907.

Straus, Murray Arnold., Richard J. Gelles., and Suzanne K. Steinmetz., *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1980.

Tannen, Deborah. *The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words*. Ballantine Books, 1999.

Vervaeke, John., and John M. Kennedy. "Metaphors in Language and Thought: Falsification and Multiple Meanings." *Metaphor and Symbol* 11, no. 4 (1996): 273-284.

Vervaeke, John., and John M. Kennedy. "Conceptual Metaphor and Abstract Thought." *Metaphor and Symbol* 19, no. 3 (2004): 213-231.

Zinken, Jörg. "Discourse Metaphors: The Link between Figurative Language and Habitual Analogies." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 18 no 3 (2007): 445-466.