



Cultural Conceptualizations of SHAME & DISHONOR in Early Poetic Arabic (EPA)

BARTOSZ PIETRZAK

Abstract

Persisting in a binary relationship with HONOR, SHAME was an important element of the pre-Islamic Arabic social evaluation system. In my study, I analyzed the two most important EPA concepts parallel to English SHAME – *ʿayb* and *ʿār* – applying the Cultural Linguistic approach. Based on the analyses on corpus of Early Arabic poetry and Classical Arabic dictionaries, I represented cultural schemata encoding the knowledge shared by pre-Islamic Arabs about those phenomena. The paper presents also metaphoric, metonymic, and image-schematic models, which account for the specifics of associated linguistic frames. Moreover, I posit a hypothesis on the existence of a schema subsuming the HONOR- and SHAME-DISHONOR-related schemata in form of SOCIAL EVALUATION of USEFULNESS, which seems to correspond to the historical and linguistic data.

KEYWORDS: *Cultural linguistics, shame, dishonor, Early Poetic Arabic, pre-Islamic Arabic Culture*

BARTOSZ PIETRZAK – a PhD student at the Institute of Oriental Studies of Jagiellonian University in Krakow. The title of his PhD thesis is *The Concept of Honor in the Language of Early Arabic Poetry – a Cultural Linguistic Study*. The author is also a PI of the grant project under the title *Conceptualization of the figure of sayyid in pre-Islamic Arabic society. A Cultural Linguistic study*. His major interest is cultural and cognitive linguistic approach in studying Semitic languages: Arabic (mostly Early Poetic Arabic), Hebrew (Biblical and Modern), and Maltese.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4588-3380>

E-MAIL: bartosz.pietrzak7@gmail.com

HONOR for pre-Islamic Arabs was an essential element of their individual and social life (Ali 1993, 408; Farès 1938, 96). The question of HONOR, however, is always connected somehow with SHAME. The traditional anthropological approach associates these two phenomena, seeing them as “two poles of an evaluation” of a community member’s behavior “by comparing it to ideal standards of action” (Peristiany 1996, 9–10). Therefore, one can assume that SHAME and DISHONOR must have also played a very significant role in how individuals may have been judged in the society of pre-Islamic Arabs.

In this article, by applying the Cultural Linguistics (CL) approach, I will attempt to recreate schemata for the knowledge those people shared about what SHAME and DISHONOR meant to them. In other words, I will aim to reconstruct some cultural schemata constituting “[t]he pool of knowledge that forms a web of concepts”, which “capture encyclopedic meaning that is culturally constructed” (Sharifian 2015, 480) for the lexis used in reference to SHAME and DISHONOR. Therefore, this paper aims to present a native understanding of these social phenomena encoded in the form of cultural conceptualizations – mainly schemata, but also conceptual metaphors, metonymies, and blends (Sharifian 2003, 188). Moreover, I hope to offer an explanation of the relationship between SHAME and HONOR in the form of a subsuming schema of SOCIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY MEMBER, which appears to have been functional in pre-Islamic Arabic society.

The CL theoretical framework assumes the existence of a bidirectional relationship between the language and culture of its native speakers. By culture, it understands *cultural cognition* – a conceptual system (Kövecses 2017, 309) or “a set of shared understandings (Kövecses 2005, 1)” – which subsumes the heterogeneously distributed knowledge shared by members of a cultural group (Sharifian 2003, 190). The major goal of CL is to describe *cultural conceptualizations* – aspects of the cultural cognition – and their impact on the linguistic system. Thus, it concentrates on defining encyclopedic meaning of lexical items, as well as on describing all sorts of linkages – metaphors, metonymies, and blends – that bind different cognitive schemata.

Since my main focus in this study is a description of the encyclopedic meaning, it might be considered to be mostly ethnographic in nature. Nevertheless, it also includes some conclusions on the content of the linguistic frames associated with the analyzed culture schemata (cf. Casson 1983 432–3). Therefore, my description covers not only the native pre-Islamic Arabic knowledge about SHAME and DISHONOR, but also how it was expressed in Early Poetic Arabic (EPA), i.e., the variety of Arabic language utilized in Arabic poetry composed in the 6th and early 7th c. (cf. Knauf 2010, 241).



In my study, I focus only on two EPA concepts – ‘*ayb* and ‘*ār* – which cover some nuclear knowledge about the negative pole of the social evaluation of an individual in pre-Islamic Arabic society. Although usually translated into English as “shame” or “dishonor”, they are actually culture-specific subschemata, which should be considered in their own right. Thus, perhaps, one can read this study as an argument against the postulate of the universality of the concept of SHAME understood in the terms of the English language only. Such a claim has been questioned by Wierzbicka (1992, 130–4), for example, and more recently by Kollareth, Fernandez-Dols & Russell (2018), or in the context of Arabic language, by al-Jallad (2010a). It follows that any reference to the concepts of SHAME and DISHONOR in this paper should be considered in a comparative frame rather than as a postulate of actual equation.

1. SHAME and DISHONOR in studies on Arabic culture

The Arabic notions of SHAME and DISHONOR have been analyzed almost exclusively in the context of studies on HONOR (Abou-Zeid 1966; Dodd 1973 Stewart 1994; Abou-Lughod 2016), with the exception of a paper by Wikan (1984), in which the author focused primarily on SHAME. They have also been the sole subject of two lexicographical studies by Nader al-Jallad (2010a and 2010b), who presented conclusions on English translations of SHAME-related lexis, as well as on the SHAME-related vocabulary in the Quran. Most of these papers focused almost entirely on the modern conceptualization of SHAME and DISHONOR in Arabic culture. As for historical stages of its development, except from Al-Jallad’s paper on Quranic vocabulary, no such study has been performed. One can find, of course, some conclusions on what was shameful for pre-Islamic Arabs in more general historical publications (e.g., Ali 1993, 593–9). Similarly, to date, no attempt to apply CL methods to study this phenomenon has been taken.

The aforementioned studies provide more or less detailed information about the conceptualization of SHAME and DISHONOR in different modern Arabic communities. Some elements of this conceptualization can be traced back to pre-Islamic times, and are to be found within data acquired from the textual corpus of Early Arabic Poetry. The most important of such continuous features of SHAME and DISHONOR in Arabic culture is the fact that they do not persist in a binary relationship with HONOR. For instance, as noticed by Stewart (1994: 129), in some modern Bedouin communities, HONOR is conceptualized as a certain WHOLE, which does not seem to have a counterpart in the same fashion as European HONOR does.



Wikan (1984) went even further in the argument against the relationship between SHAME-DISHONOR and HONOR in modern Arabic communities. Based on her field study, she noticed that the schema of SHAME is more readily activated by the members of the analyzed communities, who in their daily life, use the lexeme *ʿeb* “shame” more often than any references to HONOR (Wikan 1984, 636). She sees *ʿeb* as a broad phenomenon covering all kinds of shameful or unsuitable behavior (such as a child’s misbehavior) frequently declared shameful by the exclamation. Consequently, after Geertz, she classified it as an experience-near concept, i.e., more intuitive and more frequently experienced by people, whereas HONOR as a more analytic one and associated mostly with male machismo ideology (Wikan 1984, 637).

As I will further demonstrate, based on the on evidence from EPA, one may postulate that SHAME and DISHONOR also did not constitute a binary pair with HONOR in pre-Islamic Arabic society.

In EPA, one can find at least three major schemata, which correspond to different profiles of the concept of HONOR, being essentially the RIGHT to be RESPECTED in one’s community (Stewart 1994, 54). From among them, the most important was *ʿird*, covering more or less the notion of personal or horizontal honor, which entitles a person to the RESPECT of their peers (Stewart 1994, 54). As such it was a possession of individuals – both male and female¹– as well as tribal units of different sizes (cf. e.g., G: 21). In Early Arabic Poetry, such HONOR could have been only DIMINISHED or reduced (cf. e.g., K: 123), yet it could never turn into its opposite, in the way that English HONOR might.

Another EPAHONOR-related concept was *ḥasab*, which could be understood as a COUNT of one’s HONORABLE DEEDS. As such it constituted a certain VALUE, upon which one’s *ʿird*-HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT was founded (cf. e.g., Q: 156). Nor did it pair with an anti-value, which may correspond to European DISHONOR. In EPA, one might have only had “low and dispraised” *ḥasab*(G: 21), meaning a count of honorable deeds suitable for a base person.

DISHONOR alsodid not pair with the concept of *šaraf*, i.e., the HONOR-PRECEDENCE, which granted the RIGHT TO RESPECT based on one’s social standing (cf. Ali, 1993: 541, 573, 674). Although, it is frequently paired with

¹ Although, nowadays, *ʿird* is predominantly defined as HONOR in relation to female chastity (Dodd 1973), the original EPA concept was a broader phenomenon (Stewart 1994, 103; Ali 1993, 407). In fact, in Early Arabic Poetry, *ʿird* is ascribed to a woman only once (T: 130). Moreover, this one instance rather seems to present a manifestation of a metonymic model of *ʿird*-HONOR FOR HONORABILITY.



lu'm, its counterpart did not refer to a schema similar to that of European DISHONOR. *Lu'm* tended to be a concept of LOWNESS/BASENESS of one's social position and behavior associated with it (ergo, *lu'm* is also the opposite of *karam*-HONORABLENESS²).

Nevertheless, although in pre-Islamic Arabic culture, SHAME and DISHONOR did not constitute the opposite of HONOR, in the way they do in many European cultures, the data from Early Arabic Poetry indicates that a strong relationship between these concepts clearly existed. This relationship might be represented within a more general cultural schema, which encoded the pre-Islamic Arabic knowledge on the social evaluation of a community member. Such a schema – SOCIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY MEMBER – would subsume both, SHAME-DISHONOR subschemata of *'ayb* and *'ār*, as well as the HONOR-related ones, such as *'ird*, *šaraf*, and *ḥasab*. Within this general schema *'ayb* and *'ār* encoded the knowledge of some devaluating marks, which lowered the VALUE of an individual, affecting by that their HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT. Also in the modern Arabic communities, these concepts seem to encompass the same notion, yet they tend to be ascribed usually to one's behavior (Wikan 1984, 637) – or more precisely to one's failure “to observe the rules of good manners (Abou-Zeid 1966, 245)”. Nowadays, *'ayb* is frequently defined as the shamefulness of an act of a less damaging or weaker charge, whereas *'ār* is stronger and involves not only the perpetrator of a deed but also their family, clan, or even tribe (Abou-Zeid 1966, 246-7). Based on the evidence from Early Arabic Poetry, however, I assume that originally – in pre-Islamic Arabic culture – both *'ayb* and *'ār* also had a non-behavioral component, which seems to have been lost in their modern continuations. In EPA, *'ayb* more frequently referred to a SHAMEFUL DEFECT rather than to SHAMEFUL ACTION. Similarly, *'ār* might have also been ascribed to someone due to factors other than merely their conduct. What is present in EPA conceptualizations as well as in contemporary Arabic ones is the fact that *'ayb* is related to an individual, whereas *'ār* can fall upon the individual together with their social group (Abou-Zeid 1966, 252).

² Guth (2016, 74) proposed an interesting hypothesis regarding the relationship between these two different profiles of BASENESS/LOWNESS of *lu'm*. The hypothesis suggest a development from the concept of COMMONNESS, referred to in other Semitic languages by words derived from the consonantal root *lʔm*. Thus, in a similar way to the development of Latin adjective *vulgaris*, the Arabic concept of BEING COMMON, LOW-BORN began with time to be associated with BASENESS/LOWNESS of one behavior.



2. Applied methods

My work may be seen as an example of a lexical study (cf. Stewart 1994, 5). Following CL, I consider the meanings of the analyzed lexemes and idiomatic expressions as encyclopedic in nature, thus representing knowledge shared by language users about the phenomena they refer to. Such encyclopedic meaning might be considered as an element of cognitive schema activated while using the lexis in question (cf. Casson 1983, 433). Because of this, the study is ethnographic (cf. Sharifian 2017, 41), and it aims to define the specifics of pre-Islamic Arabic “construal of categorization of common experience (Palmer 2007, 1047)” of SHAME.

In the study, I employed three sources of data – Corpus of Early Arabic Poetry (CEAP), Classical Arabic lexicons (CAD), and onomasiological dictionaries (TBD). Due to its originality, the CEAP³ was the major subject of my analysis. The corpus consists of 50 text files, which I derived from two different corpora – Alrabiah (2014) and Alsheddi (2016).⁴ It represents the texts of poems by 40 Early Arabic poets living in the 6th and 7th c., which were extracted from existing Early Arabic Poetry anthologies known as *dawāwīn* (sg. *dīwān*). In my paper, I refer to some modern editions of these collections in order to facilitate the identification of the quoted passages. For convenience, they are referred to in the text by capital letters A–Z. The commentaries provided in these *dawāwīn* served also as the reference point for my translations of the quoted material.

CAD are Arabic dictionaries compiled by Arabic scholars in the Middle Ages. I used four examples of such works: KtA by al-Khalil Ibn Ahamd al-Farahidi († 786), AlG by Ibn Duraid († 933), AsS by al-Jawhari († 1003), and LsA by Ibn Manzur († 1311).

TBD are known as either topic-based dictionaries or books of utterances, and they are lexicons, which group Arabic lexical items in accordance to their thematic properties. As such they might be seen as recording the Arabic linguistic frames in a similar way to such modern lexicons as FrameNet

³ CEAP is available online at <https://sourceforge.net/projects/ceap-bp/files/> (Accessed:3.11.2021).

⁴ One could argue that instead of CEAP, I should have employed other databases for EPA research, such as Analytical Database of Arabic Poetry (ADAP) presented by Kirill Dmitriev in 2020 as a conclusion of his research project “Language–Philology–Culture. Arab Cultural Semantics in Transition”. Unfortunately, up until November 2021, ADAP does not seem fully functional. Moreover, the conclusions presented in this article follow a study conducted prior to the release of ADAP. For more information, consult <https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/arsem> (Accessed:10.11.2021).



(Fried and Nikiforidou 2013, 2). In my study, I employed three such lexicons: iSk by Ibn as-Sikkit († 858), aHm by al-Hamadani († 938/9), and aMh by Ibn Sidah († 1066).

My study consisted of several analyses. First, I aimed to define schemata referred to by the selected lexical items – *ʿayb* and *ʿār*, and their verbal derivatives – *ʿāba* and *ʿayyara*. Initially, I posited some expectations of their content based on CAD and Arabic-English lexicons by Lane (1968a, 1968b) and Wehr (1976). Consequently, I verified the expectations within a study on CEAP. In such a way, I acquired skeletal structures of the analyzed cultural schemata. Later, based on CEAP and TBD, I supplemented the description, by postulating the existence of some metaphorical models lending structure to some of the schemata (cf. Kövecses 2005, 198–9), as well as metonymies, which account for further extension of the analyzed categories (cf. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007, 148).

In such a way, I represented pre-Islamic Arabic cultural schemata consisting of knowledge of the most nuclear SHAME-related phenomena. My description consists not only of explications of encyclopedic meaning, but also points towards all sorts of meaning extension (metaphors, metonymies). It indicates moreover how the analyzed lexis was actually used (e.g., by defining image-schemata, cf. Oakley 2007). Therefore, my conclusions provide a detailed insight into the native perception and understanding of *ʿayb* and *ʿār* – the most significant SHAME concepts of pre-Islamic Arabs.

3. Conceptualizations of SHAME in EPA

3.1. The concept of *ʿayb*

In CEAP, the lexeme *ʿayb* (pl. *ʿuyūb*) and its verbal derivative *ʿāba* occur 52 times (NWC:⁵ 1.92). These occurrences served as the major source of my conclusions, since CAD do not provide much information about the meaning of these lexemes (KtA: 259–260; ALG: 369; AsS: 829; LsA: 741–3). This might be interpreted as an argument for the intuitiveness of the concept of *ʿayb* for the medieval dictionary compilers.

⁵ Normalized Word Count (NWC) is a statistical measurement facilitating comparison of word frequencies in different corpora. In my study, NWC is a number of occurrences per 10 000 words.



Primarily, the lexeme *ʿayb* seems to refer to the concept of DEFECT found prototypically in things, as in (1), a passage by al-Aʿsha (C:107; cf. also J: 28–32.). This prototypical category – DEFECT IN OBJECT – extends to all sorts of elaborations of the image-schema OBJECT such as animals and abstracta (cf. L: 134; Z: 17; S: 130 and H: 20).

(1) *la-hu ʿakālīlu bi-l-yāqūti zayyana-hā šuwwāḡu-hā lā tarā ʿayban wa-lāṭaba ʿā*

He has crowns with sapphire, decorated by jewelers – you will not find in [those crowns] either **defect** (*ʿayb*) or dirt or soot (cf. C: 107–8).

Subsequently, the verb *ʿāba* referred prototypically to the action of DAMAGING, MAKING DEFECTIVE (cf. K: 50–51; N: 54) or BEING DEFECTIVE (what has been claimed in CAD, however, cannot be found in CEAP).

The prototypical schema *ʿayb*-DEFECT subsumes a propositional subschema in the form of *ʿayb*-DEFECT LOWERS THE VALUE OF THE OBJECT, which could be observed elaborated in the form of the statement presented in (2) by al-Shammakh Ibn Dirar (L:134). The poet describes a rather cruel proof of loyalty of his she-camel, stating that even while tortured, she will not lose her worth – she will stay DEFECT-less – there will be nothing to complain about her.

(2) *ḡumālīyaʿūn law yuḡʿalu s-sayfu ḡarḍa-hā ʿalā ḥaddi-hi la-stakbarat ʿan taḍawwarā wa-lā ʿayba fī makrūhi-hā ḡayr aʿanna-hu tabaddala ḡawnan baʿda-mā kāna ʿazharā*

She – [my she-camel] – is so loyal that if one made the joints of her saddle out of a sword – and [made them] at its edges – she would be too proud to cry [out of complaint].

And there would be no **defect** (*ʿayb*) in her, [even as] she was in such a pitiful state, except from the fact that [the sword used in her saddle] would turn from pure white into red-and-white (cf. L: 134).

This proposition might be seen as the motivation of metaphoric model, which accounts for the category extension linking the concept of *ʿayb* with SHAME. The model might be represented as *ʿayb*-SHAME IS *ʿayb*-DEFECT. In other words, some qualities of a person could have been considered by pre-Islamic Arabs as their DEFECTS, which in a way, lower their VALUE. Therefore, *ʿayb*-SHAME might be seen as “something unsound, which makes someone defective,



and thus, something for which one is reprehended, blamed, reproached (Lane 1968b, 2206)". So, the SHAMEFULNESS of *ʿayb* rested entirely in the fact that it decreased the VALUE of a person. I think this conceptualization might be seen, for instance, in (3), a passage from Amr Ibn Ma'adi (I: 141; cf. also K: 149-150), in which the poet implies that harassing men vilify a woman in order to diminish her WORTH and claim her for themselves.

(3) *wa-rubba muḥarrišin fī ḡanbi salmà yuʿallu bi-ʿaybi-hā ʿandī šafīʿu*

How many men, while approaching Salmà, harass [her], repeating all over again the **accusation of her faults** (*ʿayb*) – for me [these men are simply] suitors, [who themselves want to possess her, and thus, they try to make her repugnant to others] (cf. I: 141).

In (3), *ʿayb*-SHAMEFULNESS was ascribed to the woman in the action of *ʿāba*, which was referred to in this passage also by the lexeme *ʿayb*, being also the name of the action itself (cf. LsA vol. 1: 742). Thus, one can see the meaning of *ʿāba* as SHAMING by ASCRIBING WITH *ʿayb*. The concept seems to be structured by the mapping *ʿayb*-SHAME IS *ʿayb*-DEFECT, and it could be formally represented as *ʿāba*-SHAMING IS *ʿāba*-DAMAGING-MAKING DEFECTIVE. This metaphor is linguistically expressed in (4) by Hatim al-Ta'i (P: 90) and confirmed by LsA (vol. 1: 742). In other words, SHAMING, by ascribing someone with *ʿayb*, was conceptualized as damaging someone or making them defective. This consequently meant lowering their value.

(4) *wa-kilmat ḥāsīdin min ḡayri ḡurmin samiʿtu fa-qultu: murri fa-nquḍī-nī wa-ʿābū-hā ʿalayya fa-lam taʿib-nī wa-lam yaʿraq la-hā yawman ḡabīnī*

I have heard the [vilifying] word of an envying man – [and I was] of no fault – so I said: pass me, [oh vilifying word], and do not make harm to me.

[So many people] have **vilified** (*ʿābū*) me in such [envying words] – but these [words] did not **damage** me (*lam taʿib-nī*), nor did my forehead temples sweat because of them – even for a day (cf. P: 90).

The verb *ʿāba* refers definitely to an action performed in speech (cf. K: 75 and P: 90). Sometimes, it can entail mockery as in the passage (5) by Ibn Muqbil (S: 71), which might be seen as a metonymic extension of the prototypical category. In three instances (I: 129, U: 34, and N: 54), poets used the passive voice of this verb. This could support the assessment of *ʿayb* as an evaluative term.



(5) *wa-stahzaʿat tirbu-hā min-nī fa-qultu la-hā: māḍā taʿibāni min-nī
yā bintay ʿaṣari
lawlā l-ḥayāʿu wa-lawlā d-dīnu ʿibtu-kumā bi-baʿḍi mā fī-kumā ʿid
ʿibtumā ʿawarī*

Thus, her sister laughed at me, so I said: Why are you **laughing** (*ta ʿibāni*) at me, daughters of ʿAṣar?

If not for [my] sense of shame (*ḥayāʿ*), or [my] obedience to customs, I would **shame** both of you (*ʿibtu-kumā*) for some of [the faults], which are in you, since you have **vilified** (*ʿibtukūmā*) my weakness (cf. S: 71).

ʿayb ascribed to someone seems to diminish this someone's ʿird-HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT. Consequently, it was a subject of SHAMING, REPREHEND, OR CENSORING by others (cf. Z: 19; K: 19-20). Therefore, ʿayb must have been kept in secret. Divulging such secret was to shame – ʿāba – a person (cf. S: 71). The subschema ʿayb SHOULD BE KEPT IN SECRET is structured by a metaphoric model KEEPING IN SECRET IS COVERING/HIDING, and it can be observed in several places in CEAP (N: 47, 100, 39). The image-schema COVER is also employed in conceptualizing the subschema ONE CAN COVER THEIR ʿayb WITH *karam*-HONORABLENESS, which encodes the knowledge that one's HONORABLE behavior can cancel the DIMINISHING effect of the ʿayb on their ʿird-HONOR. Thus – as stated by caliph Ali (N: 36) – ʿayb might have been COVERED with one's WEALTH, which was the key component of their ability to be HONORABLE (cf. Ali, 1993: 575-6).

Being structured by the metaphor ʿayb-SHAME IS ʿayb-DEFECT, the schema ʿayb was conceptualized by corresponding image-schematic models: DEFECT IS OBJECT INSIDE AN OBJECT⁶, DEFECT IS OBJECT ON AN OBJECT (on someone but never something; cf. K: 41-2), and DEFECT IS A POSSESSED OBJECT (cf. R: 300; O: 56; N: 100, 39, 36). The most interesting of those models is the one conceptualizing ʿayb as OBJECT ON (THE SURFACE OF) ANOTHER OBJECT. This could imply that ʿayb was conceptualized as a kind of stigma – a stain, something noticeable, which declares the diminished worth of a person. Perhaps, it might be seen as an example of conceptual blend operation on the schemas of ʿayb and ʿār (v.i.).

The metaphor ʿayb-SHAME IS ʿayb-DEFECT is well present in EPA also in the form of linguistic expressions of elaborations of the category ʿayb-DEFECT. TBD (iSk: 179-80) provide several examples of members of this category,

⁶ *fī* in K: 149-150; R: 16; E: 396; *bi-* in U: 56.



which seem to correspond to the metaphoric models *ʿird* IS WHOLE and ONE'S *ʿird* IS ONE'S BODY (PART). Thus, *ʿayb*-SHAME might have been referred to as *waṣmaṭ* "a crack or fracture, which does not break up" (iSk: 179), which on one hand, holds the SUPERFICIAL trait of *ʿayb* (i.e., *ʿayb* is ON someone) and on another, relates to the aforementioned image-schema of the WHOLE structuring conceptualization of *ʿird*. Similarly, this image-schema is evoked by the concept of *wakaf* "leaking" also participating in the conceptualization of *ʿayb*-SHAME (LsA vol 9: 433). The metaphor of ONE'S *ʿird* IS ONE'S BODY (PART) is present mainly in the elaboration of *ʿayb*-DEFECT in the form of a WOUND. It is linguistically expressed by a number of expressions provided by TBD (iSk: 179; aHm: 31-3), which metaphorically link to the concept of SHAMING, but literarily refer to different kinds of WOUNDING scenarios. Thus, ASCRIBING SOMEONE WITH *ʿayb*-SHAME could have been metaphorically conceptualized as CUTTING (*ʿafrā-yufri* "to cut, to split", or *qaṣaba-yaqṣib* "to cut [meat]"), PERFORATING (*ṭaʿana-yaṭʿan* "to perforate [with spear]"), SKIN WOUNDING (*mazaqtu ʿadīma-hu* "lit. I tore his skin", *mazaqtu ʿirda-hu* or *harattu ʿirda-hu* "I tore his *ʿird*"), BITING (*alġamtu ʿirda-hu* "I bit his *ʿird*", *rataʿatu fī ʿirdi-hi* "I pastured on his *ʿird*"), or STRIKING (*bakkattu-hu* "I struck him [with a club, bat]", *ṭalabtu-hu* "I struck him causing him to fall").

The schema *ʿayb*-SHAME is elaborated by several subschemas encoding the knowledge about what pre-Islamic Arabs considered to be shameful. Prototypically, the category covered visible, physical defects of an individual (cf. K: 59; U: 56). The historical data confirms that pre-Islamic Arabs used to shame people for all sorts of such physical defects (Ali 1993, 304, 596, 660-1). However, the data from CEAP suggests that such shamed *ʿaybs* always indicated some devaluating traits of a person. For instance, in aforementioned (4) by Ibn Muqbil, the disability of the poet⁷ is described as *ʿayb*. Perhaps, it is so, because it points towards weakness, and strength was an important part of one's worth as the guarantee of respect and survival in the harsh environment of the homeland of pre-Islamic Arabs (Ali 1993, 608).

Another physical defect indicating some devaluating trait, and thus being *ʿayb*, was the black skin color – as was the case of the poet Antara Ibn Shaddad, which he depicted in a number of instances (K: 10, 50, 65, 71, 75, 87, 149-150, 188). The color per se was not as shameful as the quality it indicates, namely, MIXED ORIGIN. Pre-Islamic Arabs paid a great deal of attention to one's origin, since it could be seen as implicating one's capability of being *karīm*-HONORABLE (cf. L: 136). The black skin color was associated

⁷ Ibn Muqbil was blind on one eye (cf. Ibn Muqbil 1995, 3).



with slavehood, and being of mixed blood – either of slave, non-Arabic, or craftsman (Ali 1993: 595-8) – was an *ʿayb*-DEFECT of a person (Ali 1993: 390-1). Perhaps this conceptualization motivated the conceptual metaphor BEING *karīm*-HONORABLE IS BEING WHITE/OF WHITE FACE (cf., e.g., E: 88-90). Since the BLACKNESS of one's skin indicated an inability to be *karīm*, the natural conclusion must be that WHITENESS relates to *karam*-HONORABLENESS and HONOR (Ali 1993: 589). The elements of the mapping of this metaphor are employed by Antara in the passage (6).

(6) *wa-ʿin ya ʿībūsawādan qad kusītu bi-hi fa-d-durru yastiru-hu ʿawbun mina ṣ-ṣadafi*

Thus, if they **vilify** (*ya ʿībū*) [me because of the] blackness, in which I am covered, the pearl, a cloth of the mother-of-pearl, will conceal it (cf. K: 87).

Still at the center of the category *ʿayb*-SHAME, yet less prototypically, there was the subcategory that covered defects of character. The data from CEAP suggests that someone's character was only evaluated from the perspective of *karam*-HONORABLENESS. Thus, any *ʿayb* being a SHAMEFUL DEFECT OF CHARACTER seems to indicate one's inability to be *karīm* (cf. K: 20; R: 42). Therefore, in CEAP, *ʿayb* is meant when someone was proved not to be eloquent (cf. R: 9-13) or to be a coward without warfare skills (cf. J: 32; I: 129; M: 130). Thus, one's *ʿaybs* made one unable to react in a proper – i.e., expected from *karīm*-HONORABLE man – way, which might be seen in (7) by Antara Ibn Shaddad (K: 20). This must indicate that the ability of being *karīm* can dismiss any accusation of being of *ʿayb* (cf. K: 10, 87).

(7) *wa-da ʿū-nī ʿağurru dayla faḥārin ʿindamā tuḥḡilu l-ḡabāna l-ʿuyūbu*

Thus, they called me so that I pull [forward] a tail of pride – in the time, when **shameful defects** (*ʿuyūb*) were confounding the cowards (cf. K: 20).

Moving from the center of the category, one can distinguish a subcategory covering shameful actions. It occurs at least in four passages from CEAP (K: 19-20; U: 34; S: 72; O: 56), which could indicate that in contrast to what we can observe in the modern Arabic communities (v.s.), in EPA, *ʿayb* only occasionally meant a shameful action. Perhaps then, with time, this conceptualization spread to take center-stage of this category.



3.2. The concept of *ʿār*

As mentioned previously, *ʿār* is frequently described as more grievous and serious than *ʿayb*. Nonetheless, as noticed by Wikan (1984, 637), it seems that nowadays this concept has lost its presence in the evaluation system in at least some Arabic communities. Nor did it appear in the text of the Quran (al-Jallad 2010b, 105).

In pre-Islamic Arabic society, however, *ʿār* was definitely an essential element of social evaluation. It was as important as the concept of *ʿayb*, which we can deduce based on the number of occurrences of the lexeme *ʿār* in CEAP (*ʿār*: 30, vs. *ʿayb*: 31). It seems *ʿār* was a stigma, DISGRACE or DISHONOR, ascribed to someone, whose HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT was openly questioned. What is quite important, *ʿār* was not an opposite of *ʿird*-HONOR. It was only what diminishes one's RIGHT TO RESPECT, which itself was more like a BODY PART – it could not be fully lost or destroyed, but reduced (cf. Stewart 1994, 129).

In some places in CEAP, *ʿār* is presented as extending onto someone's kin group (cf. Y: 50) or as being acquired by the entire group (cf. M: 6; R: 300; O: 66–67). This corresponds to the fact that the extension of DISHONOR upon the entire kin group is a phenomenon recorded in many societies (cf. Campbell 1966, 145).

ʿār was ascribed to someone in the action of *ʿayyara*, which is derived from the same consonantal root ʿYR. It meant “to defame someone, to vilify them because of something [shameful]”; that is, “to deem something an *ʿār* of someone”. It occurred in CEAP 23 times, similarly to the verb *ʿāba* (21 occurrences). The data acquired from the corpus suggests that although not reported in CAD, the verb could also metonymically signify “to make someone be of *ʿār*” or “to bring *ʿār* onto someone” (cf. L: 122). The verb was also used in reference to COMPLAINING about someone's behavior (cf. V: 95), which could be seen as yet another metonymy.

In CAD, *ʿār* was clearly linked with both EVALUATION and DEVIATION from the accepted way of behavior (cf. KtA 253; AsS: 830; LsA vol. 4: 716). Such a linkage might be assumed based on other derivatives of the root ʿYR. As reported by KtA, the verb *ʿayyara* could also signify “weighing something in order to compare value”. EVALUATION is also a key element of the meaning of other derivatives of the root, such as *ʿāyara* “he measured or compared the measures of capacity, and the instruments for weighing, one by or with another” etc. Other derivatives, such as *ʿāra* “to go astray, to get loose” and



ʿāʿir “astray”, clearly refer to concepts derived somehow from the idea of DEVIATION – mostly in the form of going astray (vs. obeying the owner).

Data from CEAP suggests two shameful factors, for which one could be ascribed with ʿār – actions/behavior and personal qualities – both being present in the passage (8) by caliph Ali (N: 120). First and foremost, ʿār was ascribed to someone due to their behavior. In CEAP, such shameful behavior was almost exclusively related to the violation of the code of *karam*-HONORABLENESS. Therefore, ʿār was ascribed to people because of their lack of warfare skills or cowardice (cf. Q: 213-215; D: 45; J: 97, 111; B: 69; H: 71), as depicted by al-Aʿsha in (9).

(8) *taqūlu n-nāsu lī fī l-kasbi ʿārun fa-qultu l-ʿāru fī dulli s-suʿāli*

People say that collecting wealth is **disgraceful** (ʿār) – and I say: **what is disgraceful** (ʿār) is weakness of the one [who has to] beg [people for help] (cf. N: 120).

(9) *fa-qad ṣabarnā wa-lam nuwalli wa-laysa min ṣaʿni-nā l-fīrāru
wa-qad farartum wa-mā ṣabartum wa-dāka ṣaynun la-kum wa-ʿāru*

So, we have endured [in the battle] – we did not turn back – because escape is not our habit.

And you fled – you have not endured – and this is your **disgrace** (ṣayn) and [your] **dishonor** (ʿār) (cf. C: 282-3).

Other behaviors violating the code of *karam* mentioned in CEAP were lack of endurance (cf. C: 282-3), lack of hospitality (cf. A: 81), breaking an oath (cf. C: 180), lack of a sound judgement (cf. N: 34), envy (cf. N: 120), and swaggering (cf. C: 84-5).

The corpus suggests that ʿār could be conceptualized as a matter of choice of an individual, who always had a chance to behave properly, i.e., like *karīm*, an HONORABLE man. This might be deduced from a metaphor VIOLATING CODE OF *karam* IS BUYING ʿār, which can be found in passages by two poets – al-Aswad al-Nahshali (B: 69) and al-Aʿsha (C: 180). As one can see in (10) by the latter, ʿār can be bought – i.e., exchanged – for *makrumaʿ* “an honorable deed”.

(10) *wa-qāla: lā ʿaštārī ʿāran bi-makrumaʿin fa-ʿaḥtāru makrumata
d-dunyā ʿalā l-ʿāri*

And [Samawʿal] said: I do not purchase **disgrace** (ʿār) in exchange for a deed of honor (*makrumaʿ*). Thus, I choose the honorable deed



(*makrumā*), which world [will remember], rather than **disgrace** (*ʿār*) (cf. C: 180).

One could be ascribed with *ʿār* also due to their attachment or joining to a tribe of a bad reputation (cf. E: 313), also by marrying into it (cf. K: 44-45). This conceptualization reflects the pre-Islamic Arabic concept of equalizing belonging to a tribe by birth and by choice (Ali, 1993: 257-9). Clearly, it also connects to the evaluation of low birth or mixed, impure origin. Moreover, *ʿār* could be also assigned to someone because of their sedentary, farming life – as it is in (11) by Aws Ibn Hujar (M: 38).

(11) *wa-ʿayyarta-nā tamra l-irāqi wa-burra-hu wa-zādu-ka ʿayru l-kalbi šawwaṭa-hu l-ḡamru*

You **defamed** (*ʿayyarta*) us for the dates of Iraq and its crops – and your provisions [consist] of a dog penis smoked in the burning coal (cf. M: 38).

Although, according to Abou-Zeid, in the community studied by him, *ʿār* was a shameful deed or atrocity (Abou-Zeid 1966, 247), in CEAP, it is mostly a stigma assigned to someone for committing such a transgression. Only in three places (N: 120, 34; and G: 178-9), *ʿār* refers also to ACTIONS themselves, which suggests the existence of a metonymic model *ʿār*-DISHONOR FOR *ʿār*-DISHONORING ACTION, being an elaboration of a frequently attested metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE (cf. Panther and Thornburg 2007, 258).

Alternatively, *ʿār* could be ascribed to someone because of their shameful qualities – *ʿayb*-SHAMEFUL DEFECTS. Most frequently, an *ʿayb*-SHAME, for which people deemed someone of *ʿār*, was impure, mixed origin or in other words, ignoble lineage (cf. J: 166; T: 138). Lineage was a major component of someone's RIGHT TO RESPECT (Abou-Zeid 1966, 250) and its SHAMEFULNESS could be associated with the hypothetical concept of heredity of predisposition to *karam*. Such a conceptualization might be observed, for instance, in (12) by al-Shammakh Ibn Dirar (L: 136), in which a woman states that she cannot behave in a way worthy of *ʿār* because of her origin. Thus, *ʿār* was assigned to people because of any indication of their low birth, such as their black skin (cf. K: 46) or ignobility of their mother (cf. G: 21). Other SHAMEFUL DEFECTS, for which one could be assigned with *ʿār*, were their old age (T: 22) and poverty (Y: 40).



(12) *taqūlu wa-qad balla d-dumūʿu himāra-hā: ʿabā ʿiffatī wa-maṣībī
ʿan ʿuʿayyarā*

She was saying, after tears had wetted her veil: My nobility and my origin reject [deeds, for which] I could be **defamed** (*ʿuʿayyar*) (cf. L: 136).

Perhaps, the fact that *ʿār* could be ascribed to someone because of their SHAMEFUL DEFECT, could motivate the hypothetical metonymic extension in form of *ʿār* FOR *ʿayb*, which I believe can be observed in (13) by Urwa Ibn al-Ward.

(13) *wa-mā biy-ya min ʿārin ʿihālu ʿalimtu-hu siwā ʿanna ʿahwālī ʿidā
nusibū nahdu*

I think there is nothing **shameful** (*ʿār*) in me – as far as I know – except from the fact that when assigned to lineages, my uncles are of [Banū] Nahd (cf. Y: 26).

All in all, as one can expect, *ʿār* ascribed to someone negatively affects their reputation. It is seen as something which blemishes them, what can be seen in (14) by al-Muhalhil (F: 33). Here, the poet uses the verb *šāna*, saying by this that *ʿār* defiles someone or it makes them look ugly or bad. Similar relationship between *ʿār* and *šayn* “what makes one look ugly, disfigured” – derived from *šāna* – one could observe in (9). Therefore, based on a metonymic model, *šayn* could also serve as a synonym of *ʿār* (cf. aHm: 115).

(14) *wa-hādat nāqatī ʿan dilli qabrin tawā fī-hi l-makārimu wa-l-fahāru
ladā ʿawṭani ʿarwaʿa lam yašin-hu wa-lam yaḥduṭla-hu fī n-nāsi ʿāru*

My she-camel turned away from the shadow of the grave [of my brother Kulayb], in which [so many] honorable deeds and pride have settled down.

[They settled] in the homeland of a brave man, whom **disgrace** (*ʿār*) has [never] **defiled** (*lam yašin-hu*), and who never was disgraced in [the eyes] of people (cf. F: 33).

The effect of *ʿār* on someone’s reputation was also encoded by the conceptualizations that it could stick – *ʿalḥaqa* – to someone (cf. K: 44–45) or that it could be long-lasting – literally, *tābit* “well-established” (cf. R: 300) – thus, remembered by others for a long time (cf. O: 123). The use of the lexeme *tābit* is prescribed by a conceptual blend, which allows for conceptualization of *ʿār* in terms of BUILDING/STRUCTURE as in (15) by Aws Ibn Hujar (M: 6). This



idea seems to derive from the metaphorical model *mağd*-GLORY IS BUILDING/STRUCTURE. The generic space (cf. Turner 2007: 378–9) linking those two concepts would be the schema *karam*-HONORABLENESS, since *ʿār* and *mağd* are both “rewards” for following or violating – in an exemplary way – the code of a man of honor.

(15) *wa-ṣabbaḥa-nā ʿārun ṭawīlun bināʿu-hu nusabbu bi-hi mā lāḥa fī l-ʿufqi kawkabu*

That morning, a tall **disgrace** (*ʿār*) fell upon us – we will be vilified with [this disgraceful tall] construction as long, as it shines like a star on a horizon (cf. M: 6)

The fact that *ʿār* was a stigma negatively affecting one’s reputation indicates that it must have had an impact on someone’s HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT, which linked to a communal opinion on an individual.⁸ Consequently, this impact might be interpreted as diminishing one’s VALUE in the eyes of their community.

Therefore, *ʿār* was something feared and to be avoided by all means (cf. A: 81). Nevertheless– although sometimes long-lasting – it was not forever and it could be removed. It might have, for instance, faded away (cf. Q: 97), or it could be forgiven (cf. O: 66–67). Of course, the bearer of *ʿār* could erase it by themselves. Such removal of stigma is conceptualized as CLEANING/WASHING, which evidently derives from the metaphor OFFENDING ONE’S *ird*-HONOR IS SOILING IT. *ʿār* is then perceived as something SOILING, which has to be WASHED away as it is indicated in (16) by Khansa, who compared *ʿār* to menstrual blood (D: 55).

(16) *lā nawma ḥattà [...]*

[...] *tarḥaḍū ʿan-kum ʿāran tağallala-kum raḥḍa l-ʿawārika ḥayḍan ʿinda ʿaḥāri*

There was no sleep until [...] you had washed away the **disgrace** (*ʿār*) – which fell upon you – in the manner, in which menstruating women washed away their menstrual blood on a day of purification (cf. D: 55).

⁸ This might be assumed for instance on the basis of the definition of *ird* provided by Abu al-Abbas, who understood it as a collection of all the matters involving an individual, which are mentioned about them in order to praise or shame them (LsA vol. 7: 191).



The conceptualization as something SOILING is an elaboration of the most important image-schema structuring the concept of *ʿār*, i.e., a visible OBJECT ON SURFACE. That SURFACE was one's *ʿird*-HONOR seen as their BODY (PART). This image-schematic model accounts for the collocation of *ʿār* of such verbs as *ʿalḥaqa* "to stick to", as well as for the use of the preposition *ʿalà* "on, onto" while denoting the location of *ʿār* (cf. A:81). The fact that *ʿār* was an OBJECT ON someone explains the metaphor *ʿār* IS CLOTH/CLOTHING, which can be seen as instantiated in idiomatic expressions noted in TBD (aHm: 115).

Alternatively, *ʿār* could be seen as a POSSESSED OBJECT (cf. C: 282-3; R: 300; O: 66-67), which explains the metaphoric model VIOLATING CODE OF *karam* IS BUYING *ʿār*. It could also be conceptualized as an OBJECT INSIDE SOMETHING, for which one was ascribed with it (cf. N: 120; P: 39; C: 176-7; O: 128; D: 45).

4. Conclusion: The subsuming schema of SOCIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY MEMBER

To sum it up, *ʿayb* and *ʿār*, being the nuclear concepts of the pre-Islamic Arabic schema SHAME-DISHONOR, encapsulate mainly the knowledge of what one should be ashamed of. The analyzed schemata points towards qualities and actions, which were considered to DIMINISH one's *ʿird*-HONOR-RIGHT TO RESPECT. *ʿār* can be seen as a stigma, a bad name assigned to someone, whose HONOR was openly questioned. Thus, it can be seen as corresponding in a way to English DISHONOR. Nevertheless, it should not be seen as an opposite of *ʿird*-HONOR. As long as it diminishes or reduces it, *ʿār* does not strip someone of it entirely.

When it comes to *ʿayb*, it covered the REASON one was ascribed with SHAME-DISHONOR. As a SHAMEFUL DEFECT – mostly of someone's character – it seems to profile the schema SOCIAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY MEMBER, subsuming concepts of *ʿird*-HONOR, *ʿayb*-SHAME and *ʿār*-DISHONOR, as an EVALUATION of one's ABILITY to serve as a USEFUL member of a group. It would mean then that pre-Islamic Arabs stipulated RESPECT (and persistence within a group indicated by it), by paying it to those who were considered to enhance the overall survival chances of the whole group. Such chances were definitely secured by honorable folk – brave, strong warriors, generous and hospitable rich, and obedient dependents (including women). Furthermore, this could actually help explaining the pre-Islamic Arabic preoccupation with purity of origin. Since, origin was the foundation of the tribal spirit of solidarity (Ali 1993, 352), preserving it from any presumedly dishonorable



people was a good strategy for guaranteeing maximum success in a situation requiring assistance. Thus, *ʿayb*-SHAME could easily be mediated by the schema of *ʿayb*-DEFECT: the one whose ability to be honorable was questioned might have been imagined as someone DEFECTIVE, i.e., not functioning in the way beneficial for the whole community.

Since – in line with the aforementioned hypothesis – one was kept within a group only as far as one obeyed the code of honorable behavior, breaking it would cause expulsion from the group, which in the harsh environment of the Arabic homeland could have meant death. Conceptualization of SHAME-DISHONOR in the terms of DEATH is not a phenomenon restricted to pre-Islamic Arabic culture (cf. Baroja 1966, 85). However, in the light of what we know about the outcasts living in 6th century Arabia, in the case of pre-Islamic Arabs, such a conceptualization was less metaphorical and more propositional in nature (cf. Ali 1993, 410). Someone who was DISHONORED, whose RIGHT TO RESPECT was reduced to the point they were no longer able to stay within their tribe or clan, by all means was in danger of demise, if they failed to quickly find a replacement for his kin group in the form of different kinds of client relationships (Ali 1993, 410). Therefore, the conceptualization of REDUCING/DIMINISHING one's *ʿird*-HONOR in EPA frequently employs very physical domains pertaining to the schemata DAMAGE OR WOUND, all of which relate to the quite physical in nature threat to one's BODY and LIFE posed by SHAME-DISHONOR.

Last, but not least, which is worth emphasizing, is the close relationship between the pre-Islamic Arabic concepts of SHAME with the concept of *karam*-HONORABLENESS. In contrary to what Wikan (1984) observed in her study, I believe that, for pre-Islamic Arabs, SHAME was closely related to HONOR. This relationship was not direct, as in the case of the English DISHONOR. What CEAP data suggests is that a strong relationship between SHAME and HONORABLE BEHAVIOR in all its facets – actual ACTIONS, TRAITS enabling it (i.e., traits of one's character), or even factors PREDISPOSING to it (i.e., one's lineage) – existed. The code of *karam* was not an idealized code of heroism, but it functioned – as in many cultures – as the bare minimum of socially acceptable conduct (Stewart 1994, 54). *ʿird*-HONOR was based on EVALUATING one's behavior in light of this conduct, so that those who obeyed it were considered HONORABLE – *karīm* – and with their *ʿird*-HONOR-RIGHT unquestioned. HONOR was the mark of DECENCY rather than of HEROISM, which was reserved more for such concepts as *šaraf*-HONOR-PRECEDENCE and *mağd*-GLORY/FAME. In light of this, SHAME was by all means related to HONOR,



since it was DECLARATION, SENSE, OR FEELING derived from the evaluation of one's behavior and their RIGHT TO RESPECT. Ergo, in a sense, HONOR and SHAME in pre-Islamic Arabic culture persisted in a relationship – of course only, if understood in native terms.

Dictionaries abbreviations

KtA = Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad. 2003. *Kitab al-Ayn murattaban alahuruf al-Ma'jam*. Beirut.

ALG = Ibn Duraid. 1987. *Jamharat al-Lugha*. Beirut.

AsS = Al-Jawhari. 2009. *As-Sihah*. Cairo.

LsA = Ibn Manzur. 2009. *Lisan al-Arab*. vol. 1-15. Beirut.

iSk = Ibn as-Sikkit. 1998. *Kitab al-Alfaz*. Beirut.

aHm = Al-Hamadani. 1991. *Kitab al-Alfaz al-Kitabiya*. Beirut.

aMh = Ibn Sidah. 2006. *Al-Mukhassas*. vol. 1-17. Beirut.

Abbreviations of poetry compilations

A = Abu Talib (1994), Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi

B = Al-Aswad an-Nahshali (1970), Bagdad: Al-Mu'assasa al-Amma li-s-Sahafawa-t-Tiba'a

C = Al-A'sha (-), Cairo: Maktabat al-Adab bi-l-Gamamiz

D = Al-Khansa (2014), Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifa

E = Al-Hutay'a (1958), Cairo: SharikatMaktabatwa-Matba'at Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi-wa-Awaladi-hi bi-Misr

F = Al-Muhalhil (1993), Cairo: Ad-Dar al-Alamiya

G = Al-Mutalammis (1970), Cairo: Jami'at ad-Duwal al-Arabiya – Ma'had al-Makhtutat al-Arabiya

H = Amir Ibn at-Tufayl (1979), Beirut: Dar Sadir

I = Amr Ibn Ma'adi (1985), Damascus: Matbu'atMajma al-Lugha al-Arabiya bi-Dimashq

J = An-Nabighaaz-Zubyani(1991), Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi

K = Antara Ibn Shaddad (2009), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiya

L = Al-Shammakh Ibn Dirar (1968), Cairo: Dar al-Ma'arif bi-Misr

M = Aws Ibn Hujar (1980), Beirut: Dar Bayrut li-t-Tiba'awa-n-Nashr

N = Caliph Ali (-),Cairo: Dar Ibn Zaydun

O = Caliph Mu'awiya Ibn Abi Sufyan (1996), Beirut: Dar Sadir

P = Hatim at-Ta'i (1981), Beirut: Dar Sadir

Q = Hassan Ibn Thabit (1994), Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiya

R = Hassan Ibn Thabit (2010), Beirut: Al-Maktaba al-Asriya

S = Ibn Muqbil (1995), Beirut: Dar al-Sharaf al-Arabi.

T = Ka'b Ibn Zuhayr (1989), Ar-Riyad: Dar al-Shawwaf li-t-Tiba'awa-n-Nashr

U = Labid Ibn Rabi'a (-), Beirut: Dar Sadir

V = Tarafa Ibn al-Abd (2000), Beirut: Al-Mu'assasa al-Arabiya li-d-Dirasatwa-n-Nashr

Y = Urwa Ibn al-Ward (1982), Beirut: Dar Bayrut li-t-Tiba'awa-n-Nashr

Z = Zuhayr Ibn Abi Sulma (-), Beirut: Sharikat Dar al-Arqam Ibn Abi al-Arqam



Bibliography

- Abou-Loghod, Lila. 2016. *Veiled Sentiments. Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Abou-Zeid, Ahmad. 1966. "Honour and Shame among the Bedouins of Egypt." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, edited by John G. Peristiany, 245-259. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ali, Jawwad. 1993. *Al-Mufasssal fi Ta'rikh al-Arab qabl al-Islam*, vol. IV. Bagdad.
- Al-Jallad, Nader. 2010a. "The Concept of "Shame" in Arabic: Bilingual Dictionaries and the Challenge of Defining Culture-Based Emotions." *Language Design*, 12: 13-57.
- Al-Jallad, Nader. 2010b. "The Semantic Concept of 'shame' in the Holy Qur'an." In *Sacred Text. Explorations in Lexicography*, edited by Juan Pedro Monferrer-Sala and Angel Urban, 81-106. Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Alrabiah, Maha S. 2014. *King Saud University Classical Arabic Corpus*. Ar-Riyād.
- Alsheddi, Abeer. 2016. *Edit Distance Adapted to Natural Language Words*. M.A. Thesis: Ar-Riyād.
- Baroja, Julio C. 1966. "Honour and Shame: A Historical Account of Several Conflicts." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, edited by John G. Peristiany, 81-121. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cambell, J.K. 1965. "Honour and the Devil." In *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*, edited by Peristiany, J. G., 139-170. Chicago: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Casson, Ronald W. 1983. "Schemata in Cognitive Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 12: 429-462.
- Dodd, Peter C. 1973. "Honor and the Forces of Change in Arab Society." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 4 (1): 40-54.
- Farès, Bichr. 1938. "Ird". In *The Encyclopedia of Islam. Supplement*, 96-97. Leyden-London.
- Fried, Mirjam and Kiki Nikiforidou. 2013. *Advances in Frame Semantics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Guth, Stephan. 2016. "The Etymology of Generosity-Related Terms A Presentation of the EtymArab© Project – Part II". *Folia Orientalia*, 53: 59-104.
- Knauf, Ernest A. 2010. "Arabo-Aramaic and 'Arabiyya: From Ancient Arabic to Early Standard Arabic, 200 CE-600 CE". In *The Qur'an in Context -Historical and Literary Investigations*, edited by Angelika Neuwirth, Michael Marx and Nicolai Sinai. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Kollareth, Dolichan, Fernandez-Dols, Jose-Miguel, and James A. Russell. 2018. "Shame as a Culture-Specific Emotion Concept." *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 18 (3-4): 274-292.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2017. "Context in Cultural Linguistics: The Case of Metaphor." In *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*, edited by Farzad Sharifian, 307-323. Singapore: Springer.
- Lane, Edward. 1968a. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, vol. IV. Beirut: Libraire Du Liban.
- Lane, Edward. 1968b. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, vol. V. Beirut: Libraire Du Liban.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. 2007. "Polysemy, Prototypes, and Radial Categories." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 139-169. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Palmer, Gary B. 2007. "Cognitive Linguistics and Anthropological Linguistics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 1045-1073. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Linda I. Thornburg. 2007. "Metonymy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 236-258. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peristiany, John G. (ed.) 1966. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Oakley, Todd. 2007. "Image Schemas." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 214-235. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sharifian, Farzad. 2003. "On Cultural Conceptualisations." *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 3 (3): 187-207.
- Sharifian, Farzad. 2015. "Cultural Linguistics." In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Culture*, Routledge, edited by Farzad Sharifian, 473-492. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sharifian, Farzad (ed.). 2017. *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Steward, Frank H. 1994. *Honor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Mark. 2007. "Conceptual Integration." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, 377-397. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wehr, Hans. 1976. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*. New York: Spoken Language Service, Inc.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1992. *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition. Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wikan, Unni. 1984. „Shame and Honour: A Contestable Pair." *Man*, 19: 635-52.

