



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

∞∞∞∞

تم رفع هذه الرسالة بواسطة / مني مغربي أحمد

بقسم التوثيق الإلكتروني بمركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات دون أدنى

مسئولية عن محتوى هذه الرسالة.

ملاحظات: لا يوجد





Ain Shams University
Faculty of Al-Alsun
English Department



Faculty of Al-Alsun

Cognitive Representation of Animals in Arabic and English Children's Stories:

An Ecolinguistic Study

PhD Thesis in Linguistics

Submitted by

Fadia Ahmed Abdullah

Assistant Lecturer, English Department, Faculty of Al-Alsun, Ain Shams University

Supervisors

Prof. Nagwa Younis

Professor of Linguistics,
English Department,
Faculty of Education,
Ain Shams University

Associate Prof. Fayrouz Fouad

Associate Professor of Linguistics,
English Department,
Faculty of Alsun,
Ain Shams University.

2022



كلية الألسن
كلية معتمدة



جامعة عين شمس
كلية الألسن
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

تحليل أسس التمثيل المعرفي للحيوان فى قصص الأطفال بالإنجليزية والعربية: دراسة لغوية بيئية

رسالة دكتوراه تخصص لغويات

مقدمة من

فادية أحمد عبد الله

مدرس مساعد ، كلية الألسن، جامعة عين شمس

لجنة الإشراف

أ.م. فيروز فؤاد

أستاذ مساعد اللغويات بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية،
كلية الألسن، جامعة عين شمس

أ.د. نجوي يونس

أستاذ اللغويات بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية،
كلية التربية ، جامعة عين شمس

2022

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Essentially acknowledging the enormous effort my supervisors exerted, I would love to thank **Prof. Nagwa Younis** and **Associate Prof. Fayrouz Fouad** for their professional guidance and instructions. This study would not have been possible without my supervisors' patience and continuous support.

My acknowledgements extend equally to my examiners: **Prof. Amira Agameya** (Faculty of Arts, Cairo University) and **Associate Prof. Radwa Kotait** (Faculty of Al-Asun, Ain Shams University) for their careful review of my thesis. I am also deeply grateful to **Prof. Samar Abdelsalam** (Head of English Department, Faculty of Al-Asun) for her endless support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

0. Introduction.....	1
0.1 Significance of the study.....	5
0.2 Research questions.....	5
0.3 Study hypothesis	6
0.4 Methodology	6
0.5 Data.....	7
0.6 Review of Literature	7
Chapter One: Theoretical Background	16
1.1 Ecolinguistics: New Interdisciplinary Framework.....	16
1.2 Conceptual Metaphors	22
1.2.1 Origin of Conceptual Metaphor	23
1.2.2 The Nature of the Two Domains in the Conceptual Metaphor Theory.....	24
1.2.3 Conceptual Metaphors and their Linguistic Realizations	26
1.2.4 Entailments in Conceptual Metaphors	27
1.2.5 Universality and Variation in Conceptual Metaphors.....	28
1.2.6 The role of Context in Metaphorical- Meaning Construction.....	32
1.2.7 Types of Conceptual Metaphors	32
1.2.8 Functions of Conceptual Metaphors	35
1.2.9 Motivations of Conceptual Metaphors.....	35
1.2.10 Further Developments of Conceptual Metaphor Theory	36
1.3 Frame Semantics	37
1.3.1 Frames and Culture	40
1.3.2 Frame semantics and Other Concepts	40
1.3.3 FrameNet.....	42
Chapter 2: Analysis and Discussion of the Arabic Data.....	49
2.1 Introduction.....	49
2.2 The Stories at the Lexical Level (FrameNet).....	52
2.2.1. The Representation of Animals in Relation to the Environment	52
2.2.2 The Portrayal of Animals through the Attributes in the Stories.....	55
2.2.3 Assistance and Unity between Animals as Represented in the Stories.....	59
2.2.4 Animals and the Frame Element of Speaker.....	63
2.2.5 Animals as Being Either Victims or Assailants	67

2.2.6 Human-Animals Relationships in the Stories	71
2.2.7 Animals as the Agents.....	72
2.2.8 The Representation of Animals through Neutral Frames.....	73
2.3 The Hierarchy of the Frames in the Stories	75
2.3.1 The Parent Frames in the Beneficial Stories	76
2.3.2 The Parent Frames in the Destructive Stories	76
2.3.3 The Parent Frames in the Ambivalent Stories.....	78
2.4 Stories at the Conceptual Level	78
2.4.1 The Ontological Conceptual Metaphors in the Stories	79
2.4.2 The Orientational Conceptual Metaphors in the Stories	83
2.5 The Deduced Cognitive Structures in the Stories	86
2.5.1 The Cognitive Structures in the Beneficial Stories	86
2.5.2 The Cognitive Structures Deduced in the Destructive Stories.....	88
2.5.3 The Cognitive Structures in the Ambivalent Stories.....	90
2.6 Discussion of Findings.....	93
Chapter 3: Analysis and Discussion of the English Data.....	106
3.1 Introduction.....	106
3.2 Stories at the Lexical Level (FrameNet)	108
3.2.1The Connection between Nature and Animals.....	109
3.2.2Attributes Assigned to the Animals	111
3.2.3 Unity and Collaboration.....	116
3.2.4 Giving Animals Voice	118
3.2.5 The victim and Assailant Dichotomy.....	121
3.2.6 Connection between Animals and Human Beings.....	122
3.2.7Animal as Independent Creatures	124
3.2.8Neutral Frames that are assigned Negative Connotations.....	125
3.3 The Hierarchy of the Frames in the Stories	126
3.3.1The Parent Frames in the Beneficial Stories	127
3.3.2The Parent Frames in the Destructive Stories	128
3.3.3 The Parent Frames in the Ambivalent Stories.....	130
3.4 Stories at the Conceptual Level (Conceptual Metaphors).....	131
___3.4.1The Ontological Conceptual Metaphors in the Stories.....	131

3.4.2 The Orientational Conceptual Metaphors in the Stories	135
3.5 The Deduced Cognitive Structures in the Stories	136
3.5.1The Cognitive Structures in the Beneficial Stories	136
3.5.2 The Cognitive Structures in the Destructive Stories	139
3.5.3 The Cognitive Structures in the Ambivalent Stories.....	142
3.6 Discussion of findings.....	144
Chapter 4: Comparison between the Arabic and English Data	158
4.1 Frames in the two Sets of Stories.....	158
4.2 The Hierarchy of the Frames in Arabic and English.....	167
4.3 The Linguistic Realizations of the Conceptual Metaphors in the two sets of Stories.....	169
4.4The Cognitive Structures in Arabic and English	170
5. Conclusion	174
References.....	176
Appendix (A)	
Appendix(B)	

List of Figures

Figure 1. Hierarchy of the frames in the beneficial Arabic stories	76
Figure 2. Hierarchy of the frames in the destructive Arabic stories	77
Figure 3. Hierarchy of the frames in the ambivalent Arabic stories	78
Figure 4. Beneficial cognitive structures in the Arabic stories	87
Figure 5. Destructive cognitive structures in the Arabic stories	88
Figure 6. Alternative cognitive structures in the Arabic stories	90
Figure 7. Ambivalent cognitive structures in the Arabic stories	91
Figure 8. Alternative cognitive structures in the ambivalent Arabic stories.....	92
Figure 9. The orientational and the ontological conceptual metaphors in the Arabic stories.....	101
Figure 10. The most common beneficial cognitive structures in the Arabic stories.....	102
Figure 11. The most common destructive cognitive structures in the Arabic stories.....	103
Figure 12. Hierarchy of the frames in the beneficial stories in English	127
Figure 13. Hierarchy of the frames in the destructive stories in English.....	129
Figure 14. Hierarchy of the frames in the ambivalent stories in English	130
Figure 15. Beneficial cognitive structures in English.....	137
Figure 16. Deduced beneficial cognitive structures in some English stories	138
Figure 17. Destructive cognitive structures in English.....	140
Figure 18. Alternative cognitive structures in English	141
Figure 19. Ambivalent cognitive structures in English	142
Figure 20. Alternative cognitive structures in English	143
Figure 21. The ontological and orientational conceptual metaphors in the English stories	153
Figure 22. The most common beneficial cognitive structures in English.....	155
Figure 23. The most common destructive cognitive structures in English.....	155
Figure 24. Frames and frame elements in both Arabic and English that led to destructive stories	159
Figure 25. Frames and frame elements in both Arabic and English that led to the beneficial cognitive structures	162
Figure 26. Hierarchy of the frames in both Arabic and English.....	168

List of Tables

Table 1. The linguistics realizations of the ontological metaphors in the Arabic stories and FrameNet.....	80
Table 2. The orientaional metaphors and their linguistic realizations in the Arabic stories.....	84
Table 3. STATES ARE LOCATIONS and FrameNet	85
Table 4. List of the frames and frame elements that lead to the destructive Arabic stories	93
Table 5. List of the frames and frame elements that lead to the beneficial Arabic stories	97
Table 6. List of the frames and frame elements that lead to the destructive stories in English..	144
Table 7. List of the frames and frame elements that lead to the destructive stories in English..	148
Table 8. The shared ontological and orientational metaphors detected in Arabic and English stories	169
Table 9. List of the common destructive and beneficial cognitive structures in English and Arabic.....	170

This thesis uses these typographical conventions:

Frame names are in Calibri Light

Frame elements are in SMALL CAPS

Evocative Lexical units are in *italics*

Example sentences are in *italics*

Conceptual metaphors are in SMALL CAPS

Linguistic realizations of conceptual metaphors are in *italics*

Abstract

The study aims to illustrate the cognitive representation of animals through the two cognitive theories of conceptual metaphors and frame semantics in light of ecolinguistics. To achieve this aim, the researcher employs FrameNet and applies the theories to 12 Arabic and 12 English children's stories with a special focus on animal-related evocative lexical units that give rise to frames and frame elements that contribute to the representation of animals. Also, the metaphorical depiction of the animal-related concepts in the stories is highly effective in demonstrating how animals are portrayed not just lexically, but also conceptually. Consistent with the principles of ecolinguistics, which are sustainability and harmony between all living beings, the present study reveals the three types of cognitive structures found in this field: beneficial, destructive, and ambivalent (Stibbe, 2015). When it comes to the representation of animals, these cognitive structures or stories we live by are deduced based on both the evoked frames and conceptual metaphors in the stories. Some of the beneficial cognitive structures are the unity of animals and nature, the friendship between animals and humans, and the fact that animals are cooperative and friendly. Some of the destructive views are that animals are dangerous predators; animals cannot co-exist in peace with each other or with humans and that stronger animals prey on weaker ones. Ambivalent structures are in between and are divided into beneficial and destructive examples. Since ecolinguistics also calls for adopting attitudes that promote beneficial behaviors and resist the destructive ones, the present study goes a step further to suggest alternative cognitive structures that replace the destructive ones in the stories and bridge the gap in the ambivalent structures as well. Comparing the cognitive representation of animals in children's stories in Arabic and English reveals that both languages share similar frames and conceptual metaphors that are used in the portrayal of animals. Although they are typologically heterogeneous, the Arabic and English sets of stories are similar when it comes to how animals are represented at the lexical and conceptual levels in animal-related children's stories based on the sample analyzed.

Keywords: Ecolinguistics, Animals' representation, FrameNet, Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Cognitive structures

0. Introduction

Language affects how people perceive and, accordingly, deal with the physical world surrounding them. “Language can inspire us to destroy or protect the ecosystems that life depends on” (Stibbe, 2015, p.1). Linguistics is all about specifying an approach to studying any kind of text or phenomenon. For doing so, it provides tools and techniques. Since Ecolinguistics is a branch of linguistics, it does the same. It studies texts or phenomena, but it has to link between language and the environment the language is used in. Given the contribution of language to the development of positive or negative attitudes towards nature, ecolinguistics, a new field of linguistics, is concerned with conducting linguistic analysis to reveal stories (i.e., conventional structures in mind) shared among people belonging to a certain culture, questioning these stories from an ecolinguistic perspective and contributing to the search for new stories that can be beneficial to the ecosystem.

Language productions can prompt people to respect or destroy nature. Therefore, ecolinguistics is concerned with the intersection between ecology and language (Stibbe, 2015). Language ecology was proposed by Einar Haugen in 1972 as the study of the interaction of any given language and its environment and he paved the way for its existence in the 1990s. Fill states (2001, p.35) that “ecolinguistics investigates the role of language in the development and possible solution of ecological and environmental problems”. Thus, ecolinguistics considers the destruction of biodiversity as loss to language and culture.

Garrard (2014, p.203) explains the intersection between linguistics and ecology. Linguistics offers a “sophisticated” analysis of the “linguistic mechanisms by which worldviews are constructed, reproduced, spread and resisted”. Ecology, however, provides a “sophisticated” ecological framework to consider the role of those worldviews in preserving or undermining the conditions that support life. When Lakoff’s (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, for instance, reveals that MORE IS BETTER is universally structured in the mind of people, Garrard (2014) uses ecolinguistic lenses to question the impact of this cognitive structure on nature. “Ecolinguistic discourse analysis,” states Wu (2015, p. 45), “consists of analyzing discourses and judging them within a normative framework that considers both humans and the embedding of humans within a larger community of life”. The metaphor MORE IS BETTER affects the

ecosystem as it leads to building more factories and encouraging economic development at the expense of preserving the integrity of the ecosystem. Thus, this metaphor does not fit with ecolinguistics. Fill and Mühlhäusler (2001, p.3) argue that the ecological metaphor is useful in illuminating “the diversity of inhabitants of an ecology”, and “the functional interrelationships between the inhabitants of an ecology”.

In ecolinguistics, the choice of words and how the ideas are conveyed surely affect the environment. This can result in desertification of forests; the wrong use of the language can lead to killing or saving species. The stories people live by form how people approach language and the environment, hence language affects how people tell and retell these stories and impact the beliefs. Ecolinguistics illustrates how language can contribute to the development and solution of the ecological problems. It discourages any linguistic uses or techniques that give human beings the right to destroy the environment or disrespect the species. It also calls for sustainability and preservation of the environment. Moreover, it denounces any effort to promote climate change, endangering species or languages along with the cultures (Stibbe, 2015).

Ecolinguistics typically analyzes texts representing elements of the environment and nature to clarify how words relate to objects in local environment. Adopting a critical approach, ecolinguistics offers an ecological perspective to question the different attitudes toward nature. It can, thus, resist destructive anti-nature attitudes and promote protective pro-nature ones. Garrard (2014) describes ecocriticism saying “all ecological criticism shares the fundamental premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it”.

Within the field of cognitive linguistics, Frame Semantics and Conceptual Metaphor Theories are two major and influential players. They are two cognitive tools that are employed in ecolinguistics to help reveal the stories or cognitive structures. They help divide the stories into beneficial, destructive and ambivalent, as confirmed by Stibbe (2015) in his book *Stories We Live by*. Conceptual metaphor theory was introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) to prove that conceptual metaphors are not just literary devices. They are a property of the mind as they are of the language. People think and live by the metaphors as metaphors are based on embodied experiences that are part of everyday life, and that is the reason behind the pervasiveness of the conceptual metaphors in everyday language.

Frame semantics is introduced by Fillmore (2001) to account for the meaning of the word, and how the word meaning does not exist in a vacuum, but it is a part of a network that is called a frame. Also, the frame is triggered once one word of the frame is mentioned. As Lakoff (2010, p. 73) puts it, “words can be chosen to activate desired frames”. Frames are the mental structures that allow human beings to understand reality and sometimes to create what we take to be reality (Lakoff, 2006). Based on the principles of frame semantics, a corpus-based project called FrameNet is created to meticulously account for the lexical units and the evoked frames. FrameNet is a large database that provides a frame for any lexical unit along with the frame elements which are either core or optional. The use of the tool of FrameNet assists ecolinguists to accurately conclude the stories based on the frames and classify them according to the ecosophy of ecolinguistics. Moreover, Stibbe (2015) maintains that “different frames tell very different stories about how the world is, or should be in the future” (p.47).

Stibbe (2015) also differentiates between three notions in frame semantics; namely, frame, framing and reframing. According to Stibbe, a frame is “a story about an area of life that is brought to mind by particular trigger words”, “while framing is “the use of a story from one area of life (a frame) to structure how another area of life is conceptualized”. Finally reframing is “the act of framing a concept in a way that is different from its typical framing in a culture” (p.47). Also, Stibbe (2012) criticizes framing nature conservation as a commercial transaction through some trigger words such as “shopped, discounts and customer” (p.20). These words are related to the transaction frame and they are grouped with nature in the analysis of online materials from conservation charities. This kind of framing goes against the ecosophy of ecolinguistics since it calls for reinforcing “the self-centered, consumerist frames that are implicated in the destruction of nature” (2015, p. 15). According to Stibbe (2015), the aim of ecolinguistics, when it comes to framing the environment, is that ecolinguistics should analyze the frames in the texts, and evaluate them from an ecolinguistic point of view. If problems are found with the frames, alternative frames are suggested that promote sustainability, and inspire people to protect and care for the environment. And thus, the goal of the ecolinguistic analysis is accomplished.

Stibbe (2015) emphasizes that the use of conceptual metaphors or the theory of frames in the analysis of environmental texts is one of the guaranteed methods to convey the message of ecolinguistics, which is promoting sustainability, raising people’s awareness of the strong

connection with the environment, without which the human being will be homeless. Metaphors “imply an identity between otherwise different things” (Stibbe, 2017, p. 78). Conceptual metaphors are an integral part of cognition to the extent that Stibbe (2005, p. 43) claims that choosing the wrong metaphor “may arguably contribute to the extermination of our species”.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), analyzing the metaphors includes identifying the source domain and the target domain, and then mapping some aspects from the source domain onto the target domain to explain the abstract domain in terms of the concrete one. From the ecological perspective, the conceptual metaphors are analyzed, and then the advantages are weighed against the disadvantages or are weighed against the ecosophy of ecolinguistics to conclude ecological cognitive structures that will be classified into destructive, beneficial or ambivalent (Stibbe, 2015). Even some linguists go as far as dividing the metaphors into metaphors we live by and metaphors we die by.

Stibbe (2015) argues that conceptual metaphors and frames are related and are sometimes used interchangeably. Stibbe defines metaphor in a way that uncovers the relationship between metaphors and frames stating that “metaphors use a frame from a specific, concrete and imaginable area of life to structure how a clearly distinct area of life is conceptualized” (Stibbe, 2015, p. 64). Sullivan (2013) states that the source domain of any conceptual metaphor is composed of frames. For example, he indicates how a source domain such as ‘the body’ consists of frames including exercising, ingestion and body parts. Stibbe (2015) argues that according to the framework used in *Metaphors we live by* “metaphors are a type of Framing one where the source frame is from a specific, concrete and imaginable area of life which is clearly different from the target domain” (2015, p. 65).

This study aims at revealing the underlying stories (i.e. cognitive structures) behind animal representation in children short stories in Arabic and English, through Fillmore’s (2001) Frame Semantics and Lakoff’s (1980) Conceptual Metaphor theories. The study also identifies the ecolinguistic perspective of writers, on animals, in terms of Stibbe’s (2015) ecosophy. Eventually, the present study suggests alternative cognitive structures, stories, of animal representations that contribute to promoting beneficial ecolinguistic perspectives, overcoming ambivalent ones and discouraging destructive ecolinguistic views.