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Abstract

This research is a cognitive linguistic investigation of the concepts of GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, EFFAT ‘chastity’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’, which comprise the core of control mechanism in Iranian culture. The study aimed to find out whether these moral values are interrelated and examine how cognitive linguistics can contribute to discovering the ways in which they are connected to each other and fulfill their functions in the course of controlling the sexuality of men and women. The study finds that the Persian concepts are interrelated and form a conceptual cluster that operates to regulate the sexuality of Iranians. The interrelationship between the concepts and their systematic functioning was demonstrated through lexical collocates, shared conceptual metaphors, conceptual metonymies, categorization, and embodiment.

The analysis reveals that gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab are part of a larger cultural model that operates to keep a legitimate, safe distance between men and women. According to the analysis, the cultural model of sexuality in Persian is founded on and guided by the Islamic principle of mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’, which pulls together gheirat ‘moral vigilance’, haya ‘self-restraint’, effat ‘chastity’, aberu ‘face/public image’, nàmus ‘female family members’, harim ‘holy space/border’, and hejab ‘veiling’ in order to keep the sexes segregated.

Within the identified model, mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’ defines the specific category of people toward whom one should maintain a certain physical and social distance. Gheirat surveils the situations in which social interactions take place. It monitors the conducts of individuals, triggering reactions in people to tackle cases of taboo violation through admonishing, criticizing, fighting with, and, in extreme cases, through murdering the perpetrators. Haya ‘self-restraint’ operates to prevent the self from causing and feeling (further) shame through holding back the self, setting up a barrier between the self and what is considered as taboo, offensive, shameful, and unpleasant. Effat ‘chastity’ exclusively functions to discipline the body and set limits to bodily desires. It specifically deals with concealing illegitimate sexual desire so as to prevent the person from transgressing norms of conduct. Nàmus ‘female family members’ represents the heightened significance of women as holders of the family’s honor and of their manner of conduct in society. Female family members are also strongly protected by men against social threats, such as sexually charged looks, sexual comments, and rape. Harim ‘holy space/border’ marks the boundary between cultural values and taboo behavior, assigning a high degree of sanctity to cultural values, and
highlighting the significance of protecting the values from threatening and insulting acts and behaviors. Áberu ‘face/public image’ is the value that the whole model operates to preserve it as breaching culturally specified norms and values will bring about shame and endanger the social image of the person and the whole family. Last but not least, hejab ‘veiling’ is the value which materializes the interaction of the elements of the cultural model of sexuality.

The results indicate that cognitive linguistics is indispensable to the analysis of culturally significant concepts. The cognitive linguistic framework shed light on the dynamicity of the meaning of these concepts and revealed the inadequacies that pertain to their descriptions in anthropology, sociology, and gender studies. Metaphor was found to be an indispensable component of the structure of the Persian key concepts. Metaphor was indicated to be a crucial factor in representing the basic cognitive-cultural functions of the Persian key concepts, in highlighting their various aspects, and in drawing distinctions between closely related concepts. Conceptual metaphors also provided the ground to show how culturally significant concepts are simultaneously and systematically represented in thought, speech, body, and behavior, which, in turn, can be taken as a solid proof to prove the keyness of the Persian key concepts. Conceptual metonymy links emotions with their physiological and behavioral responses; it links the key concepts with their most related concepts and is found to be an important tool for censoring and camouflaging unpleasant, offensive, and taboo aspects of speech. The role of embodiment was demonstrated through image schemas and body part terms involved in figurative conceptualizations. Furthermore, the body is indicated to be the meeting point and main site for the realization of the Persian concepts. Finally, the bâ-bi ‘with-without’ categorization is shown to be the major means of categorizing and evaluating individuals in terms of whether they possess the moral values. The thesis came to the conclusion that unraveling the complexity of cultural key concepts demands taking into account various bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors as well as concrete social actions that embody cultural models.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Statement of the problem

In each culture, there are a number of concepts which represent central norms and values and act as reference points for thinking or acting in a particular way. Such concepts are commonly referred to as “cultural key concepts” or “culturally significant concepts” (Kövecses, 2005; Lutz, 1988; Sharifian, 2011; Wierzbicka, 1997), with their linguistic manifestations being referred to as “cultural key words” (Wierzbicka, 1997; Williams, 1976; Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2009). Cultural key words have been investigated from various perspectives both inside and outside of the field of linguistics (Abu-Lughod, 1996; Bennet et al., 2005; Cortazzi & Shen, 2001; Lutz, 1988; Palmer & Brown, 1998; Ponsonnet, 2014; Rigotti & Roci, 2005; Rosaldo, 1980; Scott & Tribble, 2006; Sharifian, 2011, 2017; Stubbs, 2001; Wierzbicka, 1997, 2003; Williams, 1976; Wolf, 2006; Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2009). Adopting different approaches scholars have attempted to demonstrate the cultural significance, pragmatic uses, conceptual content and conceptual associations of key concepts, their representations in the body, and their role in determining the social action of individuals. Nevertheless, not all accounts have been able to provide a comprehensive image of key concepts by simultaneously taking into account various bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors. The lack of attention to the factors involved in forming and structuring key concepts is more observable in the lexical semantic (Wierzbicka, 1997) and social constructionist approaches (Lutz, 1988) to key concepts, where the former approach leaves out the pragmatic context, cognitive processes (metaphor and metonymy), and embodiment, and the latter approach lacks a detailed analysis of the conceptual content and structure of key (emotion) concepts, ignoring image-schematic knowledge, cognitive processes (metaphor and metonymy), and embodiment, being mainly based on subjective assessment of key (emotion) concepts (Kövecses, 1990).

Taking a glance at the properties of key concepts would indicate why any analysis of culturally significant concepts should, at the same time, pay attention to bodily, cognitive, social-cultural¹, discourse factors as well as to the way in which these concepts are enacted in

---

¹ Social-cultural factors refer to role relationships, power relations, dominant values in culture, and characteristics of members of a group (Kövecses, 2015). Social-cultural factors fall into the category of “situational context” in the categorization of types of context proposed by Kövecses (2015).
culture. Firstly, key concepts are highly abstract and hardly translatable into other languages. One clear sign of their abstractness is dictionary glosses which may be no less abstract, only providing likely motivations for their meanings rather than capturing the principal functions associated with cultural key words. Thus, without looking into the metonymic and metaphoric conceptualizations, it might not be possible to precisely show the content, structure, and functions of key concepts. Moreover, without taking figurative conceptualizations into consideration, it would be extremely hard to draw a distinction between a given key concept and those concepts that are intimately related to or synonymous with it. Secondly, key concepts have complex structures and are linked with a variety of experiential domains. This is because key concepts define broad cultural principles and their different aspects are engaged in structuring different areas of culture. Without considering the pragmatic use of key concepts, it might not be possible to identify the alternative functions they perform across contexts of use. Thirdly, a category of key concepts deals specifically with the body and bodily desires. In other words, the body is the site and target of their operation. Moral emotions and self-regulating forces are concepts which are realized in the body and their exhibition through the body is deemed important in that it can be taken as a major criterion for determining the social value and status of individuals (Farahani, 2006). Hence, in such cases, paying attention to the role of the body and embodied conceptualizations would reveal constituting aspects of these concepts and show the way the body is expected to reflect on the application of key (emotion) concepts.

An important merit of taking into account various influential factors involved in structuring key concepts is that it can show the coordination between mental, bodily, linguistic, and social representations of key concepts in a systematic way and can also be used as a rigorous proof of their keyness or significance in culture.

This study aims to provide a more comprehensive account of key concepts in Iranian culture by examining the role of bodily, cognitive (metaphor, metonymy, and categorization), social-cultural, and discourse factors in the formation of a conceptual cluster that places restrictions on the sexuality of Iranians.

1.2 Scope of the study

Iran is one of the Muslim countries in the Middle East where Islam is viewed as “the fundamental motivating force behind most aspects of culture, which has its way in practically every act and moment in life” and it is “the greatest determinant of social relationships, particularly the social construction of gender” (Sedghi, 2007, p. 34). Islam enjoins sex
segregation (Farahani, 2002; Najmabadi, 1993; Shirazi, 2001), even though Quranic verses assert that men and women, regardless of their sex, are equal before God (Sedghi, ibid, p. 35). Sex segregation may also originate in the cultural belief that regards sexuality as a dangerous and seductive power, which needs to be socially controlled and contained by rules and prohibitions (Farahani, 2002, p. 105). The psychic and physical segregation of the sexes aims to improve the individual and social value of men and women, prevent moral corruption, create a safe, private space in public for women and protect them from male gaze and sexual harassment, and preserve social equilibrium (Farahani, 2002; Hessini, 1994; Milani, 1992; Shirazi, 2001).

Haeri (2014) holds that in Iran and in many other Muslim countries, “the social structure is construed on the principle of sex segregation”, implying that “before the forces of nature (e.g., sexual instinct) moral scruples implode” (p. 5). She argues that due to the significance of moral values, strict rules of gender avoidance must be devised and external forces must be brought to bear upon the behavior of the sexes in order to keep them segregated and to control them (ibid). Milani (1992) states that sexual segregation “strives to minimize or circumvent the frequency of the male-female interactions”. According to this principle, “what can be revealed about a woman is carefully separated from what must remain concealed” (p. 23). The strong emphasis on segregating the sexes seems to have given rise to the emergence of a cluster of concepts that operate to maintain a safe distance between men and women through regulating and disciplining their sexuality.

This research is a cognitive linguistic analysis of the concepts of GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, EFFAT ‘chastity’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’, which are assumed to be major means of regulating the sexuality of Iranians. The reason for choosing these particular concepts is that in scholarly works dealing with sexuality in Iranian culture, gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab are often regarded as highly significant for understanding the mechanism with which sexuality is controlled and the way it is represented in the behavior of individuals (Eshaghi, 2006; Farahani, 2006; Goldin, 2015; Haeri, 2014; Milani, 1992, 2011; Mir-Hosseini, 2007; Najmabadi, 2000; Shirpak et al., 2008; Tizro, 2013).

Tizro (2013) holds that gheirat, haya, and effat comprise the core of control mechanism in Iranian culture. She maintains that the code of hejab is a measurement device and an objective criterion through which such subjective concepts as GHEIRAT, HAYA, and EFFAT find realization (p. 54).
Milani (1992) notes that hejab is probably the most heavily charged symbol in the modern history of Iran, which “sanctifies a system of censorship and self-censorship” (p. 23). She states that hejab does not only indicate a sexually segregated, male-dominated society; it also represents “strong forces of de-individualization, protection, and secrecy” (P. 23), referring indirectly to gheirat, haya, and effat. Milani points out that in addition to being a tool for regulating the interactions between men and women or dictating the control over the other, hejab indicates modes of being and behavior that are shaped by varying degrees and types of (internal and external) protection and censorship (pp. 22–23).

Eshaghi (2006) explains the significance of gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab in the social life of Muslim Iranians. He notes that these moral values are key components of Iranian identity, working hand in hand to guarantee the moral health of individuals. In his account, hejab ‘veiling’ operationalizes the principles of gheirat, haya, and effat (p. 26). In this network, he argues, gheirat (as a male feature) acts as a guardian, contributing to stabilizing the family and preventing female family members from violating moral codes of the family and society. He maintains that gheirat is one of the important elements that can strengthen or undermine hejab in society (p. 21), emphasizing the authoritative role of gheirat in enforcing the code of hejab. Haya, on the other hand, is an internal self-regulating force for keeping distance from all social and religious prohibitions, including illegitimate sexual desire (pp. 20–24) and effat ‘chastity’ is the product of (exercising) haya, functioning as a curtain to control lust and to protect women’s moral purity and dignity (p. 17).

Dastjerdi (2014) extracts 33 acts from the Quran that are regarded as the most important obligations and practices that a Muslim believer must perform. The list includes gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab, values which, according to the author, preserve the moral health and dignity of Muslim men and women.

1.3 Definitions of the key concepts

To the best of my knowledge neither of the Persian concepts analyzed in this research has been researched in linguistics though they have numerousely been referred to in gender studies and in sociological and anthropological literature on sexuality in Iranian culture (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014; Farahani, 2002, 2006; Hélie & Hoodfar, 2012; Khosravi, 2009; Milani, 1992, 2011; Mir-Hosseini, 2000, 2007; Naghibi, 1999; Najmabadi, 2000; Rahmani et al., 2015; Ridgeon, 2005; Shahidian, 2002; Tizro, 2013). The first problem in the way of knowing these concepts is the problem of translatability. This problem is more observed in gheirat and haya,
which are more complex in structure. In three Persian dictionaries consulted (Dehkhoda, Moin, and Amid, accessible at www.vajehyab.com²), *gheirat* is defined as *hamiyat* ‘guarding’, *ta’asob* ‘ardent, unconditional support’ *javânardi* ‘chivalry’, *nâmus parasti* ‘protecting/worshipping female family members’, *rashk/hasad* ‘jealousy’, and *rag* ‘blood vein’. These meanings point to functions, features, causes, and (physiological and behavioral) effects of *gheirat* mainly in relation to family, society, and love relationship. The dictionary meanings show that *gheirat* probably forms various relationships with other conceptual domains and the likely motivations for the meanings of *gheirat* in the dictionaries do not clarify what *gheirat* precisely means or does as a cultural key word.

Anthropological studies typically focus on the role of *gheirat* in protecting the honor of the family and controlling the sexuality of women. Beeman (1986, pp. 71–72) briefly defines *gheirat* as “a strong internal feeling” and “a sense of indignation at a personal affront”. He also takes *gheirat* as a form of anger that comes about when a man’s name is taken in vain or when he is cheated or wrongly accused. Tizro (2013) defines *gheirat* as “sexual jealousy” and “a possessive and protective shield constructed around a woman, who is perceived as carrying and personifying a Muslim man’s honor” (p. 51). She adds that in the context of marriage, *gheirat* is the right of the man as the owner of the woman to defend his territory passionately and sometimes aggressively. It is a code of behavior entitling and obliging men to ensure that the exclusivity condition in the marriage contract is fulfilled (ibid). Tizro maintains that a woman needs to internalize the right of the man to her sexuality by observing modesty and chastity. Otherwise, she would be punished by the code of *gheirat* (ibid).

The strong link between *gheirat* and honor has led some scholars to translate *gheirat* as “honor” or “sexual honor” (Akman, 2002; Milani, 1992; Mir-Hosseini, 2000). Fischer and Abedi (1990) define *gheirat* as a “form of honor that restrains men from spoiling the honor of other men” (p. 179). Smith et al. (1971) define *gheirat* as the person’s “enthusiasm or zeal in defense of his honor, [which] comes into play when an insult or injury occurs to an individual or a group that one is expected to defend” (p. 240). Akman (2002) observes that *gheirat* denotes the ability and courage to stand up and fight for the interests (the honor) of the family.

---

² This website provides an easy access to important Persian dictionaries online and it provides the same content that is included in the print dictionary. Word meanings are automatically searched in Dehkhoda, Amid, and Moin Persian dictionaries. The definitions include both old and contemporary meanings.
when they are perceived to be at stake, for example, when women are assaulted or their chastity has been compromised (p. 107).

What adds to the complexity of the meaning of *gheirat* is that some studies indicate that protecting the honor and controlling the sexuality of women are not the only functions of *gheirat*. Bakhtiar (2015) observes that *gheirat* can also act as a supplementary force to such internal forces as will, motivation, and perseverance, where *gheirat* is used to achieve certain goals (e.g., succeeding in sports matches). Moreover, *gheirat* can be applied to provide support to fellow humans in need (e.g., financially supporting a person in need). These are the contexts in which *gheirat* is not associated with indignation and sexuality (pp. 284–285).

Therefore, given the various functions that *gheirat* seems to perform, a more general, working definition would be needed to embrace all the functions, that is, a definition closer to the basic function that *gheirat* might fulfill across context of use. Despite being a hard-to-translate concept, ‘moral vigilance’ could be suggested as a more appropriate English gloss for *gheirat* in this study. This gloss may incorporate the monitoring, protective, and reinforcing functions of *gheirat* while also highlighting it as a moral value.

As pointed out earlier, previous studies have only paid attention to the role of *gheirat* in preserving the honor and controlling the sexuality of Iranians. Moreover, in such studies, *gheirat* is prototypically seen as a male feature. Hence, a more comprehensive explication of this concept is needed to accommodate its various features and functions and show the range of conceptual domains that determine the contextual meanings of *gheirat* in Persian. The analysis should also demonstrate whether *gheirat* could be regarded as a female feature or even as a gender-neutral attribute. It should also clarify how *gheirat* is triggered by various psychological, political, and social-cultural elements.

In the Persian dictionaries consulted, *haya* is defined as *sharm* roughly meaning ‘shame’, *hojb* ‘inhibition’, *sharmsâri* ‘feeling ashamed’, and *molâhezeh* ‘mindfulness’. Milani (1992) defines *haya* as a female attribute and a cultural trait that a virtuous woman maintains in order to remain hidden from the outside world (p. 46). Milani holds that the code of *haya* demands that “a woman’s body be covered, her voice go unnoticed, her portrait never be painted and her life story remain untold”. Moreover, public disclosure of any of these aspects of a woman’s life would be considered a violation of societal taboos (ibid). She observes that *haya* is as difficult to define as it is pervasive in Iranian culture. According to Milani, *haya* involves both an internal state and an external behavior. It “maintains distance,
rules the social world, and stretches into the utmost reaches of the individual’s psyche” (1992, p. 52). Milani (2011) notes that haya is a short word but contains an encyclopedia of meanings, covering the spectrum from shame to embarrassment, decency, modesty, shyness, and having an ordained place in the world, for which English has not counterparts (p. 55). From this perspective, haya is an ideal that combines such virtues as chastity, seclusion, and obedience, immobilizing women’s bodies and muting their voices (pp. 52–55).

Shirpak et al. (2008) translate haya as “modesty”. They observe that “the culture of modesty and embarrassment” related to sexuality is one of the main obstacles to Iranians seeking counseling, information, and help regarding sexual concerns and issues (p. 143). They maintain that modesty is a cultural value that Iranians practice in verbal and non-verbal communication, dressing, and relationship with the opposite sex. They add that modest behavior may be considered as a choice to maintain a personal border around oneself in order to separate the personal from the impersonal (pp. 143–144).

The definitions provided for haya in the aforementioned studies have not been able to make a clear distinction between haya (as a moral virtue) and shame (as a negative emotion), and often these two closely related emotions seem to have been taken as synonymous (Mir-Hosseini, 2000; Torab, 2007). Unlike the feminist perspective, the Islamic perspective on haya holds that this moral virtue differs from shame and shyness, being a mechanism to avoid causing or feeling shame. From this viewpoint, haya indicates one’s capability to control the self and desires and should not be taken as a psychologically passive state, which is characteristic of shame and shyness (Eshaghi, 2006; Khadem Pir, 2015; Pasandideh, 2004). Despite controversies over the definition of haya, alternative perspectives on haya share and implicitly convey the idea that haya may denote a barrier or obstacle between the self and cultural taboos. The word hojb ‘inhibition’, which is one of the dictionary meanings of haya, also implies this barrier. Therefore, rather than using either ‘shame’ or ‘modesty’ I would suggest ‘self-restraint’ as a more appropriate English gloss for this notion.

The other Persian key word investigated in the thesis is effat. In Persian dictionaries (Dehkhoda, Amid, and Mo’in dictionaries at www.vajehyab.com), effat is defined as eherent az moharramat khosus an shahavat ‘refraining from [doing] what is forbidden, particularly lust’, nahoftegi ‘the state of being concealed/covered’, pâkdâmani ‘moral purity’, and parhizkâri ‘abstinence’. Khadem Pir (2015) defines effat as an “internal attribute that prevents lust from overcoming and ruling humans”. Effat also “impedes one from committing
Eshaghi (2006) maintains that effat is a curtain that controls lust and protects women’s decency and moral purity (p. 17). He adds that women’s dignity is contingent upon observing effat, which, in turn, guarantees the moral health of society (ibid). The word effat in many studies on sexuality is translated as “chastity” (Farahani, 2002; Haeri, 2014; Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 1992; Najmabadi, 1993). On the basis of the definitions provided in Persian dictionaries and scholarly works, this gloss seems to be close to what effat stands for. Hence, ‘chastity’ will be used throughout the thesis as the rough English translation of the word effat.

Tizro (2013) holds that virginity and veiling are the objective criteria that gauge and operationalize effat for girls. According to Tizro, the code of effat is externally measured and guaranteed by premarital virginity and veiling. Moreover, when women do not observe the effat-haya codes, they are punished by the code of gheirat (p. 76). Tizro points out that the ethical codes of gheirat and effat impose strict control and surveillance upon women at all levels of society (from family to one’s social group to society at large), offering the right to men to commit honor killing in situations of indecency (adultery) (ibid, p. 79).

Khosravi (2008) explains the notion of effat by mentioning the acts and activities that are regarded in Iranian culture as incongruent with this ethical code. He observes that “[a] married couple may not hug or kiss in public, not even at their own wedding. Any sexual expression in public is discouraged. The preservation of public chastity demands the absence of anything that can be associated with female sexuality” (p. 40). He notes that veiling is the instrument through which chastity is preserved and sexuality is repressed (p. 39). In the same vein, Najmabadi (1991) states that in Iran a woman perceived to be lacking effat wears “too much make-up, too short a skirt, too tight a pair of pants, too low-cut a shirt. [She is] too loose in her relations with men, she laughs too loudly and smokes in public” (p. 65).

In many scholarly works (Eshaghi, 2006; Farahani, 2006; Golkar, 2007; Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 2011; Najmabadi, 1991; Tizro, 2013), the anthropological perspective on sexuality has not been able to make a clear distinction between haya and effat, and often descriptions of sexuality in Iranian culture involve enumerating the manifestations that jointly realize both of these moral values. Even research that aims to promote haya and effat from an Islamic perspective explains the relationship between the two moral values in general, metaphoric terms. Eshaghi (2006), relying on religious sayings of the Prophet and Imams (religious leaders), contends that “haya is the origin of effat” (p. 39). Elsewhere, he maintains
that effat is like a curtain protected by the two curtains of haya and hejab” (p. 38). Khadem Pir (2015) briefly mentions that haya and effat are interdependent. “Bihayai [Not having haya] means bieffati [not having effat, being unchaste] and a person who is not pâkdâman [morally pure] is called bihaya [lacking haya]” (p. 131). The vague relationship between haya and effat seems to arise from focusing mainly on the external representations of these forces in society without paying sufficient attention to their cognitive and linguistic representations, which can illustrate the specific underlying semantic structure associated with haya and effat and highlight the differences that might exist between them. It is important to know whether haya and effat are in fact parts of the same self-regulating force or they are associated with two different conceptual structures, overlapping only when the sexuality of individuals is to be controlled.

The last moral value to be analyzed is hejab. Hejab refers to “the institution of veiling or the actual veil itself, worn by some Muslim women to meet the Islamic emphasis on modesty” (Lindkvist, 2008, p. 170). Hejab literally means a cover or screen that separates two things (www.vajehyab.com). In Persian dictionaries (Dehkhoda, Amid, and Mo’in), hejab is defined as a) dar pardeh kardan ‘to conceal’, b) bâzdashtan ‘to impede/to prevent’, c) chador, borgha ‘pieces of clothing that women wear to cover up their hair and body’ d) efâf va haya ‘the state of having haya and effat’ (www.vajehyab.com). An important point with regard to the meanings of hejab in the dictionaries is that they seem to reflect the meanings of gheirat, haya, and effat. The verb bâzdashtan ‘to impede/to prevent’ may reflect the meaning of haya and gheirat, and the verb dar pardeh kardan ‘to conceal’ might represent the meaning of effat. The dictionary meanings of hejab imply that these concepts might be interrelated.

Wearing the veil marks the transition from childhood to adulthood, donned at the onset of puberty (Lindkvist, 2008, p. 171). The Quran (24: 30) commands women to cover their body modestly:

And say to the believing women that they should cast down their eyes and guard their private parts; that they should not display their beauty and ornaments except what must (ordinarily) appear thereof; that they should draw their veil over their bosoms and not display their beauty except to their husbands (and certain family members) (cited in Jawad et al., 2011, p. 34).

According to Milani (1992), the Quran discusses veiling in general terms and does not specify the limits and details of women’s covering. Therefore, the interpretation of hejab
depends on women’s interpretation of religious scripture and teachings. (p. 21). Many scholars agree that veiling is much more than an article of clothing. Veiling symbolizes modesty and chastity; it refers to women’s comportment and demeanor; it indicates the ways in which people relate to and interact with each other; it is the expression of culturally defined boundaries; it defines one’s Muslim identity, serves to challenge stereotypes, and it is a source of liberation for many Muslim women (Afkhami, 1995; Ahmed, 1992; Farahani, 2002; Hessini, 1994; Hoodfar, 2003; Milani, 1992; Williams & Vashi, 2007).

Milani (1992) notes that \textit{hejab} functions not only as a visible barrier between the sexes but also maintains the social order (p. 40). She adds that veiling constrains relations and creates a sense of confinement that is not exclusive to women. In her words:

In the absence of [the veil], men who are used to it become uncomfortable, their personal interactions with women problematized. Previously delineated boundaries blur. Masculine territory becomes indistinct in outline or shape as women invade forbidden physical and mental spaces. Order turns into chaos (1992, p. 26).

The image that the definitions of the concepts provide is that \textit{gheirat}, \textit{haya}, \textit{effat} and \textit{hejab} are probably interrelated. Moreover, the definitions reveal that these moral values represent a system of internal as well as external protection and censorship; they are involved in the evaluation of the behavior of Iranians and they operate on the body. The thesis aims to shed light on the cognitive and linguistic aspects of the Persian moral values, that is, aspects which have not received sufficient attention in research on sexuality in Iranian culture. A cognitive linguistic analysis might contribute to shedding light on the complexity and interrelationship of the Persian concepts. To these ends, conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy, categorization, embodiment, and cultural models could lend a hand to discover how these moral values are connected and conceptualized. Furthermore, they might illuminate the way they evaluate the morality of individuals and impact the body. To achieve these goals, each of the concepts (GHEIRAT, HAYA, EFFAT, and HEJAB) is individually analyzed in detail and the conceptualizations of each concept are examined across contexts of use. The conceptualizations are expected to show the range of functions each one of the concepts performs and reveal the conceptual cluster that is assumed to be involved in disciplining the sexuality of Iranians.

1.4 Data and methodology

Data related to \textit{gheirat}, \textit{haya}, and \textit{effat} were collected from the online version of the Persian newspaper \textit{Kayhan} at \url{www.kayhan.ir}. \textit{Kayhan} is a state-funded newspaper, which reflects the
The corpus consists of 611 extracts in total (gheirat 351, haya 110, and effat 150 extracts). Each word was individually searched in the search box. The results for each word were separately examined and categorized using a similar method. First, lexical collocates (e.g., haya va âberu ‘haya and face/public image’, hojb va haya ‘inhibiting/covering and haya’, gheirat va hasâstat ‘gheirat and sensitivity, effat va pâkdâmâni ‘effat and moral purity’) and the wider linguistic context surrounding these words were examined manually to discover the characteristic properties (e.g., modesty and mindfulness as salient features of haya) as well as the major conceptual domains (e.g., EFFAT, GHEIRAT, ÂBERU, and SANCTITIES) that interact with them. This was carried out by grouping collocations in terms of whether they denoted a feature of these concepts or a major domain interacting with them. In this study, a lexical collocate is defined as a lexical item that co-occurs with and is linked to a given key word by the conjunction word va ‘and’. On the basis of this definition, lexical items co-occurring with gheirat, haya, and effat through the conjunction word va ‘and’ (e.g., gheirat va nâmus ‘gheirat and female family members’, gheirat va imân ‘gheirat and faith’, haya va âberu ‘haya and face/public image’, haya va hejab ‘haya and veiling, effat va khishtandâri ‘effat and self-control’, and effat va pâkdâmâni ‘effat and moral purity’) were taken to be the lexical collocates of the key words. The assumption was that systematic
co-occurrences of lexical items are an indication and evidence of a possible underlying conceptual link between them (Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2007, p. 423).

Next, metaphorical uses of the words were identified using Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). Criteria for identifying linguistic metaphors in this study are (a) a contrast between the contextual meaning of a word or phrase and its basic meaning and (b) understanding the contextual meaning based on a comparison with its basic meaning. For example, in the sentence *he put haya aside and revealed the real face of these people*, the contextual meaning of *haya*, being a cover or barrier, is in contrast with its basic meaning, that is, refraining from breaking taboos, which is likened to a COVER or BARRIER, hence the metaphor HAYA IS A COVER/BARRIER. Then, metaphorical linguistic expressions were grouped together in terms of the metaphorical source domains that they evoked in order to determine the frequency of occurrence of the conceptual metaphors. For instance, in the case of *haya*, such words and expressions as *morede hajme gharar dadan* ‘attacking’, *neshâne raftan* ‘targeting’, and *az bein bordan* ‘obliterating’ picture social and religious prohibitions as OPPONENTS of *haya*. Therefore, they were grouped as instantiations of the SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROHIBITIONS ARE OPPONENTS OF HAYA conceptual metaphor. Finally, major conceptual metaphors abstracted from the linguistic instances were analyzed in terms of Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

Data related to *hejab* consisted of 10 billboards and 46 *hejab* posters. The *hejab* billboards are put up in high traffic areas, especially on main squares. They can also be found along highways. They can be seen from far away and attract the attention of passing vehicles and pedestrians. The billboards and posters comprise a significant part of the Hejab and Chastity Plan promoted by the Islamic Republic (Golkar, 2015) and their significance for the research is that they address crucially important aspects (i.e., individual, familial, social, religious, and political) of the conceptual category of HEJAB. The *hejab* statements on the billboards and posters, in fact, present a helpful summary of the domain of SEXUALITY (as construed by the political-religious conservatives) and vividly demonstrate the principal functions of *hejab* through metaphorical language. Also, through these linguistic statements, we can find the conceptual relationships that might exist between *hejab* and other important concepts in the domain of SEXUALITY.

Pictures of the billboards and posters were not included in the thesis as I could not obtain the permission of the publishing companies in Iran. Therefore, a multimodal analysis
was not conducted and instead, the focus was placed on the linguistic content of the billboards and posters. The billboards were collected through googling ‘hejab billboards in Iran’ and the hejab posters were gathered from www.hijab-poster.blogfa.com. This website is administered by a team of poster designers called goruhe saiberi e tarvije hejab va efâf ‘The Cyber Group Promoting Hejab and Chasity’ (www.iranwire.com, 12/04/2014). The data were collected over a period of approximately three years (from 07/2012 to 05/2015). Only those billboards or posters which include a hejab-encouraging statement have been recorded. The linguistic instances were grouped according to the major target meanings of the conceptualizations. Then, statements in each group were examined to find linguistic metaphors. Similar to gheirat, haya, and effat, metaphors of hejab were identified according to Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz, 2007).

Although the two types of samples represent two pragmatically different situations, they have some features in common. First, they both aim to promote Islamic moral values. In both, Iranian men and women observing moral values are praised and those violating the Islamic norms are criticized. Second, they reflect the same ideological perspective (i.e., the conservative perspective). However, the main difference between the two samples is that the billboards and posters combine text and image to communicate the message to the envisaged addressees (i.e., the modestly dressed and immodestly dressed women), whereas in the data sample collected from Keyhan, the message is conveyed only through linguistic modality and the texts intend to address a wider audience, incorporating ordinary people (men and women), politicians, officials, artists, intellectuals, etc. Also, in the billboards and posters, much of the conceptual content of the domain of sexuality is presupposed and the hejab mottos are assumed to evoke cultural and religious concepts connected to hejab, whereas in the newspaper, the connections between the concepts are traceable through their linguistic realizations in the texts. Despite the fact that visual elements have not been incorporated in the analysis, the verbal messages are conceptually rich enough to examine the relationship between hejab and other concepts.

Determining the level of specificity of both source and target meanings of hejab metaphors was a difficult task given the sensitivity of the topic and the risk of unintentional manipulation of the intended meanings. For instance, in humans set a password on their valuable things, I have chosen VALUABLE THINGS as the source domain of WOMEN ARE VALUABLE THINGS rather than THINGS, or in If there wasn’t any protection for the flower, it wouldn’t remain refreshing and beautiful, I have chosen FLOWER rather than
PLANTS as the source label (in the WOMEN ARE FLOWERS), since shifting to a more general concept would have changed the positive connotations of the lexical items and might have turned them into anti-woman mottos, especially when interpreted by a non-Iranian readership. As for the target domains, the major challenge was to identify the relevant target domains especially in cases where concepts of MEN and WOMEN were assumed to be the target meanings. For instance, deciding whether such source domains as FLIES or DEVILS are applied to men in general or a category of men (corrupt men). In order to resolve the problem, I relied on the broader cultural-religious context within which these statements are constructed and interpreted. Given the ideal image of a Muslim Iranian man as depicted by religious conservatives, a Muslim man is assumed to be a person who does not gaze at nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ women and avoids extramarital relationships (Farahani, 2002; Milani, 1992). Based on these criteria, men outside this category (lacking these features) are assumed to be corrupt, that is, they do not see extramarital relationships or gazing at nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ women as a sin, and those assumed to possess the features are excluded from what the metaphor refers to. Therefore, it seems that the poster designers have considered the category of corrupt men as the target meaning of the negative conceptualizations.

When identifying metaphorical expressions, I did not use a second coder. However, I reanalyzed the metaphor candidates a few times during the preparation of the research, which resulted in modifying the conceptual labels of many of the identified metaphors. The more accurate assessment of the examples was facilitated by involving broader cultural and religious contexts in cases where the immediate context did not give sufficient clues.

This study adopts a top-down approach to analyze the Persian concepts. The main goal in the thesis is not identifying an exhaustive list of conceptual metaphors that conceptualize the Persian key concepts but finding out how a select number of conceptual metaphors reveal their principal cognitive-cultural functions across contexts of use. For this reason, the metaphor analysis of the Persian concepts deals first with those metaphors that address the cognitive-cultural tasks of the concepts rather than the ones which feature in the data as the most important in terms of their frequency of occurrence. In other words, the identified metaphors are analyzed to see “to what extent and what content metaphors contribute to the conceptualization of abstract concepts, as well as their cognitive representations” (Kövecses, 2011, p. 33). The other reason for adopting a top-down approach in this research is that it provides additional details of postulated conceptual mappings by
examining patterns in a large number of linguistic expressions (Charteris-Black, 2004; Deignan, 2005; Kövecses, 2011; Krennmayr, 2013; Semino, 2005). The same approach has been adopted for examining the lexical collocates. The analysis of the lexical collocates is not on the basis of their frequency of occurrence. The most important goal was to identify the interacting conceptual domains, features, and functions of the key concepts through lexical collocations.

1.5 Aims and hypotheses

In general, this research seeks to find out how a set of key concepts regulates the interpersonal relationship between men and women in Iranian culture and examine the role of cognitive processes (metaphor, metonymy, and categorization), embodiment, social-cultural factors, and discourse in the conceptualizations of the Persian key concepts. As stated earlier, *gheirat, haya, effat*, and *hejab* are considered the main components of Iranian identity and are major tools for controlling the sexuality of Iranians (Eshaghi, 2006; Farahani, 2006; Goldin, 2015; Haeri, 2014; Milani, 1992). The cultural significance assigned to these concepts and their involvement in controlling sexuality trigger some questions, which the research aims to answer:

1. Are these concepts interrelated?
2. Do they form a conceptual cluster and operate together?

On the basis of the above research questions, the first hypothesis of the thesis is postulated as follows:

The concepts of GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, EFFAT ‘chastity’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’ are interrelated and in regulating the sexuality of Iranian men and women, these concepts operate in the form of a cluster and jointly fulfill their functions.

If these concepts are indeed interrelated, the analysis of each of the concepts should reveal the conceptual cluster that they form in the course of placing restrictions on the sexuality of Iranian men and women.

The second goal of the study is to discover how these concepts are connected to each other and what role(s) each concept plays within the hypothetical cluster responsible for restricting the sexuality of Iranians. It is important to see how a cognitive linguistic analysis can contribute to discovering the conceptual relationships and cognitive functions of the key
concepts. The cognitive linguistic approach should enable us to uncover the internal structure and contextual functions of each concept, account for the similarities and differences that these concepts have with their most related concepts either in their internal structure (e.g., the difference between *gheirat* and anger, *haya* and shame, and the difference between *effat* and *hejab*) or with a neighboring concept within the cluster (e.g., the difference between *haya* and *effat*). The questions that are raised when thinking of such conceptual relationships are: Would it be possible to provide an account of these concepts without making use of metaphor and metonymy? Given the highly abstract nature of these concepts, to what extent can metaphor analysis reveal the functions of these concepts and indicate the similarities and differences that exist among them? These questions direct us to postulate the second hypothesis:

Cognitive linguistics is indispensable to the study of key concepts and it can account for the interrelationship between the Persian key concepts.

### 1.6 Structure of the thesis

The thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter one introduces the concepts under investigation and presents their definitions in Persian dictionaries as well as in sociological and anthropological studies. Chapter two deals with the theoretical framework of the study and provides an overview of the research conducted on cultural key words and emotion concepts. The chapter also examines the conceptual tools of cognitive linguistics used in the thesis. Chapter three studies the concept of GHEIRAT and its contextual use in the data sample. Chapter four studies the conceptualizations of HAYA and its relationship with shame. Chapter five shows how EFFAT is conceptualized in different contexts and how it disciplines the body and behavior. Chapter six analyzes the concept of HEJAB and demonstrates the way a system of self-regulating forces produces *hejab*. Chapter seven discusses the findings and implications of the dissertation.
Chapter 2: Theory and past approaches

This chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study and deals with explaining the major tenets of the theories that are most relevant to the analysis of the Persian concepts. The first section introduces the conceptual tools that are used to analyze the Persian concepts. In the second section, definitions of cultural key words, approaches to analyzing key words, and criteria for identifying culturally significant concepts (in other studies as well as in this study) are introduced. The third section focuses on the relationship between metaphor and context (Kövecses, 2015). The fourth section provides an overview of important theoretical models of emotions.

2.1 Conceptual tools used in the thesis

This section introduces the conceptual tools (metaphor, metonymy, categorization, cultural models, and embodiment) which will be used to analyze the Persian cultural key concepts and attempts to demonstrate their significance by providing examples from the data. In both cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics, these conceptual tools are used to examine the interrelationship between language, culture, and cognition (Kövecses, 2005, Maalej, 2004; Sharifian, 2011, 2017; Yu, 1998). The assumption is that many features of human languages are entrenched in as well as reflect aspects of culture and cognition (Kövecses, 2005; Sharifian, 2011). Therefore, these conceptual tools may help find out how various elements of the cultural model of SEXUALITY are connected to each other and how the conceptualizations represent norms, values, beliefs, and expectations pertaining to this segment of Iranian culture.

2.1.1 Metaphor

In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, metaphor is defined as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 4). The main components of a metaphor are referred to as source and target domains. Source domain is a more concrete, physical domain of experience which is employed to make sense of the target, which is less physical and more abstract. The source and the target domain are connected by a set of conceptual correspondences or mappings. A conceptual metaphor has linguistic realizations, which are called metaphorical linguistic expressions. These expressions are used
to talk about the target domain (Kövecses, 2015, p. 2). Metaphorical mappings are partial and a source can highlight only a certain aspect of the target domain. The part of the target that is not highlighted is said to be hidden (Kövecses, 2010, p. 103). The other component of a conceptual metaphor is metaphorical entailment. Metaphorical entailments are a common property of metaphors. In Kövecses’s words, “we have a rich knowledge of the source and [its] constituent elements […]; when rich additional knowledge about a source is mapped onto a target, we call it metaphorical entailment” (ibid, pp. 121–122). Here is one example from the data to explain how metaphoric language is used to encourage Iranian women to observe hejab:

(1) Agar hefâzi barâye gol nabud chenin bâtarâvat va zibâ nemimând.

‘If there wasn’t any protection for the flower, it wouldn’t remain refreshing and beautiful.’

The WOMEN ARE FLOWERS metaphor underlying this expression provides a highly positive image of women by bringing the salient features associated with flowers, namely BEAUTY, SENSITIVITY, TENDERNESS, into correspondence with the target domain of HEJAB. As a result, the social-religious pressures exerted on women to dress modestly in accordance with Islamic guidelines is replaced by women’s inherent physical and psychological traits as the reasons for doing so. Using FLOWER as a source concept conceals any traces of religious motivation for pro-hejab language. Having attributed such features to women through the metaphor, the need arises to protect this tender and beautiful being against threats. This metaphor presents the chador3 as a protective garment that keeps away annoying gazes and sexual abuse. One of the main metaphorical entailments of the metaphor is that improper hejab would lead to moral corruption and the loss of social value, corresponding to the flower withering in the source domain.

Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) work showed that metaphor is indispensable to thought and language, playing a central role in shaping the structure of the human mind. Metaphors are ubiquitous and central to language and thought since they structure the mind by providing conceptual content for understanding many abstract concepts, such as LOVE, LIFE, DEATH, etc. (Lakoff, 1993; Lakoff & Turner, 1989), structure both common and expert knowledge (Boyd, 1993; Kövecses, 2002), are central to abstract thought (Kövecses, 1990; Reddy, 1993;

3. A chador is a black outfit that covers up the whole body from head to toe.
Sweetser, 1990), are grounded in physical experience (Grady, 1997; Lakoff, 1993), and are potentially ideological (Charteris-Black, 2004; Deignan, 2005). The other important characteristic of metaphors is that they are culturally grounded (Gibbs, 2006; Kövecses, 2005; Yu, 1998).

Gibbs (1994, pp.124–125) observes that people speak metaphorically because first, metaphors provide a way to express ideas that cannot be easily or clearly expressed with literal speech (the inexpressibility hypothesis). Second, metaphor provides a compact means of communicating complex configurations of information (the compactness hypothesis). Third, through metaphors, people can convey richer, more detailed, more vivid images of their subjective experience that cannot be expressed by literal language (the vividness hypothesis). As an example, the following hejab linguistic metaphor shows in a compact manner how gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab are engaged in indicating the society’s expectations of a married woman:

(2) Adamizad ruye chizhaye bâarzesh ramz migozarad. Hagh bede ke to ra ba chador bepasandam azizam.

‘Humans set a password on their valuable things. So, darling! You will agree with me why I like you with a chador.’

In this example, the speaker conceptualizes women as VALUABLE THINGS and the chador as a PASSWORD. Since female family members are regarded as the nâmus of the family (i.e., the sexual honor of the family), a man should be sensitive to the way his wife or other female family members dress and behave in public (exhibiting gheirat). In the above example, the speaker (the husband) advises his wife in a gentle manner to conceal her body from other men by wearing a chador, as it is only the husband who can have access to and enjoy the physical beauty of his wife (Haeri, 2014). The wife, on the other hand, is expected to cover up her hair and body in order to show her love and loyalty to her husband, to avoid causing shame for the family (observing haya), to preserve her own âberu ‘face/public image’ and social value by controlling her sexual desire (observing effat). All these forces or moral values collaborate with each other and realize in the piece of clothes which is used for covering up, motivating the production of THE CHADOR IS A PASSWORD metaphor.

The other noticeable function of metaphor is characterizing major aspects of complex concepts (Gibbs, 1994; Kövecses, 1990, 2000). Given that gheirat and haya are complex in
structure, metaphor may help discover various aspects (e.g., the existence, emergence, and intensity aspects) that are associated with these concepts. The following example indicates the way the harm aspect in the conceptual structure of GHEIRAT is metaphorically highlighted. In this example, mingling of the sexes at workplaces is considered to be incongruent with the code of gheirat, which is supposed to be applied to keep men and women segregated. The verb khadsheh dâr shodan ‘being scratched’ provides a metaphorical understanding of the way mingling of the sexes is believed to undermine the sensitivity to the violation of religious taboos via the EMOTIONAL HARM IS PHYSICAL HARM metaphor.

(3) Shahrdar e Tehran nesbat e khadshe dar shodan e gheirat e dini dar surat e hozur e karmandan e zan va mard dar yek otagh hoshdar dad (Keyhan, 26/08/2014).

‘Tehran mayor warned [the officials] that if men and women work in the same room, religious gheirat will be scratched.’

As stated earlier, metaphors are used to “present a particular interpretation of situations and events” (Deignan, 2005, p. 23), which means that metaphors are ideological in nature. In this research, the term ‘ideology’ is used in its neutral sense. As Charteris-Black (2005) defines it:

Ideologies provide coherent and comprehensive representations of reality that serve as the basis for engaging in social life. They are group perceptions that provide a focus to the belief system of the group and an underlying rationale for the forms of action in which members actually engage (p. 21).

Based on the above definition, ideology as a higher-level concept incorporates belief systems linked to both political and religious practices (ibid, p. 21). The metaphors discussed in the research present the worldview of political and religious conservatives in Iran. The conservatives make use of these values metaphorically to establish what is good and bad so as to justify their existence and legitimize their political action inside the country as well as on the international scene.

2.1.2 Metonymy

According to Kövecses and Radden (1998):

Metonymy is a cognitive process in which a conceptual element or entity (thing, event, property), the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity (thing, event, property), the target, within the same frame, domain or idealized cognitive model (ICM). We can conceive of this as a “within-domain mapping” where the vehicle entity is mapped onto the target entity.
For example, in the expression *effat e faraj* ‘chastity of private parts’, the word *faraj* ‘orifice’ (the vehicle) through a metonymic chain stands for or provides mental access to the forbidden act of having sexual intercourse outside of marriage (the target meaning). The first metonymy involved is the PART FOR WHOLE whereby ‘orifice’ stands for the ‘private parts’, which in turn provides mental access to the act of sexual intercourse via the INSTRUMENT INVOLVED IN THE ACTION FOR ACTION metonymy, an instantiation of the more general PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. The metonymies involved operate within a single ICM, frame or domain that is comprised of the private parts and their components, and the actions that are done with the private parts. In this example, *effat* motivates the construction of a religious euphemism using conceptual metonymy.

Metonymy is a property of both conceptual and linguistic system (Gibbs, 1994). Littlemore (2015) points out that we need metonymy because meaning is always underspecified in the sense that it cannot express everything that is relevant to its interpretation. Hence, inferences are needed to specify the intended meaning in context. Also, activating all the knowledge we have of a particular concept is not physically possible; therefore, we tend to focus on a salient aspect of that concept as a point of access to the whole concept (pp. 4–5).

Metonymy is primarily a cognitive phenomenon that can refer to entities or aspects of entities in all modes of expression, such as film, music, and advertisement (Forceville, 2009; Müller, 2008) regardless of whether language is involved. The meaning of metonymy is heavily context-dependent and its recognition highly depends on shared knowledge between the interlocutors in communicative contexts (Langacker, 1993; Littlemore, 2015). Many studies in cognitive linguistics have emphasized the referential function of metonymy (Deignan et al., 2013; Langacker, 2008; Panther & Thornburg, 2002, 2012). However, scholarly works have demonstrated that metonymy performs many other functions in discourse and other forms of symbolic communication; metonymy can be used to perspectivize entities by highlighting some particular features of entities while downplaying others (Croft & Cruise, 2004). It can also be a tool for creating and maintaining coherence and cohesion in discourse through anaphoric reference (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011; Ruiz de Mendoza & Diez Velasco, 2004), can act as a link between what is said and what is meant in indirect speech acts (Panther & Thornburg, 2003), and create social stereotypes (Kövecses, 2006; Lakoff, 1987).
Metonymy is also involved in the construction of euphemisms (Allan & Burridge, 2006; Crespo-Fernández, 2006; Littlemore, 2015). Given that the key cluster in Persian has to do with restricting and censoring taboo aspects of behavior (fear-based, shame-based, and politeness-based taboos) in Iranian culture, it comes as no surprise that many euphemistic expressions might be basically motivated by these moral principles and metonymy would be an ideal tool to attenuate or camouflage unpleasant, distasteful or forbidden topics. Here is one example:

(4) Shoma dar barabr e ta’aroze namus e khodetan che vakoneshi neshan midahid? (Keyhan, 11/09/2016).

‘How would you react if your own nâmus were abused [raped]?

In (4), the phrase ta’aroze namus ‘abusing or raping the nâmus’ euphemistically refers to rape and sexual abuse. The meaning of the phrase rests on the operation of two metonymies. The SUBEVENT FOR WHOLE EVENT metonymy is applied to indirectly refer to sexual rape through the use of the word ta’aroze. The basic meaning of ta’aroze is assaulting or reaching out to something, which can be considered as the subevent that provides mental access to the whole frame of RAPE. On the other hand, the word nâmus metonymically refers to female family members in order to highlight the sanctity associated with women, their crucial position as holders of the family’s honor’, and call attention to the horrendousness of rape. This substitution is facilitated by the SALIENT PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY metonymy.

Metonymy can also play a role in associating physiological and behavioral responses of emotions with the emotions that cause them to emerge (Kövecses, 1986, 1990). For example, blushing, casting down the gaze, and walking modestly (non-erotic or non-arrogant way of walking) are main physiological and behavioral effects that metonymically denote haya ‘self-restraint’ (Milani, 2011) As a further example, the jugular vein sticking out when norms and values are violated metonymically refers to gheirat (Bakhtiar, 2015, p. 286).

Littlemore (2015, p. 90) notes that metonymy contributes to developing strongly established religious beliefs in faith communities, leading members of the community to form opinions about themselves and others in terms of their behavior and belief system. For example, from the perspective of some religious conservatives, hejab stands for the chador (the CATEGORY FOR MEMBER OF CATEGORY metonymy). Moreover, hejab is
believed to be suggestive of effat ‘chastity’ (the HEJAB FOR EFFAT, a realization of the moral general REPRESENTATIVE PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY metonymy), implying that only women who wear the chador and are completely covered up might be viewed as chaste, pure and socially revered (Afshari, 2011, p. 268). This metonymy-based mentality categorizes Iranian women in terms of their hejab status (modestly dressed vs. immodestly dressed), which has given rise to social and political conflicts between proponents and opponents of compulsory hejab in Iran (Ghahramani, 2016). On the other hand, for the opponents of compulsory hejab, hejab might denote a manteau and a headscarf only, which are less strict forms of veiling. From this perspective, hejab may not be the main criterion to evaluate the chastity, moral purity, and social value of a woman (Sardar, 2011, p. 334).

2.1.3 Categorization

Categorization is one of the most basic cognitive devices of the mind for storing and organizing knowledge (Barsalou, 1992; Lakoff, 1987; Rosch, 1978). Categorization is “the ability to identify perceived similarities (and differences) between entities and thus group them together” (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 248). It is mostly an unconscious and automatic process and has been shown to be an indispensable part of thought, perception, speech, reasoning, and action (Lakoff, 1987; Taylor, 1989; Ungerer & Schmid, 2006). Lakoff (1987, p. 6) maintains that categorization is not only classifying things (people, animals, and physical objects), which has led to the impression that categories of the mind fit categories of the world in the classical view. It is also involved in classifying a large proportion of abstract entities, such as events, actions, emotions, spatial relationships, and social relationships, which emerge out of the interaction of the body with physical, social, and cultural environment and also of the operation of imagination mechanisms (metaphor, metonymy, and mental imagery).

There are four major models to define categorization: the classical model, the prototype model, the exemplar model, and the dynamic construal model. Below, I briefly explain the main tenets of these views.

The classical view of categorization holds that categories are defined by necessary and sufficient conditions (or essential features); the members of the category share the same

---

4. A manteau, originally a French word, is a tunic or thin overcoat and is the preferred dress of a large number of young girls and women since it provides more freedom and a better way to show physical beauty.
features; all category members have equal status and categories have sharp and rigid boundaries (Taylor, 1989 in Kövecses, 2006, p. 21). Based on this view, for example, the category of MAN would be defined as HUMAN, ADULT, MALE, and the category of WOMEN as HUMAN, ADULT, --MALE. These semantic features are assumed to be the necessary and sufficient ones to distinguish categories, and for any entities to be assigned to the categories, they need to meet these conditions (possess these features).

Prototype view postulates that categories are defined by prototypes (the best examples of categories) and not by essential features, which means that despite the claims of the classical view, category members do not have equal status and have different degrees of typicality (Kövecses, 2006; Rosch, 1978). Moreover, members of a category are held together by family resemblance relations rather than essential features and category boundaries are in many cases fuzzy rather than fixed and rigid. The fuzzy point is the point at which it becomes unclear whether a given entity is a member of a given category or not. Also, category boundaries are flexible which provides the basis for extending categories creatively and adding new members (Kövecses, 2006, pp. 22–23). These findings were achieved by Eleanor Rosch and her associates (Rosch, 1978; Rosch & Mervis, 1975), who conducted a series of experiments to investigate the internal structure of categories using various techniques (listing members of categories, goodness-of-example rating, priming, etc.). For example, in one experiment (Rosch, 1975), subjects were asked to provide goodness-of-example ratings for between fifty and sixty members of each category (BIRD, FRUIT, VEHICLE, FURNITURE, etc.) based on a seven-point scale. The findings consistently showed that some members of the categories were judged to be more representative than others. For example, robin and sparrow for the BIRD category, orange and apple for the FRUIT category, and chair and sofa for the FURNITURE category were shown to be the most prototypical members.

In the exemplar model, the category is solely represented by previously encountered or stored exemplars and not by the abstract summary of the instances or the schematic representation of the central characteristics associated with category members (Polzenhagen & Xia, 2015, p. 255). On this view, similarity to exemplar memories provides the basis for assigning an entity to a given category (Kövecses, 2006, p. 27).

Dynamic construal approach rejects the notion of fixed categories with permanent representations, which is the main assumption in the traditional view of prototype
categorization (Barsalou, 1983; Croft & Cruse, 2004). In this approach, prototypes are viewed as “variable structures that are created online (i.e., in real time) in context given the goal of the situation” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 27). Barsalou’s (1983) experiment involving ad-hoc categories with no conventional names like ‘things to take on a picnic’ and ‘things on a desk that could be used to pound in a nail’ indicated that the ad-hoc and goal-driven categories that subjects formed in context produced prototype effects just like conventional categories.

The context sensitivity of prototypes brings to the fore the role of culture as a crucial contextual factor. Polzenhagen and Xia (2015, p. 261) maintain that the situatedness of our experiences in culture makes categories not only embodied but also encultured, with prototypes acting as reference points in social cognition. The variation of prototypes across and within cultures shows how stereotypes of different types (national, gender-based, ethnic, etc.) are created (Kövecses, 2006, p. 28) and reveal differential patterns of inference that underlie their representativeness. For example, some ethnic groups in Iran like Lors and Turks are prototypes of gheirat and courage in the context of war and defending the country. However, in some other contexts, the same ethnic groups would be the targets of ethnic jokes by being viewed as prototypes of naivety and lack of intellectual abilities (Abedinifard, 2016).

Studies in cultural linguistics and linguistic anthropology, especially those focusing on kinship terms, demonstrate that in many languages, lexical items instantiate culturally constructed categories that provide significant information as to how cultural norms, values, and social relationships are organized in different speech communities (Arthur, 1996; Degani, 2017; Gaby, 2017; Kronenfeld, 2015). In this regard, Sharifian (2011) reports cultural categories that are denoted by kinship terms in Aboriginal English. He points out that Aboriginal people use the word cousin to refer to all the relatives of their own generation, evoking the sense of solidarity in the interlocutors and the need for being protected by a distant relative in debating situations (p. 54).

The Persian concepts under investigation are important means of evaluating the morality of Iranians (Eshaghi, 2006; Tizro, 2013). Therefore, one important goal is to see how these moral values reflect culturally constructed categories and find out the main categorization system(s) that underlie(s) their linguistic instantiations.
2.1.4 Embodiment

Embodiment “emphasizes the role of the body in grounding and framing cognition within the cultural context” (Yu, 2015b, p. 227). The central claim of the embodiment hypothesis is that the mind is shaped by the body with which we interact with our environment and stresses the continuing and motivating character of the relationship between bodily experience and cognition (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Maalej & Yu, 2011; Rohrer, 2007). Human embodiment is said to shape understanding, reasoning, and speaking. Embodiment can also refer to patterns of behavior that are enacted on the body and expressed in the bodily form (Yu, 2015b, p. 231). Despite the fact that humans have the same biological and physical body, the body and bodily experiences are construed differently across cultures and cannot be defined universally. Cultures attribute different values to various bodily organs and their functions, motivating different conceptualizations and giving rise to varied understandings of the world (Kövecses, 2005; Yu, 2015b). Maalej and Yu (2011) point out that the body has different symbolic properties in different cultures and many elementary bodily experiences are shaped by cultural models. The body, therefore, could provide a basis for understanding cultural systems and exploring the root causes of cultural miscommunications across the globe.

Many scholars have emphasized the sociocultural situatedness of embodiment (Gibbs, 2006, Maalej & Yu, 2011; Maalej, 2004; Sharifian et al., 2008; Sinha & Jensen de Lopez, 2000), suggesting that embodied experience is both informed and constituted by culture. From this point of view, “even image schemas which arise from recurring embodied experiences might have a strong cultural component to them” (Gibbs, 1999, p. 54). Maalej (2004) uses the term “cultural embodiment” to refer to a form of embodiment that is mediated and motivated by cultural imagination. He observes that many of the conventional metaphors in Tunisian Arabic that refer to anger do not show any significant physiological changes when a person is angry and their association with anger originates in specific cultural rituals and experiences. Sharifian et al. (2008) indicate how cultural models display their interpretive function in viewing the body and its role in metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of the mind and its functions. Moreover, various cultural models of the mind are shown to evoke certain regions of the body as the locus of the mind (the abdomen region, the heart region, and the head/brain region).
The most important reason for which embodiment needs to be taken into consideration in this study is that in regulating the sexuality of individuals, the body becomes the object of control (Farahani, 2002), with moral concepts acting to place restrictions on the body and bodily desires in one way or another. One of the concepts exemplifying this function conspicuously is EFFAT, which deals exclusively with bodily-based desires through concealing the body or bodily desires from social and religious taboos. The other equally important reason is that survival in cultural groups is contingent upon displaying the moral concepts through the body. In other words, if a person does not wish to be categorized as lacking these values (i.e., being viewed as biâberu, bieffat, bihaya, bigheirat), which would have dire consequences for their social position, they should demonstrate via the body that they possess haya, gheirat, effat, and âberu. Furthermore, research shows that the body provides source domains for metonymical and metaphorical conceptualizations of abstract concepts (Gibbs, 2006; Kövecses, 2005; Sharifian et al., 2008; Maalej & Yu, 2011). Hence, it is also important to see how image schemas and body part terms reflect aspects of embodiment in metonymical and metaphorical conceptualizations of the Persian concepts. Some examples in the data show that the NEAR-FAR image schema is employed to metaphorically measure the deviation of one’s speech or behavior from the principle of haya by viewing it as a PHYSICAL LOCATION, exemplified by be dur az haya ‘far away from haya’. As another example, in the expression rag e gheirat ‘the vein of gheirat’, the jugular vein metonymically stands for the feeling of gheirat.

2.1.5 Cultural models

A variety of terms have been used across disciplines (linguistics, psychology, and anthropology) to characterize the structure of knowledge in cultures, such as cognitive model (Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987), cultural model (Holland & Quinn, 1987), frame (Fillmore, 1982), cultural schema (Sharifian, 2011, 2015), script (Schank & Abelson, 1977; Wierzbicka, 1997), scenario (Palmer, 1996) among others. Regardless of their differences, all these terms aim to describe the “coherent organization of human experience shared by people” (Kövecses, 2005, p. 193). In Cognitive Linguistics, a cognitive model (or Idealized Cognitive Model) refers to a network of loosely connected knowledge which is embodied, encyclopedic, abstract, usage-based, prototype-based, socially constructed and culture-specific, idealized, and somewhat idiosyncratic. These mental models are said to build up and develop over time as a result of our interactions with other humans as well as the physical, social, and cultural environment. Moreover, the activation of cognitive models largely
depends on context (Croft & Cruse, 2004; Lakoff, 1987; Littlemore, 2015). Cognitive anthropologists view culture as a cognitive system and define cultural models as cognitive schemas that are inter-subjectively shared by a social group (D’Andrade, 1987, p. 112). These knowledge structures are acquired and stored in the individual minds of the members of a community. What is more, linguistic forms express and are interpreted on the basis of cultural models (Dirven et al., 2007, pp. 1216–1217). A frame is “a structured mental representation of a conceptual category” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 64). Frames characterize mental representations that cannot be given as feature lists. According to Kövecses (ibid, pp. 64–68), frames serve to define meaning by relativizing meaning to larger mental representations that a particular word or expression evokes. In addition, similar to Idealized Cognitive Models, frames are prototype-based and idealized (i.e., what they define does not exist in reality). Also, the use of a particular word profiles certain elements of a frame and the frames that are evoked impose a particular perspective on the situation. For cultural linguists, cultural schemas are culturally constructed schemas that are abstracted from the collective cognitions associated with a cultural group (Sharifian, 2015, p. 478). Cultural schema is another term for cultural models. These schemas enable individuals to communicate cultural conceptualizations. Sharifian maintains that cultural schemas are to some extent collective and based on shared experiences, and to some extent idiosyncratic. At the macro-level, cultural schemas arise from the interaction between the members of a cultural group and are constantly negotiated and renegotiated across time and space. At the micro-level, they are acquired and internalized by each individual in a heterogeneously distributed manner. Cultural schemas capture culture-specific meanings that are encoded by lexical items and are necessary to make sense of speech acts across cultures and languages (ibid, 478–480). Scripts and scenarios are cultural models of social action. The term script focuses on fixed sequences involved in social actions, whereas the term scenario highlights the expectations and contingencies associated with social actions (Palmer, 2007, p. 1046).

In order to explain the cognitive and cultural functions of the Persian key concepts and their representations in bodily experience, linguistic structure, and social action, we would need a model that could simultaneously account for the (conceptual) complexity, conceptual interrelationship, and culturally constructed nature of the key concepts. Such a model should also explain the way cultural knowledge associated with the domain of SEXUALITY is heterogeneously represented in the collective mind of Iranians. The terms cognitive model, cultural schema, and cultural model are the ones which seem to contain
some or all of these characteristics and could be taken as candidate terms for the analysis of the Persian concepts. However, among these terms, cognitive model primarily focuses on the cognitive aspects of human experience, subsuming patterns of cultural knowledge (Dirven et al., 2007, p.1205). Moreover, from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, “the individual minds are the primary locus of linguistic and cultural knowledge” (Langacker, 1994, p. 24, emphasis added). Hence, cognitive model might not a suitable term as it does not seem to embrace the notion of “heterogeneous distribution” (Sharifian, 2011), which allows for the explanation of partially shared distribution of schemas in individuals and across members of a social group (Dirven et al., 2007, p. 1205). The other two terms, cultural model and cultural schema, have been adopted by both cognitive anthropologists and cultural linguists (Sharifian, 2011; Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2007; Strauss & Quinn, 1997). Sharifian (2015, p. 479) states that cultural models and cultural schemas closely overlap with each other. Cultural models and cultural schemas are both used as analytical tools to explore cognitive schemas that are culturally constructed, intersubjectively shared, and heterogeneously distributed across members of a social group (D’Andrade, 1987; Sharifian, 2015, 2017). The only difference between cultural models and cultural schemas could be that cultural models are used to represent more general and complex schemas (Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2007; Strauss & Quinn, 1997). On the basis of the definitions of the terms, it seems that cultural model is the most appropriate term for the analysis of the Persian schemas as it bears all the characteristics needed.

One important issue regarding cultural models is the role of metaphors in providing content and structure for the models. Some scholars (e.g., Quinn, 1987) hold that cultural models are formed on the basis of a set of proposition-schemas and the metaphors that cluster around these schemas only reflect the literal cultural models, i.e., metaphors are merely cultural tools that assist in explicating aspects of experience for others and cultural models are non-metaphorically constituted. Quinn’s argument is based on the analysis of the American cultural model of MARRIAGE. Her interview with a number of American couples yielded some proposition-schemas, such as MARRIAGE IS MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL, MARRIAGE IS ENDURING, MARRIAGE IS DIFFICULT, MARRIAGE IS RISKY, and a group of metaphors like MARRIAGE IS JOURNEY and MARRIAGE IS A JOINT ENTERPRISE, which serve to explicate the “proposition-schemas”. She concludes that cultural models are constituted by “cultural postulates” and metaphors are derived from this literal model. Other scholars (Kövecses, 2005; Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987) take the opposite
view, proposing that metaphors are constitutive of cultural models. Kövecses (2005) reanalyzes the cultural model of MARRIAGE and suggests that the cultural model of MARRIAGE is linked to the concept of LOVE, which is itself metaphorically understood as the physical unity of two persons. He argues that the metaphorical structure of love is mapped onto the model of marriage and demonstrates that many of the linguistic expressions in Quinn’s data set are in fact the realizations of the MARRIAGE IS THE PHYSICAL UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS metaphor, which is a more specific-level realization of the higher-level metaphor NON-PHYSICAL UNITY IS PHYSICAL UNITY. Kövecses concludes that the proposition-schemas that Quinn identified in her analysis are themselves derived from the UNITY metaphor, hence, the cultural model of marriage seems to be metaphorically constituted.

Kövecses (2005, p. 215) explicates the relationship between metaphor and cultural models, emphasizing that without metaphors there is no way to account for the content and structure of abstract concepts. The examination of conceptual metaphors that characterize the key concepts should clarify whether metaphor is essential to the structure of such abstract concepts as GHEIRAT, HAYA, EFFAT, and HEJAB. Also, the analysis is expected to demonstrate whether the cultural model of SEXUALITY in Persian is literally or metaphorically constituted.

2.2 Cultural key words

Key words in a culture are “words which are particularly important and revealing in a given culture” (Wierzbicka, 1997, p. 15). Key words represent core cultural values. According to Wierzbicka (ibid), key words can be studied as focal points around which entire cultural domains are organized and through an investigation of these focal points one may be able to show the general organizing principles that lend structure and coherence to a cultural domain as a whole, and also has explanatory power extending across a number of domains (pp.16–17). Williams (1976) defines key words as “significant, binding words in certain activities and their interpretations” and “significant, indicative words in certain forms of thought”. Firth (1957 [1935]) uses the term focal or pivotal words to refer to sociologically important words. Beneviste (1945, p. 336 [in Stubbs, 2001, p. 145]) proposed that the whole history of modern thought and principal achievements of Western intellectual culture are linked to the creation and development of a small number of key words. In many books and articles, Wierzbicka
(e.g., 1992, 1997, 1999) has argued that key words of a language can provide insights into the history and culture of speech communities.

Williams’ (1976) book, *Keywords*, is the best known scholarly work on culturally significant words. This book is a collection of over a hundred words and associated phrases in English. Williams’ study is mainly based on historical evidence from Oxford English Dictionary and the choice of the entries largely reflects the author’s concern for social organization and his interest for key terms in Marxism, such as *revolution*, *alienation*, *capitalism*, and *bourgeois*. His analysis shows how senses of the key words change over time, implying that different meanings are associated with different phrases as well as with different collocations. For example, he analyses the word *standard* and its changing senses from the twelfth century to the present evidenced by such phrases as *royal standard* (meaning a flag and symbol of authority), *standard lamp* and *standard rose* (representing an erect or upright object), *standard textbook* and *standard foot* (reflecting an authoritative example of correctness), *standards* (referring to levels of competence), which are some of the phrases in which the word *standard* is embedded (pp. 296–299). Jay (1998, pp. 2–3) criticizes Williams’ approach for ignoring the illocutionary function of words. He notes that meaning (what words signify) and etymology alone are not sufficient to investigate the history of words and a cultural semantic approach should be attentive to what words do and perform (i.e., the illocutionary function of words), which is determined in context.

Wierzbicka (1997) studies various key words in different cultures using Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). She maintains that culture-laden words of one language cannot be clarified by culture-laden words of another (p. 236), calling attention to the need for constructing a metalanguage independent of the idiosyncratic structure of all individual languages (p. 24). Her approach is based on the assumption that all languages have a common core, which is innate and shaped by universal conceptual system. Wierzbicka holds that universal semantic primitives consisting of nearly sixty categories and parts of speech can be used as a mini-language to exit from the confines of a language and to decode culture-specific meanings (pp. 24–26). Her study concentrates on the semantic analysis of areas of the lexicon where language-specific distinctions reflect specific ways of thinking and living in a given community. She demonstrates the unsuitability of the proposed English glosses for cultural key words through contrasting the semantic structure of the key words in question with the semantic structure of their English equivalents. One of the key words that Wierzbicka analyzes is *enryo*, which expresses one of the most important values in Japanese
culture. In Japanese to English dictionaries, a variety of glosses have been assigned to enryo, such as ‘reserve’, ‘restraint’, ‘hesitation’, ‘deference’, ‘reservation’, ‘modesty’, and ‘shyness’. Wierzbicka notes that the dictionary glosses do not capture the concept as such and only capture the likely motivations of the behavior in question (p. 248). Relying on the comments on this concept in sociological and cultural studies, Wierzbicka lists a set of speech acts that instantiate enryo in communicative situations. She observes that enryo is applied to refrain from expressing disagreements with the majority’s opinion and with one’s addressees in general, which goes against the frankness with which Westerners express their opinion. Enryo also calls for a self-effacement which would stop people from saying what they think, wish, and desire, aiming not to hurt, offend, or embarrass anybody (pp. 243–247). She holds that the model she provides for enryo (and other cultural key words) accounts for all different features of the key word. Nevertheless, the explication she proposes for enryo is a highly abstract representation of the analytical comments on this concept in Japanese culture rather than an abstract representation of the linguistic uses of enryo in discourse contexts. She provides a relatively static account of the meaning of this concept, ignoring alternative prototypes which might exist for enryo (prototypes derived from the pragmatic uses of the key word) in Japanese culture, which in turn would shed lights on other psychological, social, and linguistic functions of the key word. Furthermore, she leaves out the role of the body and cognitive processes (metaphor and metonymy) in structuring the meanings of key concepts.

Stubbs (2001) explores the use of a number of key words like ethnic, racial, tribal, heritage, care in discourses expressing evaluative moral values about different groups of people. His research indicates how corpus methods can provide evidence about the significance of key words in English or how cultural significance may derive from the history of words borrowed from other languages. Stubbs observes that evaluative meanings are expressed not only by individual words but also by longer phrases and co-occurring collocates. Moreover, he points out that discourse patterns demonstrate that evaluative meanings are not merely idiosyncratic but widely shared in discourse community and words or phrases may evoke cultural stereotypes (p. 215).

Cortazzi and Shen (2001) studied six key words in Chinese culture from a contrastive language awareness perspective. The cultural key words included in their study were ren ‘humanity’, li ‘politeness’, xia ‘filial piety’, de ‘virtue’, he ‘harmony’, junzi ‘a decent person or saint’ collected from literary sources. The participants of their study were native speakers
of Chinese, English speaking learners of Chinese and English speakers without knowledge of Chinese. Their study focused on the difficulties language learners may have in understanding the central meanings of cultural key words and perceiving interconnections. They found significant differences between the three groups of participants in terms of understanding the central meanings of the key words and of their awareness of the interrelated and overlapping meanings which constitute part of a belief system relatively alien to cultural outsiders.

Adopting a cultural linguistic perspective, Sharifian (2011, 2017) surveys some of the key words in Persian culture, such as shekasteh nafsi ‘modesty’, aberu ‘face/public image’, tārof ‘ritual courtesy’, and sharmandegi ‘being ashamed’. Sharifian explicates the cultural schemas underlying the key words and shows how these cultural schemas are instantiated in conventional linguistic expressions and motivate Persian speakers to perform certain speech acts in communicative situations. He also demonstrates how these Persian cultural schemas are involved in causing intercultural miscommunications as well as the way in which these schemas are reflected in Persian English, which is an emerging variety of English among Persian speakers. As an example, Sharifian (2011) studies the cultural model of shekasteh nafsi ‘modesty’ in Persian. He notes that the cultural schema of shekasteh nafsi motivates Persian speakers to “negate or scale down compliments, downplay their talents, skills, achievements, etc., and return the compliments to the complimenter” (p. 111). He made use of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and its translated version in English in order to explore how Persian and Australian English speakers respond to compliments and more specifically, how the cultural schema of shekasteh nafsi may be represented in the responses to compliments by Persian speakers. The results showed that Persian speakers largely instantiated the cultural schema in their responses to compliments in both Persian and English, whereas the Australian participants’ responses did not reflect a similar schema though in some cases their responses overlapped with those of Persian speakers in downplaying the trait that was the target of the compliment.

Sharifian and Tayebi (2017) investigate the perceptions of impoliteness among Persian speakers, drawing on discourse analysis and the ethnography of cultural conceptualizations that are applied to different situations in which interlocutors perceive impoliteness. They maintain that conceptualizations of (im)politeness in Persian are associated with the over-arching cultural schema of adab roughly meaning ‘courtesy, politeness, social etiquette, manners’, which is conceptually linked to other cultural conceptualizations, such as shakhsiyat ‘personality and character or one’s effort to construct a
socially acceptable image of himself/herself’, *sho’ur* ‘the cognitive ability to assess social situations properly and act and behave accordingly’, *tarbiyat* ‘upbringing, especially the role of family in one’s upbringing’ (p. 395).

Sharifian and Tayebi (ibid) propose that the macro schema of *adab* ‘politeness’ comprises several lower-level cultural schemas like *shekasteh-nafsi* ‘self-lowering’, *rudarbāyesti* ‘state or feeling of distance out of respect’, *sharmandegi* ‘being ashamed’, *târof* ‘ritual courtesy’, and *âberu* ‘face/public image’. It is argued that Persian speakers draw on these lower-level cultural schemas to express, perceive and evaluate politeness in situational contexts and failure to act according to these schemas can trigger negative evaluations and provoke perceptions of impoliteness (pp. 395–396). The following example from the authors’ data (p. 404) illustrates how breaching the cultural schema of *âberu* is evaluated as offensive by the speaker:

(5) Chand ruz pish, jelo yek pesarâ kelâs ke xeili azash xosham miyâd, Nedâ yeho goft xaste nemishi enghadr kafshât pâshne bolande?! xeili behem barxord, âberum ro bord jelo hame.

‘A couple of days ago, right in front of one of the boys that I have a big crush on, Neda told me that she wonders whether I ever get tired of wearing high heels?! I was really offended because she ruined my *âberu*’.

In this example, according to the authors, the speaker has evaluated her friend’s comment as offensive since the comment has implied a negative remark on her personal qualities (her short height) and threatened the *âberu* of the speaker in the presence of a significant person. Their research shows that Persian speakers often mark their evaluations of impoliteness at the level of meta-discourse and provide details about the nature of the perceived offensive acts or speech at the discourse level.

**2.2.1 Identifying cultural key words**

One issue raised in relation to the study of cultural key words is finding a method for identifying key words. Wierzbicka (1997) maintains that there is no objective procedure for identifying cultural key words. However, she proposes that for the identification of key words it should be established that the word in question is common, is at the center of a whole phraseological cluster, and is frequently used in a particular domain or in book titles, songs, sayings, as well as in other modes of language use (p. 16). For Wierzbicka, the primary issue
is not to prove whether a particular word is a cultural key word or not but rather to show that an in-depth semantic analysis leads to significant insights on that culture (p. 16).

Other scholars, however, claim that cultural key words can indeed be objectively identified (Rigotti & Rocci, 2005; Wolf, 2006; Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2007, 2009). Wolf and Polzenhagen (2007, 2009) suggest that in order to determine the keyness of lexical items, statistical examination of the frequency of lexical items and collocational patterns can provide reliable tools for objectively identifying key words. They note that the systematic co-occurrence of lexical items stemming from a particular domain can be taken as evidence of a possible underlying conceptual link. In other words, collocational patterns are the realizations of parallel conceptual activation patterns (Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2007, p. 423). Wolf and Polzenhagen (2007) apply this method to explore the conceptualization of leadership, witchcraft, and wealth in the framework of the African community. They combine cognitive analysis and the comparative corpus analysis to provide a more comprehensive image of the community model in African varieties of English. Their study shows that the L2 varieties of English have become indigenized and can function as a medium for the expression of non-Western culture.

In this research, I rely on some clues (linguistic properties of the Persian key concepts and their realizations across modalities) in order to provide evidence as to the keyness of the concepts under study. First, Persian marks many of its cultural key words with two prepositions, bālbi ‘with/without’, that appear in compound adjectives as prefixes. These two prepositions are major means of categorizing individuals in Iranian culture in terms of perceived existence or lack of cultural values in individuals (Goldin, 2015). Such adjectives as bāhejab/bihejab ‘having or lacking hejab’, bāâberul/biâberu ‘having or lacking public image or face’, bâhayâ/bihaya ‘having or lacking haya’, bâgheirat/bigheirat ‘having or lacking gheirat’ are linguistic manifestations of bā-bi categorization. A person perceived to possess such features is culturally appreciated and admired, and the perceived non-existence of the features is culturally despised. Hence, the adjectives containing bā are compliment terms and those containing bi are used to insult the person in question. Second, in Persian, the relationship between core cultural values and their most related concepts is manifested through lexical collocations (Bakhtiar, 2015), such as haya va effâf ‘haya and chastity’, hojb o haya ‘inhibiting/covering and haya’, gheirat va nâmus ‘gheirat and female family members’, hejab va effâf ‘hejab and chastity’, gheirat va hassâsiyat ‘gheirat and sensitivity’, effat va salâmat ‘effat and [moral] health’, haya va imân ‘haya and faith’. These lexical
collocations realize various underlying conceptual relationships. Linguistic items collocating with the key words specify the characteristic properties of the key concepts, the interacting domains, and the effects of applying the moral values (i.e., the key words). For example, the word *hassāsiyat* ‘sensitivity’ in *gheirat va hassāsiyat* ‘gheirat and sensitivity’ profiles a defining feature of *gheirat*; in *haya va imân* ‘haya and faith’, *haya* gets connected to faith by being considered as a main component of or a prerequisite for religious faith; the word *salāmat* ‘health’ in *effat va salāmat* ‘effat and moral health’ profiles moral health as the immediate effect of observing chastity. Third, these concepts are simultaneously represented in thought, speech, body, and behavior (Milani, 1992). For example, the concept of *HAYA* is represented in the mind through a number of metaphors like *HAYA IS A BARRIER* and *HAYA IS A CURTAIN*; it is linguistically realized in such expressions as *haya râ kenâr gozâshtan* ‘putting *haya* aside’[deliberately violating *haya*], *pâreh kardan e pardeye haya* ‘tearing down the curtain of *haya*’[violating *haya* in a rude way]; it is manifested in the body and behavior through shrinking, casting down the gaze, maintaining physical distance with the other, observing *hejab* ‘veiling’, lowering the voice, speaking politely, silence, and so on. It is extensively applied to show respect to the other, preserve social relationships, avoid causing shame for the self and the other, display modesty, censor out taboo speech, and so on (Milani, 2011).

### 2.3 Morality and moral emotions

The concepts analyzed in this study are, first and foremost, moral values, which provide the grounds for moral evaluation and moral judgment in Iranian society (Eshaghi, 2006, 2009; Milani, 1992). Two of the moral values, i.e., *gheirat* and *haya*, are emotion concepts that bear the characteristics of “moral emotions” (Haidt, 2003; Kroll & Egan, 2004). The question which might arise here is that which emotions can be regarded as moral emotions? And more specifically, which properties of *gheirat* and *haya* qualify to be moral emotions and not just emotion concepts?

Mulligan (2009) maintains that those emotions which present their object as instantiating a certain moral value might be said to be moral. For example, *gheirat* presents certain acts as humiliating, insulting, unfair, and against religious norms. Or *haya* presents certain acts and activities as socially and religiously prohibited (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014; Pasandideh, 2004). Hence, in this sense both of the emotions are moral. Haidt (2003) defines moral emotions as those “that are linked to the interests or welfare either of society as a
whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent” (p. 276). Both *haya* and *gheirat* serve the purposes of preserving the social value of individuals, maintaining social order, and providing the welfare of individuals in society (Eshaghi, 2006, 2009). Kroll and Egan (2004) hold that moral emotions provide the motivational force to do good and to avoid doing bad. Both *gheirat* and *haya* are powerful sources of motivation for moral beliefs to translate into corresponding actions. For example, *gheirat* drives one to protect the sexual honor of the family by fighting with the offenders or *haya* motivates the person to keep physical distance from a *nâmahram* ‘non-intimate’ (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014; Eshaghi, 2009). In yet another sense, to the extent that the occurrences of emotions can be the targets of moral evaluations and the agents can be praised or blamed on the basis of their emotional responses they can be said to be moral or immoral (Cova et al., 2015, p. 398). Exhibiting *haya* and *gheirat* provides the ground for evaluating a person’s individual and social value, which is carried out through categorizing individuals in terms of whether they are perceived to possess (being *bâgheirat* and *bâhaya*) or lack (being *bigheirat* and *bihaya*) these moral values (Goldin, 2015; Limbert, 1987). Given the above definitions for moral emotions, it seems that *haya* and *gheirat* fall neatly into the category of moral emotions.

Cognitive linguists argue that moral cognition is not simply the product of abstract reasoning but rather is modeled after our interaction with the physical and social world, emphasizing that moral reasoning is largely metaphorical in nature (Kövecses, 2005; Johnson, 1993; Lakoff, 1996; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Yu, 2015a, 2016). Research in areas of study other than linguistics also points to the metaphorical nature of moral cognition (Haidt, 2003; Haidt et al., 1993; Meier & Robinson, 2004; Zhong & House, 2014). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), morality in its basic form is concerned with human well-being (our own well-being and that of others), which includes things like health, wealth, strength, balance, protection, nurturance, and so on. For this reason, morality and immorality are metaphorically conceptualized in terms of what people believe is important to their well-being (pp. 291–292). Johnson (1993) observes that metaphor is essential to our moral understanding at two basic levels: a) our most important moral concepts (e.g., will, action, purpose, rights, duties, and laws) are metaphorically defined b) morally problematic situations are understood via metaphorical conceptualizations (p. 33).

Jäkel (2002) explores the instantiations of the JOURNEY metaphor in the Old Testament of Bible. He observes that the JOURNEY metaphor in the Bible draws a dichotomous distinction between two ways of life, the good, moral life and the bad, immoral
life (p. 25). Jäkel shows how this dichotomy applies to various aspects of the metaphorical model, such as types of paths, kinds of travelers involved, and God’s roles in the metaphorical scenario. For example, moral journey is conceptualized by the LEADING A MORAL LIFE IS MAKING A JOURNEY ON GOD’S WAY and SINNING IS DEVIATION/SWERVING FROM GOD’S WAY metaphors; alternative paths are pictured by the GOD’S WAY IS A STRAIGHT PATH and EVIL WAYS ARE CROOKED metaphors. Characteristics ascribed to types of travelers (the righteous and the wicked) are: THE RIGHTEOUS TAKE HEED OF THEIR WAY, THE RIGHTEOUS KEEP A STRAIGHT WAY, THE WICKED ARE IGNORANT OF GOD’S WAY, and THE WICKED LAY TRAPS FOR THE RIGHTEOUS. Moreover, God’s roles are depicted by GOD IS THE GUIDE, GOD GUARDS THE PATH AND PRESERVES THE WAY, GOD TEACHES THE RIGHTEOUS HIS WAY, and GOD OBSTRUCTS THE WAY OF THE WICKED (pp. 25–31).

In a corpus linguistic research, Pavlović (2012) focused on the nouns and adjectives that describe the state of cleanliness and its absence in English and Serbian. The main objective of the study was to find out which abstract domains are structured by the domain of PHYSICAL CLEANLINESS. Her research indicates that MORALITY and SEXUALITY are the prominent target domains that are metaphorically structured by the domain of PHYSICAL CLEANLINESS. The metaphor MORALITY IS CLEANLINESS is realized by the English adjective clean and its Serbian counterpart čist, which metaphorically refer to virtuous behavior and actions in general. Moreover, the negative pair (dirty, filthy/prljav) instantiates the IMMORALITY IS DIRT conceptual metaphor in both English and Serbian. The research also finds that in English, open manifestations of sexual desire (i.e., words, conducts, actions, feelings, and people exhibiting such conducts) are metaphorically conceptualized as DIRT (P. 35).

Yu (2016) studies the linguistic patterns in Chinese that realize a subsystem of spatial metaphors for morality. His research indicates that the central metaphor MORALITY IS SPATIALITY summarizes the subsystem for morality metaphors in Chinese. It is also shown that the identified conceptual metaphors (e.g., MORAL IS HIGH vs. IMMORAL IS LOW, MORAL IS STRAIGHT vs. IMMORAL IS CROOKED, MORAL IS LEVEL vs. IMMORAL IS UNLEVEL, and MORAL IS BIG vs. IMMORAL IS SMALL) emerge from the image schemas of UP-DOWN, BALANCE, PATH, and OBJECT. Yu also demonstrates
the way prototypical target aspects of MORAL and IMMORAL are addressed by the spatial metaphors.

Given that the Persian concepts analyzed in this research represent some of the most important moral values in Iranian culture (Eshaghi, 2006, 2009; Milani, 1992, 2011; Tizro, 2013) and given the metaphorical nature of moral concepts (Johnson, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), it is expected that similar to moral concepts in other cultures, aspects of well-being (e.g., health, strength, and protection) will be among the major source domains involved in their metaphorical conceptualizations. The following examples from the data show how the concepts of GHEIRAT and EFFAT fulfill their role with respect to perceived immorality.

Example (6) narrates the story of a Muslim young man who had allegedly touched a woman in a sexual way. The Prophet hears of what he had done and admonishes him for neglecting gheirat, encouraging him to amend his conducts. In this example, the word āludegi ‘pollution’ metaphorically refers to the forbidden act via the MORAL CORRUPTION IS ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION metaphor. The text emphasizes the monitoring and prohibitive roles of gheirat in preserving morality in a Muslim society. The verb phrase shokufā kardan e gheirat ‘to make the gheirat bloom’ [to encourage one to exercise gheirat] depicts the emergence of gheirat as a FLOWER, which provides a positive evaluation of exercising gheirat. The metaphor entails that sins are committed when gheirat is passive in Muslims (corresponding to the BUD in the source domain). It is also understood from the text that repenting from sins and restoring moral order are facilitated by applying gheirat, which operates to stop Muslims from violating moral values and reminds them of their moral duties.

(6) Payambar dar in hadese ba shokufa nemudan e gheirat e an javan, ou ra nahi e az monkar kard va ou dar partov e gheirat az aludegi nejat yaft (Keyhan, 04/01/2016).

‘In that incident, the Prophet forbade the young man from committing sins by making his gheirat bloom and he could survive from [moral] pollution in the light of gheirat.’

Example (7) refers to the controversial plan of Tehran ex-mayor, Mohammad Bagher Ghalibaf, for separating workers by gender (www.al-monitor.com, 18/07/2014). The use of pishgiri ‘prevention’ and darmân ‘cure’ in the last clause provides the clue to set up the MORAL CORRUPTION IS DISEASE metaphor, whereby mingling of the sexes at the
workplace is depicted as the cause of the disease. Furthermore, the text seems to consider gender mixture as a threat to the *effat* ‘chastity’ and *esmat* ‘moral purity’ of individuals, implying that these moral values are more likely to be preserved if men and women are separated from each other.

(7) Har no barnamehrizi dar in zamineh be in khater ast ke be *effat* va esmat e anan sianat e bishtari bakhshand va in no karha janbeye pishgiri darad ke behtar az darman ast *(Keyhan, 11/08/2014)*.

‘Any kind of planning in this regard would aim at providing more protection to their *effat* and *esmat* and such plans have preventive aspects, which are better than cure.’

The relationship between metaphor and morality in Iranian culture will be discussed in more detail in chapter seven.

**2.4 Metaphor and context**

Context can be defined as conceived relevant features of the situation in the form of an abstract mental schema *(Widdowson, 2007)*. This status grants the elements of context a prototype-based and dynamic structure. It means that the contextual elements activated in the course of communication constantly receive various degrees of significance (or relevance) and hence have different effects on the meaning production and comprehension *(Kövecses, 2015)*. Relying on the representational nature of knowledge in human mind, *Van Dijk* (2008) formulates a theory of context in which he proposes that the contextual content is represented in the mind as a pragmatic frame called “context model”. This model is the abstraction of the situation in which communication takes place. According to *Van Dijk*, these context models control the way the speaker adapts the utterance to the communicative environment through the subjective interpretation of the social environment by the participants (p. 219). He suggests that out of the rich knowledge associated with each social situation, conceptualizers pick out only a few relevant properties, such as the setting, the ongoing situation, and the participants (their identities, roles, relations, goals, and knowledge) for speaking or writing (p. 220).

Metaphorical analysis of the four concepts in this research is based on Kövecses’s (2015) account of metaphor in context. Kövecses (2015) relying on *Van Dijk* (2008) readdresses the issue of context by taking the context model as the principal factor that primes the construction of metaphorical meaning in discourse. The central point in
Kövecses’s approach to metaphorical meaning is that metaphor does not simply arise from systematic correspondences between two domains on the basis of correlations in experience or resemblance, but rather from the joint operation of a set of contextual factors (Kövecses, 2015, p. 1). This point is clearly supported by the study of the metaphors in the research. Kövecses’s account of metaphor in context is perfectly adapted to the analysis of the Persian concepts as it gives weight to both local and global aspects of context, i.e. to more immediate features of the situation as well as elements of relative stability, such as cultural norms and values. This, however, does not mean that all the factors are equally relevant to the construction of a given metaphoric meaning. This method serves the purpose of questioning the stereotypical definitions that are given for key concepts in anthropological and lexical semantic approaches, helping instead shed light on various associations and functions that such complex concepts in Persian have built in. The most important contribution of this account to the analysis of the Persian key concepts is that it helps indicate their different cognitive and social functions. Kövecses proposes four types of contexts that influence the construction of metaphors in discourse, which are introduced below.

2.4.1 Situational context

The situational context is the physical, social, and cultural situation in which metaphorical conceptualization takes place. The physical setting includes the physical circumstances, the viewing arrangement and the salient properties of the environment. The elements of the physical context do not, according to my analysis, have any immediate effect on the formation of the metaphors used. The social situation includes role relationships such as husband vs. wife and power relations. The principle of sex segregation which keeps men and women segregated in the social space (Haeri, 2014) could be a relevant feature of the social context influencing the figurative conceptualizations of the Persian concepts in this study. COVER and BARRIER metaphors can be taken as evidence as to how sex segregation influences the metaphorical conceptualizations of gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab. These concepts specify men and women’s roles toward each other and clarify the legitimate physical, social, and emotional distance that should exist between men and women (Eshaghi, 2006; Milani, 1992; Tizro, 2013). The cultural situation comprises the dominant values and characteristics of the members of a group, key concepts governing their lives and the various products of a culture such as TV shows and films (Kövecses, 2015, p. 59). A large part of the conceptual structure of the key concepts seems to be under the influence of the cultural context and its constituent elements.
2.4.2 Discourse context

The discourse context includes the co-text (linguistic context) that surrounds a particular metaphor used, intertextuality, dominant forms of discourse in a society, and knowledge about the main elements of the discourse (the speaker, hearer, and topic). For example, in the following text, the verb mâne shodan ‘to impede’ in the same linguistic context metaphorically defines the role of haya in protecting women’s moral purity via the HAYA IS A BARRIER metaphor.

(8) Haya mâne’ az gereftar shodan e zan dar dâm e mardan e shahvatran va zamene pakdamani e oust (Keyhan, 20/08/2014).

‘Haya impedes women from getting stuck in the trap of lustful men and guarantees their purity’.

As another example, the hejab discourse is a predominant discourse in Iranian society propagated by the conservative politicians and religious authorities (Farahani, 2002; Mir-Hosseini, 2007). This discourse introduces hejab as a protective cover and barrier (Farhani, ibid). In the data, for example, the HEJAB IS AN UMBRELLA or LUST IS VIRUS metaphors can be taken as novel conceptualizations that reflect this construal of hejab.

2.4.3 Cognitive-conceptual context

The experiential knowledge represented by frames, as a major part of the conceptual system, acts as a contextual factor in metaphor production. Kövecses suggests that the conventionalized figurative part of the conceptual system (metaphor and metonymy) can play the role of contextual factors through motivating the use of particular linguistic metaphors and metonymies (2015, p. 196). For example, the metaphorical relationship between hejab and efâf ‘chastity’ in hejab is the pleasant smell of chastity is influenced by the conventional conceptual metonymy HEJAB FOR CHASTITY or the metaphorical conceptualization of the chador as angel’s wings is motivated by the already existing metaphor SPIRITUAL LIFE IS A JOURNEY. Compared to the bottom-up approach to metaphor which views metaphor as a totally emergent phenomenon (Cameron & Deignan, 2006; Deignan, 2005), Kövecses’s formulation while admitting the emergent nature of metaphors in context also leaves space for the motivating role of already existing conceptual metaphors in the production of metaphors in discourse. Some of the novel metaphors in the data are in compliance with the
established metaphors that constitute these concepts. Hence, the constant presence of these well-established metaphors when creating discourse metaphors cannot be ignored. For example, without having access to the EFFAT IS A CURTAIN, HAYA IS A BARRIER, and GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY metaphors, which are well-established metaphors, it would be hard to understand why the HEJAB IS A TRENCH or THE CHADOR IS A BULLET-PROOF VEST emerge in hejab discourse.

2.4.4 Bodily context

The body is involved not only in the formation of conceptual metaphors by providing a large number of source domains, but it can also influence the choice of metaphors locally, i.e., in the ongoing discourse (ibid, p. 184). Kövecses shows how Emily Dickinson’s optical illness could have an effect on the emergence of metaphors in her poems (ibid, pp.121–122). The crucial role of the body in relation to the concepts under study is justified by the fact that these self-regulating forces exist and operate in order to place restrictions on the body and bodily desires (Farahani, 2006; Milani, 2011).

Kövecses’s formulation of the contextual factors that work to form context models includes some more general or global factors. He suggests that even the shared frames across a culture are omnipresent in each and every communicative exchange (culture functioning as global context), in addition to the immediate (local) relevant features of the situation though with varying degrees of activation (p. 95). In addition to the factors suggested by Kövecses, which I find plausible and relevant to the meaning of the Persian key concepts in context, I would like to add ‘enactment of conceptualization’ as a further element in shaping metaphorical meaning in discourse. This simply means concrete actions taken on the basis of particular conceptualizations and particular ways of talking about concepts. For example, by applying this further dimension to the analysis of hejab, it can be argued that morality police actions (fining or detaining offenders) and unveiling despite Islamic laws, while representing particular forms of thinking and speaking about hejab, can, in turn, influence the pre-established or dominant conceptualizations and/or statements about veiling. Resisting police action by insisting on wearing a loose hejab is a major concrete action that affects the language used to persuade women to dress modestly. I take ‘enactment’ to be a concrete contextual factor, which together with other relevant features of the situation, affects the formation of the metaphors. In order to reinforce the analysis of the Persian concepts,
references have been made to the events and actions that are relevant to and materialize the figurative conceptualizations.

2.5. Approaches to emotion concepts

Two of the key concepts investigated, i.e., gheirat and haya are prototypical emotion concepts in Persian. Therefore, this section explains the main tenets of theories of emotion that are most relevant to the study of the Persian key concepts. In what follows, the main properties of the lexical semantic, social constructionist, and experientialist approaches to emotions will be reviewed.

2.5.1 Lexical semantic approach

The lexical semantic approach to emotions (Wierzbicka, 1992, 1998, 1999) contends that there are no universal concepts for basic or complex emotions and although people in different cultures experience feelings like anger, shame, sadness, etc., the emotions are conceptualized differently across cultures and languages. However, Wierzbicka puts the idea forward that emotion concepts can be defined by a set of non-technical, self-explanatory words “which themselves are not names of specific emotions or emotional states” (1992, p. 541). These words are language-independent “lexical universals”, including think, do, want, can, happen, feel, know, say, there is, someone, something, sometimes, I, you, very, good, bad, and so on, which are believed to provide a framework for comparing emotion concepts encoded in different languages and distinguishing their meanings. Wierzbicka (1992, p. 548) postulates four parameters or themes in terms of which people appear to think about their emotional experience: a) good and bad things that happen to the person (the experiencer of emotion) and to other people b) good and bad things that people do c) what the person thinks about himself/herself and what other people think about him/her d) emotional attitudes toward other people such as love, anger, and compassion triggered by actions and events. These themes are said to comprise the universal basis of classifying emotion concepts across languages and cultures.

Wierzbicka (1997) suggests the following mental scenario for the Japanese concept of enryo roughly meaning ‘self-restraint, modesty, shyness, and courtesy’:

(a) when X is with person Y, X thinks something like this:

(b) I can't say to this person:
(c) "I want this, I don't want this"

(d) "I think this, I don't think this"

(e) if I did this, someone could feel something bad because of this

(f) someone could think something bad about me because of this

(g) because of this X doesn't say things like this

(h) because of this X doesn't do some things

(i) people think: this is good

Components of the above script point to different aspects of *enryo*. For example, stages (b), (c), and (d) illustrate how Japanese refrain from expressing disagreement with majority’s opinion, from expressing dissenting opinions in order to avoid confrontation, and from expressing personal desires and wants openly. Stage (e) reflects a desire not to hurt, offend, or embarrass anyone. Stage (f) indicates the relationship between *enryo* and face. Stages (g) and (h) show how *enryo* is realized in speech and behavior.

In some aspects, *enryo* shows some general similarities to some emotion concepts in Persian. For example, the concept of *rudarbayesti* ‘the state or feeling of distance out of respect’ (Sharifian & Tayebi, 2017), similar to *enryo*, may be used to refrain from directly expressing desires and wants. Or, *haya* ‘self-restraint’ is similarly used to refrain from offending or embarrassing other people. Also, *haya* as a taboo-avoiding strategy is similarly linked to *âberu* ‘face/public image’ (Pasandideh, 2004). However, in the absence of contextual and performative information, it becomes extremely hard to tell how the two languages actually differ from each other in terms of conceptualizations and how in the two languages these emotions perform their functions across discourse situations. Wierzbicka’s hypothesized scripts would have been more illuminating if they had been formulated on the basis of the range of possible meanings of emotion terms in discourse contexts (i.e., in the sense of what emotion terms are used for). Bamberg (1997) addressed this problem in Wierzbicka’s model of emotion concepts, criticizing it for being unclear as to how the experiencer of emotion transforms culture-independent ways of thinking and feeling into situation-bound emotion talk, where the meaning of emotion terms are negotiated and undergo changes according to the particular social goal for which they are employed (p. 211).
Wierzbicka’s model has also been criticized for being limited by the semantics of emotion lexemes, ignoring the role that metaphors can play in throwing light on the conceptualization of emotion concepts (Kövecses, 1990, 1995; Kövecses et al., 2003; Taylor & Mbense, 1998). Taylor and Mbense (1998) note that emotion talk does not require that the emotions be named and one can verbalize emotions or verbally describe emotions without using the emotion term (p. 193). They add that the figurative expressions that describe emotions cannot be paraphrased or explicated through the semantic analysis of their constituent lexemes and that various metaphors characterizing emotion concepts present different understandings of the concepts. Hence, cross-linguistic comparisons of emotions should also pay attention to conceptual correspondences that are formed at the level of conceptual metaphors and metonymies (ibid).

Some of the semantic primitives included in the emotion prototypes imply some of the aspects that emotion metaphors address. For instance, “good and bad” correspond to positive and negative evaluations, “happen” to passivity, “feel” to the category of emotion, “there is” to existence, “want” to desire, “very” to intensity, and so on (Kövecses, 2000, p. 47). However, as Kövecses rightly observes, there are certain other aspects like control and harm that do not seem to be easily recognized from the model proposed by Wierzbicka.

### 2.5.2 Social constructionist approach

The social constructionist view criticizes previous approaches to emotions for “essentializing emotions as psychobiological universals” and drawing distinction between emotion and cognition, which does not apply in non-western societies (Palmer & Occhi, 1999, p. 4). For social constructionists, emotions are defined as responses to social events. They arise in social situations and trigger certain types of responses (Lutz, 1988; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990). Thus, emotions are not just internal, private feelings as it is conceived in Western societies but sociocultural institutions whose meaning depends on and is shaped by cultural values, personal and social roles, facial expressions, personal and social goals, moral points of view, actions, and sequences of events (Lutz, 1988; Lutz & White, 1986). Lutz (1982, 1988) proposes a prototype-based schema for emotions on the basis of her analysis of emotion words in Ifaluk:
SOCIAL EVENT  
↓ EMOTION  
↓ ACTION RESPONSE

This schema generally represents the path through which emotions are inferred in situational context and the way social reality is evaluated and constituted through the mediation of social action and reaction. This schema, Lutz maintains, is instantiated in different ways in social situations, which means that the meaning of emotions is negotiated and does not simply arise from the schemas associated with social events.

Research adopting the social constructionist perspective has demonstrated the culturally constructed nature of emotions, indicating the way emotional experience is linked to local understandings of the self and social relationships, as well as the way emotion is displayed and enacted in discourse in different societies (Berman, 1999; Irvine, 1990; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990; Rosaldo, 1980; Wilce, 1999).

Lutz (1982) examines the use of emotion words in Ifaluk society. She groups emotion words into five major clusters in terms of basic situations that elicit the emotions and the clusters are named after these emotion-eliciting situations: “good fortune”, “danger”, “connection and loss”, “human error”, and “inability”. Each cluster contains sequentially related emotion words that frequently co-occur in contexts of use. For example, the category of “human error” includes gasechaula ‘hate’, lingeringer ‘irritation’, tipmochmoch ‘short-temper’, song ‘justified anger’, tang ‘frustration/grief’, niyefiyef ‘regret/anger at self’, and sagengaw ‘jealousy/competitiveness’. The common feature of these emotions is that “all feel bad inside” (p. 117) and all include an element of human error. “Each emotion word further distinguishes between whether the error is one’s own or another’s” (p. 117). The most important emotion of this cluster is song ‘justified anger’, which is positively evaluated because displaying song indicates that one has properly noticed the violation of a cultural norm by another. Song is a response to situations where one is interrupted in his/her work in an offensive manner. The other emotions like lingeringer ‘irritation’, tipmochmoch ‘short-temper’, and tang ‘frustration/grief’ emerge when one is called away to do something for someone of higher rank. Also, tang ‘frustration/grief’ will be felt when one is justly or unjustly thwarted and he/she cannot do anything about it. Lutz finds that the evaluations that are made of situations within each cluster as well as the fine pragmatic distinctions that exist between the emotion words primarily refer to cultural values that are either observed or
violated and to the reactions of other individuals to the way the person behaves within the situations (p. 120). She further notes that the emotional meaning of the situation is created by the cultural factors that give meaning and structure to the situations and emotion words are the holders of such socio-cultural values (pp. 123–124).

Berman (1999) explores the use of emotion in natural Javanese discourses. She shows how Javanese women signal their emotions (fear, pain, sadness, and humiliation) when talking about dignity in workplace and rape. She demonstrates how emotion attitudes and display in everyday talk are shaped by dominant discourses of class and gender identity. For example, in the case of rape, the emotion that most of the Javanese women mentioned was disgust, which aimed inwards at the victim rather than their rapist, family or friends who could not help and the public action response of each of the women was silent acquiescence. As a result of being raped, some of the unmarried women avoided social contact because they regarded themselves as impure, stained and dirty (p. 96). Berman states that the women did not express anger at or question the hierarchy that imposed the moral standards and what traumatized them was their failure to live up to the dominant discourse of ideal femininity that the society imposed upon them (p. 97). She also finds that the ideology of women’s subordination in Javanese society is adopted by women themselves and becomes the means of evaluating their victimized status and reinterpreting their positions (p. 71). These observations led Berman to suggest that the emotion (disgust) and the action response (silent acquiescence) are linked to and filtered by sociocultural propriety (the idealized model of women in Javanese).

Kövecses (1990) and Kövecses et al. (2003) criticize the social constructionist approach and attempt to provide a synthetic view of emotions (by viewing emotions as “body-based social constructs”), reconciling the experientialist and social constructionist approaches. They hold that social constructionists investigate the entire system of emotional meaning and its interaction with the larger system of cultural values, which is an advantage of this approach but they have paid less attention to the detailed examination of the content and structure of particular emotions. Kövecses (1990, p. 24) notes that the detailed examination of particular emotion concepts is necessary because it may reveal fine details that link a given emotion with larger cultural values. He points out that some of the anger-related expressions point to the existence of retributive justice, which also reflects broader cultural values. Without a detailed analysis of the concept of ANGER, Kövecses argues, the connection between the concept of ANGER and the system of cultural values would be lost. Kövecses
(ibid, p. 25) maintains that cross-cultural comparisons of systems of emotions lacking a detailed analysis of each emotion concept are largely based on the subjective assessment of how a given emotion is conceptualized in the cultures under study.

Another criticism leveled at the social constructionist approach is that domains of experience are merely understood in terms of propositional schemas, ignoring image schematic knowledge that emerges from universal properties and functions of the body (Kövecses, ibid, p. 25). Kövecses et al. (2003, p. 143) note that these basic image schemas can be expected to be universal and to the degree that the metaphors constituting a given emotion concept are motivated by the physiological functioning, the concept is motivated by the human body rather than being a completely sociocultural construct. For example, Kövecses (2000) compares the conceptualizations of anger in English, Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian. He finds that despite culture-specific metaphorical conceptualizations, which are motivated by specific cultural values, these languages share the metaphors BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and ANGER IS A LIQUID IN A CONTAINER. Kövecses suggests that the image-schema of CONTAINER as a metaphorical source domain shared by the four languages could be taken as evidence to consider a degree of universality in the conceptualizations of emotions. He cites research conducted in diverse cultures to provide evidence for his hypothesis (i.e., the near-universality of metaphors of emotions), such as studies in English (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987), Chinese (Yu, 1998), Japanese (Matsuki, 1995), and Tahitian (Levy, 1973).

Last but not least, the social constructionist approach is criticized for not paying attention to the role that metaphor and metonymy play in providing content and structure for emotions. Kövecses (1990, 2000) maintains that figurative language including metaphor and metonymy may express any aspect of emotion concepts. Metaphorical expressions can point to many aspects of emotions, including the existence, intensity, passivity, control, and harm, and some metaphors can reflect universal image schemas, such as the ANGER IS PRESSURE IN A CONTAINER metaphor. Metonymies can also express universal physiological aspects of emotions. For example, redness in the face and a rise in the body temperature are physiological aspects of anger that are metonymically expressed.

2.5.3 Experientialist approach

Unlike social constructionists, who seem to deny universalities in emotions, experientialists, as stated above, consider a degree of universality for emotional experience and hold that this
partial universality arises from basic image schemas that emerge from fundamental bodily experiences (Kövecses, 1986, 1990; Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987; Yu, 1998). In this approach, the emphasis on universalities in emotional experience is justified in that it can help discover commonalities between languages and regularities in the conceptualizations of emotions, making it easier to see and identify cultural relativity and culture-specific conceptualizations.

In several books and papers, Kövecses, a representative proponent of the experientialist approach, has described this approach and applied it to the analysis of various emotion concepts (e.g., ANGER, FEAR, LOVE, PRIDE, and SURPRISE). Kövecses’s model of emotion concepts consists of systems of metaphors, metonymies, cognitive models, and related concepts. He bases his work on the assumption that conventionalized language used to talk about emotions is a significant tool in discovering the structure and content of emotion concepts (1990, p. 3). His analyses demonstrate that emotions are not amorphous feelings, but rather, they have a rich conceptual content and structure through a network of metaphorical and metonymic conceptualizations. Therefore, metaphor and metonymy receive privileged status in the experientialist approach, as they have been shown to contribute to the conceptualization of emotional experience and that some of these metaphors and metonymies are constitutive of the structure of emotion concepts (Averill & Kövecses, 1990; Kövecses, 1995; Lakoff, 1987).

The cultural model that Kövecses proposes for emotion concepts is prototype-based, with each emotion concept having several prototypical models. This cultural model consists of both propositional schemas (propositions defining and expressing the range of attitudes toward an emotion) and image schemas, which together with metaphor and metonymy form a prototypical model for an emotion concept. Kövecses contends that the cultural model of emotions is a joint product of (possibly universal) actual human physiology, metonymic conceptualization of actual human physiology, metaphor, and cultural context (2000, p. 162).

Kövecses (2000, p. 129) proposes a five-stage model for the prototypes of emotion concepts, with stages of the model being causally and temporally connected:

1. cause of emotion \(\Rightarrow\) 2. emotion \(\Rightarrow\) 3. attempt at control \(\Rightarrow\) 4. loss of control \(\Rightarrow\) 5. response

Kövecses notes that the causality involved in the stages of the model results from the application of the metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE, which characterizes basic as well as non-
basic emotion concepts in Western and non-Western cultures (p. 129). The EMOTION IS FORCE metaphor is said to be instantiated by a variety of emotion metaphors, such as NATURAL FORCE, OPPONENT, and FIRE, each of which capturing different aspects of emotions (p. 61). Kövecses points out that the master\textsuperscript{5} metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE and its specific-level metaphorical representations can demonstrate the coherence in the conceptual organization of emotions, making it also possible to see in which ways the conceptualization of emotion concepts differs from that of other domains of thought (e.g., rational thought).

One of the emotion concepts that Kövecses (1990) analyzes in his book is PRIDE. He presents prototypical cognitive models for different forms of pride (pride, dignity, self-esteem, conceit, and vanity) and differentiates each member of the category of PRIDE through different sets of metaphors and metonymies that characterize different aspects of each of the concepts. For example, physiological effects that characterize justified pride such as redness in the face and increased heart rate are less intense than those that characterize conceit such as interference with normal mental functioning and interference with accurate perception. In the case of metaphors, for example, the OPPONENT metaphor seems to characterize conceit and vanity, and not proper pride or self-esteem, or the metaphor VANITY IS A (SENSUAL OR INDULGENT) PERSON only characterizes vanity. He concludes that ‘enhancement’ as a central idea characterizing pride is inherently metaphorical. It is further pointed out that ‘balanced pride as immediate response’ is the prototypical model of pride from which other non-balanced forms of pride (conceit and vanity) are derived. In other words, the state of the balance between the pride and value scales is regarded as an ideal or cognitive reference point with respect to which other forms of pride are defined (p. 108).

Gheirat and haya are triggered by certain social events and their meaning is highly context-bound. They also define personal and social roles as well as personal and social goals (Limbert, 1987; Milani, 1992; Pasandideh, 2004). What is more, they represent moral viewpoints and significantly influence people’s social actions. On the other hand, gheirat and haya are inextricably linked to the physiology of experience and embodiment, and they both

\textsuperscript{5} In the terminology used by Kövecses (1990, 2000), master metaphor is a schematic metaphor that governs all emotions, namely the EMOTIONS ARE FORCES metaphor. Kövecses argues that this metaphor subsumes specific-level instantiations, such as the EMOTION IS INTERNAL PRESSURE, EMOTION IS FIRE, EMOTION IS A NATURAL FORCE, and EMOTION IS A BURDEN metaphors.
give rise to a range of physiological and behavioral responses that are metonymically and metaphorically conceptualized. Therefore, in order to provide a fuller account of gheirat and haya, we need to take into account their various physiological, psychological, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse aspects. The conceptualizations of gheirat and haya should demonstrate which one of the approaches discussed above can account for the structure and meanings of these concepts.
Chapter 3: Gheirat ‘moral vigilance’

3.1 Definitions of gheirat

Gheirat is a significant emotion concept in Iranian culture and plays an important role in constructing the identities of Iranians. Gheirat may be defined as a monitoring device in the minds of Iranians, functioning to protect one’s values against threat, insult, and injury (Bakhtiar, 2015). Despite its pivotal role in regulating Iranians’ social behavior, this concept has not received due attention in scholarly works and has been marginally dealt with. Assadi (1982: 203) maintains that “Iranians are very protective of their self-esteem and their family” and he calls this *gheirat o nâmus* ‘gheirat and female family members’, which means that any insult to one’s self-esteem, honor, or female family members (one’s *nâmus*) would activate the feeling of *gheirat* and would result in a social conflict (e.g., communication break down or honor killings). Eshaghi (2006) defines *gheirat* as a male moral virtue that acts as the guardian of one’s values, operating to strengthen familial and public chastity in a religious society and to prevent moral corruption. On the basis of this definition, men are required to react promptly to any violations of moral and religious values (ibid, pp. 22–25).

Behravesh (2015) defines *gheirat* as a type of virile moral courage with an occasional religious touch that is directed toward *nâmus* ‘female family members’ or *harim* ‘holy space/border’ and intended to guard it against external adulteration. Behravesh shows how the cultural values of *gheirat* and *nâmus* shape the political stance of the Islamic Republic concerning its nuclear program by considering military sites as the *nâmus* or the sacred, private space of the nation, and the necessity for safeguarding it against alien interventions.

Limbert (1987, p. 37) states that “*gheirat* means pride and honor and the readiness to defend oneself against an insult, especially to the honor of one’s family”. He adds that when a man’s wife, sister, or daughter is insulted, he must react in some way or be ridiculed as “bi-*gheirat*, roughly ‘a gutless cuckold’” (ibid). Limbert notes that *gheirat* can also be national, ethnic, and religious pride. He also views *gheirat* as a defining feature of Iranian men, citing the Persian proverb *mard bud va gheiratesh* ‘a man exists by his *gheirat*’ to support his argument.

Mir-Hosseini (1999) defines *gheirat* as “sexual honor and jealousy” (P. 232). She cites Abdolkarim Sorouch, a famous Muslim intellectual, who distinguishes *gheirat* as
jealousy from hesâdat ‘envy’. According to Sorush, whereas gheirat ‘jealousy’ in the context of love relationships is “preventing another sharing what one has”, hesâdat ‘envy’ is “wanting what belongs to another”. The first (i.e., gheirat) is a “positive ethical value that is extra religious and should be encouraged” but the second (i.e., hesâdat ‘envy’) is “negative and should be controlled” (p. 234).

Gheirat is not unique to Iranian culture. The word gheirat, originally an Arabic word, derives from the root gheir ‘the other’. Gheirat is basically a religious concept that requires Muslims to protect their honor, sanctities, and female family members. Scholarly works have only drawn attention to the role of gheirat in causing social conflicts, such as honor killings in such Muslim cultures as Palestine (Ruggi, 2000), Turkey (Sev’er, 1999) and Pakistan (Werbner, 2005).

In this chapter, I argue that gheirat is a complex concept with a variety of functions and this multi-faceted concept cannot be reduced to the senses of indignation and jealousy. Moreover, gheirat is not only a male feature and can be assigned to women as well as to humans regardless of their sex. A cognitive linguistic analysis can reveal further aspects of this concept and shed light on its multiple cognitive-cultural functions. To achieve this goal, I investigate the role of bodily, cognitive (metaphor, metonymy, categorization, and cultural models), social-cultural, and discourse factors in the formation of the cultural model of GHEIRAT in Persian. The meaning(s) of gheirat will be clarified only when the conceptual network within which it operates is identified and when the roles of other interacting concepts are discovered.

3.2 Dictionary meanings and major characteristics

In Persian dictionaries, gheirat is defined as a) jealousy b) chivalry c) male courage d) nâmus worshiping (Mo’in Persian Dictionary, www.dic.abadis.net). The dictionary meanings of gheirat are largely metonymically motivated. The EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy forms the conceptual relationship between jealousy and gheirat (GHEIRAT FOR JEALOUSY), and the one between male courage and gheirat (GHEIRAT FOR COURAGE). The relationship between chivalry and gheirat seems to be motivated by the CATEGORY FOR SALIENT PROPERTY metonymy and THE CAUSE OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION metonymy is involved in associating nâmus and gheirat.
Crucial to understanding the meaning of *gheirat* is to understand the meaning of *harim* ‘holy space/border’. This holy space encompasses one’s *nâmûs*, family, honor, religion and sanctities, co-religionists and is extended to one’s social group, country, and fellow human beings. On that basis, *gheirat* means ‘not permitting others to enter into one’s harim and not permitting oneself to transgress the harim of others.’ Example (1) shows the use of *harim* ‘holy space/border’ and the role of *gheirat* in protecting this space in the context of married life:

(1) Mard va zan bayad ahle khianat nabashand va nesbat be yekdigar amanatdari konand. Albate shayesteye mard ast ke *gheirat* varzad va digaran ra az harim e khish dur negahdarad va mardi ra be harim rah nadahad vali bar zan ast ke amanatdari karde ve be shoharash khianat nakonad va mardi ra be harim e khish rah nadahad (*Keyhan*, 22/10/2016).

‘The man and the woman should not cheat on each other and should be honest with each other. Of course, it is appropriate for the man to exercise *gheirat* and keep other men away from his own *harim*, not letting any man into his *harim*, and it is appropriate for the woman to be honest, not to cheat on her husband, and not let any man into her own *harim*.

*Gheirat* is a defining feature of Iranian men whose lack or passivity, as perceived by others, is highly disparaging and discrediting for the person (Beeman, 1986; Limbert, 1987). *Gheirat* is characterized by sensitivity, reaction, thoughtfulness, pride, power, and courage. Lack of *gheirat* is characterized by insensitivity, passivity, mindlessness, weakness, and inattentiveness. A person who is perceived to possess *gheirat* is called *bâgheirat* ‘having or possessing *gheirat*’, which is a compliment term and a culturally pleasant form of address and a person perceived to lack *gheirat* is referred to as *bigheirat*, which is extremely humiliating. A man’s *gheirat* is constantly measured by others on the basis of his reaction to the situations. The decision over the sufficiency or insufficiency of *gheirat* in a person will have individual and social consequences for the holder of *gheirat*. Hence, *gheirat* forms an important part of an Iranian man’s identity. Example (2) clearly shows the way *gheirat* is viewed as a male feature:


‘In this match, they [the Iranian football team] played very manly and with *gheirat*. 
Although they lost the game, they made people happy.’

**Gheirat** in example (2) refers to the courage and the utmost attempt the Iranian football players exhibited against a powerful team (Argentine) in the World Cup 2014, which is admired and seen more important than the result of the game.

**Gheirat** is a salient feature of **javânmand** ‘chivalrous’ men. **Javânmand** is a man who selflessly supports others in need. Courage, sacrifice, thoughtfulness, manliness, and **gheirat** are representative features of a **javânmand**. **Gheirat** can be seen as the primary force motivating a chivalrous man to provide support to the others. Example (3) illustrates how the word **javânmandi** ‘chivalry’ collocates with **gheirat** and characterizes it:

(3) In hey’at tasmim be tajlil az khanevadeye shahid Hamedani be namayandegi az shohadaye modafe e haram ke varede god e gheirat va javanmardi shodand va rang e asayesh va amniyat ra baraye in keshvar be armaghan avard, gereft (Keyhan, 18/02/2016).

‘This committee decided to appreciate the family of Martyr Hamedani as a representative of all martyred defenders of the holy shrine [Iranian soldiers killed in Syrian war], who provided peace and security for the country by displaying **gheirat** and chivalry’.

The following examples from the data indicate how other characteristic features of **gheirat** manifest themselves in lexical collocations:

(4) Vali khoshhali e mardom bekhatere **gheirat** va eghtedar e sepah e pasdaran dar esarat e tofanguzaran e motejaveze amriki be ayan ghabele moshahede bud (Keyhan, 14/02/2016).

‘But people were obviously happy of the Army of Guardians’ exhibition of **gheirat** and power in capturing the invading American marines.’

(5) Az hamân dorehaye avale enghelab anhai ra ke dar barabar e doshman taslim bude va hassasiat va gheirat e lazem ra nadaran ra miane ro ya motadel esmgozari mikardand (Keyhan, 26/02/2016).

‘From the very early periods of the revolution, those who have been submissive to enemies and have not had the necessary sensitivity and **gheirat** have been named moderates.’

(6) Moteasefane, ruznamehaye zanjirei jor’at va gheirat e an ra nadashtand ke hozur e mellat ra be rokhe doshmanan bekeshanand (Keyhan, 17/02/2014).
‘Unfortunately, chained newspapers [reformists’ newspapers] did not have the audacity and *gheirat* to proudly show the presence of the nation [in the presidential elections] to the enemies.’

(7) In barnameha malul e *enfe’al* va *nadashtan* e *gheirat* dar nazde barkhi modiran va maghamat e balaterist ke be nagshe hedayati va nezarati e khod be dorosti amal nemikonand (*Keyhan*, 01/06/2016).

‘Such programs are the consequence of the passivity and lack of *gheirat* in managers and higher-ranking officials who do not perform their guiding and monitoring roles appropriately’.

(8) Agar shoja’at e rahbar e moazzam e enghelab va *gheirat* va *eteraz* e nokhbegan nabud hatman kar e moammar ghazzafi ra mikardand va hameye tasisate hastei ra bar e keshti mikardand va be samt e amrika ya orupa gosil mikardand (*Keyhan*, 13/05/2016).

‘If it wasn’t the bravery of the supreme leader [Ayatollah Khamenei] and the elite’s *gheirat* and protest, they [President Rouhani and the negotiating team] would do the same thing that Muammar Ghaddafi did [the former Libyan leader] and would ship all the nuclear facilities to the U.S. or Europe’.

(9) In salha anghadr dar fazilat va zarurat e tasamoh va hamzisti e mosalemat amirz sokhan gofte va neveshteand ke sokhan goftan az *salâbat* va ghâteivyat va *gheirat* e dini khoshunat talabi va gonah e kabireh mahsub mishavad (*Keyhan*, 01/03/2015).

‘These years, there have been so many lectures and articles on the value and necessity of exercising tolerance and peaceful co-existence that taking about firmness, determination, and religious *gheirat* would be considered as aggression and a capital sin’.

### 3.3 Conceptual domains interacting with *gheirat*

In addition to revealing the characteristic features of *gheirat*, lexical collocations and the wider linguistic context surrounding the word *gheirat* are also proper means of identifying the major conceptual domains that interact with and structure it. Table 1 presents the list of lexical items that collocate with *gheirat* along with their frequency of occurrence. Some of the lexical collocates were presented in the previous section. The rest of the lexical items on the list will be introduced in the following sections.
Table 1. Lexical collocates of *gheirat*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical collocates</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Javânmardi</em> ‘chivalry’</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ta’asob</em> ‘ardent support’</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamiyyat</em> ‘guarding’</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nâmus</em> ‘female family members’</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Shojâ’at</em> ‘courage’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hejab</em> ‘veiling’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Âberu</em> ‘face/public image’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ghorur e melli</em> ‘national pride’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Istâdegi</em> ‘resistance’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imân</em> ‘faith’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haya</em> ‘self-restraint’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Effat</em> ‘chastity’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eghtedâr</em> ‘strength’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mardânegi</em> ‘manliness’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erâdeh</em> ‘will’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poshtkâr</em> ‘perseverance’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ergh e melli</em> ‘patriotism’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aghl</em> ‘reason’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Angizeh</em> ‘motivation’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sharaf</em> ‘dignity’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ruhîyeh</em> ‘spirits’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heisîyeh</em> ‘prestige’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Khashm</em> ‘anger’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hassâsiyat</em> ‘sensitivity’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eterât</em> ‘protest’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sherâfat</em> ‘honor’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jora’t</em> ‘audacity’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ezzat</em> ‘esteem’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ghâţeiyaţ</em> ‘determination’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sâzeshnâpaziri</em> ‘irreconcilability’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Satvat</em> ‘grandeur’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Derâyat</em> ‘wisdom’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the lexical items on the list, *ta’asob* ‘ardent support’ and *hamiyyat* ‘guarding’ seem to profile the protective and supportive roles of *gheirat*. The word *ta’asob* is an Arabic word meaning ‘showing ardent, unconditional support of someone or something’. In a negative sense, it could also mean ‘bigotry’ (www.vajehyab.com). Here is one example:

(10) Motmaenan tanha âmel e mândan va jangidan e in koshtigiran ta’asob va gheirat e anhast (*Keyhan*, 06/01/2016).
'For sure, the only reason which makes these wrestlers stay [with the team] and try hard is their ardent, unconditional support and *gheirat*.'

*Hamiyyat* is also originally an Arabic word meaning ‘guarding or defending’, which primarily emphasizes the role of men in protecting values, including the female family member. Example (11) shows the role of *gheirat* and *hamiyyat* in protecting cultural and political values and building up resistance against world powers:

(11) Chera bayad sharm konim az inke *gheirat va hamiyyat* e sahih va istadegi dar moghabele ghodrathaye batel ra be surat e dars e amali be mellathaye digar talim dahim (Keyhan, 26/06/2015).

‘Why should we be ashamed of teaching the correct form of *gheirat* and *hamiyyat*, and resistance against void powers [world’s political powers] to other nations as a practical lesson?’

The examination of the linguistic contexts surrounding the word *gheirat* suggested the following conceptual domains.

3.3.1 *Âberu* ‘face/public image’

Such words as *Âberu* ‘face/public image’, *sharaf* ‘dignity’, *sherâfat* ‘honor’, *ezzat* ‘esteem’, *satvat* ‘grandeur’, and *heisiyyat* ‘prestige’ collocated with *gheirat* in the data. *Âberu* can be considered a more inclusive category containing concepts which, in one way or another, refer to one’s social image (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014, p. 78). *Âberu* “embodies the image of a person, a family, or a group, particularly as viewed by others in the society” (Sharifian, 2007, p. 36). In almost all social interactions, Iranians attempt to preserve their own *Âberu* as well as that of their family or social group by virtue of presenting a socially pleasant image of their speech, behavior, appearance, and possessions. “Loss of *Âberu* is regarded as a great misfortune and makes it difficult to function in a group because it is associated with shame and embarrassment” (Zaborowska, 2014, p. 14). Therefore, *gheirat* operates to guard one’s *Âberu* against any threatening speech or behavior through showing one’s dissatisfaction or protest verbally, swearing at the perpetrator, physical fighting or even killing the offender in extreme cases. The significance of *Âberu* for Iranians derives, to a large extent, from concerns over what the others might think or say about one’s family, social behavior and relationships. Since one’s life is constantly monitored and commented on by others, gossips could seriously injure the face of the person and that of his/her family. In Persian, the judgments people make...
about someone’s personality, appearance, relationships, the way of dressing and make-up are referred to as *harf e mardom* ‘people’s talk’ (Sharifian 2007, p. 37).

The following example is a critique of the Iranian director Asghar Farhadi’s 2017 movie, *The Salesman*, which won the Oscar award for the best foreign language movie. The main character of the movie is searching for an unknown man who has assaulted his wife. The writer criticizes the director for depicting *gheirat* as an irrational reaction and equating it with violence.

(12) Amma dar film e forushandeh, talash baraye defa az sherafat va gheirat e khanevadegi ta’asob va khoshunat talaghi shod e ast (*Keyhan*, 23/05/2016).

‘But in the movie, *The Salesman*, the attempt to defend the honor and familial *gheirat* has been regarded as bigotry and violence.’

Example (13) reflects the concerns of the political conservatives over the threats that the results of the nuclear negotiations with the West could pose to Iran’s *heysiyyat* ‘prestige/honor’ on the international scene. From this perspective, giving in to the pressures of the international community to curtail the nuclear program would violate the national *gheirat*, which demands resisting pressures, over-expectations, and bullying.

(13) Dar chenin halati diplomathaye ma nabayad az moze’ e za’f vared beshavand balke bayad batamam e vojud az gheirat va heisiyyat e irani de fakonand (*Keyhan*, 12/11/2014).

‘In such circumstances, our diplomats [negotiators with the West] should not take a weak stance but they should do their best to defend the Iranian *gheirat* and prestige’.

In (14), the writer addresses President Rouhani, warning him that the U.S. government is taking advantage of the nuclear deal signed between Iran and the West (known as JCPOA or Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action), using the deal as a tool to force Iran to surrender to further pressures. The text implies that submitting to other demands of the U.S. government and any failure in the proper implementation of the JCPOA would question the President’s *gheirat* and stain his *aberu* ‘face/public image’ and *sherafat* ‘honor’.

(14) Agar tasmim e shoma moghavemat ast, emruz haman ruz ast. Amrika faratar az barjam, ke sherafat va gheirat va aberuye shoma dar geroe an ast, tama’ karde va az shoma motalebeye emtiaz e bishtar mikonad (*Keyhan*, 24/04/2016).
‘If your decision is to resist, you should do it right now. The U.S. has hungered after gaining more advantages beyond JCPOA, on which your honor, gheirat, and āberu are dependent’.

Extract (15) refers to the return of the bodies of 175 Iranian divers who were killed during the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988). The word satvat ‘grandeur’ collocating with gheirat in the sentence could be taken as part of one’s āberu. The relationship between satvat and gheirat could be that satvat ‘grandeur’ is achieved when gheirat is demonstrated in an impressive manner (e.g., by defending the country against the enemies). The word rokh ‘face/profile’ refers to the martyrs via the FACE FOR THE PERSON metonymy.

(15) Bacheha motshakerim ke rokh namayandid ta neshanei bashad baraye satvat va gheirat e irani (Keyhan, 27/06/2015).

‘Boys! Thanks for showing your face so that it will be a sign of Iranian grandeur and gheirat.’

The other collocate of gheirat is ezzat ‘esteem’. This value could also be part of one’s social image or honor, obtained and protected through exhibiting gheirat. Example (16) demonstrates the contrast between ezzat ‘esteem’ and zellat ‘humiliation/lowliness’, where the former is gained by resisting oppression (i.e., by showing gheirat) and the latter is the consequence of submitting to oppression, which results from lacking gheirat.

(16) Ou kesist ke be hameye mardom dars e gheirat va ezzat dad, va marg dar zire sayeye shamshir ra be zendegiye ba zellat tarjih dad (Keyhan, 18/04/2016).

‘He is the one who gave the lesson of gheirat and esteem to all people and preferred to die under the shadow of swords than to live under humiliation.’

3.3.2 Sanctities

This category includes God, religion, the Prophet, 12 Shiite Imams (religious leaders), the Quran, holy places (mosques and holy shrines), and any objects or events associated with holy figures. Any threat or insult to the religious sanctities would give rise to the emergence of gheirat and the expression of outrage at the offenders. Issuing a death sentence to the British novelist, Salman Rushdie in 1989 by Ayatollah Khomeini, the Founder of the Islamic Republic, for writing a novel deemed offensive to Islam and the Muslim Prophet (www.nytimes.com, 15/02/1989) is a prime example of how insulting the sanctities can cause
Gheirat to emerge. According to Islamic teachings, “God Himself is ghayur [having or possessing gheirat] and loves those humans who exercise it. Since God is ghayur, He has banned sins whether committed in public or in private” (Eshaghi, 2009, p. 84). Example (17) shows how gheirat is attributed to God:

(17) Amma az anjai ke kohdvand gheirat darad nesbat be harim e ghods e kesh kesi ra rah nemidahad va sherk va kofr ra be hich onvan nemipazirad (Keyhan, 08/07/2015).

‘But, since God has gheirat, He does not permit anyone to enter His holy space and never accepts sherk ‘worshiping anybody or anything other than the singular God’ and infidelity.’

A basic Islamic principle called amr e be maruf va nahy az monkar ‘promotion of virtue and prevention of vice’ requires Muslims to pay attention to the conducts of their co-religionists and fellow human beings (Golkar, 2015). Gheirat is the underlying force for performing this principle in society. Hence, inattentiveness to the sins committed or moral corruptions occurring in society would make the others question the existence of gheirat in the person. Promoting modestly dressed women and fining immodestly dressed ones by morality police in Iran are part of the political conservatives’ attempts to fulfill the objectives of the Islamic principle, i.e., regulating social order and preserving public chastity (Afary, 2009).

Extract (18) attributes economic corruption in Iran to the lack of gheirat and religious faith.

(18) Dar inja na ba yek ettefagh balke ba yek fesad e sazman yafte ruberu hastim ke harf e aval va akhare an ra bigheirati va khodforushi va din forushi mizanad (Keyhan, 17/05/2016).

‘Here we are facing with not an incident but an organized corruption which is entirely caused by lack of gheirat, trading on the self and religion.’

In (18), the two phrases Khod forushi ‘trading on the self and din forushi ‘trading on religion’ highlight the negative influences of not exercising gheirat on one’s self-esteem and religious faith. It can be interpreted that it is the lack of gheirat in some authorities (insensitivity to moral and religious values) that has contributed to the financial corruptions. Here, self-esteem and religious assumptions are figuratively seen as COMMODITIES, which are traded on in order to gain economic interests.
The other example showing the relationship between *gheirat* and sanctities refers to a historical event where Fatemeh, the Prophet’s daughter, defends her husband, Imam Ali, the first Shia Imam, against his enemies:

(19) Ali ra motalebe kardand v aba tahdid az to khastand ke emam e zaman e khod ra be anan vagozari, shoja’ane posht e dar gerefti va *gheirat ra baraye ânan tafsir kardi* 

(‘They demanded Ali from you and asked you threateningly to surrender your Imam ‘religious leader’ but you courageously held the door and interpreted the meaning of *gheirat* for history.’)

The underlined clause in (20) admires Fatemeh’s *gheirat* and courage. Moreover, she is pictured as a role model of *gheirat* for other humans. The main message conveyed by the statement is the necessity for protecting sanctities under any circumstances.

In some extracts, the collocational relationship between *gheirat* and *imân* ‘faith’ indicates the religious basis of *gheirat*, where *gheirat* is seen as an important component of Islamic faith that thwarts enemy conspiracies:

(21) Doshmanan zamanî mikhastand âzarbayejan ra tajzieh konand va bârhâ in tote’e tekrâr shod ammâ *gheirat va imân e mardom e âzarbayejan* mane’ az an ahdaf e shum shod (Keyhan, 29/05/2016).

(‘Enemies once intended to separate Azerbaijan [a province in the north western of Iran] from the country and this conspiracy recurred many times but the *gheirat* and faith of the people of Azerbaijan thwarted those sinister goals’).

### 3.3.3 Nâmus and family

*Nâmus* refers to the sanctity associated with one’s female family members (sister, mother, wife, and daughter) and can be figuratively extended to all females within a social group or community. In other words, females related to a man are considered his *nâmus*. The sanctity linked with *nâmus* is largely sexual. Some sociologists call *nâmus* “sexual honor” (Meeker, 1976, p. 244, cited in King, 2008). In Persian dictionaries, *nâmus* is defined as a) *esmat* ‘prohibition/immunity from sin’, b) *effat* ‘chastity’ and c) *âberu* ‘face/public image’. *Nâmus* may also metonymically refer to the body of women, as in *nâmus e zan* ‘woman’s *nâmus*’,
whereby the taboo and sanctity associated with women’s bodies provide mental access to the body.

Protecting one’s nāmus is maintaining one’s āberu ‘face/public image’. Any insult to a man’s nāmus would jeopardize his āberu. Controlling the sexuality of women and protecting them against social threats, such as sexual male gaze and sexual harassment are two major duties of men performed through demonstrating gheirat (Tizro, 2013). Women, on the other hand, watch their own speech and conducts so as to observe effat and more importantly, protect the āberu of their families (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014). This is one of the main contexts in which women demonstrate gheirat. Observing hejab, restricting relationships with nāmahram ‘non-intimate’ men, keeping virginity, avoiding talking, and behaving provocatively are simultaneously the realizations of effat and female gheirat. A morally admired woman is figuratively referred to as pāk ‘pure’ and sangin ‘weighty’. Pāki ‘purity’ of a woman is mainly her refraining from having a premarital sexual relationship and distancing from men until she gets married (Fischer, 2004, p. 215). Sangini ‘weightiness’ of a woman, on the other hand, refers to the moral virtues that she has accumulated over time motivated by the MORAL VIRTUES ARE MEASURABLE OBJECTS metaphor. A sangin woman observes the cultural redlines and attempts to act and talk appropriately.

The following examples from the data show how gheirat plays its protective role in relation to nāmus ‘female family members’. Example (22) indicates to what extent remaining indifferent to insults or threats to one’s female family members can have negative consequences for one’s āberu ‘face/public image’. Example (23) implicitly approves of the use of physical force to defend the nāmus. The athlete is admired for using his physical power in the right place (i.e., only for defending his own nāmus and that of others), turning him into an ideal athlete possessing javānmardi ‘chivalry’ and gheirat.

(22) Yeki az mavaredi ke shakhsiat e ensan ra hefz mikonad va be ou arzesh midahad gheirat va hefz e namus ast. Harkas nesbat be namus e khod bie’tena bashad biaberu mishavad (Keyhan, 26/11/2016).

‘One of the things that protect one’s character and assign value to the person is gheirat and protecting the nāmus. Anyone who is inattentive to his nāmus will lose āberu.’
(23) Vaghti sohbat az gheirat va defa e az namus mishod ghodrat e badaniash chand barabar mishod, amma hichvaght az ghodrat e badani va mogheiyat e ghahramaniash sue estefadeh nakard (Keyhan, 27/4/2016).

‘When it came to [demonstrating] gheirat and defending the nâmus, his physical power would multiply but he never took advantage of his physical power and athletic position.’

Nâmus is figuratively extended to include all Iranian females. This means that an Iranian man is expected to demonstrate gheirat to protect not only his own female family members but also all other Iranian females once they are subject to social threats, such as sexual harassment or when they need support (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014, p. 75). In other words, all females are seen as one’s own nâmus. This conception of nâmus can be taken to be the manifestation of the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor. Two examples from the data represent the extended sense of nâmus and the use of gheirat at the social level. In both examples, gheirat is conceptualized as a CONTROLLING AUTHORITY, whose duty is monitor the situations to identify the threats to or violations of moral and religious codes and eventually propel the person to take proper actions.

In (24), a truck driver expresses his dissatisfaction with women working as data collectors/statisticians outside the cities, believing that the job is not appropriate for women mostly because they would be subject to rape and sexual harassment. The figurative use of the word khâhar ‘sister’ justifies the concern and responsibility that the truck driver feels over the safety of the women’s career. The underlined clause in (24) means that the man cannot give a blind eye to and remain inattentive to what he believes to be an unsafe working environment for women.

(24) Che lozumi dasht baraye amargiri az hamlo negh e jaddei e keshvar az niruye khanom estefade konand? Gheirat e band eke ranandeye biaban hastam ghabul nemikonad khahare hamvatanam ra dar kenar e jade dar biaban dar in kar moshahede konam (Keyhan, 13/07/2015)

‘What was the necessity of employing females for taking census of the roads traffic? As a truck driver, my gheirat does not accept that my compatriot sister does this job by desert roads’.

In example (25), the man addresses his employee as dokhtaram ‘my daughter’, which figuratively assigns him the role of a father who is protective of his daughter. More
importantly, this form of address sends across the senses of trust and affection to the woman in a non-sexual way. The boss decides to separate her from her male colleagues in order to give her more security and freedom at work. Gheirat causes the person to act in compliance with the responsibilities that culture has specified for men in relation to women.

(25) Bebin dokhtaram man be onvan e yek mard gheiratam ejazeh nemidahad shoma ra biandazam jeloye yek mosht mard ke har ragham bekhahand behet negah konand va bahat barkhord konand (Keyhan, 06/08/2014).

‘My daughter! As a man, my gheirat does not allow me to put you in front of a bunch of men to look at you and treat you the way they would want to’.

Another excerpt from Keyhan newspaper reflects the strong emphasis that the religious conservatives place on sex segregation in the workplace. In example (26), the writer criticizes the government officials who seem to hold liberal viewpoints on the issue of maintaining physical distance between men and women:

(26) Kesani hastand ke hazerand zan va mard e namahram ba yekdigar ekhtelat dashte bashand be in omid ke gharbiha in harekat ra tahsin konand. Gheirat e in afraid koja raft east? (Keyhan, 18/08/2014).

‘There are people who would like to mix nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men and women in the hope that Westerners will praise them for doing so. Where has their gheirat gone?’

The government officials addressed in the text are accused of neglecting a basic Islamic principle that underscores the necessity of segregating nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men and women to avoid moral corruption. The underlined sentence is a rhetorical question conventionally used to express one’s discontent of a person’s inattentiveness to violations of moral values. Both Iranian liberals and Westerners are placed in the same category through a common feature i.e., lacking gheirat. Gheirat in the sentence is conceptualized as a CONTROLLING AUTHORITY. The metaphor pictures the human body as the site of gheirat, where it monitors the conducts of the person and the lack of gheirat corresponds to the authority figure leaving the control center (the body).

Example (27) shows the contrastive functions or forms of gheirat within the family and indicates how gheirat defines an ideal father:
(27) Pedarân e rastin inguneand: kanune atefeh va separ e bala baraye khanevadeh va farzandan, va kanun e gheirat va ghazab va ghâteiyat dar moghabel e aghyâr (Keyhan, 08/04/2016).

‘True fathers are like this: the epicenter of affection and a shield for the family and children, and the epicenter of gheirat, rage, and determination for aliens/strangers’.

In the above example, gheirat is depicted as a protective force with two different manifestations. In relation to family members, the father’s gheirat drives him to pay attention to the emotional and financial needs of the family and to protect them against all types of threats under any circumstances (the GHEIRAT IS A SHIELD metaphor). In contrast, in relation to strangers who might dishonor the family or cause any trouble or danger, his gheirat is an offensive weapon to tackle the trouble-makers, which is realized as rage.

There is a particular form of gheirat whose expression indicates a man’s love to his wife or partner. This type of gheirat is admired and expected by many women. Here, gheirat conveys the protection a man provides for his wife, which is indicative of love. For example, noticing that one’s wife or partner is paying attention to other men can raise the feeling of gheirat in a man. The application of this kind of gheirat indicates that a man never accepts the involvement of other males in his life. In this sense, gheirat foregrounds love and jealousy. It should be noted that, in Persian old literature, the word gheirat used to mean jealousy in a general sense. Here is one example:


‘Hâjar [a female name] wore her golden earrings and became more beautiful. Sareh [a female name] got more jealous.’

However, in contemporary Persian, gheirat seems to have undergone semantic narrowing and its semantic association with jealousy has been narrowed down only to the context of love relationships.

Apart from nâmus and the particular protection gheirat provides for females, within a family, a man is expected to show his gheirat by helping his parents and siblings around the house especially in doing things that require physical strength or are difficult to do for elders, women, and children. Moreover, he is expected to readily reflect on the problems that occur
by attempting to find a solution. Evading such responsibilities would question the existence of gheirat in him.

3.3.4 Haya ‘self-restraint’, effat ‘chastity’, and hejab ‘veiling’

In some extracts, haya, effat, and gheirat appear in the same linguistic context and demonstrate how each of these values contributes to maintaining social equilibrium through defending the harim ‘holy space/border’ that embraces one’s own nâmus ‘female family members’ and through respecting the harim of others.

In (29), haya, which functions to set up a barrier between the person and taboos, and effat, which functions to curtail and conceal sexual desire, are presented as the means with which one would avoid transgressing the harim ‘holy space/border’ of other families. On the other hand, gheirat is recommended to be exercised in order to defend one’s own harim.

(29) Az nazar e ghoran hamangune ke ensan bayad nesbat be harim e digaran mahfuz be haya va effat bashad va moteareze navamis e digaran nashavad, hamchenin bayad nesbat be navamis e khish niz moraghapt dashte va gheirat varzad (Keyhan, 15/05/2015).

“From the viewpoint of the Quran, humans should observe haya and effat in relation to the harim ‘holy space/border’ of others and not offend the nâmus of others. Also, they should take care of/protect their own nâmus and exercise gheirat’.

In example (30), a cleric suggests some solutions for preserving Islamic moral values and controlling sexual desire in men and women. For women, his suggestion is that hejab should be practically taught to preschool girls and be internalized. As for men, he suggests that haya and gheirat should be reinforced in men; the former value (i.e., haya) will motivate men to avoid gazing sexually at or having relations with nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ women and the latter (gheirat) should be exercised to exert force over their female family members to dress modestly in public.

(30) Gherâ’ati edameh dad: hejab bayad az pishdabestani tamrin shaved va bayad ruye haya va gheirat e mardan kar shaved zira fetrat e hejab ra ghabul darand va az taraf e digar bayad nahadineh kardan e hejab dar dastur e kar gharar girad (Keyhan, 13/07/2016).

‘Gherâ’ati [a famous Iranian cleric] continued: hejab should be practiced as from preschool. On the other hand, haya and gheirat in men should also be reinforced because
men admit the innate nature of *hejab*. Moreover, the establishment of *hejab* should be on the agenda’.

Example (31) refers to a Quranic verse in which Muslim women wearing jingling anklets are ordered to tread carefully so that the sound of the jewelry will not arouse the sexual feeling of *nâmahram* ‘non-intimate’ men. Here, *gheirat* in women is supposed to impede them from enticing men and *effat* should be applied to conceal any form of dressing or behavior that might provoke men’s sexual desire.

(31) Khodavand baraye hefz e gheirat va effat e zanan mifarmayad: “zanan bayad hengam e rah raftan pahaye khod ra bar zamin nazanand ta mabada zinat e penhaniyeshan danesteh shaved (Keyhan, 31/12/2015).

‘In order to preserve the *gheirat* and *effat* of women, God orders [Muslim women]: “while walking, women should not put their feet down loudly so the sound of their hidden jewelry could not be heard’.

In example (32), the speaker holds men accountable for the improper *hejab* of some women in Iran, asserting that controlling the *hejab* status of women is one of the main duties of men, which would, in turn, indicate that he possesses *gheirat* as a Muslim. The heightened significance of demonstrating *gheirat* for the conservatives becomes more evident in that in the text *gheirat* is used as a criterion to decide whether a man qualifies as a human being or not.

(32) Mard e momen bayad nesbat be zan e khod gheirat dashte bashad va kasi ke gheirat nadashte bashad az ruhiyeye ensani be dur ast. Gheirat va hejab az eftekharat e anbia va oliaye mast ke bayad an ra negah darim (Keyhan, 15/10/2015).

‘A believing man should exhibit *gheirat* toward his own wife and a person who does not have *gheirat* does not have a human temperament.’ *Gheirat* and *hejab* are among the glories of our Prophet and Imams ‘religious leaders’, which we should preserve.’

3.3.5 Patriotism

A number of extracts from the data illustrate the relationship between *gheirat* and patriotic feelings. Such expressions as, *ghorur e melli* ‘national pride’, *ta’assob e melli* ‘ardent support of the nation’, and *ezzat e melli* ‘national esteem’ collocate with *gheirat* in some linguistic contexts. Here, *gheirat* is employed to protect national interests, cultural-religious
assumptions, and the honor of the nation against the interference, humiliating or unfair
treatments, and transgressions of enemies and aliens. The following examples indicate how
applying or not applying *gheirat* may affect national values and interests:

(33) Ta’asob e melli va gheirat e dini ejaze nemidahad ke dashtbord e amrikaiha be
manabe’e mali e mellat dar in keshvar ra raha konim (*Keyhan*, 25/04/2016).

‘National ta’asob and religious gheirat do not allow us to ignore Americans’
embezzlement of this nation’s [Iran] financial resources in that country [the U.S.]’

(34) Mellat e Iran bish az 30 sal ast anva’e tahrimha ra be jan kharide va gheirat va ezzat
va manfa’at e melli ra be gheir vagozar nakarde ast (*Keyhan*, 10/12/2013).

‘The Iranian nation has endured the sanctions for over 30 years and has not given up its
gheirat, self-esteem, and national interests to the others.’

(35) Aghaye Rohani! In mavaze baese gheirat zodai vagereftan e ghorur e melli khahad
shod. (*Keyhan*, 10/06/2014).

‘Mr. Rouhani! [The Iranian president] This stance [toward the West in nuclear
negotiations] will obliterate gheirat and take away national pride.’

In example (36), the conservatives’ negative attitude toward normalizing relationships
with the West is expressed by accusing the government of President Rouhani of lacking
gheirat and being *dayyus*. *Dayyus* is a pejorative term referring to a man who offers his own
wife to other men, which is, in turn, suggestive of lacking *gheirat* and sensitivity toward
one’s *nâmus* and family. Here, the word *dayyus* is figuratively attributed to those politicians
who have been attempting to provide the ground for Western countries to invest in Iranian
economy and normalize diplomatic relations. Such attempts are viewed by the conservatives
as selling the country to the West.

(36) Kesani ke rah e nofuze biganegan ra dar fazaye siasi ya eghtesadi be ruye keshvar
migoshayand az gheirat e eghtesadi ya siasi barkhordar nabude va dayyus hastand
(*Keyhan*, 14/05/2016).

‘Those who open the way for aliens to infiltrate the political and economic space of the
country do not possess political or economic gheirat and are *dayyus*.’
3.3.6 Internal forces

Gheirat may act as a supplementary force to such internal forces as erādeh ‘will’, angizeh ‘motivation’, shoǰā’at ‘courage’, istādegi ‘resistance’, ruhiyeh ‘spirits’, and poshtkār ‘perseverance’. In this function, gheirat applies to achieve the goals of the actions or activities in which these forces are involved. The combination of gheirat with these forces assigns an overall positive meaning to the goal and the activity involved. The following examples indicate how gheirat is used in relation to these forces:

(37) Reza Yazdani ba gheirat va poshtkar tavanest bar asibdidegish ghalabe konad (Keyhan, 06/06/2015).
‘Reza Yazdani [the Iranian wrestler] could overcome his injury with gheirat and perseverance.’

(38) Bayad gheirat va istadegi e mardan e in sarzamin dar barabar e doshman be goosh e hameye donya beresad (Keyhan, 04/11/2014).
‘The whole world should hear the story of Iranian men’s gheirat and resistance against the enemy.’

(39) Bachehaye tim ba gheirat va angizeye faravan dar tamrin hozurdarand (Keyhan, 07/07/2014).
‘Team members participate in practices with a lot of gheirat and motivation.’

(40) Time football e iran dar jam e jahani mitavanad fan va honor ra dar khedmate yek hadaf bekar begirad va ba gheirat va ruhiyeye irani baese khoshnudi va hatta ghorur e yek mellat shavad (Keyhan, 27/06/2014)
‘In the World Cup, the Iranian football team can employ technique and art for one goal and cause the nation to feel contented and even proud by means of the Iranian gheirat and spirits.’

Gheirat, when applied as a supplementary force, seems to be a gender-neutral feature, i.e., in this context, gheirat equally characterizes both men and women. The other point is that the accompaniment of gheirat to these forces would imply the insufficiency of such forces for accomplishing the intended goals and resisting hardships on the way of achieving goals. In other words, the use of gheirat for achieving a certain goal guarantees success.
3.3.7 Reasoning

In some examples, a connection is made between one’s general ability to make proper judgments or sensible decisions and exercising *gheirat*. Such words as *aghlu* ‘reason’, *derâyat* ‘wisdom’ and *sho’ur* ‘the ability to properly assess social situations’ collocate with *gheirat* in some contexts, showing that *gheirat*, which involves a prompt judgement on and a prompt reaction to social and political events, is suggestive of and in full compliance with normal reasoning.

In example (41), the collocational relationship between *gheirat* and *sho’ur* ‘reason/intellect’ indicates that political rallies against the U.S. and Israel in Iran are not illogical emotional reactions but rather righteous reactions based in proper assessments of political events. The following remark expresses political conservatives’ dissatisfaction with the foreign policy of President Rouhani, who disapproves of using political swearwords and of creating political conflicts between Iran and the West:

(41) Be aghaye reis e jomhur az mikonam shoarhaye zedd e estekbari e mardom biposhtvaneh nist va poshtvaneye anha *gheirat va sho’ur* ast v aba in *gheirat va sho’ur* ast ke enghelab dar hal e obur az marhaleye mohemm e khod ast (*Keyhan*, 03/08/2016).

‘I would say to Mr. President that the anti-imperialist slogans that people chant are not pointless; they are backed by *gheirat* and *sho’ur* ‘reason/intellect’ and it is with this *gheirat* and *sho’ur* that the revolution is passing through one of its important stages’.

In example (42), the combination of *gheirat* with *derâyat* ‘wisdom’ is suggested as the solution for implementing the political, cultural, and economic schemes of the Islamic Republic, where *gheirat* is the motivational as well as the administrative force that can make the plans become a reality:

(42) *Mardom sabet kardeand ke paye barnamewaye Nezam miistand. Meghdari gheirat e dini va meli va andaki derayat va barnamerizi mitavanad oza ra be saman konad* (*Keyhan*, 18/07/2016).

‘People have proved that they will firmly support the plans of the state. [Exercising] *some national and religious* *gheirat* and *some wisdom* and planning can handle things’.

3.4 *Gheirat* and gender segregation

Some extracts illustrate the relationship between *gheirat* and the principle of *mahranyiat* ‘legitimate intimacy’. *Mahraniyat* specifies the legitimate physical, social and emotional
intimacy between men and women. This law segregates men and women in social space and sets conditions for their social interactions (Khosravi, 2008; Tizro, 2013). According to this principle, men and women’s level of intimacy is determined by whether they are mahram ‘intimate’ or nāmahram ‘non-intimate’ to each other. This is a mutual relationship, meaning that if a man is mahram to a woman, she will also necessarily be mahram to him. For a man, his mother, mother-in-law, sister, wife, daughter, aunt, grandmother, and niece are considered his mahrāms ‘intimates’, which means that females of this category are unmarriageable (except for one’s wife who becomes a mahrām through marriage) and physical touch is not regarded as sinful (Haeri, 2014, p. 76). Females outside this category are considered nāmahram ‘non-intimate’. In presence of nāmahram females, men are required to keep physical distance and avoid touching them or speak provocatively (Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 1992). For a man, a nāmahram female can turn into a mahrām one only through marriage. On the other hand, for a woman, her father, father-in-law, brother, husband, uncle, grandfather, and nephew are considered her mahrāms, which means that members of this category (except for her husband who becomes a mahrām through marriage) are unmarriageable. Moreover, physical touch is not regarded as sinful and in presence of mahrāms they need not observe hejab. Men outside this category are viewed as nāmahram. In presence of nāmahrams, women are required to keep physical distance, observe hejab, and avoid touching them or speak provocatively (Koutlaki, 2010, p. 40).

Although mahrāmiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’ is not among the lexical items that immediately precede or follow gheirat, within a wider linguistic context (in some extracts), it appears to be strongly linked to mahrāmiyat and gender segregation. The extracts analyzed below indicate the role that gheirat plays in maintaining gender segregation.

Example (43) refers to the controversial initiative of Tehran mayor to separate men and women’s offices in the municipality. Possessing religious gheirat as a Muslim (i.e., the capability of identifying and tackling violations of religious norms) is mentioned to be the main motive for enforcing gender segregation. The threat planned to be removed by applying gheirat is that a woman spending time with her male colleagues at work would run the risk of getting emotionally close to nāmahram ‘non-intimate’ males and as a result she would not be able to pay enough attention to her own family (her mahrāms ‘intimates’), who are the ones who deserve full attention. Therefore, gheirat intervenes as an authoritative force to keep men and women separate from each other.
Shahrdar e tehran ba eshareh be sohbatheh matrah shode darbareye tafkik e Jensiyati dar shahrdari goft: ma gheirat e dini darim, harf e ma in ast ke nabayad ejazeh dahim yek khanom dar tul e zaman moasherat e bishtari ba namahraman dashte bashad ta ba mahraman e khod va shohar va farzandash, zira in mozu kanun e khanevadeh ra that e tasir e manfi gharar midahad (Keyhan, 19/07/2014).

‘Referring to the remarks raised on gender segregation policy in the municipality, Tehran mayor said: “we have religious gheirat. What we say is that we shouldn’t let a woman spend more time with nâmahrams [at work] than she spends with her mahrams, husband, and kids because this [spending more time with nâmahrams] will affect the family negatively.’

In the other extract (example 44), gheirat (as a religious value) and law are used to legitimize the enforcement of gender segregation. In other words, separating men and women at work is taken to be the result of applying gheirat and in conformity with what gheirat demands. Moreover, the message communicated is that women would be negatively affected by the mingling of the sexes at workplaces. The conservatives argue that in the presence of male colleagues, women would have to constantly mind their speech and conducts, which would cause discomfort and stress for them. On the other hand, being subject to sexual harassment and sexual assault would undermine women’s dignity (www.qudsonline.ir, 04/05/2015).

Emam jom’eye movaghat e Tehran bakhsh e payani sokhanan e khod ra be tajil az hefz e keramat e zan va afzayesh e amniyat e ravani dar mohit e kar ke bar asas e jodaie e mahram az namahram mibashad ekhtesas dad va khaterneshan kard in mas’aleh motabegh e gheirat va ghanun ast (Keyhan, 25/07/2014).

‘In the last part of his speech, Tehran’s Friday Prayer Imam glorified the preservation of women’s dignity and the increase in their psychological security at work, which are obtained by separating mahram from nâmahram. He pointed out that this [the segregation] is in compliance with gheirat and law.’

3.5 The embodiment of gheirat

As stated before, unfair treatments, threats or insults to one’s self-esteem, âberu ‘face/public image’, nâmus ‘female family members’, and sanctities can activate the feeling of gheirat. In
such cases, *gheirat* gives rise to anger/indignation. The following excerpt clearly shows the causal relationship between *gheirat* and anger:

(45) Be yaghin khashm e barkhaste az gheirat e dini larze bar andametan khahad andakht (*Keyhan*, 07/05/2013).

‘Certainly, the anger arisen from religious *gheirat* will make you shiver.’

According to Kövecses (1986, pp. 12–13), “increased body heat, increased internal pressure (blood pressure and muscular pressure), redness in face and neck area, agitation, and interference with accurate perception” are the physiological effects of anger that metonymically stand for the feeling of anger. While the same physiological responses signal the emergence of *gheirat*, this feeling is identified when the jugular vein sticks out. The protrusion of the jugular vein seems to be the exclusive physiological sign of *gheirat*, which in Persian is referred to as *rag e gheirat* ‘the vein of *gheirat*’. On that basis, a person who remains inattentive or passive to the violations of cultural-religious values would be called *birag* ‘veinless/having no veins’, which is extremely humiliating. The metonymic association between vein and *gheirat* has given rise to the metaphorical conceptualization of vein as a CONTAINER for *gheirat*:

(46) Ghalb e hezaran javan e momen e tabrizi chenan be tapesh oftad ke khune jushaneshan dar raghaye gheirat be jaryan daramad (*Keyhan*, 13/05/2014).

‘The hearts of Tabrizi young believers started beating so fast that their boiling blood circulated in the veins of *gheirat*’.

The above sentence shows two physiological effects of *gheirat*: increasing heart rate and increasing blood circulation. Also, *rag e gheirat* ‘the vein of *gheirat*’ metonymically stands for *gheirat*. The metaphor GHEIRAT IS THE HEAT OF BLOOD IN VEINS, which characterizes the intensity of *gheirat* in the above example, can be compared with the ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor underlying the expressions *you make my blood boil* and *I had reached the boiling point* (Kövecses, 1990, p. 53).

In (47), the nominal phrase *khun e gheirat va hemmat* ‘the blood of *gheirat* and endeavor’ metaphorically depicts *gheirat* and endeavor as defining or salient features of chivalrous men through GHEIRAT AND ENDEAVOR ARE BLOOD COMPONENTS
metaphor. A javânmard ‘chivalrous’ man would not remain inattentive to the needs of his fellow human beings and may even sacrifice or endanger his life to provide support or protection to the other(s).

(47) […] hameye javanmardan ke khun e gheirat va hemmat dar raghayeshan jarist […] (Keyhan, 22/12/2013).

‘[…] all those chivalrous men in whose veins the blood of gheirat and endeavor flows […].’

In example (48), the protrusion of the jugular vein (the vein of gheirat) is used as a yardstick for measuring the sensitivity level of government officials to the inequality in payments:

(48) Yani ba didan e dastmozdhaye nojumie footballistha va moghayesye an ba dastmozd e andak e mardom e mostazaf be rag e gheirat e anha bar nemikhorad? (Keyhan, 08/04/2014).

‘Doesn’t it irritate their gheirat when they compare the sky-high wages of soccer players with low wages of poor people?’

The idiomatic expression be rag e gheirat barkhoran [literally one’s vein of gheirat being irritated] means ‘to feel hurt, dissatisfied or angry when a cultural-religious taboo is violated or when one encounters an unfair treatment’. This idiom may be motivated by the EMOTIONAL HARM IS PHYSICAL HARM metaphor and PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECT OF EMOTION FOR EMOTION metonymy.

The bodily effect of gheirat can be observed in two other phrases dandan e gheirat be ham saidan ‘gnashing one’s teeth in gheirat’ and ba hanjareye gheirat javab dadan [literally, answering with the larynx of gheirat] ‘answering determinedly’:

(49) Salam bar anan ke dandan e gheirat be ham misayand (Keyhan, 27/07/2014)

‘Bravo to those who gnash their teeth in gheirat.’

Gnashing the teeth is one of the responses associated with anger, which can also be demonstrative of gheirat. As the example shows, this behavior is positively evaluated since it indicates one’s sensitivity and attention to moral and religious values.
In (50), the genitive construction *hanjarey e gheirat* literally ‘the larynx of gheirat’ represents a causal relationship between *gheirat* (the cause) and the manner of expressing *gheirat* through the larynx (the effect). Through the INSTRUMENT INVOLVED IN ACTION FOR THE MANNER OF DOING THE ACTION metonymy, the larynx stands for the determination in voice, which is suggestive of *gheirat*.

(50) Shahid Ahmad Zarei be Khomeini ba hanjareye gheirat ghalu bali goft va baraye pasdari az eslam va enghelab rahi jebhe shod (*Keyhan*, 25/01/2014).

‘Martyr Ahmad Zarei said yes to Imam Khomeini’s call determinedly and went to the battlefield to guard Islam and the revolution’.

The other important word pointing to the embodied aspects of *gheirat* is *ergh* ‘vein’, which is an Arabic word and collocates with *gheirat* (e.g., *gheirat va ergh e melli* ‘gheirat and patriotism’). The conventional expression *ergh dashtan*, literally ‘to have veins’ describes one’s unconditional support of national values and a high level of sensitivity to offensive or threatening acts and statements. Similar to *rag* ‘vein’, *ergh* ‘vein’ metonymically stands for *gheirat*, with the difference that *ergh* mainly profiles patriotic feelings and one’s ardent support of the country, as in *ergh e melli* ‘national ergh’.

3.6 Metaphor analysis of *gheirat*

This section deals with the analysis of metaphors that characterize functions and different aspects of *gheirat*. The examination of the linguistic expressions revealed 14 types of conceptual metaphors, which are presented in Table 2 along with their frequency of occurrence. The list excludes novel metaphors that did not occur frequently. However, some of these novel metaphors, which will be discussed in the course of the research, highlight important aspects of the meaning of *gheirat*, such as the emergence (*GHEIRAT IS SOUL*), passivity (*PASSIVITY OF GHEIRAT IS SLEEP*), and intensity (*GHEIRAT IS A NATURAL FORCE*) aspects.
Table 2. Frequency of *gheirat* metaphors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual metaphors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A POSSESSED OBJECT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL HARM IS PHYSICAL HARM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A SHOOTING TARGET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NATION IS A FAMILY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NATION IS A PERSON</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A MOVING OBJECT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE INTENSITY OF GHEIRAT IS THE INTENSITY OF COLOR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A PERSON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS A BLOOD COMPONENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHEIRAT IS FIRE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The metaphor GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY seems to represent the monitoring and protective functions of *gheirat*. This metaphor shows that the duty of *gheirat* is to police the situations to ensure religious values and national interests are not threatened or violated by others. Such clauses as *gheiratam ghabul nemikonad/ ejazeh nemidahad* ‘my *gheirat* does not accept/let’ show one’s refrainment of violating cultural values as well as one’s determination to prevent others from violating the norms. Also, a rhetorical question like *gheiratet koja rafte* ‘where has your *gheirat* gone?’ is asked to criticize the person harshly for not exhibiting *gheirat*. These expressions are the conventional conceptualizations that highlight the monitoring role of *gheirat*:

(51) *Gheirat e man ejazeh nemidahad* kharejiha az marakez e nezamieman bazresi konand *(Keyhan, 05/07/2015)*.

‘*My gheirat* does not allow foreigners to inspect our military bases.’

In (52), the writer accuses the government of President Rouhani of allegedly giving in to the requests of the West during the nuclear negotiations between Iran and P5+1, and of reaching a bad deal in which national interests were not supposedly preserved. In the sentence, lack of a firm resistance against the West is relativized to the lack of *gheirat* in the officials, that is, President Rouhani and the negotiating team. In the GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY metaphor, passivity toward unfair treatments corresponds to the physical absence of *gheirat* in the body.
Gheirat e dolatmardan e in dolat koja rafte bud ke hamaye dashtehaye in mellat e ghayur ra ruye miz e mozakereh gozasht va chub e haraj be anha zad? (Keyhan, 25/04/2016).

‘Where had the government officials’ gheirat gone that they put all the possessions of this brave nation on the negotiation table for sale?’

Another metaphor that represents the role of gheirat in preserving moral values and social order is GHEIRAT IS A PERSON. In statements in which gheirat is personified, the metaphor presents a tragic image of the loss of gheirat in individuals evidenced by their supposedly obvious negligence to moral and religious values. More specifically, gheirat is viewed as a person holding a significant responsibility, who leaves his residence (the society) because of being displeased with the situations (people’s inattentiveness to the values). In (53), a person in his diary expresses his discontent with low morality in Iranian society before the Islamic revolution. In the text, the act of leaving or moving from the residence is metonymically expressed through rakht bar bastan ‘packing clothes’.

(53) Gheirat, ensaniat va shoja’at az mian e ejtema rakht barbaste ast va zendegi dar chenin ejtemaie, joz zellat baraye man va amsal e man nist (Keyhan, 17/06/2016).

‘Gheirat, humanity, and bravery have moved away from the society. Living in such a society is nothing but abjection for me and people like me.’

Many words and expressions in the data figuratively conceptualize various aspects of gheirat, such as existence, sufficiency, intensity, emergence, passivity, harm, vulnerability, and value.

Existence

In Persian, the perceived existence or lack of moral values in individuals is estimated through two basic prepositions, bâ-bi ‘with-without’, that appear in compound adjectives as prefixes (Goldin, 2015, p. 34), which I refer to as bâ-bi categorization. This fundamental categorization system is based on the MORAL VALUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS metaphor. Some adjectives containing the word gheirat realize this metaphor: bâgheirat ‘having or possessing gheirat’, gheiratmand ‘a gheirat-possessing person’ in which the suffix mand ‘possessor’ denotes the existence of gheirat, bigheirat ‘a person lacking gheirat’, barkhordar az gheirat ‘possessed of gheirat’, and feghdan e gheirat ‘the loss of gheirat’. The adjective ghayur contextually meaning ‘courageous’ is another word that refers to a person
who admiringly exhibits *gheirat* where necessary. While possessing *gheirat* is praiseworthy and culturally expected of men and women, the perceived lack of it is deemed humiliating and insulting when attributed to a person:


‘The Iranian *bāgheirat* young men sent the enemy out of the country.’

(55) Hamantor ke akhiran aghaye Javadi Amoli be an eshare kardand, forooshe khane va mamlekat be bigane mesdaghe kamel e *bigheiratist* (*Keyhan*, 28/05/2016).

‘As Mr. Javadi Amoli [a religious authority in Iran] recently pointed out, selling the house and country to aliens is a perfect example of lacking *gheirat* [being *bigheirat*].’

### Sufficiency

A number of words and expressions denote the insufficiency of *gheirat* in situations in which *gheirat* needs to be adequately applied. Such phrases as *Zarei gheirat* ‘a bit of *gheirat*’, *kamtarin mayei az gheirat* ‘the least amount of *gheirat*’, *sare suzani sharaf va gheirat* ‘a pinprick of honor and *gheirat*’, *yek jo gheirat* ‘a grain of *gheirat*’, *yek mesghal gheirat* ‘a bit of *gheirat*’ [*mesghâl* is a unit of weight nearly equal to 5 grams] offensively criticize the low level of *gheirat* in a person:

(56) Harkas *sare suzani sharaf va gheirat* dashte bashad hadeaghal kari ke mitavanad bokonad shenidan e harfhaye bazmandegan va alaghemandan be shohadast (*Keyhan*, 17/06/2015).

‘Anyone who has a pinprick of honor and *gheirat* could at least listen to the survivors and to those who are interested in martyrs.’

(57) Agar saran e arab be andazeye *yek jo gheirat* midashtand, sarnevesht e felestin va mardom e ghazze in nabud ke emruz shahedash hastim (*Keyhan*, 03/08/2014).

‘If Arab leaders had a grain of *gheirat*, the fate of Palestine and people of Gaza would not be the one we are observing now.’

(58) In moddaian e eslahat *yek mesghal gheirat e melli va esteghlal* nadarand? (*Keyhan*, 10/05/2016).
‘Don’t the proponents of reformism have a bit of national *gheirat* and independence [from foreign countries]?’

Similarly to other emotion concepts such as anger and love (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987; Kövecses, 1990, 2000), the human body is seen as a metaphorical CONTAINER for *gheirat*. In example (59), the word *vojud* ‘the body’ is conceived as a metaphorical container that gets filled with *gheirat*, which is the content of the container (*GHEIRAT IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER*). A high level of *gheirat* is positively viewed in (59) as opposed to example (60) where the passivity of the Shah [the king of Iran before the Islamic revolution] toward foreign governments’ interference in Iran’s internal affairs is harshly criticized by depicting a container (the body) devoid of its content (*gheirat*).

(59) *Vojud e emam mamlov az gheirat e dini bud va amadeh bud ghorbani e eslam shaved* (*Keyhan*, 04/06/2016).

‘Imam [Ayatollah Khomeini, the founder of the Islamic Republic] was *replete with religious gheirat*. He had come to sacrifice himself for Islam.’

(60) *Yek on sor e fased, nalayegh, vabaste, va ghaleban tohi az gheirat e meli saheb e mamlekat bud* (*Keyhan*, 01/04/2016).

‘A corrupt, inept, dependent person [the Shah], who was often *devoid of national gheirat*, owned the country [Iran].’

*Intensity*

The intensity level of *gheirat* varies with different impacts that various social, religious, and political events and situations can have on individuals. In other words, such impacts may increase or decrease one’s sensitivity to cultural and religious values. The variability of the level of *gheirat* is shown through *LEVEL OF GHEIRAT IS THE LEVEL OF SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER* metaphor in the following examples:

(61) *Pas az Ashura va dar mohit e ro’b o khafaghan, gheirat e dini e mardom afzayesh yafteh bud* (*Keyhan*, 25/04/2014).
‘After Âshura⁶, in an atmosphere of dread and suffocation, people’s religious gheirat had increased.’

(62) Doshman talash mikonad dar jaryan e tahajom e farhangi gheirat va hasasiat e mardom ra nesbat be arzeshhaye eslami kam konad (Keyhan, 31/05/2015).

‘Through cultural invasion, the enemy attempts to reduce people’s gheirat and sensitivity to Islamic values.’

In (63), gor gereftan ‘to blaze’ sets up the metaphor GHEIRAT IS FIRE. The metaphor highlights the intensity of gheirat, which is caused by recalling a historical event in which the daughter of the Prophet, Fatemeh, the symbol of purity and chastity in Muslim cultures, was allegedly killed in front of her husband (Imam Ali, the first Shia Imam). The excerpt illustrates how harming or insulting the sanctities can trigger and intensify gheirat:

(63) Agar tanha dokhtare rasule khoda nabudi va agar dar moghabele hamsarat tora nemikoshtand inghadr gheirateman gor nagerefte bud (Keyhan, 11/03/2016).

‘If you had not been the only daughter of the Prophet and if you had not been killed in front of your spouse, our gheirat would not have blazed that much.’

In (64), the threat of ISIS to Shia sanctities in Syria, particularly the possibility of destroying the shrine of Zeinab, the granddaughter of the Prophet buried in Syria, intensifies the feeling of gheirat in Shia Muslims. It should be noted that the Iranian soldiers dispatched to Syria to support the Syrian government are referred to as modâfein e haram ‘defenders of the shrine’. The phrasal verb be jush âmadan ‘to come to a boil’ provides a metaphorical understanding of the intensity of gheirat via the GHEIRAT IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor. In the sentence, the intensity of gheirat corresponds to the intensity of the fluid in the container:

(64) Harkas vaghti mishenavad momken ast daeshiha biayand va ghabr e hazrat e zeinab ra takhrib konand gheiratash be jush miyad (Keyhan, 11/07/2016).

‘The gheirat of anyone hearing that ISIS may demolish the tomb of Zeinab [the granddaughter of the Prophet] comes to a boil.’

---

6. The day of Ashura for Shia Muslims is a major religious commemoration of the martyrdom of Imam Hossein, a grandson of the Prophet (www.bbc.co.uk, 06/12/2011).
In another excerpt, the GHEIRAT IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER characterizes the intensity of *gheirat* through a larger metaphorical container. In (65), it is the Islamic world which is seen as the container, with *gheirat* being conceived as a hot fluid boiling in the container. The shift in the use of the metaphorical container is facilitated by the metonymic substitution of land for people. The metonymy WHOLE FOR PART contributes to understanding *gheirat* as a collective experience rather than an individual feeling state, which serves the purpose of presenting Iranians as having a unified viewpoint toward Western powers. The word *sâzeshnâpaziri* ‘irreconcilability’, which collocates with *gheirat* in the text, represents the result of applying *gheirat*. The cause of *gheirat* in this context is apparently the West’s attempt to change the political and religious structure in Iran, which would turn Iran into a secular state. Iranians allegedly resist the pressures of the West and show their support of the Islamic Republic by applying *gheirat*.

(65) Afarin bar mellati ke shur va sho’ur va shoarhayeshan paytakhte enghelab va ommolgharaye jahan e eslam ra be [kanun e jusheshe gheirat va sazesh napaziri](Keyhan, 19/06/2015) tabdil karde ast.

‘Bravo to a nation whose zeal, understanding, and slogans have turned the capital of the revolution [Tehran] and the most important land of the Islamic world [Iran] into the center for boiling *gheirat* and irreconcilability.’

Another evidence for showing the similarity between anger and *gheirat* is provided by the source domain of NATURAL FORCE, which characterizes the intensity aspect of both of the emotions. This is the source domain that also characterizes the intensity aspect of anger in English (Kövecses, 2000, p. 41). Extract (66) refers to the political unrest in Iran following the 2009 presidential elections. The demonstrators protested against the alleged electoral fraud in support of one of the presidential candidates and street fight broke out between the proponents of the supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, and the protesters.

(66) In [gerdbadhaye be gheirat daramade taslim e rahbarand ke tufan nemikonand](Keyhan, 06/07/2015).

‘These whirlwinds obey the leader, that’s why they do not show a fierce reaction.’

*Gerdbâd* ‘whirlwind’ refers to the proponents of the supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, through the GHEIRAT IS A NATURAL FORCE metaphor. The metaphor characterizes the intensity of anger as well as the intensity of reaction to the protesters induced by *gheirat*. The
metaphor GHEIRAT IS A NATURAL FORCE is further manifested in the verb *tufân kardan* literally ‘to make storm’ [to rage or to show a fierce reaction]. The participle adjective *be gheirat daramade*, literally ‘into-gheirat-turned’ modifying the noun *gerdbâd* ‘whirlwind’ shows the change of state from rational to emotional as a result of the political unrest in the country.

A number of extracts illustrate how the intensity of *gheirat* influences the quality of culturally important acts and activities by employing the source domain of COLOR.

In (67), *gheirat* contextually means the ardent support of football fans to their favorite teams. The verb *rang bâkhtan* ‘to pale’ provides a metaphorical understanding of the decreasing intensity of *gheirat* (ardent support) via the INTENSITY OF GHEIRAT IS INTENSITY OF COLOR metaphor. This metaphor also presents the low intensity of *gheirat* as a tragedy.

(67) Garche momken ast gheirat be pirahan dar futbal e ma rang bakhte bashad amma hanuz gushei az zehne besyari az ma Iranian hamvareh dargir dar futbal ast (*Keyhan*, 21/07/2015).

‘Although the ardent support of football teams may have paled, football still always occupies a corner of the minds of many of us Iranians’.

In extract (68), the writer admires the bravery of bulldozer drivers who would build earthwork for the Iranian soldiers during the Iran-Iraq war under heavy artillery and mortar fire at the frontline. The metaphor INTENSITY OF GHEIRAT IS INTENSITY OF COLOR is employed to highlight the effect of applying *gheirat* on the quality of the battle with the enemy and its role in protecting Iranian troops.

(68) Jesarat va shojaat e mesalzadani e karegarani ke dar ruzhaye sakht e jang e tahmili rang e gheirat va mardanegi bar chehreye khakrizhaye defa az eslam va enghelab neshandand farmush shodani nist (*Keyhan*, 08/09/2014).

‘The exemplary courage and bravery of the workers are unforgettable, who, during the difficult days of the imposed war, painted the battlefields of defending Islam and the revolution with *gheirat* and manliness.’
A group of metaphors focuses on the emergence of *gheirat* in response to situations that are expected to trigger this feeling. In (69), the GHEIRAT IS A MOVING OBJECT metaphor shows the change of feeling states from rational to emotional in men as a result of seeing or hearing about their *nâmus* ‘female family members’ being in close contact with *nâmahram* ‘non-intimate’ men, which is a violation of Islamic moral codes specified for married women. In this example, the emergence of *gheirat* corresponds to the movement of an object. The statement criticizes the passivity of some men toward a supposedly explicit flouting of moral codes by their wives in public.

(69) Be man khabar reside ke zanan e shoma dar bazarha dushadush e mardan rah miravand. Aya *gheirat* e shoma be harekar dar nemiyad? (Keyhan, 15/07/2014).

‘I have been informed that your wives walk shoulder to shoulder with men in bazaars. **Doesn’t your gheirat move [don’t you get irritated]** when you notice that?’

In (70), a political event, Richard Nixson’s visit to Iran in 1953, is the cause of the emergence of *gheirat* in the students of the University of Tehran at the time. The verb *derakhshidan* ‘shining’ provides a positive evaluation of the activation of *gheirat* and its manifestation (the protest against President Nixson’s visit) via the GHEIRAT IS A STAR metaphor. The university students in the example are referred to as *farzandân e mellat* ‘children of the nation’, which seems to suggest that the demonstrators had represented the whole Iranian nation through NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor.

(70) Amma nagahan gheirat e enghelabi e farzandan e melat dar daneshgah e Tehran derakhshid va javanan e ghayur aleih e hozur e Nikson tazahorat kardand (Keyhan, 07/12/2013).

‘But suddenly the *gheirat* of the revolutionary children of the nation [the university students] shone at Tehran University and *ghayur* ‘gheirat-possessing’ young people demonstrated against the presence of Nixson [the former U.S. president].’

Example (71) sarcastically questions the *gheirat* of a well-known political commentator in Iran who, contrary to the views of some political conservatives, believes in normalizing diplomatic relationships with the West. The verb *gol kardan* ‘to flower’ figuratively refers to the emergence of *gheirat* after a period of being inactive, especially
when one has not exhibited *gheirat* in situations in which it has been expected to be shown. Through the idiomatic expression, the passivity of *gheirat* is likened to a bud.

(71) Gheirat aghaye zibakalam koja momken ast gol konad? Yani mellat e iran bayad ekhtiari e hayat o mamak e khod ra be amrika va englis besparand? (*Keyhan*, 28/01/2014).

‘Where may Mr. Zibakalam’s *gheirat* flower [where may he exhibit *gheirat*]? [Does he mean that] the Iranian nation should let the U.S. and Britain decide for its life and death?’

In (72), martyrs of the war (the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980’s) and the sanctity associated with them cause *gheirat* to emerge in Iranians, leading to building resistance against the U.S., which allegedly supported Iraq during the war with Iran. The significance of *gheirat* in maintaining resistance against the current political pressures of the U.S. is depicted by the GHEIRAT IS SOUL and NATION IS A HUMAN BODY metaphors.

(72) In Jemaat negaranand ke amdan e ghavasan ruhe gheirat va ezzat ra dar mallat va dolat zendeh konad va shekastan e khatte moghavemat e Iran hamchenan arezuye dast nayaftani e amrika baghi bemanad (*Keyhan*, 21/06/2015).

‘These people are worried that the arrival of [the body of] the divers would revive the soul of *gheirat* and esteem in the nation and the government, and breaking Iran’s line of resistance [against the West] would remain an inaccessible dream for the U.S.’

In example (73), the metaphorical use of *gheirat* profiles a change of state from rational to emotional triggered by certain social situations. The expression, *be gheirat âvardan* ‘to bring to *gheirat*’ is a caused-motion construction. Given the event structure metaphors CAUSES ARE FORCES and CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS (*Lakoff*, 1993), which are involved in the formation of the construction, an external element (the particular acts of the enemies such as attack or insult) causes the person to feel *gheirat* and react to the situation promptly.

(73) Goruhi ra niz doshmanan e nadan be gheirat miavarand ve be tasmim mirasanand (*Keyhan*, 28/02/2016).

‘A group of people are brought to *gheirat* and decision making through ignorant enemies’

In (74), *gheirati shodan* ‘to get *gheirati*’ refers to the state of feeling *gheirat*. This feeling state is a combination of indignation and/or discontent since a social-religious norm is
perceived to have been violated (women not observing hejab properly in this case), driving the person to ask the woman to cover up.

(74) Har mardi ba didan e inchenin sahnehai gheirati shode va ehsas e narezayati mikonad (Keyhan, 13/11/2015).

‘Every man gets gheirati and feels discontented by seeing such scenes [seeing women with an improper hejab].’

The adjective gheirati is also used to refer to men who are known to be very sensitive to or vigilant of the covering status and behavior of their female family members in relation to other men and strictly control them. Moreover, a gheirati man does not stand any insult to his nâmus on the part of other men.

Passivity

Passivity is a further aspect of gheirat depicted through SLEEP metaphor. Example (75) refers to the returning of the bodies of 175 divers buried alive by the Iraqi army during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980’s (www.reuters.com, 16/06/2015).

(75) Mardom be tazim e shahidani amadeh budand ke ba dastane baste zende dar zire kharvarha khak khoftand ta gheirat va iman hargez be khab naravad (Keyhan, 16/06/2015).

‘People had come to bow down to martyrs who slept alive under piles of soil with tied hands so that gheirat and faith would not fall asleep.’

Defending the country against foreign threats is a prime means of exhibiting gheirat. For that reason, martyrs are symbols of gheirat and bravery for Iranians. The source domain of SLEEP simultaneously characterizes death and passivity of gheirat. It seems that the DEATH IS SLEEP metaphor realized in zire kharvarha khak khoftan ‘sleeping under piles of soil’ contextually induces the PASSIVITY OF GHEIRAT IS SLEEP metaphor. By entailment, the activated form of gheirat corresponds to the state of being awake. The DEATH IS SLEEP metaphor contributes to illustrating a very emotional image of the way the divers sacrificed their lives for the country and in the last clause, the PASSIVITY OF GHEIRAT IS SLEEP metaphor reflects the negativity associated with insensitivity toward religious values. Moreover, preserving gheirat and faith is presented as the goal of the soldiers for going to the battlefield.
Harm

Harm is the other aspect of gheirat that is metaphorically highlighted. In (76), the EMOTIONAL HARM IS PHYSICAL HARM metaphor evoked by the expression jarihe dar shodan e gheirat e dini ‘the wounding of religious gheirat’ reflects the outrage the late Richard Frye’s request to be buried in the city of Isfahan provoked in some political conservatives, who accused him of being a CIA agent (www.bbc.co.uk, 08/04/2014).

(76) ba tavajoh be aksolamal e shadid e mardom va jarihe dar shodan e gheirat e dini va melli e mardom entezar miravad hazrat e ali dasturi lazem be vezarat e khareje va ettelaat sader farmayand ke be hich onvan tan be in nang e diplomatic nadahand (Keyhan, 14/04/2014).

‘Given the intense reaction of the people of the province [Isfahan] and the wounding of their religious and national gheirat, it is expected that you [the president] require the ministries of foreign affairs and intelligence to not give in to this diplomatic disgrace.’

In example (77), the presumed enemy of Iranians is accused of planning to transform national and religious assumptions in the minds of young Iranians. Here, gheirat seems to be pictured as a glass object whose normal shape is damaged by the effects of Western lifestyle and media, leading to decreasing sensitivity to national and religious values:

(77) Doshman ghasd darad gheirat e javanane irani ra khadshedar konad (Keyhan, 06/05/2015).

‘The enemy intends to scratch the gheirat of young Iranians’.

Vulnerability

A group of sentences metaphorically highlight the vulnerability of gheirat. This aspect of the concept indicates the significance of gheirat as a moral virtue and the necessity for preserving it. In the following examples, un-Islamic lifestyle and particular political positions of the Iranian officials are believed to be endangering the existence of gheirat. In (78), based on the GHEIRAT IS A PERISHABLE FOOD IN A CONTAINER metaphor, gheirat is conceptualized as a perishable food inside the body motivated by the verb zâye shodan ‘to rot’ and adopting an un-Islamic lifestyle (having a luxurious life) is seen as the element that eliminates the gheirat (spoils the food in the source domain).
Anha jozve kesani budand ke daramadeshan ra sarf e tajamolgerai kardand. Az in ru, gheirat e dini dar daruneshan zaye shod (Keyhan, 22/06/2016).

‘They were among those who spent their income on luxury. Therefore, religious gheirat rotted away in them.’

In (79), the significance of gheirat in protecting national pride is demonstrated by conceptualizing the nation as an EMOTIONAL PERSON. Here, gheirat functions to resist the allegedly unacceptable expectations of the West for curtailing Iran’s nuclear program. From the viewpoint of some political conservatives in Iran, compromising with the West demeans the image of Iran as a powerful and independent country on the international scene.

Ahgaye rohani! In mavaze baese gheirat zodai va gereftan e ghorur e melli khahad shod va dar natije taslim dar barabar e zurguyan ra teorizeh khahad kard (Keyhan, 10/06/2014).

‘Mr. Rohani [the Iranian president] such positions [toward the West in nuclear negotiations] will obliterate the gheirat and take away the national pride. As a result, they will provide the ground for surrendering to bullies.’

Another means of showing the significance of gheirat as a moral value is depicting the particular acts of people and media representations as opponents of gheirat. In such statements, gheirat is metaphorically viewed as a SHOOTING TARGET:

Iman va gheirat e dini amaj e tupkhane e tahajom e farhangist (Keyhan, 01/09/2014).

‘Faith and religious gheirat are being targeted by the artillery of cultural invasion.’

Example (80) pictures a scene in a battlefield where fundamental cultural values are attacked by Western lifestyles and media. The metaphors WESTERN MEDIA AND LIFESTYLE ARE ARTILLERY BULLETS and GHEIRAT IS A SHOOTING TARGET provide the interpretation that the West is discontent with such values and attempts at dominating other (Muslim) cultures through changing their religious beliefs and traditions.

In (81), gheirat is metaphorically seen as a hefâz ‘shield’ protecting other religious values (effat and haya) and Persian-speaking satellite channels are bullets aiming at gheirat. The source domain of BULLET in the PERSIAN CHANNELS ARE BULLETS metaphor
highlights the allegedly destructive impacts of such channels on core values in Iranian culture. The destructive impacts are supposedly brought about by TV series illustrating cheating in married life, immodestly dressed women and sexual relationships.

(81) Rah andazi e shabakehhaye mahvareye farsi zaban akharin tire tarkeshe doshman baraye az bein bordan e hefaze effat va hayaye jamé’e yani gheirat ast (Keyhan, 11/08/2014).

‘Launching Persian-speaking satellite channels is the last bullet of the enemy for destroying ghierat, which is the shield of effat and haya in the society.’

Value

In (82), gheirat be khajr danad ‘spending gheirat’ contextually means ‘exercising or applying gheirat’, evoking the GHEIRAT IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY. Here, gheirat acts as a propelling force that would motivate the government officials to draw attention to the management defects in the system and resolve the problems.

(82) Bayad naresaiha ra goft ta masulin gheirat be khajr bedahand va be fekr e chareh bioftand (Keyhan, 07/06/2015).

‘Inadequacies should be expressed so that the officials spend gheirat and think of finding a solution.’

Example (83) deals with Iran’s nuclear negotiations with P5+1. Gheirat and ezzat ‘esteem’ are metaphorically seen as non-tradable, valuable commodities. The metaphor implicates that Iran will not yield to the demands of the West during the negotiations. A pivotal role is assigned to gheirat in this statement since this feeling preserves national pride by reacting to any humiliating acts of the negotiating partners.

(83) Mellat e shoja e Iran neshan khahad dad ke hazer be moamele va mozakere bar sar e manafe’e melli, ezzat va gheirat e khod nist (Keyhan, 09/10/2013).

‘The brave Iranian nation will show that it will not negotiate and trade over its national interests, esteem, and gheirat.’

3.7 Cultural prototypes of gheirat

Given the linguistic and nonlinguistic usages of gheirat, this concept seems to demonstrate
three main functions. Below, I introduce these functions along with a prototypical model for each function and some illustrative examples from the data. In the explication of the prototypes, following Kövecses (1990), I assume that the master metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE characterizes different stages of the prototypical models of *gheirat*.

1. *Gheirat* is used to protect a man’s überu ‘face/public image’, pride, nâmus, family, love relationships, religious sanctities, and national values against threat, insult, and injury. Anger, hatred, and jealousy\(^7\) are three prototypical emotions that arise from the application of *gheirat*.

*The prototype of the protective function:*
1. The self monitors the other
2. The other violates a moral code or threatens a value important for the self
3. The self realizes the threat/insult/injury
4. The threat exerts force upon the self
5. *Gheirat* comes into existence
6. *Gheirat* exerts force upon the self
7. Emotions come into being (indignation, hatred, or jealousy)
8. The self becomes emotional
9. Emotions are expressed
10. The self protects the values.

(84) *Gheirat e man ejazeh nemidahad* kharejiha az marakeze nezamieman bazresi konand *(Keyhan, 05/07/2015).*

‘*My gheirat does not permit* foreigners to inspect our military sites.’

(85) Kesani hastand ke janeshan ra fadaye nehzat e engelab va mandegarie khate emam mikonand va gheirat e dini darand *(Keyhan, 05/06/2016).*

‘There are persons who *have religious gheirat* and would sacrifice their lives for the revolution and the survival of Imam Khomeini’s line [Ayatollah Khomeini, the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran].’

2. *Gheirat* is exercised to provide support to the needs of the other. Selflessness, benevolence, and philanthropy are the main senses that are triggered by *gheirat*.

\(^7\) Jealousy as an emotion triggered by *gheirat* appears only in the context of love relationships.
The prototype of the ‘supportive function’

1. The self monitors the situation
2. The other runs into a problem or is in need of attention and support
3. The self realizes the problem of the other
4. The problem exerts force upon the self
5. *Gheirat* comes into existence
6. *Gheirat* exerts force upon the self
7. Emotions come into being (selflessness and philanthropy)
8. The self becomes emotional
9. The self expresses his emotions
10. The other is supported

(86) *Kojast gheirat e irani? Chetor mitavanim asude bekhabim vaghti hamvatanan e irani e ma hamzaman darand ghatl e aam mishavand?* (*Keyhan*, 17/06/2016).

‘Where is the Iranian *gheirat*? How can we sleep comfortably when our Iranian compatriots are at the same time being murdered?’

(87) *Bayad naresaiha rag oft ta masulin gheirat be kharj dahand ve be fekr e chareh bioftand* (*Keyhan*, 07/06/2015).

‘Shortages should be expressed so that officials would spend *gheirat* and think of finding solutions.’

3. *Gheirat* is applied to provide a supplementary force to assist the self in accomplishing goals.

The prototype model of the ‘reinforcing function’

1. The self engages in an activity
2. The self exerts force to accomplish the activity
3. The self fails to accomplish the activity
4. *Gheirat* comes into existence
5. *Gheirat* exerts force upon the self
6. The self becomes emotional
7. The self expresses his emotion
8. The self accomplishes the activity

(88) *Gheirat va istadegi e mellat e iran baest shode ta keshvareman be yek ghodrat e defai...*
e bartar dar jahan mobaddal shaved (Keyhan, 29/06/2015)

‘The gheirat and resistance of the Iranian nation have made our country turn into a superior defensive power in the world.’

(89) Bachehaye tim ba gheirat o angizeye faravan dar tamrin hozurdarand (Keyhan, 07/07/2014).

‘Team members participate in practices with a lot of gheirat and motivation.’

The causal, ontological, and expressive parts of gheirat in different social situations could be illustrated by the basic schema for emotion concepts (Kövecses, 1990; 2000):

Cause of emotion → emotion → response
Cause of emotion → gheirat → emotion(s) → response
A man winking at one’s wife → gheirat → anger → punching the person in the face
One’s wife/lover socializing with a male colleague → gheirat → jealousy → forcing her to stop seeing or speaking with him.

The other being in need of help and support → gheirat → senses of selflessness and philanthropy → emotional response
The other loses his job → gheirat → senses of selflessness and philanthropy → the other is financially supported regularly until he/she finds a job.
Insufficiency of internal forces for accomplishing goals → gheirat → exerting additional force → goals are accomplished
One has lost hope to finish a project within a short time → gheirat → one increases efforts → the project is done.

As the realizations of the cultural model of GHEIRAT in various situational contexts demonstrate, this emotion is predominantly triggered by social events, leading to particular social actions, though in one function, i.e., the reinforcing function, gheirat is triggered by psychological events rather than actual social events. However, even in this case, gheirat is largely motivated by imagining cultural expectations and social situations. For example, graduating from a foreign university is regarded as a culturally precious goal, which could substantially promote the social position of the person (one could gain a considerable amount of âberu ‘face/public image’), and failing to achieve the goal could be very humiliating. The imagination of the social expectations as well as the negative consequences of failing to
finish one’s studies would make the person apply *gheirat* to achieve his/her goals. Considering these points, *gheirat* is, to a large extent, a “social construct” (Lutz, 1988).

### 3.8 Discussion and summary of the findings

The analysis reveals that in the course of regulating the sexuality of individuals, *gheirat* forms a cluster with *mahramiyat* ‘legitimate intimacy’, *haya* ‘self-restraint’, *effat* ‘chastity’, *âberu* ‘face/public image’, *hejab* ‘veiling’, *nàmus* ‘female family members’, and *harim* ‘holy space/border’. Within this cluster, *gheirat* polices the interpersonal relationships between Iranian men and women. More specifically, it acts as an authoritative force, setting limits on the sexuality of men and women. Therefore, while the analysis demonstrates the interrelationship between *gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab*, it also reveals a larger conceptual network involved in the restriction of sexuality.

Data analysis indicates that *gheirat* acts as a notifier. It operates to notify the self of the violations of rights and values by the other, of the other’s need for receiving protection and support, and of one’s own need to exert extra force in order to accomplish goals. Such functions show that the definitions provided for *gheirat* in sociology, anthropology, and gender studies are incomplete and do not reflect the multifaceted nature of this concept. The cognitive linguistic analysis of *gheirat* does justice to the definition of *gheirat* and proves to be useful in unraveling the complex structure of concepts which, similar to *gheirat*, represent core cultural values. Moreover, it is shown that, despite being typically defined as a male feature, *gheirat* can be assigned to both sexes (evidenced by cases in which *gheirat* turns into a necessary feature of women and is demonstrated through observing *hejab* and *effat* and even in some contexts it can be a gender-neutral feature. The application of *gheirat* to internal forces (the reinforcing function of *gheirat*) is the evidence for cases in which *gheirat* may be considered as a gender-neutral feature.

The unpleasant consequences of neglecting the rights, values, and goals for the self and the social group one subscribes to justifies the existence of a mental monitoring device that propels the person to take proper actions promptly before facing the consequences. Given this basic function of *gheirat*, i.e., being a notifier and a monitoring device, this concept can be found in not only Muslim cultures but also in cultures in which honor and self-restraint play a significant role in regulating interpersonal relationships, with the difference that in Muslim cultures *gheirat* is largely motivated by Islamic teachings, which underscore the necessity of defending the sanctities and *nàmus* of the family.
The conceptualizations of gheirat in different situational contexts demonstrate that gheirat is a “body-based social construct” (Kövecses, 2000; Kövecses et al., 2003). On the one hand, unlike culturally constructed emotion concepts which, according to social constructionists, “contain less reference to physiological responses”, such as song ‘justified anger’ in Ifaluk (Lutz, 1987, p. 292) gheirat is inextricably linked to the physiology of experience and embodiment. Physiological responses associated with gheirat (e.g., the protrusion of the jugular vein) are important clues for identifying the emotion and determining the social status of individuals. Various metonymic and metaphoric conceptualizations of the physiological responses of gheirat are further evidence for the cultural significance of the expressive part of this emotion. Similar to other emotion concepts investigated from the experientialist perspective (Kövecses, 1986, 1990, 2000), gheirat is characterized by the image schema of CONTAINER, which provides the source domain for the BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR GHEIRAT metaphor. Given that image schemas emerge from universal properties and functions of the body (Kövecses, 1990, p. 25), it could be suggested that gheirat is to some extent motivated by universal human experience. On the other hand, gheirat largely arises in social situations and triggers various action responses. Moreover, the meaning of gheirat is dependent on and is shaped by personal and social roles and goals, and moral viewpoints.

Key functions and major aspects of the concept of GHEIRAT (the existence, sufficiency, emergence, intensity, passivity, harm, vulnerability, and value aspects) are metaphorically conceptualized and constructed. The GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY metaphor demonstrates the most important and most general function of gheirat, which characterizes nearly all pragmatic uses of the concept. This degree of precision in describing this concept would not have been achieved if metaphorical representations had not been taken into account. This finding reinforces the idea that the analysis of emotion concepts without considering the role of metaphors would be incomplete, leaving much of the conceptual content of emotion concepts in the dark (Kövecses, 1990, 1995, 2000).

Some of the metaphors characterizing the intensity aspect of gheirat, such as GHEIRAT IS FIRE and GHEIRAT IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, are similar to metaphors of anger (ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER) as analyzed by Kövecses (1990). However, gheirat seems to lack the control aspect, which is one of the main aspects addressed by metaphors of anger. The lack of control aspect in
gheirat can be attributed to the fact that this aspect would disrupt the normal functioning of gheirat, which is propelling the self to take action in response to violations of norms and values. Also, gheirat is seen as a moral virtue and is positively evaluated, whereas anger is negatively evaluated (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987).

Gheirat fulfills its functions through giving rise to a wide range of emotions, such as anger, hatred, jealousy, pride, and selflessness. The multiplicity of the feelings triggered by gheirat could be attributed to the variety of domains that interact with it. This feature of gheirat distinguishes it from other prototypical emotion concepts.

Gheirat is capable of standing flexibly in metonymic relationship with the emotions that it gives rise to (the GHEIRAT FOR COURAGE, GHEIRAT FOR PRIDE, and GHEIRAT FOR JEALOUSY conceptual metonyms), its causes (the GHEIRAT FOR NÂMUS, an instantiation of the EMOTION FOR CAUSE OF EMOTION metonymy), and with the ultimate physiological responses associated with it (the JUGULAR VEIN FOR GHEIRAT, an instantiation of the EMOTIONAL RESPONSE FOR EMOTION). In prototypical emotion concepts investigated by Kövecses (1986, 1990), metonymic relationships mainly occur between emotions and the associated physiological or behavioral responses. Obviously, metonymy demonstrates a wider scope of conceptual operation when applied to the conceptual structure of gheirat.

Other than being a culturally significant concept, gheirat is shown to be a political key concept and appears to be an important part of the political language of the Islamic Republic. One example for showing how gheirat manifests itself in diplomatic talks could be the statement that the Iranian Foreign Minister, Javad Zarif, made during nuclear negotiations in Vienna in 2015, where he reportedly shouted at the representatives of P5+1: “Never threaten an Iranian” (www.bbc.co.uk, 10/07/2015), which quickly went viral on social media. Investigating the manifestations of gheirat in the political language of Muslim politicians could be a fascinating line of research which can indicate to what extent political language reflects and is structured by cultural conceptualizations.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter deals with the role of bodily, cognitive, social-cultural and discourse factors in the formation of the cultural model of GHEIRAT in Persian. The analysis indicates that gheirat notifies the self of the violations of rights and values by the other, of the other’s need
for receiving support, and of one’s own need to apply extra force in order to accomplish goals. *Gheirat* is shown to be associated with sanctities, *nâmus* and family, patriotism, *âberu* ‘face/public image’, *haya* ‘self-restraint’, *effat* ‘chastity’, *hejab* ‘veiling’, reasoning, and internal forces. The interaction of *gheirat* with these domains leads to the emergence of a large number of feelings, such as anger, hatred, jealousy, pride, and selflessness. Similar to other emotion concepts, major aspects of the GHEIRAT concept are metaphorically conceptualized.
Chapter 4: *Haya* ‘self-restraint’

4.1. Introduction

The concept of SHAME has been extensively researched from various perspectives across cultures and languages (Abu-Lughod, 1996; Díaz-Vera & Manrique-Antón, 2015; Gilbert & Andrews, 1998; Holland & Kipnis, 1995; Jamieson, 2000; Li et al., 2004; Myers, 1979; Tissari, 2006, 2011). In individualistic cultural contexts, shame is experienced when one has done something bad or wrong (when one has violated norms and standards) in his/her own eyes or in the eyes of others. Moreover, shame typically involves being negatively evaluated by others and occurs more frequently in the presence of others (Benedict, 1946; Gilbert & Andrews, 1998; Lewis, 1992). This construal of shame is close to what is referred to as *khejâlat* or *sharmandegi* ‘feeling ashamed’ in Persian. The following examples taken from Google denote shame in Persian:

1. *Az khejâlat āb shodam*/*az khejâlat ghermez shod*

   ‘I melted *with shame/He blushed of shame.*’

2. *Az khejâlat dus dashtam zamin dahan bâz kone.*

   ‘I felt so ashamed I wished the earth had opened its mouth for me.’

3. *Az sharmandegi nemitunest saresho boland kone.*

   ‘He/she was *so ashamed* that he couldn’t raise his head.’

4. *Aragh e sharm ruye pishunish neshest.*

   ‘The sweat of shame appeared on his/her forehead.’

Sweating, blushing, lowering the head, and hiding/disappearing figuratively represent the physiological and behavioral responses associated with *khejâlat/sharm/sharmandegi* ‘shame/being ashamed’ in Persian. Some of these responses such as blushing, lowering of the head and hiding are similarly associated with shame in Western culture (Holland & Kipnis, 1995; Lewis, 1992; Tissari, 2006).
Sharifian and Jamarani (2011) analyze the speech acts associated with the cultural schema of SHARMANDEGI ‘being ashamed’ in Iranian culture. They conclude that the expression *sharmandeam* ‘I am ashamed’ is used by Iranians to express gratitude, offer goods and services, request goods and services, refuse goods and services, and to apologize. Moreover, they indicate how the application of the schema results in misunderstandings in intercultural contexts.

This chapter studies the conceptual organization and contextual use of the concept of HAYA, which is closely related to shame. *Haya* may be defined as an emotion that operates to prevent the self from causing or feeling (further) shame. “*Haya* is a self-regulating force that constitutes a main component of religious faith in Islam” (Pasandideh, 2004, p. 3). Main religious sources providing guidance for Muslims’ individual and social behavior (i.e., the Quran and *hadith* ‘religious sayings’) underscore the significance of *haya* in preventing sins, promoting self-esteem, and preserving chastity (Khadem Pir, 2015, pp. 131–134).

*Haya* sets up a barrier between the self and what is considered as taboo, offensive, shameful, and unpleasant, eventually leading to censoring or amending one’s speech or behavior. In psychological accounts, *haya* is defined as an inhibiting as well as an impelling force aroused when one faces situations in which a social or religious taboo is violated or is prone to transgression (Pasandideh, 2004). It inhibits one from violating taboos and simultaneously impels the person to amend/mind their speech or behavior (Pasandideh, 2004, pp. 30–31). Whereas *sharm/khejâlat* ‘shame’ and *kamrui* ‘shyness/timidity’ are psychologically passive states and are indicative of being submissive to external factors, *haya* is considered a capability that is voluntarily applied; it is a psychologically active state, an impelling force that is suggestive of having control over internal forces. Due to having similar behavioral responses, in some situations, *haya* may not be easily distinguished from shame, shyness, and timidity. For example, lowering the gaze when talking to a nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ man could signal either of these feelings. However, deciding on whether this particular behavioral effect designates *haya* or not largely depends on whether the addressee regards the behavior of the speaker as a response to a particular social-religious taboo or attributes it to the speaker’s passivity and lack of self-confidence. When lowering the gaze is seen as an act to refrain from committing sins and a way of demonstrating modesty it would be framed as *haya*. Otherwise, it would be framed as *khejâlat* ‘shame’ or *kamrui* ‘shyness/timidity’.
Among shame-denoting words in Persian, the word *sharm* needs more explanations. *Sharm* ‘shame’ is one of the conventional collocates of *haya*, (*sharm va haya* ‘shame and *haya*’). Many words referring to shame in Persian are derived from *sharm*, such as *sharm-andeh* ‘ashamed’, *sharm-gin* ‘ashamed’, *sharm-sâr* ‘ashamed’, *sharm-âvar* ‘shameful’, *bi-sharm* ‘shameless’. In many contexts, similar to the word *shame* in English, *sharm* means ‘feeling shame’ or ‘being ashamed’. In the following examples, *sharm* refers to the actual experience of shame:

(5) Raftaretan aragh e sharm bar pishani e har mosalman e azadei neshand (Keyhan, 10/07/2016).

‘Your behavior made every noble Muslim sweat in shame’.

(6) Rahbar e aziz e ma! Chera shoma sharmandeh shavid? Kesani bayad sharmandeh shavand ke vaz’e eghtesad ra be in rokud keshandand (Keyhan, 10/07/2016).

‘Dear leader! Why should you feel ashamed? Those who caused the economic recession should feel ashamed’.

(7) Che kasi mitavanad hamin emruz posteri az sinamaye Iran e pish az enghelab ra be dast begirad va bedun e sharm mian e mardom ghadam gozarad? (Keyhan, 15/04/2017).

‘Who can today hold a poster of pre-revolutionary Iranian cinema and walk with it among people without feeling shame?’

(8) Be onvan e yek shahrvand e addiye jame’e vaghean sharm mikonam ke reis e jomhor e fe’li e keshvar baraye tarsandan e mardom az raghiban e entekhabatie khod motevassel be zadan e ettehamhaye biasas mikonad (Keyhan, 10/05/2017).

‘As an ordinary citizen of the society, I really feel ashamed that the current president of the country is resorting to baseless accusations against his opponents in order to scare people’.

In some other contexts, *sharm* refers to one’s imagination of an unpleasant, shameful, and offensive act or speech along with its negative consequences for one’s social image. In such cases, it is the imagination of shame rather than the actual experience of shame which would propel the person to refrain from saying or doing something unpleasant or shameful. In such contexts, *sharm* would perform the same function that *haya* does. Hence, in contexts in
which *sharm* and *haya* collocate with each other (*sharm* va *haya* ‘*sharm* and *haya*’), the collocation should be taken an idiomatic construct with a relatively fixed meaning (i.e., refraining from breaking taboos). The following examples show how the verb *sharm kardan* ‘to exercise *sharm*’ describes ways of refraining from breaking norms and values:

(9) Eddei hastand ke dar fazaye majazi esrar darand ke monkarat ra arzesh jelveh bedahand, monkarati ke ensan az bayan e anha ham sharm mikonad (*Keyhan*, 03/09/2016).

‘There are some people on social networks who insist on representing sins as values, sins which one would feel ashamed of expressing.

(10) Man *sharm* mikonam be didan roustahayi beravam. Kakhneshinan e paytakht dard e in mardom ra nemifahand (*Keyhan*, 15/01/2017).

‘I would feel ashamed of visiting some of the villages. The palace-dwellers of the capital [Tehran] do not understand the pain of these people.

In some contexts, *haya* interacts with the actual experience of shame caused by breaking a social or religious taboo. In such cases, *haya* performs a corrective function by preventing the person from feeling further shame and amending his/her behavior in compliance with the cultural norms of conduct. Feeling shame after one has broken a norm or value would indicate the existence of *haya* in a person, which shows one’s awareness of culturally specified codes of behavior and more importantly, one’s attempt to compensate for the wrongdoing. In other words, *sharm* ‘shame’ metonymically stands for *haya* (SHARM FOR HAYA). Therefore, *sharm* could be positively evaluated only when it leads to correcting one’s behavior or adjusting one’s behavior to the specified norms of conduct through the operation of *haya*. It should be noted that physiological and behavioral responses associated with *sharm* (blushing, lowering the gaze) exhibit *haya* only when a social or religious norm is involved and this type of shame should be distinguished from the manifestations of shame that result from lack of self-confidence and personality disorder.

This chapter explores the role of the body, cognitive processes (metaphor, metonymy, and categorization), social-cultural factors, and discourse elements in the formation of the cultural model of HAYA in Persian. I attempt to show that *haya* is a “body-based social construct” (*Kövecses*, 2000; *Kövecses* et al., 2003) and that unraveling the complex structure
of emotion concepts requires paying attention to various factors that play a role in characterizing different aspects of emotion concepts.

4.2 Causes of haya

*Haya* emerges when one perceives the physical or non-physical presence of an observer (Pasandideh, 2004, p. 19). The perceived observers and the particular emotions they may trigger in an individual could be the basis for categorizing different types of *haya* (ibid, pp. 20–22): a) *Haya az khod* ‘haya toward the self’ (self as observer) b) *Haya az digari* ‘haya toward the other’ (the other as observer) c) *Haya az khodâ* ‘haya toward God’ (God as observer) d) *Haya az moghaddasât* ‘haya toward sanctities’ (sanctities as observers).

Due to the contagious nature of taboos, a wide variety of people, objects, places, and events can indirectly play the role of observers. Refraining from holding celebrations or listening to music in the month (Safar in Arabic calendar) the Prophet passed away, and avoiding drinking in one’s parents’ house since they pray in the house (even when they are away) are examples of how *haya* is applied through perceiving the presence of non-physical observers.

As Pasandideh’s (2004) research demonstrates, the observers perceived in a particular situational context trigger a number of emotions that result in the emergence of *haya* and its expressive responses:

a) Abhorrence of committing sins and violating social norms and values: This may originate in the senses of *kerâmât e nafs* ‘self-esteem’ and *vejdân* ‘conscience’.

b) Fear of being criticized or punished by a socially or religiously more powerful observer or by an observer in one’s social group or community.

c) Fear of jeopardizing or losing one’s *âberu* ‘face/public image’.

d) Respect to the observer: Class, gender, and age are among the main social factors determining the emergence and intensity of *haya* in relation to others. *Haya* is a major means of maintaining respect among individuals, particularly when one has the right or capability to respond to the other’s disrespectful or offensive behavior but one applies *haya* to hold back what he/she could have done or said in response. Parents, women, relatives, neighbors, elders, teachers and clerics are among the classes of individuals one may avoid criticizing or confronting openly.
Assessment is the key to activating *haya* (Pasandideh, 2004, p. 113). Assessing the degree of unpleasantness of a particular behavior, the consequences of demonstrating the behavior, and social and religious status of the perceived observer(s) determine the emergence, intensity, and physiological and behavioral effects of *haya*.

### 4.3 Cognitive structure and cultural prototypes of *haya*

In Persian dictionaries, *haya* is defined as *tobeh* ‘repentance’, *sharm/khejâlat* ‘shame, feeling ashamed’, or refraining from doing something due to the fear of being criticized (Dehkhoda online dictionary). *Haya* is a prohibiting as well as an impelling force (Pasandideh 2004). It psychologically operates to hold back the self and set up a screen or barrier between the self and what is socially and religiously considered taboo, offensive, and unpleasant, eventually leading to censoring or amending one’s speech or behavior.

The expression *haya kardan* ‘exercising or applying *haya*’ has two slightly different contextual meanings. In one of its usages, the expression is conventionally used to criticize a person who has violated social norms and values. In this sense, *haya kardan* contextually means that one should be ashamed of what he/she has done and cease doing or talking about it:

(11) Ruhe payame rahpeimai e 22 Bahman be amrika in ast ke bayad az tahrimha aleihe iran hayâ konad (Keyhan, 15/02/2014).

‘The gist of the message sent through the 11 February demonstration [the anniversary of founding the Islamic Republic in 1979] to the U.S. government is that it should be ashamed of and avoid imposing sanctions on Iran’.

However, in contexts in which one is already mindful of the consequences of breaching norms and values, the meaning of *haya kardan* seems to be closer to ‘avoiding an unpleasant act’, where feeling shame might be conceptually less prominent:

(12) Vey bar zedde Ali aliehesalam ta’abire zanande va namonasebi bekar mibord. Be hamin jahat, barkhi az raviane hadis az naghl e anha hayâ kardeand (Keyhan, 19/04/2016).

‘He would use unpleasant words to describe Ali (the first Shia Imam). Therefore, some of the *Hadith* ‘religious saying’ narrators have avoided retelling them’.
Haya is characterized by avoidance, shame, concealment, politeness, indirectness, modesty, and mindfulness. A large number of adjectives in Persian represent such characteristics of haya: Mahjub ‘covered/veiled’ [courteous], makhuz be haya ‘held back by haya’ [possessing haya], sar be zir ‘head-toward-down’ [modest], cheshm pâk ‘pure-eyed’, afif ‘chaste’, oftâdehy literally ‘fallen’ [humble], khishtandâr ‘self-controlled’, najib ‘decent’, kam ru ‘shy’.


Given the linguistic and non-linguistic usages of haya, three main prototypical models, among many others available to the speakers, can be suggested for this emotion concept:

1. A social or religious value is subject to violation > haya comes into existence > haya exerts force upon the self to hold it back > the self overcomes the force of haya > the self violates the taboo.

This prototype characterizes behaviors that are described as shameless and against moral values.

2. A social or religious value is violated by the self > the self feels shame/embarrassment > haya comes into existence > haya holds back the self > the self quits the taboo act > the self amends his/her behavior.

This prototype may illustrate situations in which haya and shame are closely interrelated, where feeling shame suggests the existence of haya in the person. Although a norm or rule is broken, the person attempts to correct his/her conduct in compliance with expected behavioral principles. In such cases, haya is the corrective part of the schema followed by being ashamed of violating a particular norm.

3. Self is subject to violating a social or religious value > the self feels fear/anxiety/resentment/embarrassment > haya comes into existence > haya holds back the self > the self avoids violating the value > haya is manifested in behavior.
Given the skeletal emotion schema (cause of emotion-emotion-response) suggested by Kövecses (2000), the control aspect involved in *haya* can be understood both as a physical force applied to the causal part of the schema, where *haya* exerts its force to hold back the self (to cause control, which is the inherent responsibility of *haya*) and as a physical force exerted by the self to resist the force of *haya* (to control the controlling cause). In the case of *haya*, being emotional can be translated into ‘being in control.’ A person avoids violating norms and values when he/she is overcome by the force of *haya* and he/she violates taboos when one resists and overcomes the force of *haya*. The expression *hefz e haya* ‘preserving *haya*’ and *haya ra kenâr gozâshtan* ‘putting *haya* aside’ represent the two forms of control involved.

### 4.4 Lexical collocates and interacting domains

Lexemes collocating with *haya* specify the characteristic properties of the concept as well as major domains that interact with and structure *haya*. Table 3 presents the list of lexical items that collocate with *haya* along with their frequency of occurrence.

**Table 3. Lexical collocates of *haya***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical collocates</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sharm</em> ‘shame’</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hojb</em> ‘inhibiting/covering’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imân</em> ‘faith’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Effat</em> ‘chastity’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hejab</em> ‘veiling’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Âberu</em> ‘face/public image’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Akhlâgh</em> ‘morality’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salâmat</em> ‘moral health’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gheirat</em> ‘moral vigilance’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aghl</em> ‘reason’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nejâbat</em> ‘decency’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tavâzo</em> ‘modesty’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Din</em> ‘religion’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Helm</em> ‘patience’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hosn e khojgh</em> ‘good-temperedness’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above list, exercising *haya* is assumed to be indicative of *imân* ‘religious faith’, *aghl* ‘reason’, and *âberu* ‘face/public image’. *Gheirat* ‘moral vigilance’ can be seen as
an emotional cause of haya. Hejab ‘veiling’ is the realization of haya. Effat ‘chastity’, salâmat ‘moral health’, nejâbat ‘decency’, helm ‘patience’, tavâzo ‘modesty’, and hosn e kholgh ‘good-temperedness’ could be the results of applying haya. The other collocate of haya is sharm ‘shame’, which was explained in the introduction.

Among the lexical collocates of haya, the word hojb ‘inhibiting/covering’ profiles the segregative and/or prohibitive role of haya in the course of regulating the social behavior of individuals, as example (13) indicates:

(13) Dar vaghe in sinama bud ke dar dahehaye 1330 va 1340 anha ra az hojb va hayaye khanevadeye irani be pardehdari va bibandobari davit kard (Keyhan, 10/09/2016).

‘In fact, it was the cinema of the 1950’s and 1960’s that took hojb and haya from Iranian families, directing them toward insolence and debauchery.’


(14) Hejab jozi’i az haya budeh va dar vaghe haya va salamat e zan ast (Keyhan, 14/03/2016).

‘Veiling is a component of haya, indicating, in fact, the haya and moral health of a woman.’

(15) Vaghti sokhan miguyad, sedayeshan ra payin miavarand ta sokhanan e ou ra beshnavand. Be ehtram e ou hargez negaheshan ra bar ou tiz nemikonand va dar kamal e haya va tavâzo be ou negah mikonand (Keyhan, 25/09/2016).

‘When he was talking, the Prophet lowered his own voice so that he could hear the man’s speech. Out of respect, the Prophet never looked at him sharply and looked at him with utmost haya and modesty.

(16) Khadijeh yeki az chahar zan e bargozidehye khodast ke dar haya va nejabat saramad e zanan e arab bud (Keyhan, 28/02/2016).

‘Khadijeh, the Prophet’s first wife, is one of the Divine’s four select women, superior to Arab women in terms of haya and decency.'
‘His meetings were overwhelmed by patience and *haya*, where nobody would raise his voice and no one would lose honor. If someone blundered, nobody would disclose it anywhere.’

‘He counted *haya* and good-temperedness among the characteristics of a believer, adding that today we have to strengthen our beliefs so that the enemy cannot mislead our thoughts.’

The examination of the pragmatic uses of *haya* shows that it interacts with the following domains:

### 4.4.1 Sanctities

God, religion, the Prophet and the 12 Shia *Imams* ‘religious leaders’, the Quran, and many other people, objects, and events associated with Islam and religious figures are expected to be respected by Muslims. *Haya* is exercised to avoid doing or saying things that might be disrespectful to religious sanctities. For example, Iranians do not hold celebrations in certain months of the year (Moharram and Safar on the Arabic calendar) because these months coincide with the passing anniversaries of the Prophet and the third Shia Imam, Imam Hossein (Khosravi, 2008, p. 49).

Many religious bans enforced by religious conservatives in Iran are justified by the necessity of observing *haya* toward sanctities. For instance, some religious authorities in Iran forced the government to ban concerts in the city of Mashhad, where the eighth Shia Imam (Imam Reza) is buried ([www.dailymail.co.uk](http://www.dailymail.co.uk), 27/08/2016) since they believe music is forbidden in Islam and holding concerts is disrespectful to the Imam. Also, only *chador*-wearing women are admitted to the shrine of Imam Reza (Harris, 2008, p. 129).
Hayat is a main component of faith in Islam. A number of excerpts in the data point to the crucial role of *haya* in shaping the structure and integrity of Islamic faith. In Example (19), faith is metaphorically seen as a TREE, with *haya* being a branch of it.

(19) Aemeye athar lazemeye iman ra vojud e haya dar ensan onvan kardeand. Sharm va haya shakhei az iman ast va kesi ke haya nazarad iman nazarad (Keyhan, 07/04/2013).

‘Religious leaders have regarded *haya* in humans as a prerequisite for faith. *Sharm* and *haya* is a branch of faith and anyone who does not have *haya* has no faith.’

In (20), *haya* and faith are pictured as two existentially dependent objects or entities in close proximity to each other. This metaphorical conception accentuates the inseparability of *haya* and faith. In the second sentence, the body is implied to be the space containing both *haya* and faith, where losing *haya* or faith is seen as a MOVEMENT (ACTION IS MOTION) endangering the concrete existence of the other component as well as the whole unity.

(20) Haya va iman dar kenar e yekdigarand, pas hargah yeki az an do kenar beravad digari niz az bein miravad (Keyhan, 01/06/2014)

‘*Hayat* and faith are next to each other. If one of them goes away, the other will be obliterated too.’

Exercising *haya* toward God is the most general form of *haya* in the category of sanctities, which is supposed to make a Muslim avoid committing sins. Given that God is seen as an omnipresent observer of human conducts, the amount of *haya* applied by a Muslim to control his/her illegitimate desires is a function of the extent to which God is perceived to be monitoring human acts. In a religious saying by the Prophet, observing *haya* toward God is considered to be one of the conditions of going to heaven:

(21) Mikhahi beheshti shavi faghat ba se shart moyasar ast: inke arezu hayat ra kutah kon, hamishe marg ra jeloye cheshmanat bebin va be fekr e marg bash va az khoda be manaye vaghei haya kon (Keyhan, 26/07/2014)

‘Going to heaven is possible only with three conditions: shorten your wishes, always see death in front of your eyes and think of it, and observe *haya* toward God indeed.’
4.4.2 Effat ‘chastity’

Effat is a defining feature of Iranian women, constituting an important part of their identity (Farahani, 2006). Effat applies to restrict the speech and behavior of women in relation to men. The sufficiency of effat in women is estimated by monitoring their conducts when encountering nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men: women are not supposed to arouse the sexual feelings of nâmahram men intentionally (i.e., by controlling their gaze), nor use heavy make-up, nor go out with and touch nâmahram men, nor talk and laugh provocatively (flirtatiously) (Naficy, 2000, p. 562). Besides, keeping virginity until marriage and observing hejab in the presence of nâmahram men are other important properties that define the conceptual category of EFFAT. Such features can form a prototype for an afif ‘chaste’ woman.

The above-mentioned properties indicate that this concept is tailored to harness illegitimate sexual desire in women. The significance of effat in evaluating the social and moral statuses of women is demonstrated by a variety of linguistic expressions that mainly characterize and appreciate women’s sexual self-control. Such adjectives as najib ‘decent’, sangin ‘weighty’, pâkdâman ‘sexually pure’, masum ‘innocent/pure’, sâlem ‘healthy’, and affif ‘chaste’ describe women who are perceived to possess effat and demonstrate it in their speech and behavior. Showing effat is demonstrating haya as well. Whereas Effat is tailored to harness illegitimate sexual desire in men and women, haya encompasses a wider range of taboos, including sexual desire.

Since a woman is considered as the nâmus “sexual honor” (King, 2008) of the family, her behavior with nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men is constantly monitored and evaluated in almost all communicative contexts by her own family and the others to make sure she does not stain the honor of the family, and more broadly, she does not violate effat e omumi ‘public chastity’ (Khosravi, 2008). It should be noted that sexual self-control is not only expected of women. Men are also expected to display it when communicating with women. Cheshm pâk ‘pure-eyed’, sar be zir ‘head-toward-down’ [modest] are the expressions used to describe men who restrict their social interactions with nâmahram women.

In situations in which a woman suddenly notices the presence of a nâmahram man or when she has not been given enough time to cover up, hayâ might be realized by shrinking and putting one hand on head as a cover followed by an apology to the addressee for appearing without a headscarf, leaving the scene quickly to get a chador or head scarf. In this case, haya might give rise to feelings of shame/embarrassment. An afif ‘chaste’ woman may
find it embarrassing to be seen in plain clothes and without a veil by a nāmahram man, and apologizing to the addressee is conveying the message that she has unintentionally violated the taboo (Najmabadi, 2005).

Chastity also includes refraining from using vulgar language in public or in situations in which women and children are present. This type of chastity is called effat e kalām ‘chastity of speech’. Applying haya is supposed to censor out taboo topics in conversations.

The following text (example 22) compares the level of haya and effat in Iranian women before and after the revolution in terms of the covering status of women, which appears to be indicative of possessing haya and effat. The writer presents haya and effat as larger self-regulating forces that can be operative even if they are not materialized through the veil under certain circumstances (e.g., when being forced to unveil). This means that a chaste woman can preserve her chastity and demonstrate haya (by controlling her speech and behavior in relation to nāmahram ‘non-intimate’ men) even if she is enforced to take off her hejab. It is implied that attempts to persuade the current generation of Iranian women to dress modestly in public are futile as they do not seem to be fully aware of the underlying moral principles (haya and effat) that are realized in hejab ‘veiling’.

(22) Vagheiat e amr in ast ke reza shah be zur hejab ra az sare mardom Bardasht amma mardom hanuz haya va efâf dashtand vali moteasefane emruz ma hejab ra mikhahim sare nasli bekeshim ke ma’na va haghghat e effat va hejab ra kamtar dark kardeand (Keyhan, 15/02/2014).

‘The fact of the matter is that Reza Shah [the former Iranian King, 1925–1941] enforced people [women] to unveil but people [women] still had haya and effat, but unfortunately, today we want to make a generation [of women] wear the veil who has less understanding of the truth and meaning of haya and hejab.’

4.4.3 Âberu ‘face/public image’

Loss of honor is a frequent cause of shame in shame-oriented cultures (Díaz-Vera & Manrique-Antón, 2015; Lindisfarne, 1998). The word âberu, literally meaning ‘water of face’, is morphologically composed of âb ‘water’ and ru ‘face’ (Sharifian, 2007, p. 36). Metonymically, âberu “refers either to the freshness and healthiness of one’s face or to the sweat on one’s face”, and metaphorically it “embodies the image of a person, a family, or a group, particularly as viewed by others in the society” (Sharifian, 2007, p. 36). Zaborowska
(2014, p. 125) maintains that “âberu is a veil covering the human face, protecting his personality from disclosure and guarding his moral character in the eyes of others.” In almost all social interactions, Iranians attempt to preserve their own âberu as well as that of their family or social group by virtue of presenting a socially pleasant image of their speech, behavior, appearance, and possessions. A major part of this attempt necessarily involves concealing or restricting aspects of speech and behavior that might threaten one’s public image. “Loss of âberu is regarded as a great misfortune and makes it difficult to function in a group because it is associated with shame and embarrassment” (Zaborowska, 2014, p. 14).

Hence, showing haya by means of avoiding violating social norms and values is to demonstrate that one possesses âberu, that is, a bâhaya person is bââberu ‘having âberu’ and conversely, a bihaya person is biâberu ‘lacking âberu’. The main emotion triggering haya in connection with âberu is fear, i.e., the constant fear of losing âberu propels the person to observe haya. Tars e az âberu ‘fear of losing âberu’ is a relatively common phrase in Persian used to express the main reason why people may opt to remain passive to the face-threatening acts of others:

(23) Polis: Ghorbanian e tajavoz az tars e âberu va tahdid e mojreman shekayat nemikonand (www.yjc.ir, 15/04/2015).

‘Police: victims of rape do not file complaints against the perpetrators for the fear of [losing] âberu and of being threatened by them’.

Observing haya automatically acts to preserve one’s âberu in public. Keeping a low profile of familial troubles and conflicts, censoring what one could say in response to the offensive speech, and concealing such issues as sexual harassment and rape directly reflect the application of haya for the purpose of preserving âberu (Fotouhi, 2015, p. 96).

Excerpt (24) enumerates the effects that going to the mosque can have on controlling moral corruption in society and intensifying the fear of God and the fear of losing haya and âberu in Iranian Muslims. The intensity of this fear is believed to effectively keep Muslims’ conducts in check and result in abandoning sins.

(24) Tasirhaye ravabete dustaneyi ke dar masjed shekl migirad mitavanad jameye dini ra az fesad va gonah pak konad va mosalmanan ra be suye jame’yi salem hedayat konad ya kalamati mishenavad ke ou ra az fesad va gonah baz midarad ya be khater e tars az khoda ya haya va aberu gonahi rat ark mikonad (Keyhan, 17/10/2015).
‘Friendly relationships formed in mosques can cleanse a religious society of sin and corruption and guide Muslims toward a healthy society. There, he [a Muslim] hears words which would keep him from corruption and sin or he would abandon a sin for the fear of God or of haya and âberu.’

Through the verb pâk kardan ‘cleansing’, sin and corruption are conceived as DIRT (SIN IS DIRT/MORAL CORRUPTION IS DIRT). Also, the adjective phrase jâme’ye sâlem ‘a healthy society’ evokes two metaphors: SOCIETY IS HUMAN BODY and MORAL HEALTH IS PHYSICAL HEALTH. This conception of society and moral corruption represents the interdependent nature of self in Iranian society and the concerns of religious conservatives over the threats that individuals’ anti-Islamic acts might have for the whole society. Religion and culture contribute to designing an efficient monitoring system that keeps people under control in private (through haya and fear of God) and in public (through âberu and fear of losing it).

Closely connected with âberu is the word Ru ‘face’ in Persian, which represents both the figure and image of a person (Zaborowska, 2014, p. 120). It also expresses shame, shyness, embarrassment, and haya. Two adjectives kam ru literally ‘little-face’ [shy/timid] and por ru literally ‘full-face’ [rude] denote shyness and lack of haya respectively. Given the common behavioral responses associated with both shyness and haya, such as hiding the face, lowering the gaze, shrinking, and so on, haya may be mistakenly taken for shyness. However, these two feelings are not the same. Whereas shyness denotes the incapability of a person in showing proper behavior in communicative situations, haya is regarded as a capability and a moral virtue, which is voluntarily applied to restrict the self in relation to taboo behavior in the presence of an observer.

The following passage (example 25) highlights the restrictive function of gheirat, âberu, and haya through BLOCK metaphor. The noun mâne ‘block’ and the verb phrase obur kardan az in sonnathâ ‘passing over these traditions’ are linguistic clues to infer a metaphorical conception of these moral values. These concepts differ with respect to the way they exert their restrictive or preventive force. Gheirat mainly causes a restriction for the other when one’s values are perceived to have been threatened or violated. In contrast, haya and âberu apply their force to restrict the self and ultimately preserve values. The BLOCK metaphor is embedded within the JOURNEY metaphor, which conceptualizes the process of reaching calmness in life.
(25) Be tor e vazeh, farhadi sonathaye akhlaghi manand e gheirat, haya va aberu ra mane e residan be aramesh midanad, harchand obur az in sonnatha ra baraye shakhsialayash besyar sakht tarsim karde ast (Keyhan, 16/08/2016).

‘Obviously, Farhadi [the Iranian movie director] considers such moral traditions as gheirat, haya, and aberu as blocks on the way of reaching calmness, though he has depicted passing over these traditions as being very difficult for the characters of his movie’.

In example (26), hejab and effat are regarded as indicators of possessing haya and aberu. This means that a woman observing hejab is aware of the significance of preserving her own aberu and that of her family.

(26) Hejab va efaf abzar e moghadas e din ast ke agar dar jam’e paymal shavad digar nemitavan az an jame’e entezar e haya va aberu dasht (Keyhan, 12/07/2014).

‘Hejab and efaf are holy devices of religion. If they are overstepped in a society, one cannot expect that society to have haya and aberu.’

Haya may also be applied to protect the public image of people by keeping their secrets, concealing their personality defects, and refraining from backbiting (Khadem Pir, 2015; Pasandideh, 2004). A common strategy in Persian media to protect the public image of individuals is using initials instead of the full names of defendants or those who are associated with moral, political, and economic scandals:

(27) Sardabir e ruznameye ghods ba bayan e inke enteshar e joziyat e akhbar e havades sahih nist bar lozum e modiriyat e jaryan e khabari va reyat e janebe haya va aberu va jarihe dar nakardan e ehsasat e omumi takid kard (Keyhan, 08/05/2016).

‘The Ghods newspaper’s editor-in-chief stated that releasing the details of incidents is not proper and reiterated the necessity of managing news streams, observing haya and aberu, and not wounding the public’s feelings.’

4.4.4 Akhlâgh ‘morality’

In cases where haya collocates with akhlâgh ‘morality’, it is understood as part of and a principal means of observing morality. In example (28), the religious ban on looking at the body of the opposite sex exemplifies the conceptual relationship between haya and morality,
where *haya* impedes the person from taking sexual pleasure through the eyes. This is done in order to preserve sexual morality.

(28) Yeki az amuzehaye shar’i ke rohaniyat e shi’e va Nezam e amuzeshi hokumat e dini be onvan e *haya* va akhlagh be dokhtaran va pesaran enteghal midahad negah nakardan be Jens e mokhalef ast. Na tanha negah nakardan be badan e Jens e mokhalef balke negaristan e ba shahvat be surat va dastha ham haram engashteh shod east (*Keyhan*, 30/09/2014).

‘One of the lessons that Shia clerics and the education system of a religious state *teach as* *haya* and morality to boys and girls is to not look at the opposite sex. Not only looking at the body of the opposite sex but also looking passionately at the face and hands has been regarded as forbidden.’

In example (29), the writer criticizes the government officials for not censoring all sexual or un-Islamic content of social media, such as women posting unveiled photos of themselves, boy and girls displaying their relationships online, and so on. These posts are believed to be against norms of *haya* and morality in general. What is more, the West is accused of propagating immorality among Iranians through social media. It is worth noting that President Rouhani is a proponent of a free internet, portraying it as a civil right and an opportunity, whereas religious conservatives see it as the propagator of immoral behavior (*www.bloomberg.com*, 07/05/2017).

(29) Kesani ke mas’aleyhe hejab va efaf ra kuchak mishemarand, masulini ke daghdagheye Adam e reayat e *haya* va akhlagh dar fazaye majazi ra nadarand khasteh ya nakhasteh be gharb komak mikonand ta khanevadeye irani va jamiyate javan e keshvar ra nabud konand (*Keyhan*, 08/05/2016).

‘Those who downplay the importance of *hejab* and *efâf* and those government officials who do not worry about the lack of observance of *haya* and morality in virtual space, intentionally or not, help the West destroy Iranian families and the young population of our country.’

4.4.5 *Gheirat* ‘moral vigilance’

Whereas *gheirat* can be a major source of social conflicts, such as physical fighting and honor killing, *haya* is one of the major means of avoiding social conflicts. In fact, *haya* can
be seen as a mitigator and a counterforce that brings about peace and social harmony. For example, staring sexually at a woman walking with her husband or brother may result in a serious physical fighting. Therefore, in such cases, observing *haya* (e.g., by lowering the gaze) plays a crucial role in maintaining social order, which would suggest that one is respecting the *harim* ‘holy space/border’ of others.

In example (30), *gheirat* and *haya* appear in the same linguistic context, where the writer strongly disapproves of the way some government officials sympathize with Westerners’ statements on the parliamentary elections in Iran. The persons addressed by the writer are accused of lacking *haya* since they have violated the taboo of sympathizing with or supporting the presumed opponents and accused of lacking *gheirat* since they do not react to the Westerners’ meddling in Iran’s internal affairs:

(30) Doreye estemargari be payan reside ast va mordom e iran ejazeh nemidahand ke kharej az marzha barayehsan tasmimgiri konand va che bihaya hastand anan ke bimahaba va ba bigheirati amalan parcham e biganegan ra bar sar dar e khanehaye khod nasb mikonand (*Keyhan*, 21/02/2016).

‘The era of colonialism has come to an end and Iranian people do not allow foreigners to make decision for them. *How bihaya* [shameless] are those who daringly and without any *gheirat* put up the flag of aliens on top of their house doors.’

The connection between *gheirat* and *haya* in the above text is such that the passivity toward the West’s interference (lack of *gheirat*) leads further to the open violation of political norms (lack of *haya*). The adverb *bimahâbâ* ‘daringly’ describes the way the principle of *haya* is overstepped.

Example (31) emphasizes the role of *haya* and *gheirat* in preventing and constraining sins. More specifically, the text refers to the taboo act of staring at women for the sake of taking sexual pleasure and attributes it to the lack of *haya* and *gheirat* in men who tend to do that. In this case, *haya* and *gheirat* seem to perform very similar functions. *Haya* impedes the person from violating the taboo of sexually stating at women and *gheirat* does not permit the person to violate the *harim* ‘holy space/border’ of other men, that is, their *nâmus* ‘female family members’.

(31) Hengami ke *dar vojud e shakhsh haya va gheirat* nabashad be anjam e har kari dast mizanad va shakh e cheshmcheran faghed e iman va hayast (*Keyhan*, 07/05/2016).
‘When there is no haya and gheirat in a person, he will commit all sorts of sins and a person who stares sexually at women is devoid of faith and haya’.

Example (32) shows how reciprocal observance of haya and gheirat can preserve the sanctity of the námus of Iranian men and bring about peace and social order. As the text indicates, the notion of námus is the meeting point of haya and gheirat; it is through the joint operation of these two moral principles that individuals take care of the sexual honor of their own families and that of others (Eshaghi, 2006; Tizro, 2013). Therefore, haya and gheirat are observed partly because disrespecting the námus of other families is socially and religiously condemned and partly because by exercising haya and gheirat one is, in fact, requesting others to recognize his commitment to social norms and to equally exhibit the same moral values toward his own námus. This is how the notion of námus can provide the ground to build up mutual trust and create a social bond.

(32) Haya yani ba namus e digaran tori barkhord va rafter koni ke entezar dari ba namus e khodat be hamun shekl rafter konand. Gheirat yani agar az inke kesi be chehreh va badan e namus e to zol bezanad, khunet be jush miyad, to ham khireh be badan va chehreye namahram nashi (Keyhan, 29/10/2015).

‘Haya means behaving with other people’s námus in the same way that you would expect them to behave with your own námus. Gheirat means if someone stared at the face and body of your námus, your blood would come to a boil, and it also means that you don’t stare at the face and body of a namahram ‘non-intimate’ [woman] as well.’

4.4.6 Aghl ‘reason’

Some examples in the data deal with the mutual relationship between aghl ‘reason’ and haya. From example (33) it can be understood that refraining from social-religious prohibitions by applying haya is indicative of possessing aghl. The text assigns a higher degree of significance to haya, implying that human intellect alone is not capable of identifying the full range of conducts that might be detrimental to human dignity and in the absence of haya, the intellect might not be able to control human desire. The other point alluding to the insufficiency of the intellect is that human intellect, according to the writer, draws on the religious principle of haya in the course of its development, which is to say that religion (i.e., Islam) compensates for the deficiencies of human intellect by incorporating an assisting force
(i.e., *haya*) that heightens sensitivity and consciousness to one’s conducts and their consequences.

(33) *Haya va aghl* rabeteye mostaghimi darand. Haya komak konandeh va roshd dahandeye aghl ast; harche bishtar haya be kharj dahim aghleman bishtar mishavad va harche aghleman bishtar shaved hayayeman bishtar mishavad (*Keyhan*, 12/02/2015).

‘There is a direct relationship between *haya* and intellect. Haya assists and develops the intellect; the more we exercise *haya*, the more our intellect grows, and the more our intellect grows, the more *haya* we gain.’

Example (34) uses the story of the creation of Adam to explain the significance of *haya* in Islam. Similar to the previous example, the text seems to question the self-sufficiency of the intellect for distinguishing right from wrong in general or for regulating the conducts of humans in relation to God and other human beings. The narrative relies on the personification of the notions of *din* ‘religion’, *haya*, and *aghl* ‘reason’ to picture Islam’s perspective on the relationship between *haya* as a religious notion and human intellect. This metaphorical image also involves imagining the human mind as a PHYSICAL SPACE containing the three metaphorical residents. Through these metaphors, the outcome of the wrong decision taken by Adam is conceptualized as the returning of *haya* and religion from their residence, corresponding to the loss of *haya* and religious faith in the target domain. The order to return might also allude to the angel’s disappointment of Adam’s ability to make a proper decision for his moral life and that in the absence of religion and *haya*, Adam would not have a morally sound life and would incur losses. On the other hand, the inseparability of the three notions is conceptualized as three people living naturally within the same physical space, highlighting what Islam conceives of an ideal form of moral life.

(34) *Tebgh e revayat, zamani ke adam khalgh shod maleki az janeb e khodavand khatab be ou miguyad: az mian e se mored e din, haya va aghl kodam ra entekhab mikoni?* Adam aghl ra entekhab mikonad va malek khatab be din va haya miguyad bargardid. Amma in do miguyand khodavand be ma gofteh jai ke aghl bashad din va haya bemanand (*Keyhan*, 30/07/2016).

‘According to religious narratives, when Adam was created, an angel of God told him “which one would you choose among religion, *haya*, and reason?”’ Adam chooses the reason and the angel asks religion and *haya* to return. But these two [*haya* and religion] say God has told us that wherever there is reason, *haya* and religion should stay as well.’
4.4.7 Hejab ‘veiling’

Examples from the data show that hejab is seen as the manifestation of haya, meaning that haya and hejab are inseparable from each other. This construal might also drop the hint that women who do not observe hejab do not possess haya.

Example (35) is, in fact, a response to those Iranian women who may believe that hejab is not indicative of possessing haya and that hejab cannot be used as a criterion to make judgments about one’s observance of haya. The writer attempts to explain the relationship between haya and hejab and their interdependence by likening women to WALNUTS. Through the metaphor WOMEN ARE WALNUTS, a conceptual correspondence is created between haya and maghz e gerdu ‘walnut core’, representing haya as the most important internal value a woman possesses. The other correspondence is made between hejab and pust e gerdu ‘walnut husk’, representing hejab as a protective cover and the external manifestation of haya. The metaphor entails that without hejab women would lose haya and would be subject to moral corruption.

(35) Rabeteye haya va hejab be maghz e gerdu va pust e an bishebahat nist. Arzesh e haghighi e gerdu be maghz e an ast vali in be in ma’na nist ke pust e gerdu hich arzeshi nadarad. Maghz e gerdu dar mohafezat haman pust arzesh yafteh va hefz mishavad. Maghz e gerdu bedun e pust dar ma’raz e fesad ast (Keyhan, 14/05/2015).

‘The relationship between haya and hejab is not dissimilar to the one between the walnut core and its husk. The real value of a walnut comes from its core but this does not mean that the husk has no value. Walnut core gains protection and value through its husk. Walnut core without husk is subject to decay.’

In example (36), haya and hejab are both metaphorically seen as a BARRIER (mâne in Persian) between women and nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men. The difference between the two barriers is that haya is conceived of as an INTERNAL BARRIER between the self and social-religious taboos and hejab as an EXTERNAL BARRIER. The metaphor provides the interpretation that removing the external barrier (i.e., hejab) would result in the elimination of the internal barrier (i.e., haya) as well, causing moral corruption in society as a result of the mingling of the sexes.

(36) Zani ke haya va hejab nadarad va mane’i bein e ou va namahram nist baes e gostaresh e fesad va fahsha dar jamé’e migardad (Keyhan, 28/01/2016).
‘A woman who has no haya and hejab, with no barrier between her and the non-intimates, contributes to the development of corruption and vice in society.’

4.5 Haya and gender segregation

Sex segregation is a fundamental means of controlling the sexuality of individuals and of preserving chastity in Islam (Farahani, 2002). It is a preventive measure to block the possibility of moral corruption, which is deemed to result from unchecked interpersonal relationships. Some examples in the data set represent the role of haya in keeping the sexes segregated. In other words, these examples show the way haya is involved in protecting the principle of mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’. The following passage deals with the negative outcomes of ekhtelāt ‘gender mixture’ in public places:

(37) Sue estefade az ehsasat e pak e javanan, ersal va daryaesh va moharekhaye jensi ba pushesh va arayesh va begubekhand va adam e reayat harimhaye haya va salamat, jozve lavazem e tabi’i va bimarizaye ekhtelat ast (Keyhan, 24/11/2015).

‘Taking advantage of the pure and intact feelings of the young, transmitting and receiving sexual stimuli through [inappropriate] covering and make-up, chatting, and not observing the harim ‘borders’ of haya and moral health are among the common and disease-generating means of gender mixture.’

In the above text (example 37), sexual stimuli transmitted through improper dressing and un-Islamic relationships are presented as bimârizâ ‘disease-generating’, which provides a metaphorical understanding of moral health (MORAL HEALTH IS PHYSICAL HEALTH). Lack of haya is also taken to be contributing to moral corruption. The word harim ‘holy space/border’ (translated in the text as ‘borders’) specifies the range of behaviors that are congruent or incongruent with the principle of haya via the HAYA IS A HOLY SPACE metaphor. In this context, mixing nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men and women in public places (e.g., in universities and workplaces) is an open violation of haya, which is supposed to maintain the physical and emotional distance between men and women.

In example (38), observing haya in relation to nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men in public places is considered a characteristic feature of bâeffat ‘chaste’ women. In this case, observing haya is shown by abstaining from touching non-intimate men or from being in crowded places, where there is a possibility of being touched (accidentally or intentionally) by men. Launching women-only transport service in the form of reserving metro carriages
and buses for women is part of the Iranian government’s attempt to prevent sex attack and sexual harassment in public transport spaces (www.telegraph.co.uk, 26/08/2015; Khosravi, 2008, p. 46).

(38) Zanan e baeffat az inke dar sholugh dar kenar e mardan e namahram gharar girand haya varzideh va makanhaye dar jamye dini bayad mahram ra az namahram tafkik konad (Keyhan, 23/02/2016).

‘Chaste women refrain from standing next to nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men in the crowd and [hence] a religious society should separate the mahram ‘intimate’ from the nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ in public places.’

4.6 The embodiment of haya

Physiological and expressive responses associated with an emotion metonymically refer to it (Kövecses, 1990, 2000). Blushing, perspiring, shrinking, maintaining physical distance with the other, casting down the gaze, silence, lowering the voice, walking modestly, covering up hair and the body (observing hejab), standing up when an elder or a respectable person enters into a place, and folding legs in front of elders are other physiological and behavioral responses that can designate haya through EMOTIONAL RESPONSE FOR EMOTION conceptual metonymy. However, linguistic representations of the responses associated with haya occur non-metonymically as the causing emotion (haya) is also realized in the same linguistic context. Examples 39–42 show some of the physiological and behavioral effects of haya:

(39) Be man goft: Be an zan che gofti? Man az shedat e sharm o haya suratam ra pushandam (Keyhan, 25/01/2014)

‘He told me: “what did you say to the woman?” Out of extreme haya and sharm, I covered my face.’

(40) Mardom e in shahr nejâbat va haya darand va hich nemigooyand. Ama moteasefane barkhi az in nejabat sooe estefade mikonand (Keyhan, 15/03/2016).

‘Residents of this city have haya and decency and say nothing. Unfortunately, some people are taking advantage of their decency.’
(41) Mard *az sharm o haya sar be pain andakhte bud* va gush mikard (*Keyhan*, 09/07/2014).

‘The man had lowered his head out of *haya* and *sharm* and was listening.’

(42) Bazi be hadi bahaya hastand ke *ba hameye nadari va bicharegi hazer nistand niaz e khod ra ezhar konand* (*Keyhan*, 19/07/2014).

‘Some people are so *bâhaya*/possess so much of *haya* that they do not want to express their need despite all their poverty and desperation.’

Some linguistic expressions demonstrate the role of the body in the conceptualizations of *haya* metaphors. The BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR HAYA is the higher-level metaphor that provides the basis for characterizing the existence, sufficiency, and intensity of *haya*. The metaphor can be inferred from the use of the prepositional phrases *dar ou* ‘in him/her and *dar vojud e kesi* ‘in the body/spiritual essence of someone’, as the following examples show:

(43) Zanan ba hefz e hejab e khod *haya ra dar mardan niz afzayesh midahand* (*Keyhan*, 18/01/2016).

‘By observing *hejab* ‘veiling’, women would augment *haya* in men as well’.

(44) Nahadhaye farhangi bayad be *taghviat o nahadineh kardan e haya va effat dar vojud e javanan ehtemam varzand* (*Keyhan*, 07/03/2015).

‘Cultural institutions should make efforts to reinforce and establish *haya* and *effat* in [the spiritual essence/body of] young people’.

In addition to the body in general, the mouth, heart, and stomach also play the role of metaphorical CONTAINERS for *haya*:

(45) Besyari *az anha sharm ra khoorde o haya ra ghei kardeand* va ba anasore zede enghelab hamkari mikond (*Keyhan*, 17/05/2016).

‘Many of them have *eaten sharm* and *vomited haya* and are cooperating with the anti-revolution camp.’


‘Anyone who has *haya* in his heart and *del* will keep distance from sins.’
Example (45) is an idiom that is used to describe people who openly break norms and values. The idiom, based on the HAYA AND SHARM ARE FOOD metaphor, conveys speaker’s extreme dissatisfaction with the addressee’s inattentiveness to moral prohibitions. What may have motivated the use of the mouth as the container for shame is that the mouth is the organ of speech (INSTRUMENT FOR ACTION); shame as the content of the container (the mouth) controls the quantity and quality of one’s speech and prevents one from uttering face-threatening speech. The expression haya ra ghei kardan ‘vomiting haya’ in (45) provides the inference that the stomach is the metaphorical CONTAINER for haya (the content). Also, in (46) the heart and del ‘heart/stomach’ are seen as the CONTAINERS. In Persian, the word del ‘heart/stomach’ “refers to the area of the body below the chest and above the pelvis, roughly similar to the area described in English by abdomen” (Sharifian, 2008, p. 249). This area of the body is figuratively viewed as “the seat of emotions, feelings, and desires” (Sharifian, 2008, p. 251). Haya figuratively exists in del so as to restrict or control desires that do not conform to cultural values. Therefore, vomiting the content of the stomach (haya) corresponds to the deliberate act of removing the barrier that haya sets up in the way of breaking a norm or value.

4.7 Metaphors of haya

This section deals with the analysis of frequently occurring conceptual metaphors in the data set. Table 4 presents the frequency of occurrence of haya metaphors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual metaphors</th>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A POSSESSED OBJECT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A COVER/BARRIER</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A PHYSICAL LOCATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A HOLY SPACE/TERRITORY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A SHOOTING TARGET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A PERSON</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS A CURTAIN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYA IS CLOTHES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE INTENSITY OF HAYA IS THE INTENSITY OF COLOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of metaphors represent the protective, prohibitive, and segregative functions of haya. An important psychological function of haya (i.e., setting up barriers between the self and taboos) is extensively reflected in Persian conceptualizations of hayâ through various metaphors employing BARRIER, COVER, CURTAIN or CLOTHES as
their source concepts. The expression *pardehdari*, literally meaning ‘curtain-tearing’, for instance, refers to the deliberate infringement of social-religious norms and values. The adjective *mahjub*, literally meaning ‘covered’, is also a compliment term based on the same higher-level metaphor used to describe a modest person who properly observes *haya* and refrains from transgressing cultural-religious red lines.

In example (47), *haya* is conceptualized as a CURTAIN (the HAYA IS A CURTAIN metaphor); removing curtains corresponds to ignoring all elements that restrict or regulate one’s social behavior in a Muslim country. Likewise, in (48), based on the HAYA IS A COVER/BARRIER metaphor, putting the screen or cover aside corresponds to disregarding one’s previous considerations for not reacting to a dishonest behavior (e.g., because of considering the *âberu* ‘face/public image’ of the person):

(47) Bardashte shodan e kheili az pardehaye *haya* va tarvije bihayâee va addisazi e ravabet e nasalem az mazerrat e shabakehaye ejtemaeest (*Keyhan*, 12/01/2016).

‘Removing many of *haya* curtains, propagating shamelessness, and normalizing immoral relationships are some of the disadvantages of social media’.

(48) Ama u *haya* ra kenar nahad va chehreye vaghei e in jemaat ra neshan dad (*Keyhan*, 14/05/2016).

‘But he put *haya* aside and revealed the real face of these people’.

In examples 49–51, the verb *mane’ shodan* ‘to impede’ metaphorically conceptualizes *haya* as a BARRIER. The HAYA IS A BARRIER metaphor highlights the role of *haya* in protecting moral purity, dignity, and in controlling speech.

(49) *Haya mâne’* az gereftar shodan e zan dar dâm e mardan e shahvatran va zamene pakdamani e oust (*Keyhan*, 20/08/2014).

‘*Haya* impedes women from getting stuck in the trap of lustful men and guarantees their purity’.

(50) Tangnahaye zendegi feshar miavarad vali *haya mâne’* az an mishavad ke ensan az digari pooli ra gharz konad (*Keyhan*, 03/04/2015).

‘Straits of life put strain [on humans], but *haya* impedes one from borrowing money from the other’.
(51) Haya mâne’ az an mishavad ke ensan harchizi ra kea z ghalbash migozarad bar zaban avarad (Keyhan, 19/11/2013).

‘Haya impedes one from expressing verbally whatever goes on in his/her heart’.

In example (52), the metaphor HAYA IS A CURTAIN is applied to conceptualize the manner in which haya is violated by presumed enemies of Islam. The verb daridan ‘tear up’ in its semantic structure involves ferociousness and in its metaphorical usage in the sentence conveys the rudeness of those who, according to the text, attempt to make the young generation abandon their religious beliefs through social networks (such as Facebook, Instagram, and Tweeter)

(52) doshman az tarigh e tolid va tarvij e shobahat va hamchenin tolid e mohtavaye zedde effat va haya, be donbal e enheraf e javanan e momen va salem az asl e din va daridan e pardehaye hayast va emrooz in kar dar bastar e fazaye majazi anjam mishavad (Keyhan, 06/09/2016).

‘By producing and promoting [religious] misgivings as well as producing contents against effat and haya, the enemy is seeking to deviate faithful, morally sound young people from the truth of religion and tear up the curtains of haya. Today, this is carried out on the platform of virtual space.’

The saying of the Prophet in (53) shows the significance of haya in Islamic teachings. In the statement, faith is metaphorically seen as a naked body and haya is perceived as clothes (HAYA IS CLOTHES), completing or protecting the faith. The metaphor implies that religious faith without haya would be incomplete or unprotected:

(53) Payambare akram mifarmayand: Haya lebas e iman ast (Keyhan, 20/05/2014)

‘The Prophet says “haya is the clothes of faith”.’

The other metaphor that represents the significance of haya in preserving Islamic lifestyle and in controlling the social behavior of individuals is HAYA IS A PERSON. The underlined clause in (54) addresses persons who show no respect for social and religious prohibitions and audaciously violate them. The metaphor presents a tragic image of the way haya is violated in society by some people. In the text, haya is conceptualized as a person holding a significant responsibility in society, who decides to leave his residence due to being displeased with people’s open violation of moral codes. The expression rakht bar bastan ‘to
pack clothes’ metonymically stands for the act of moving from the residence. Here, the act of leaving corresponds to the abandonment of *haya*.

(54) Nemunehaye asargozari e in rasaneha dar noe pushesh va rafter e barkhi az aghshar dar manategh e shomali e Tehran ghabele moshahede ast ke *haya be tore koli az mianeshan rakht bar baste ast* (*Keyhan*, 17/05/2016).

‘The effect of such media [Western media] can be seen in the way some residents in the north of Tehran dress and talk, where *haya* has completely moved away from among them.’

Important aspects of *haya* including the existence, sufficiency, intensity, value, harm, vulnerability, and sanctity are figuratively conceptualized.

**HAYA IS A POSSESSED OBJECT:** Adjectives containing *bâ* ‘with’ and *bi* ‘without’ along with a number of other Persian expressions like *haya dashtan* ‘having *haya*’, *az haya barkhordâr budan* ‘possessing/having *haya*’ conceptualize *haya* as a POSSESSED OBJECT:

(55) Bazi be hadi bahaya hastand ke ba hameye nadari va bicharegi hazer nistand niaz e khod ra ezhar konand (*Keyhan*, 19/07/2014).

‘Some people are so *bâhaya* / possess so much of *haya* that they do not want to express their need despite all their poverty and desperation.’

(56) Che *bihaya* hastand anan ke bimahaba v aba bigheirati amalan parchame biganegan ra dar sar dare khanehaye khod nasb mikonand (*Keyhan*, 21/02/2016).

‘How *bihaya* [shameless] are those who rudely and without any *gheirat* [sensitivity to taboo violations] practically put up the flag of aliens on top of their house doors.’

(57) Hich hayai dar ishan vojud nadarad (*Keyhan*, 26/04/2016)

‘No *haya* exists in him’.

**HAYA IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER:** The intensity of *haya* is figuratively conceived as the level of a substance in the body (the body is conceived as a CONTAINER), as in *ahamiat e taghviate haya* ‘the significance of reinforcing *haya*’, *mazerrât e kahesh e haya* ‘the disadvantages of the decrease of *haya*’, *sharm o hayaye andak* ‘a low (amount of) *sharm* and *haya*’.
(58) Az ghena beparhizid ke haya ra kam mikonad (Keyhan, 06/04/2016).

‘Refrain from singing as it lowers haya.’

(59) Be man goft: Be an zan che gofti? Man az shedat e sharm o haya suratam ra pushandam (Keyhan, 25/01/2014).

‘He told me: “what did you say to the woman?” Out of extreme sharm and haya I covered my face.’

(60) Baraye inke nafs be masuniyat beresad va be kontrol e havahaye nafsani dar nayayad mibayest taghva ra dar ou taghviat kardeh va osul e haya va effat ra dar ou tashdid kard (Keyhan, 08/03/2016).

‘In order for the self to reach immunity and not to be overcome by passion, piety should be reinforced and the principles of haya and effat should be intensified in it [in the self].’

Intense forms of haya in the above examples are thoroughly positively evaluated, which is in contrast with the rather negative evaluation of the intense forms of shame in English (Tissari, 2006, p. 152). Moreover, while increasing intensity in many of prototypical emotion concepts, such as anger, love, and sadness can lead to loss of control over one’s emotions (Kövecses, 1986, 1990, 2000), an increase in the intensity of haya results in gaining more control over socially-religiously negatively viewed emotions, such as lust, anger, and conceit.

INTENSITY OF HAYA IS INTENSITY OF COLOR: The source domain of COLOR is used to make sense of the varying degrees of haya and its varying effects on people’s way of talking and dressing. In (61), women’s degree of veiling is assumed to be correlated with the level of haya they possess and exhibit. As a result, women’s improper dressing is attributed to the gradual elimination of haya in Iranian society in the eyes of political-religious conservatives:

(61) Khanomhaye badhejab az koja amadan? Mal e haminja hastan. Faghat vaghti ke haya tu jam’e kamrang shod lebas e anha ham taghir kard (Keyhan, 15/02/2014).

‘Where do immodestly dressed women come from? They are from here [Iran]. When haya paled/faded in society, their clothes changed as well.’
According to this view, women possessing a sufficient amount of *hayā* would observe *hejab* properly in public as *hayā* prevents them from violating Islamic dress codes specified for women.

(62) Yeki az amâl e asli e badhejabi va kam shodan e effât, kamrang shodan e bârkhi az fazâele akhlâghi manand e hayâ dar jame’e ast, zira bar asas e revyat, natijeye sharm va hayâ pakdamanist (*Keyhan*, 05/04/2013).

‘One of the main causes of *badhejabi* ‘improper *hejab*’ and the decline of *effât* is that some of the moral virtues like *hayâ* have faded in society. According to religious narratives, the result of applying *sharm* and *hayâ* is purity’.

In other examples, the HAYA IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER represents the sufficiency or insufficiency of *hayâ* and its effect on one’s speech and conduct:

(63) Imam Ali farmud: Kesi ke ziad sokhan miguyad ziad ham eshtebah mikonad va harkas ke besyar eshtebah kard *sharm o hayaye ou andak ast* va anke *sharm o hayaye ou andak ast* parhizkari e ou niz andak khahad bud (*Keyhan*, 23/06/2014).

‘Imam Ali [the first Shia Imam] said: anyone who speaks a lot makes too many mistakes and anyone who makes too many mistakes has a low amount of *sharm* and *hayâ*, and the one who has a low amount of *sharm* and *hayâ* will have a low amount of piety too’.

(64) Akhlagh e khanevadegi dar zendegi e zanashui baraye zan dashtan e hayaye kafist ke hamsare ou az rafter e ou ehsas e sharmsari va hegharat nakonad va tazmini baraye amniyat va ghorur e ou bashad (*Keyhan*, 28/07/2015).

‘Family morality for a married woman is having sufficient *hayâ* so that her husband will not feel ashamed and humiliated of her behavior and that [having sufficient *hayâ*] will guarantee her own security and pride’.

HAYA IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY: Verbal objects modifying the verbs *be kharj dadan* ‘spending’ and *hefz kardan* ‘preserving’ typically denote valuable objects or entities. For that reason, VALUABLE COMMODITY seems to be a proper source domain for the metaphors of this category. This metaphor highlights the value of *hayâ* as a moral virtue:
Agar ma haya be kharj midahim va hochigari nemikonim anha ham reayat konand (Keyhan, 04/05/2014).

‘If we spend haya [observe haya] and do not raise a ruckus, they should also observe it.

Pakdamani va efaf haya ra dar jamé’e hefz mikond (Keyhan, 17/05/2016)

‘Sexual purity and chastity preserve haya in society.’

HAYA IS A VALUABLE POSSESSED OBJECT: This is also a metaphor that highlights the value of haya. In example (67), the verb setân dan ‘to take something (valuable) from someone’ can involve the exertion of force. In the following extract, begging for things and coveting (two unpleasant features) are depicted as threats to haya as a valuable possession:

Emam zein ol abedin farmud: darkhast az mardom va cheshm e tama be anha sharm o haya ra az adami misetanad (Keyhan, 12/12/2015).

‘Imam Zein al-Abedin [the fourth Shia Imam] said: begging people for things and coveting what others have take sharm and haya away from humans.’

A group of metaphors focus on the sanctity and vulnerability of haya, revealing the ways in which human conducts posit threats to the existence and normal functioning of this moral value.

HAYA IS A HOLY SPACE/BOUNDED REGION: The word harim in Persian dictionaries is defined as “a holy place or territory which must be protected” (Dehkhoda Online Dictionary). Harim appears in such verb phrases as pasdari az harim e haya ‘guarding the space or territory of haya’ and reayat e harim e haya ‘observing/respecting the space or territory of haya’. These expressions seem to be verbal metaphors forming the HAYA IS A HOLY SPACE/BOUNDED REGION conceptual metaphor. Example (68) shows an elaborated form of this metaphor, where scenes featured in a TV series are seen as being destructive to social-religious norms, which demand respecting and obeying parents through exhibiting haya:

Osyangari dar barabare valedin va shekaste shodan e harim e haya va sharm ra mitavan nemunehayi az nokate manfie in serial onvan kard (Keyhan, 16/02/2014).
‘Rebelling against parents and breaking the space of *haya* and *sharm* are among the negative points of the TV series’.

**SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROHIBITIONS ARE OPPONENTS OF HAYA:** In some examples, social-religious prohibitions violated by individuals are metaphorically pictured as OPPONENTS OF HAYA. OPPONENT is a well-known source domain in the metaphorical conceptualization of emotions, which can be seen as an instantiation of the EMOTION IS FORCE metaphor (Kövecses, 2000, p. 61). Some particular acts and behaviors such as disrespecting parents, begging, dressing immodestly in public, and representing taboos in the media and novels (e.g., prostitution, drug addiction, and cheating in married life) are verbally shown to be attacking (*morede hajme gharâr dâdan*), targeting (*neshâne raftan*), and obliterating (*az bein bordan*) *haya*. Other phrases such as *defâ az harim e haya* ‘defending the holy space/border of *haya*’ and *herâsat az harim e haya* ‘guarding the holy space/border of *haya*’ also provide further evidence for taking social-religious prohibitions as metaphorical opponents of *haya*:


‘How can it be accepted that moral values and religious assumptions, such as *haya, efafe, and decency* get attacked like this on the pretext of cinema, movies, and story-telling’.

(70) Inha pusheshhayi hastand ke *haya va efafe ra neshane miravand* (*Keyhan*, 31/01/2016)

‘These are forms of dressing that target *haya and efafe*’.

**HAYA IS A PHYSICAL LOCATION:** PHYSICAL LOCATION evoked by the prepositional phrase *be dur az* ‘far away from’ is a significant source domain for measuring the deviation of one’s speech and behavior from expected social and religious values, exemplified by *be dur az haya/adab/ensâniat/javânmardei/ensâf/efâf* ‘far away from *haya/politeness/humanity/chivalry/fairness/chastity*’. Moreover, the metaphorical spatial distance between one’s act or speech and moral values determines the reaction of observers (people or government officials) to taboo violations, as example (71) indicates:
(71) Moteasefane bad az tazakorat e mokarrar e mardom va mas’ulan, hamchenan barkhi az forushgahha lebashaye mardane va zanane ra dar mankanhaye be door az haya va effat e eslam-i irani tarvij o tabligh mikonand (Keyhan, 02/03/2014).

‘Unfortunately, despite repeated admonishments of people and officials, some clothes stores are still displaying men and women’s clothes in mannequins that are far away from Islamic-Iranian haya and effat.’

In Iranian society, representations of nudity (e.g., mannequins, sculptures, and statues exposing female head, bodily curves, and private parts) are believed to cause shame on a par with actual nudity, motivated by the REPRESENTATIONS OF TABOO FOR TABOO conceptual metonymy. In this case, haya operates to avoid causing shame. Therefore, shopkeepers are required to veil mannequins exposing the body and bodily curves (www.dailymail.co.uk, 24/09/2009). This religious prohibition is also taken into consideration when Iranian top officials visit museums in Europe. During the Iranian president’s visit to Capitoline Museum in Rome, the sculptures were covered with white boards (www.independent.co.uk, 27/01/2016). In a Muslim country like Iran, nudity also includes women’s head. The expression bâ sar e berahneh birun raftan, literally ‘going out with a naked head’, describes a taboo act in a situation in which a woman appears in public without a headscarf.

4.8 Discussion and summary of the findings

The explications of haya indicate that this emotion concept is a “body-based social construct” (Kövecses, 2000; Kövecses et al., 2003). Haya largely emerges as a response to social events as well as individual psychological states that draw on the imagination of social situations in solitude. Such properties of haya lend support to the view that emphasizes the social nature of emotion concepts (Lutz, 1988; Lutz & White, 1986; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990). However, the metaphor analysis highlights the significance of embodiment in shaping the structure and meanings of haya. The conception of the body as a CONTAINER as well as body part terms (the heart and stomach) that play the role of CONTAINERS for haya reinforce the hypothesis that emotion concepts are to some degree motivated by universal properties of human physiology (Kövecses, 1990; Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987). In addition to its contribution to shedding light on universal properties of haya as an emotion concept, the body is also a vital factor in revealing the social significance of haya. This means that physiological and behavioral manifestations of haya are as important as social events and social actions that
point to the social nature of the concept. The realizations of haya in the body are not merely automatic and unconscious responses of the body to the emotion but rather they are repercussions of a social pressure that requires individuals to exhibit the emotion in order to determine their social status. The ostensible exhibition of haya in some situations is evidence for the role of social pressure in triggering the expression of moral emotions. Thus, the social constructionist approach to emotions needs to pay more attention to the role of embodiment in the construction of universal and culture-specific aspects of emotions.

The study of haya demonstrates some inadequacies in descriptions that have been provided in anthropological research for concepts that, similar to haya, are applied to avoid causing or feeling shame in honor cultures (Muslim and Mediterranean cultures). First, in majority of studies (Abu-Lughod, 1986; Delaney, 1987; Dumitrescu, 2005; Giovannini, 1987; Menon & Shweder, 1993; Moxnes, 1996; Peristiany & Pitt-Rivers, 2005; Stiebert, 2002), scholars refer to shame-avoiding concepts as “positive shame”, distinguishing it from the actual experience of shame, which is referred to as “negative shame”. The dual senses of shame are based in a contrast made between honor and shame in honor cultures, where loss of honor is perceived to bring about shame for the person and the community to which he belongs (negative shame) and constraints on women’s behavior are regarded as a means to preserve honor (positive shame). However, the analysis of haya shows that women’s sexuality is only one of several domains of experience in Iranian culture (as a Muslim or honor culture) that is controlled and regulated by haya. Haya as a fundamentally religious concept places restrictions on any behavior that might threaten or stain one’s own honor and that of the family, and its possession and application is as significant for men as it is for women (Milani, 1992; Pasandideh, 2004). Second, in many anthropological descriptions of shame-avoiding concepts, such as hashama in Egyptian society (Abu-lughod, 1986), lajya in Orissa (Menon & Shweder, 1993), kezhüghi keya in Naga society (Thong, 2014), shyness is mistakenly taken as a meaning or realization of the shame-avoiding concepts. As I explained in the introduction, although haya and shyness are at times expressed in a similar way (e.g., by lowering the gaze or self-effacing), they obviously signal distinct mental states. Pasandideh (2004) and Khadem-Pir (2015) attribute shyness to lack of self-confidence and see it as a psychologically passive state, whereas haya, they argue, indicates one’s capability to control desires and manage behavior in compliance with cultural codes of conduct.

Some of the haya metaphors are similar to metaphors of shame in English. The conceptual metaphors SHAME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, SHAME IS DOWN,
SHAME IS A COVER/CLOTH, and SHAME IS A FLUID, SHAME IS AN OBSTACLE (Tissari, 2006) can be compared with the HAYA IS DOWN (a metonymy-based metaphor), HAYA IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, HAYA IS A COVER, and HAYA IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER metaphors. A major difference between the metaphors is that the metaphorical source domains of haya provide a thoroughly positive evaluation of the concept, whereas the metaphorical source domains of shame in English depict a rather negative image of shame.

Metaphors of haya in Persian and those of shame in English (Tissari, 2006) both employ THE BODY and THE HEART as metaphorical containers. However, Persian presents two more metaphorical containers for haya (DEL ‘HEART/STOMACH’ and the MOUTH). Moreover, while the substance in the metaphorical container is negatively characterized in English (Tissari, 2006, p. 152), the fluid in the metaphorical containers for haya is positively viewed. Whereas shame is seen as NUDITY in English (Holland & Kipnis, 1995), haya is conceived of as a COVER. This contrast highlights the protective function of haya in Iranian culture.

Data analysis indicates that the most important functions of haya, i.e., the protective, segregative, and prohibitive functions, are shown via the HAYA IS A COVER/CURTAIN and HAYA IS A BARRIER conceptual metaphors. The source domain of COVER is also used in the metaphorical conceptualization of other cluster members associated with haya (ðberu ‘face/public image’, effat ‘chastity’). These functions originate from a fundamentally religious outlook that believes in segregating men and women and in separating public and private realms in order to preserve social order and reduce moral corruption.

The conceptual link between haya and shame in social interactions is facilitated by the SHAME FOR HAYA metonymy, whereby physiological and behavioral manifestations of shame, such as blushing and lowering the gaze provide mental access to haya. Furthermore, demonstrations of modesty (walking modestly, lowering the head, not being talkative, and downgrading one’s own achievements) also metonymically refer to haya. This conceptual association highlights one of the main functions of haya, which is creating modesty. Haya and modesty also get connected through COVER metaphors. Observing hejab is a chief manifestation of COVER metaphors in social-physical reality and is illustrative of modesty.
The conceptualizations of *haya* in Persian demonstrate similarities to the conceptualizations of shame in collectivist cultures. Some of the emotional causes (fear of losing one’s åberu ‘face/public image’ and respect to the other), physiological and behavioral responses (lowering the head, blushing, hiding the face) and functions (prohibitive and protective functions) characterizing *haya* similarly characterize shame in Tagalog (Palmer & Brown 1998), Thai (Ukosakul, 2003), Dalabon (Ponsonnet, 2014), the Mediterranean cultures (Abu-Lughod, 1996), Chinese (Li et al., 2004) and Indian (Menon & Shweder, 1993).

Whereas shame in some cultures is mostly experienced in face-to-face interactions, such as hiya in Tagalog (Plamer & Brown, 1998), kunta in Pintupi (Myers, 1979), swira in Kakabila (Jamieson, 2000), yer(mu) in Dalabon (Ponsonnet, 2014), and lajya in Orissa (Menon & Shweder, 1993), *haya* can also emerge in private and under the influence of objects, places and events functioning as observers. The other point distinguishing *haya* from similar concepts in other cultures is the overwhelming role of religion in shaping the structure and defining the functions of *haya*. *Haya* is shown to be predominantly guided by religious assumptions that underscore the necessity for controlling such desires as lust, anger, conceit, self-displaying, and covetousness, which damage self-esteem and disrupt social order. Compared to the concept of SHAME in the aforementioned cultures, *haya* seems to have a wider scope of application. This is due to the large number of social and religious prohibitions as well as a large number of non-physical or non-human elements that can take on the role of observer.

4.9 Conclusion

The analysis of *haya* in linguistic and nonlinguistic contexts indicates that *haya* is a constituent element of a key conceptual cluster that regulates and restricts the individual and social behaviors of Iranians. For the purpose of controlling sexuality, *haya* forms a conceptual cluster with mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’, gheirat ‘moral vigilance’, effat ‘chastity’, åberu ‘face/public image’, harim ‘holy space/border’, nâmus ‘female family members’, and hejab ‘veiling’. Within this network, *haya* sets up barriers between men and women in order to keep them segregated, with hejab ‘veiling’ (and other physical barriers, such as walls) being the chief manifestation of the existence and operation of *haya* in social interactions between men and women. Furthermore, the cultural model of HAYA is shown to be formed through the interaction of bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors.
Moreover, studying the concept of HAYA supports Kövecses’s view that emotions are mostly figuratively conceived (Kövecses, 2000, p. 85).

Various approaches view emotions as social constructs (Lutz, 1988), discourse models (Rafael, 1988; Rosaldo, 1980), and as individual feeling states formed through universal bodily experiences and cognitive processes (Kövecses, 1990, 2000). There are also approaches that relate the emergence of emotions to a combination of factors, such as social actions, discourse models, and figurative meaning-making devices (Palmer & Brown 1998). The present research finds that the complex structure of emotion concepts and key cultural concepts may be more illuminated when sufficient attention is given to various bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors and views emotions as being jointly formed through the collaboration of all these factors. This goal was achieved by providing a detailed analysis of metaphors. These metaphors are shown to be crucial to comprehending the meaning of emotion concepts and concepts representing core cultural values. Considering the immediate linguistic context and the discourses surrounding the key concept of HAYA proves to be useful in systematically identifying the range of related emotion concepts as well as broader conceptual domains that interact with and structure it, contributing to discovering the cognitive-cultural functions of the concept. Besides, since the cultural underpinnings of metaphors are emphasized in both Cultural Linguistics (Sharifian 2015) and in recent approaches to metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics (Deignan, 2005; Kövecses, 2015), a context-based metaphor analysis preserves the interdisciplinary nature of the investigation and takes into account the objectives of both Cultural Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics.
Chapter 5: Effat ‘chastity’

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the conceptualizations of effat and its conceptual relationship with the other forces (haya, gheirat, and hejab). Unlike gheirat and haya, which were shown to be involved in controlling different aspects of individual and social behavior in Iranian culture, effat is a restrictive force that deals exclusively with controlling sexual desire (Eshaghi, 2006). The study of effat is supposed to demonstrate its cognitive-cultural function(s) and the way it interacts with other self-regulating forces.

5.2 Chastity across cultures

Purity, self-control, and incorruptibility are essential qualities of a chaste person (Mahalingam, 2007, p. 239). These qualities highlight the biological and psychological components of chastity. Chastity expectations show how cultures exercise control over women’s sexual behavior (Lindisfarne, 1998). Chastity is a main component of women’s identity in honor cultures. Ethnographic studies suggest that African, Middle Eastern, and Latino cultures place a high premium on chastity (Lindisfarne, 1998; Paternostro, 1998; Wikan, 1982). In such cultures, family honor rests on women’s chastity, and women’s self-control and purity prove the masculinity of the male members of the family. Furthermore, in these cultures, wanton behavior is condemned and women face serious social consequences for transgressing chastity norms (Giovannini, 1987; Weisfeld, 1993). In Asian, Latino, Arab, and African cultures, women’s social status is determined by their purity and capacity to control their bodies, which is the basis for categorizing women as either pure or polluted (Lindisfarne, 1998; Mahalingam, 2007; Paternostro, 1998).

Effat is one of the principal forces for controlling the behavior of Iranians in relation to social and religious taboos. In Dehkhoda online dictionary, effat is defined as a) nahoftegi ‘the state of being covered or concealed’, b) pâkdâmani ‘moral purity’ c) parhizkâri ‘piety d) ehterâz az moharramât be vizhe shahavât e harâm ‘refraining from taboos particularly lust’. As the dictionary meanings suggest, effat performs its function largely through concealing or covering taboos. Effat specifically deals with concealing taboos related to sexuality and sexual desire so as to impede the person from transgressing norms of conduct. It
simultaneously applies to protect the person against the negative consequences of succumbing to sexual desire (Eshaghi, 2006, p. 39). Effat is founded on and has acquired its significance from sex segregation and spatial, physical, and emotional distance between men and women as stressed by Islam. The negative view to sexual desire and out-of-wedlock relationships is reflected in the linguistic expressions that conceptualize lust as FIRE. For instance, based on a traditional belief, men and women are likened to panbeh va âtash ‘cotton and fire’ (Farahani, 2002). This metaphor points to the grave individual and social consequences of unchecked relationships between men and women, namely losing self-value and âberu ‘face/public image’. Given the LUST IS FIRE metaphor, effat acts as an insulator between men and women. Scholarly works promoting Islamic moral values touch upon the same metaphor to encourage men and women to observe effat. Eshaghi (2006, p. 10) maintains that “men and women are like two electric wires that can strike flames of impurity and burn off the values in the absence of an insulator between them”. Any erotic thought and behavior would violate the principle of effat. Thus, effat is expected to be manifest in one’s way of looking, walking, talking, dressing, and in one’s postures and gestures in social situations (Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 1992). Both men and women should observe effat when communicating with each other. Nevertheless, effat is seen as an essential feature of women. For this reason, they are much more expected to observe and preserve it. The overemphasis on female chastity would put Iran in the category of “sexually restrictive societies” (Martel et al., 2004) as opposed to sexually permissive societies, such as Western societies. Martel et al. (2004) observe that sexually restrictive cultures attempt to limit both the occurrence of sexual expression and the ways it can be expressed. In such cultures, sex is seen as holding a dangerous power and harmful to members of society. Furthermore, virtue is often associated with premarital chastity; sexual abstinence is stressed mostly for women while men are typically permitted some greater amount of sexual freedom (p. 3). These properties also generally characterize views toward sex and sexuality in Iran. What should be added to the above account is that in Iran gender roles and sexual relations are male-defined (Farahani, 2006; Khosravi, 2009; Milani, 1992). Khosravi (2009) defines Iran as a patriarchal society, arguing that in Iranian social context male honor is vested in the chastity of the man’s female relatives and manliness is defined by emphasizing and sustaining spatial distinctions and sex segregation. Women also gain status and prestige through concealing their sexuality (p. 593).

Keeping virginity until marriage and observing hejab are chief signs of a chaste woman (Rahbari, 2017; Tizro, 2013). Rahmani et al. (2016) explore the viewpoints of
sexually active single Iranian women about premarital sexual relationships from a sociological perspective. Their research shows that majority of their interviewees assign a high degree of holiness to physical virginity, making them abstain from having vaginal sex despite experiencing other types of sexual behaviors, such as oral sex, outer-course, and anal sex. Commitment to virginity is a predominant attitude in Iranian culture and the sanctity attached to the hymen seems to have originated from this attitude. The other reason for withholding (vaginal) sex is that Iranian girls want to increase their chances to get married (Hooshmand, 2006, p. 385). An unmarried girl without virginity might run the risk of being called kharâb ‘rotten’, a highly offensive word that refers to prostitutes. The significance of virginity is also reflected in the way Iranian females are addressed and categorized. Virginity is the feature on the basis of which girls are distinguished from women in Persian language. A dokhtar ‘girl’ is an unmarried and sexually inexperienced female, regardless of her age and a zan ‘woman’ is a married female regardless of her age (Farahani, 2006, p. 195). The word dokhtar ‘girl’ is also conventionally used to euphemistically say that a female is a virgin, as in ezdevâj karde ammâ hanuz dokhtare ‘she has got married but she’s still a girl [Virgin]’ where SEX (being a girl) metonymically refers to VIRGINITY. The social demand for keeping virginity has established the binary categorization of women as chaste/honorable and impure/non-honorable (Farahani, ibid). It is worth noting that the Persian expression for hymen is pardeye bekârat ‘virginity curtain’, which is based on the HYMEN IS A CURTAIN metaphor. Farahani (2006) notes that this term “exhibits how a woman’s hymen symbolizes a gateway that allows men’s entrance and it indicates the possibility of taking off or unveiling a virgin woman” (p. 195). Nâghes shodan ‘to get defected’ is another conventional metaphorical expression which is used when a girl loses her hymen without having sex or as a result of premarital sexual relationship. The metaphor characterizing this expression is WOMEN ARE COMMODITIES, which makes the value of a woman contingent upon her virginity status, demonstrating the way a ‘normal’ female body is defined.

Ethnographic research demonstrates that Iranian women who are not properly veiled (not cloaked in the chador) are subject to constant scrutiny and may experience sexual comments (matalak) on their way to the market or bank. They may also meet gendered harassments from vendors and businessmen (Hooshmand, 2006, p. 385). Eshaghi (2006) states that men unconsciously treat improperly dressed women as tools of meeting sexual needs, whereas they treat properly veiled women with full reverence. He concludes that a
woman’s way of dressing reveals her character as either a chaste woman or a sexual object, and determines men’s attitude toward them (p. 10).

5.3. Effat and the body

Effat’s scope of functioning goes beyond sexual desire, acting to curb all illegitimate desires. A range of Persian linguistic expressions provide clues as to the specific desires that are targeted by effat: Effat e negâh ‘chastity of look’, effat e gush ‘chastity of ear’, effat e kalâm ‘chastity of speech’, effat e shekam ‘chastity of stomach’, effat e faraj ‘chastity of private parts’. The expressions all refer to desires that have a bodily basis. The body parts or the properties of bodily organs (look and speech) metonymically stand for the forbidden actions that are done with or involve these organs (via the INSTRUMENT INVOLVED IN ACTION FOR ACTION metonymy). Thus, it seems that effat is designed to set limits to certain bodily actions and states. In other words, effat shapes ways of using certain body parts in a legitimate way. Looking at nâmahrams ‘non-intimates’, listening to exciting music, drinking alcohol, using obscene words, and having premarital sexual relationships are the forbidden acts that the expressions metonymically refer to. These embodied conceptualizations have their roots in the emphasis that the Quran has placed on the role of the body in committing sins. In a number of Quranic verses, body parts are personified in order to point to God’s awareness of human thoughts and actions and to warn Muslims of the outcomes of their sins:

(1) On this day, We will seal their mouths, and their hands will speak to Us, and their feet will testify to everything they had done (36: 65).
(2) Until when they have reached it, their hearing and their sight and their skin will testify them regarding what they used to do (41: 20)
(3) On the day when their tongues and their hands and their feet will testify against them regarding what they used to do (24: 24). (www.clearquran.com).

The Quran demonstrates how body parts involved in sinful acts will stop submitting to the agentive mind on the Judgment Day and reveal the truth as individuals capable of speaking. The metaphor BODY PARTS ARE HUMANS instantiated in the Quranic verses can play the role of a reminder for those committed to Islamic teachings and justify the observance of effat.
A couple of examples in the data show how observing the chastity of body parts during Ramadan\(^8\) contributes to the purification of sins. In example (4), `effat e shekam va faraj` ‘chastity of the stomach and private parts’ metonymically refer to forbidden acts of drinking, overconsumption of food, and extramarital sexual intercourse. The word `faraj`, literally meaning ‘orifice’, is a religious euphemism that metonymically stands for sexual organs via the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. Also, the expression `zabân râ negah dâshtan` ‘holding the tongue’ metonymically refers to such taboo acts as backbiting, slandering, and using offensive or vulgar language via the SPEECH ORGAN FOR SPEAKING metonymy. The writer conceptualizes time and sin as CONTAINERS to synchronize the metaphorical motion within both of the spaces. In the TIME IS A CONTAINER metaphor, the motion corresponds to the acts that a Muslim should do and avoid doing during Ramadan (the ACTION IS MOTION). In the SIN IS A CONTAINER metaphor, the person’s movement across the container corresponds to the gradual process of getting purified and being purified of sins corresponds to leaving the container.

(4) Harkas ruzeh begirad va shab ra be doa bepardazad va effat e shekam va faraj dashte bashad va zabanash ra negah darad, az gonahan e khod birun miravad hamantor ke az mah e ramezan kharej mishavad (Keyhan, 20/11/2016).

‘If a person fasts, stays up the night to pray, observes the chastity of stomach and private parts, and holds their tongue, they will get out of their sins as they leave the month of Ramadan.’

5.4 Effat and gender segregation

Some examples in the data provide the rationale for gender segregation and depict the role of `effat` in keeping the sexes segregated.

In the following text (example 5), sex segregation is framed as a protective as well as a preventive measure, with `effat` being a key tool for implementing it. In other words, `effat` preserves the specified `harim` ‘holy space/border’ between `nâmahrâm` ‘non-intimate’ men and women, protects the `kerâmât` ‘dignity’ and `sha’n` ‘social standing’ of women, and also prevents men and women from engaging in relationships outside the confines of marriage. It should be noted that gender segregation regulations enforced by the Iranian government in schools (from primary to high school), sports centers, some workplaces, and public

---

8. Ramadan (Ramezan in Persian) is the ninth month in the Islamic calendar during which Muslims fast from dawn until sunset every day.
transportation have been criticized by human rights activists and the liberal segment of the society. Opponents of the gender segregation policy argue that the policy is an open violation of women’s rights and a pretext to deprive Iranian women of access to high-ranking positions, such as presidency and judgeship (www.iranhumanrights.org, 03/09/2014). The writer (in example 5), however, probably attempts to show that such criticisms are baseless and that tafkik e jensiyati ‘gender segregation’ should not be equated with restriction.

(5) Efaf va re’ayat e hodud e shar’i dar ertebat e zan va mard e namahram be mani tahaffoz va pishgiri az barkhi ravabet e namashrou ast. Tafkik e jensiyati va ijad e harimhayi dar barkhord mian e zan va mard be hich vajh be mani e mahdud kardan e zanan va momaneat az eshteghal e anan nist balke manzur az chenin eghdami hefz e keramat va shan e banovan ast (Keyhan, 12/08/2014).

‘Observing effat and religious boundaries in the relationship between nâmahram men and women mean protecting [the boundaries] and preventing illegitimate relationships. Gender segregation and setting up boundaries in social contacts between men and women do not whatsoever mean restricting women and forbidding their employment but rather these are measures taken to protect women’s dignity and social standing.’

Example (6) provides another justification for segregating the sexes. The justification relies on a Quranic verse in which Muslims are instructed how to demonstrate chastity. What can be inferred from the text is that effat is positioned as a cover between the person and taboo acts (e.g., staring at non-intimates and watching sexually charged scenes), which can provoke sexual desire. On the basis of the Quranic verse, the writer concludes that staring at a nâmahram or at (unveiled, semi-naked or naked) pictures of a nâmahram is the root cause of violating the specified borders between men and women. The violation occurs when effat is not applied by lowering the gaze or closing the eyes.

(6) Dar sureye nour ayeye 30 mifarmayad be momenin begu cheshmhaye khod ra bar haram bebandand va foruje khod ra az haram hefz konand. Dar in Ayeh be zibayi eshareh shod east ke mohemtarin amel e tahrirk e gharizeye jensi didan e namahram va tasavir e va sahnehaye namonasenb ast; leza dastur midahad ke cheshmhayetan ra bar haram bebandid (Keyhan, 16/07/2016).

‘In Nour chapter, verse 30, God says [to the Prophet]: tell believers to close their eyes to harâm ‘forbidden’ scenes and guard [conceal] their private parts. In this verse, it has been
beautifully pointed out that staring at a nâmahram and watching inappropriate pictures and scenes are the most important causes of sexual arousal. Hence, [God] commands [believers] to close their eyes to forbidden scenes.’

5.5 Lexical collocates and interacting domains

Words or expressions collocating with effat define its characteristic properties and highlight the results of its existence or non-existence. They also specify the major conceptual domains that are conventionally associated with it. The word effat collocates with such positive characteristics as esmat ‘prohibition/immunity from sin’, pâkdâmani ‘moral purity’, nejâbat ‘decency’, khishtandâri ‘self-control’, kerâmat ‘dignity’, and salâmət e akhlaghī ‘moral health’. Bieffati ‘lack of effat’, on the other hand, collocates with negative characteristics, such as harzegi ‘debauchery’, shahvatrâni ‘lustfulness’, bihejabi ‘the state of lacking hejab’, fesâd ‘corruption’, fahsha ‘vice’, and âludegi ‘dirt/pollution’. Also, similar to gheirat and haya, effat collocates with imân ‘faith’, aghl ‘reason’, which means that effat is indicative of one’s commitment to religious beliefs and of one’s intellectual capability to protect oneself against moral corruption. Table 5 provides the list of lexical items that collocate with effat along with their frequency of occurrence.

Table 5. Lexical collocates of effat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical collocates</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pâkdâmani ‘moral purity’</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hejab ‘veiling’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haya ‘self-restraint’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salâmət ‘moral health’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmat ‘prohibition/immunity from sin’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khishtandâri ‘self-control’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nejâbat ‘decency’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åberu ‘face/public image’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imân ‘faith’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gheirat ‘moral vigilance’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushidegi ‘the state of being covered’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerâmat ‘dignity’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghl ‘reason’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the lexical items collocating with effat, esmat ‘prohibition/immunity from sin’ and pushidegi ‘the state of being covered/concealed’ seem to profile the prohibitive and
concealing functions of *effat*. Example (9) shows the collocational relationship between *effat* and *esmat* ‘prohibition/immunity from sin’:

(7) Dalil e digari ke mojeb shode khodavand zanan ra az nabovat va rahbari ma’af konad va in omur ra be mardan beseparad rehayat e *effat* va *esmat* e zanan ast. Emam va rahbar e jame’e modam ba mardan dar tamas ast va in guneh omur ba ruhiye zanan sazegar nist (*Keyhan*, 06/10/2015).

‘The other reason for which God exempted women from [taking the roles of] prophethood and leadership and assigning these roles to men is considering women’s *effat* and *esmat*. The leader of a society is constantly in contact with men and such roles are incongruent with women’s character.

The word *pushidegi* ‘the state of being covered/concealed’ reflects the role of *effat* in concealing or covering taboo bodily desires or it may profile the result of applying *effat*, that is, veiled bodies. In example (8), it seems that the word *pushidegi* refers specifically to veiling. The writer contends that such issues as divorce and moral corruption stem from abandoning the principle of *effat*. In this case, veiling (as the realization of *effat*) symbolizes women’s commitment and devotion to family.

(8) Natijeye sahlengari va mosameheh dar amr e din va bitavajohi be *effat* va *pushidegi* gosast e khanevadeha va roshd e mafased e akhlaghi dar jame’e ast (*Keyhan*, 10/07/2016).

‘The consequence of negligence to religion and lack of attention to *effat* and covering will be a split in families and the growth of moral corruption in society.’

Among the collocates of *effat*, the words *pâkdâmani* ‘moral purity’, *salâmat* ‘moral health’, and *nejâbat* ‘decency’, seem to profile the effects or results of applying *effat* (examples 9–11):

(9) *Effat* va *pakdamani* ensan ra dar barabar e asibhaye ejtemai hefz mikonad va baes mishavad ke ensan dar barabar e masuliyathaye zendegi e khod moteaheded bashad (*Keyhan*, 28/02/2016).

‘*Effat* and moral purity protect humans from social harms, making one feel committed to their life responsibilities.’
‘What is crucially important is observing a kind of covering that would guarantee the effat and moral health of men and women in society.’

‘She asks Muslim women to not fall in the trap the West has spread for them and instead of imitating Western women, [they should] be protective of their own effat and decency.’

The other collocate of effat is khishtandari ‘self-control’. In fact, effat is employed to achieve self-control. In other words, effat could be seen as a tool for exerting self-control.

‘Marriage is the way to satisfy sexual needs but those do not afford to get married should exercise effat and self-control.’

Examples 13–17 show the collocational relationship between bieffati ‘the state of lacking effat’ and lexical items that profile the negative consequences of lacking effat.

‘Lacking effat and hejab in some young girls and women stem from having degenerate friends.’

‘By making use of anti-moral movies, the enemy attempts to extenuate the indecency of corruption and bieffati [the state of lacking effat].’
(15) Doshman ba tohin va tamaskhor e hejab say darad ta mardan ra be samt e shahvatparasti va zanan ra be samt e bieffati va harzegi sogh dahad (Keyhan, 09/07/2016).

‘By insulting and mocking hejab, the enemy attempts to direct men to lustfulness and women to debauchery and bieffati [the state of lacking effat].’

(16) Baziha dar ein hal e khod be bieffati va shahvatrani ruy avardeand az hamsareshan entezar darand ke malakeye effat va pakdamani bashad (Keyhan, 26/08/2014).

‘Some men are themselves oriented toward bieffati and lustfulness but still expect their wife to be the queen of chastity and moral purity.’

(17) Tajarod e mardan va zanan mohemtarin amel baraye forupashiye akhlagh e Jens dar jame’e ast va ishan be sabab e anke dar ma’raz e fahshâ va bieffati hastand mitavanand jame’e ra dar halat e bohran gharan dahand (Keyhan, 08/01/2014).

‘The singlehood of men and women is the most important element that can break down sexual morality in society and because of being exposed to vice and bieffati, they can put the society in crisis mode.’

The examination of the uses of effat across contexts indicates that effat is linked to the domains of GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, ÂBERU ‘face/public image’, IMÂN ‘faith’, AGHL ‘reason’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’. In what follows, I attempt to show how each of these concepts interacts with effat and assists it in fulfilling its function(s).

5.5.1 Gheirat ‘moral vigilance’

In example (18), the relationship between effat and gheirat is demonstrated by making reference to the tale of Joseph (Yusof in Persian and Arabic) and the aftermath of his resistance to the seduction of his master’s wife. The monitoring and prohibitive functions of gheirat are represented by the GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY metaphor, which is inferred from the use of the verb bâzdâshtan ‘to prohibit’. Here, gheirat applies to ensure sexual desire, which is supposed to be controlled by effat, remains concealed and in control. The metaphorical conceptualization of effat and lack of it as two PATHS help present a rather different, more concrete image of the way gheirat performs its function. Within the PATH metaphor, gheirat is depicted as a GUIDE blocking the wrong way to the traveler (Joseph) and showing him the right way (the path of effat). Furthermore, bieffati ‘the
state of lacking effat’ is pictured by the STATES ARE LOCATIONS metaphor. The word enherâf ‘digression’ and the phrase ruykerd be suye ‘turning toward’ point to the metaphorical PATHS.

(18) Khodavand doaye yousof ra be ejabat resanid va garche salha be jorm e gheirat va effat zendani shod, vali gheirat ou, ou ra az enherâf va ruykerd be suye bieffati bazdasht (Keyhan, 04/01/2016).

‘God accepted Joseph’s prayers and although he was jailed for years on the charges of showing gheirat and effat, his gheirat kept him from digression and turning toward bieffati [the state of lacking effat].’

Moral corruption is assumed to result from not observing effat and haya in society (Pasandideh, 2004; Khadem Pir, 2015). The following text shows how moral corruption can undermine the feeling of gheirat in people and damage the family institution:

(19) Tarvij e fesad e akhlaghi akhlagh ra dar jame’e zaye’ mikonad, bonyad e khanevade ra sost mikonad, nerkhe talagh ra afzayesh midahad va jame’e ra dar yek kalam bigheirat va bitafavot mikonad (Keyhan, 19/06/2016).

‘Promoting moral corruption will obliterate morality, undermine the family, increase the divorce rate, and in short, will make people bigheirat ‘lacking gheirat’ and indifferent’.

5.5.2 Âberu ‘face/public image’

Extract (20) is part of a diary in which the writer narrates his memories of the time he had been tortured by police (before the Islamic revolution) in order to reveal the name of his lover who had committed a murder. He is encouraging himself to resist the torture (he is exercising gheirat) as he believes the murder is justified because she has tried to defend her effat and Âberu ‘face/public image’, which are important values a woman lives by (EFFAT AND ÂBERU ARE VALUABLE POSSESSIONS). The text demonstrates a correlation between effat and Âberu such that losing effat (by surrendering to sexual abuse and rape) would be losing one’s honor and social image in the eyes of others. The other commonly used term for describing the joint involvement of these two concepts in similar contexts is nâmus ‘female family members’, which is a collective term embracing both effat and Âberu.
(20) Eshgh arzesh e hame no fadakari ra darad. Taze in aslan javanmardi nist ke ou ra lo bedaham. Hatta agar ashegh ham nemibudam che chiizi balatar az in ke ou sa’y karde bud az aberu va effatash defa konad (Keyhan, 26/01/2016).

‘Love is worth any sacrifice. Moreover, it would not be chivalrous to reveal her name. Even if I wasn’t in love, what could be more important than that she had tried to defend her āberu and effat.

In example (21), premarital sex is viewed as a serious threat to one’s āberu ‘face/public image’, and observing haya and effat are suggested as solutions for protecting the āberu and reducing sexual desire:

(21) Ensani ke dar ma’raz e masael e jensist baraye hefze khish az biaberui mitavanad az rahhaye chon taghviat e effat va haya, ruzeh gereftan, varzesh kardan, va karhayi ke ghovaye jensi ra kahesh midahad bahreh girad (Keyhan, 21/05/2016).

‘A person who is subject to sexual issues can protect his/her āberu by reinforcing effat and haya, fasting, exercising, and doing things that would reduce sexual desire’.

Another word collocating with effat is kerâmat ‘dignity’. Dignity could be taken as part of the general honor or āberu one possesses. In example (22), hejab ‘veiling’, as the realization of effat, is considered the protector of women’s dignity and social value. The text conveys that without wearing the veil women would be sexually objectified and would lose their social value.

(22) Dar vaghe’ hejab na be manzur e mahdudiyat baraye zan, balke dar rastaye pasdari az effat va keramat e ou mibashad. Eslam mikhahad ke zan az rah e shakhshiyat, elm va agahiyash arzeshmand bashad na inke be dast avizi baraye erzaye meil e jensi e goruhi faribkar tabdil shaved (Keyhan, 14/07/2014).

‘In fact, hejab is not meant to restrict women but to guard their effat and dignity. Islam wants women to gain value through their own personality, knowledge, and awareness, and not to be objects for pleasing the sexual desire of a group of deceivers.’

5.5.3 Haya ‘self-restraint’

Example (23) introduces haya and effat as defining features of the wise relying on an interpretation of Quranic verses. In the last clause of the statement, the verb phrase ejtenâb az
"Zeshtihā ‘avoiding obscenities’ provides the clue as to the function that haya and effat have in common. The difference between the two concepts concerns their specificity level and scope of application. Effat predominantly operates to hinder and/or conceal sexual desire and moral corruption. Haya, however, is a more general category dealing with a wider variety of taboos.

(23) Hamchenin dar in ayat bayan shod e ke osulan kheradmandan kesani hastand ke ahle haya va effat bude va az zeshtiha ejtenab mikonand (Keyhan, 27/08/2016).

‘Also, these [Quranic] verses express that the wise are those who tend to observe haya and effat, and avoid obscenities.’

Example (24) is a religious saying attributed to the Prophet in which Muslims are recommended to observe haya and effat in order to conceal their moral and personality defects. Here, haya and effat are conceptualized as CLOTHES (jâmeh in Persian) and moral/personality defects are conceptualized as PHYSICAL DEFECTS. As a broad self-regulating force, haya conceals any moral and personality defects and effat conceals those defects that have to do with sexual desire. The metaphorical representation of the role of haya and effat also implicitly foregrounds the significance of people’s judgments on one’s conducts, which is the basis for evaluating one’s āberu ‘face/public image’ and social position.

(24) Harke jâmeye haya va effat be tan konad mardom eib e our a nakhâhand did (Keyhan, 26/11/2013).

‘Nobody will see one’s [moral] defects if one puts on the outfit of haya and effat’.

5.5.4 Hejab ‘veiling’

Example (25) deals with the relationship between hejab and effat by regarding hejab as the materialization of effat. In hejab e zâheri ‘external hejab’, hejab is used in its literal meaning, i.e. pieces of clothes worn to cover the body’ but in hejab e bâteni ‘internal hejab’, it is figuratively used to refer to effat based on the EFFAT IS A COVER/CURTAIN metaphor. As an internal force, effat sets up a barrier/curtain between the person and taboos related to sexual desire.

(25) Hejab do janbeh darad: yeki hejab e zaheri va digari hejab e bateni ke az an be effat yad mishavad (Keyhan, 20/11/2016).
‘Hejab has two aspects. One is the external hejab and the other is the internal hejab, which is referred to as effat.

In another example, hejab, as a chief representation of haya and effat, is regarded as a means of increasing the quality of life:

(26) Az anjai ke rah e afzayesh e keifiyat e zendegi modiriyat e ehsas ast, hejab va pushesh e sahib baes e ijad va taghviyat e haya va effat mishavad va dara budan e in do sefat ensan ra be samt e modiriyat e ehsas hedayat mikonad (Keyhan, 19/06/2015).

‘Since managing desires is the solution for increasing the quality of life, hejab and proper covering can create and reinforce haya and effat and possessing these two features will guide one to manage desires’.

5.5.5 Imân ‘faith’

In contexts in which effat collocates with imân ‘faith’, effat is profiled as a component of and a means of preserving religious faith.

As example (27) demonstrates, sexual desire is regarded as a main threat to chastity and religious faith. For that reason, Muslims are strongly recommended to get married in order to satisfy their sexual needs in a legitimate way. According to a religious saying attributed to the Prophet, marriage constitutes half of the faith (www.islamquest.net/en/archive/question/fa1276).

(27) Baraye taghviyat e iman va effat din e eslam ezdevaj ra kamel konandeye iman moarefi mikonad chera ke agar afrad e Jame’e ezdevaj nakonand baraye erzaye niaz e jensi e khod dast be daman e gonah mishavand va be inmaneshan latmeh khahad khord (Keyhan, 26/08/2015).

‘In order to strengthen faith and effat, Islam introduces marriage to complete one’s faith because if people of a society do not get married, they will have to commit sins to meet their sexual needs, which will damage their faith.’

In example (28), women are advised to observe chastity in order to control the desire to display physical beauty to nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men. The verb gereftâr budan ‘to trap’ metaphorically pictures women’s self-adorning and self-displaying as TRAPS, highlighting the negative perspective that religious conservatives take on the issue. Moreover,
such acts are regarded as disgraceful to Muslim women, who are expected to display their physical attraction only to their husband (Haeri, 2014).

(28) Khod arayie va khod namayie zanan ke vizhegi e fetri va moshtarek miyan e zanan ast dar barabar e namahram amal e jahelaneyist ke zanan e asr e jaheliyat be an gereftar budand va zanan e mosalman nabayad zir e bar e hamchin nangi beravand, balke bayad in gharizeye tabi’i ra ba iman va effat kontrol va ta’dil konand (Keyhan, 29/05/2014).

‘Women’s self-adornment and self-display, which is a natural and common characteristic of women, when done in front of a nâmahram man, is an ignorant habit that women of the ignorance era had trapped in and Muslim women should not accept this disgrace. Instead, they should control and moderate this natural instinct through faith and effat.’

5.5.6 Aghl ‘reason’

Only one example in the data shows the collocational relationship between effat and aghl ‘reason’. Observing effat could be seen as a clear sign of possessing sufficient intellectual power to avoid breaching taboos related to sexuality. The following excerpt refers to religious sayings in which Muslim men are recommended to pay more attention to female qualities that would preserve women’s own honor and that of her would-be husband. Therefore, when choosing a marriage candidate such qualities as haya, effat, and aghl ‘reason’ should take precedence over other female characteristics, such as physical beauty and fertility.

(29) Hamchenin haya, effat va aghl az vizhegihaye zanan e shayesteh talaghi shodeh ke be hengam e entekhab e anan be hamsari bayad bar digar khesal e anan moghadam dashte shavad (Keyhan, 25/07/2015).

‘Also, haya, effat, and reason have been regarded as characteristics of competent women, which should be preferred over other characteristics when choosing one’s wife.’

5.6 Metaphor analysis of effat

This section deals with the analysis of frequently occurring metaphors as well as novel metaphorical conceptualizations induced by the linguistic context. Table 6 summarizes the extracted metaphors along with their frequency of occurrence. The list does not include novel

9. The ignorance era refers to the era prior to Islam.
metaphorical conceptualizations. However, they are discussed in the metaphor analysis section.

**Table 6. Frequency of effat metaphors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual metaphors</th>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A POSSESSED OBJECT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALITY IS A BUILDING</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL HEALTH IS PHYSICAL HEALTH</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL PURITY IS HAVING CLEAN CLOTHES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CULTURE AND MEDIA ARE OPPONENTS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A CURTAIN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A BARRIER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A GLASS OBJECT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A SHOOTING TARGET</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A CURTAIN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFAT IS A PLANT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMANS ARE PLANTS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE HEART IS A CONTAINER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prohibitive and concealing functions of effat are represented through EFFAT IS A CURTAIN/BARRIER metaphor. In a number of examples, effat is conceptualized as a CURTAIN between the person and social-religious taboos, setting up a barrier to protect moral values. The realizations of this general metaphor conceptualize the manners in which effat is violated or neglected. This is carried out through the use of action verbs, such as daridan ‘to tear up’, and kenâr zadan ‘to put aside’.

In example (30), the word pardeh ‘screen/curtain’ in the expression be ruye pardeh āvardan ‘to put on movie screen’ contextually induces the metaphorical expression bipardegi ‘the state of lacking effat and haya’ [literally meaning ‘without curtains’], which is based on the HAYA AND EFFAT ARE CURTAINS metaphor. The metaphor is coherent with the topic of the discourse, which is nudism (berehneh gerâie) in cinema. It is a protest to the covering status of some actresses in Iranian and foreign movies. The CURTAIN metaphor reveals the degree to which the taboo of nudity is perceived to have been broken. The word bipardegi ‘shamelessness’ profiles both lack of effat and haya.

‘I don’t know if you have seen how some of the Iranian and foreign movies put these indecent pictures on screen with utmost shamelessness? Why? What’s the point of illustrating this nudism?’

Example (31) deals with the reasons for which some married men cheat on their wives. From this viewpoint, immodestly dressed women on the street and movies featuring immodestly dressed, semi-nude or nude women would incite men to seek love outside their families. Here, effat is regarded as a value that keeps family life together. In order to tackle the immoral effects that satellite TV programs can have on Iranians, every now and then Iranian police launches campaigns to seize privately owned dishes from the rooftops of apartment buildings (www.latimes.com, 19/06/2014).

In the text (example 31), the EFFAT IS A CURTAIN metaphor highlights the role of effat in concealing social-religious taboos from the sight in order to block access to sexual stimuli. Putting aside the curtain corresponds to the utter negligence of effat. The source and the target domain of this metaphor are manifested in the noun phrase pardeye effat ‘the curtain of effat’. This example shows that effat is not only considered a female property but rather it can be attributed to men as well even though it is prototypically expected of women to observe it (Goldin, 2015, p. 33).

(31) Mardan ba moghayeseye zaheri e bein e zanan e kuche va khiaban ba hamsaran e khod hamchenin didan e filmhaye mostahjan az mahvareh pardeye effat ra az moghable didegan e khod kenar mizanand (Keyhan, 14/07/2014)

‘Men would put aside the curtain of effat in front of their eyes [would completely abandon effat] by comparing the appearance of their own wives with those of women on the street and watching obscene movies on satellite TV channels.’

In (32), the EFFAT IS A CURTAIN metaphor conceptualizes the aggressive, inhumane manner with which effat has been violated through raping chaste women, which is inferred from the verb daridan ‘tear up/rip up’. What adds to the indecency of the person’s act is the metaphorical conceptualization of the body of women as harim ‘holy space/border’. Moreover, this metaphor facilitates making euphemistic reference to the act of rape via the GENERIC FOR SPECIFIC metonymy. The metonymy gives prominence to the transgression of women’s harim, camouflaging the specific action (raping) that has been carried out.
(32) Jenayat e sofyan dar sham gheir e ghabele zekr ast. Bana bar ravayat, ou pardeye effat ra dar an sarzamin midarad va be harim e banovan e afif tajavoz mikonad (Keyhan, 27/09/2013).

The crimes of Sofyani in Sham [current Damascus] are unmentionable. According to historical accounts, he tore apart the curtain of effat in that land and transgressed the harim of chaste women’.

In another example, the prohibitive function of effat is represented by the EFFAT IS A BARRIER metaphor. In (33), the verb mâne shodan ‘to hinder/block’ metaphorically reveals the role of effat in linguistic censoring of taboo topics, such as sex and drinking. It is worth noting that effat is one of the main psychological factors motivating the use of euphemisms in Persian (Khosravi, 2008, p. 40).

(33) Roso dar ketab e “eterafat” ayyam e tavahosh va harzegi e khod ra – ke effat e kalam mane az bazgu kardan e an ast – behtarin doran e omr e khod midanad (Keyhan, 11/04/2014).

‘Rousseau in the book ‘Confessions’ considers his time of barbarity and debauchery, which the chastity of speech hinders mentioning it, as the best period of his life’.

EFFAT IS A POSSESSED OBJECT: Similar to the other Persian moral values investigated in the research, the higher-level metaphor MORAL VALUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS is used to categorize individuals (women in particular) in terms of whether they possess effat. Based on the metaphor, individuals are grouped into bâeффat ‘possessing effat’ and bieффat ‘lacking effat’. Afif ‘chaste’ is another conventional form of referring to chaste people, reflecting the same metaphorical conceptualization with the difference that this word profiles the state of having or observing effat. The following examples show how these words are used in context:

(34) Harkas аффif va пakдaman bashad khodavand be ou hekmat ataa mikonad (Keyhan, 12/07/2014).

‘God grants wisdom to those who are chaste and pure.’

Example (34) relates the observance of effat to common sense and wisdom. Effat draws on intellectual power to adapt behavior to the accepted norms of conduct, to refrain from breaking social-religious taboos, and more particularly, to make prompt decisions to protect
moral values once a person is exposed to sexually tempting stimuli. Hekmat ‘wisdom’ is a higher level form of knowledge and wisdom that few people can achieve. It is believed that moral strength through constant exercising of effat contributes to obtaining hekmat.

In example (35), chaste women are assigned a critical position in society. The underlying argument is that the moral status of individuals largely depends on women’s manner of conduct. This perspective holds that women can provoke sexual desire in men through displaying their bodies and having extramarital relationships with men, which would automatically affect men’s conducts in a negative way. Hence, it is women who should watch and restrict their interactions with men in order not to extend moral corruption to other members of the society (Shahidian, 2002, p. 86). In the above statement, the writer also communicates the idea that effat is a universal principle that keeps the moral health of all societies under control. The word enhetât ‘decadence’ profiles the dire consequences of abandoning effat in society.

(35) Agar zanan e bāeffat va shoja az mellatha gerefte shavand shekast ve enhetat e an javame ghat’I khahad bud (Keyhan, 04/01/2014).

‘Taking chaste and courageous women from nations will ensure their failure and decadence.’

In example (36), the writer makes allusions to the sexual allegations leveled against the U.S. president, Donald Trump, taking under the question his moral character as well as American cultural values. Trump’s allegedly immoral character is believed to be the representation of American cultural values featured in Hollywood movie characters and heroes. What Trump and American heroes have in common, according to the writer, is that both are havasbāz roughly meaning ‘fickle/lustful’ and bieffat ‘unchaste’. Havasbāz in Persian describes a person who tends to follow his sexual desire and is engaged in sexual relationships with many women, which is an offensive term used to denigrate the moral character of the person. The adjective bieffat, also an offensive word, is used in a more generic sense referring to both male and female movie characters and heroes who display nudity and sexual intercourse. What is more, in the last sentence, the same negative attributes are generalized to the whole American society or at least those Americans who voted for Trump: an immoral president represents an immoral society.
‘It’s been many years that main characters and various American heroes have all been fickle and unchaste, from Batman to the most recent movie characters in Hollywood. How can one expect such a society to choose a morality icon and a pure person [as president]?

In example (37), the negative religious viewpoint toward the perceived non-existence of effat in humans is represented via the LACKING EFFAT IS A DISEASE metaphor. According to Islamic teachings, this disease resides in the heart of humans who do not observe effat, with the heart being the locus of moral emotions. Refraining from extramarital relationships with nâmahrams ‘non-intimates’ and displaying the body are among the chief measures offered by the religion for curing the disease. The destructive impact of lacking effat on family structure is highlighted by the metaphors FAMILY IS A BUILDING and LACKING EFFAT IS A DESTRUCTIVE/NATURAL FORCE, which are inferred from the use of the adjective khânemân barandâz ‘devastating’.

EFFAT IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY: In the data, the verbal phrases morâghebat kardan ‘to take care of’ and hefz kardan ‘to preserve’ conceptualize effat as a VALUABLE COMMODITY, as the following excerpts demonstrate:

(36) Salhast shakhsiathaye asli va ghahremane e mokhtalefe amrikai hame havasbaz va bieffat hastand az batman ta tazetarin karaterhaye sinemai e halivood. Aya az chenin jame’ei bayad entezar dasht yek moalem e akhlagh, yek fard e pakdaman ra bargozinad (Keyhan, 09/11/2016).

(37) Talash e din dar sureye ahzab inast ke ensan afif bashad, mariz nabashad. In bimari agar darman nashavad kheneman barandaz ast (Keyhan, 29/10/2016).

‘In Ahzab chapter [a chapter in the Quran], the religion attempts to encourage humans to be chaste and not to be ill. This disease, if not cured, will be devastating’.

(38) Dar hali ke eslam dar ein e inke az keramat, ezzat, effat va pakdamani, hejab va poushesh morâghebat e shadidi be amal miavarad, hichgah ba faaliathaye ejtemai va eghtesadi va siasi e monaseb ba sha’n e zanan hamchon moalemi, parastari, va pezeshki mokhalefat nadarad (Keyhan, 27/04/2014).
‘While Islam takes extreme care of dignity, self-esteem, effat, purity, and hejab, it never opposes women’s social-economic-political activities that are proportionate to their dignities, such as teaching, nursing, and medical profession.’

The main idea conveyed in the above extract (extract 38) is that women’s presence in social activities is contingent upon observing moral principles, which function to preserve the individual and social values of women. The word sha’n ‘dignity/social standing’ refers to one’s level of individual and social value as perceived by the person and the others (Sharifian, 2005). On the basis of this perceived position, a person decides to do certain things and avoid doing certain others. People have to take into account their sha’n when choosing friends, taking jobs, choosing marriage candidates and so on. In the above text, moral principles are considered to be the defining elements of the sha’n of Iranian women, which predominantly relate to women’s manner of interaction with men in social space. Therefore, from this perspective, not all jobs are appropriate for women, especially those requiring women to dress fashionably and look pretty in order to attract customers, such as working in clothes stores. In some government offices, women are required to wear a chador to cover up and they should remove their make-up (Mir-Hosseini, 2002, p. 169). In each governmental office, there is a unit called herāsat literally meaning ‘guarding/protection’. Herāsat monitors the behavior of employees to ensure that government policies are obeyed and employees observe moral principles (Sedghi, 2007, p. 217).

Extract (39) reflects a broad attempt to make use of education system to establish and internalize moral principles in the minds of Iranian students. The Supreme Council for the Cultural Revolution is the institution in charge of making policies to maintain and promote Islamic-Iranian values in governmental organizations, schools, universities etc. The president is the head of the Council and the Council’s acts are communicated to all organizations to be implemented. In July 2005, the Council approved the Law of Promoting Efāf ‘chastity’, presenting various methods of establishing and reinforcing hejab and chastity, such as promoting thinking about and enquiring into religious assumptions for the purpose of building an internal belief to these values, explicating the eminent position of women in Islam and comparing it with other religions, creating sensitivity in parents, especially mothers to be conscious of the harms that lacking effat can cause for the family and children, employing hejab-believing women in all educational and official centers, explicating religious teachings on the necessity of observing haya and effat according to the
characteristics of men and women, and setting a balance in the relationship between men and women. (www.farsnews.com, 11/05/2010).

(39) […] bayad amuzehayi ra baraye dokhtaran va pesaran dar labelaye mozuate darsi gonjandeh va payamadhaye zibaye hefze hejab va effat ra dar jame’e va khanevadeh baraye nojavanan va javanan tashrih kard (Keyhan, 20/11/2016).

‘Some lessons should be incorporated into course books for boys and girls, and beautiful, positive outcomes of preserving hejab and effat in family and society should be explained to the adolescent and the young’.

The supreme leader’s quote in example (40) is in line with a famous saying of the Muslim Prophet in which he regards poverty as a main threat to faith and morality (www.hadith.net, 09/04/2014). Poverty is among the main factors that can cause divorce and prostitution (www.afkarnews.ir, 21/01/2013), resulting in endangering and obliterating effat respectively. Since after the divorce people cannot meet their sexual needs in a legitimate way, they are subject to moral corruption if they do not observe effat (control their sexual desire).

(40) Rahbar e moazam e enghebab: Masaleye ma’ishat ghat’an dar olaviyat e aval last. Ma’ishat ke nabud din ham nist, akhlagh ham nist, hefz e esmat va effat ham nist, omid ham nist (Keyhan, 27/10/2016).

‘The supreme leader of the revolution: The issue of livelihood is the first priority. When there is no source of income, there is neither faith, nor morality, nor preserving purity and effat, nor hope.’

EFFAT IS A PLANT: Plants are used as metaphorical source domains to conceptualize the origins of effat and to dysphemistically describe people who lack effat. In example (41), the word risheha ‘roots’ provides a metaphorical understanding of effat and Iranian society, giving rise to the SOCIETY IS A PLANTATION/GARDEN and EFFAT IS A PLANT metaphors. Kövecses (2010, p. 126) notes that the source domain of PLANT is utilized to structure complex abstract systems, such as social organizations, economic and political systems, people, sets of ideas, etc. One of the main constituent mappings of the COMPLEX ABSTRACT SYSTEMS ARE PLANTS metaphor is THE BIOLOGICAL GROWTH OF THE PLANT IS THE ABSTRACT NON-BIOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPLEX SYSTEM, which also structures effat as this concept is considered a
complex abstract system with many constituent elements and relations. In the EFFAT IS A PLANT metaphor, roots correspond to the cultural and religious origins of effat, which, similar to plants, need to be taken care of and developed in order to lead to desired effects. By entailment, Western lifestyle, improper dressing, and extramarital relationships could be the elements that can undermine the roots of effat.

(41) Kare farhangi va karshenasi shode dar derazmoddat va hamahangi mian e tamam e marakez e farhangi va modiran e farhangi mojeb e taghviate rishehaye efaf va hejab dar jame’e mishavad (Keyhan, 11/08/2014).

‘Long-term cultural and professional work and coordination between all cultural centers and cultural managers would reinforce the roots of effat and hejab in the society.’

Example (42) uses a conventional dysphemistic term to describe the enemy. The word harzeh literally meaning ‘weed’ refers to a person who is morally corrupt, specifically a person who tends to have sexual intercourse outside marriage framework. This adjective is typically attributed to womanizers and prostitutes, conveying highly insulting connotations. The higher-level metaphor characterizing this word is HUMANS ARE PLANTS and the specific mapping of this metaphor carrying the dysphemistic features is PEOPLE LACKING EFFAT ARE WEEDS. The knowledge that is carried over from the source domain is that weeds are unwanted, block the growth of plants and should be pruned. In the target domain, people perceived to be lacking effat are considered harmful to society and should be isolated from the rest of people.

(42) Ou selah bar kaf gereft ta az youresh e harzegan e bieffat ke hich sharm o hayai ra nemifahmidand jelogiri konad (Keyhan, 07/10/2016).

‘He went to the battlefield to prevent the assault of debauched, impure enemies [Iraqi military forces] who had no understanding of sharm and haya.’

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROHIBITIONS ARE OPPONENTS OF EFFAT: A group of metaphors focuses on the vulnerability and sanctity of effat, revealing the ways in which human conducts posit threats to the existence and normal functioning of this moral value in the society. A variety of phrases like zarbe zadan ‘to hit’, makhdush kardan ‘to scratch’, jarihe dâr kardan ‘to wound’, hajme vâred kardan ‘to attack/assail’, neshâne raftan ‘to target’, effat zodaie ‘to obliterate effat’ linguistically realize this aspect of effat. These
verbal metaphors provide a completely negative representation of people whose acts and activities stand opposed to the principle of effat as understood by the religious conservatives.

In example (43), fashion designers are viewed as enemies who intend to fight Islamic moral values through promoting un-Islamic dressing. WAR metaphors are employed to highlight both the allegedly malign intentions of the presumed enemies and the perceived threat to Islamic values. The phrases hajme be effat ‘attack on effat’ and effat va haya ra neshane raftan ‘targeting effat and haya’ give rise to the formation of the EFFAT IS THE TARGET OF ATTACK and EFFAT IS A SHOOTING TARGET metaphors respectively, justifying taking actions against fashion models and fashion designers. In December 2016, 12 people involved in the fashion industry in Iran were jailed. They were convicted of charges including spreading prostitution and promoting corruption via the publication of obscene images online (www.bbc.co.uk, 05/12/2016). In both metaphors, effat is conceived of as a PHYSICAL OBJECT or a BOUNDED REGION.

(43) Jafari hajme be effat, akhlagh va farhang e eslami dar ghaleb e mod va zibai ra mazmum danest va moghabele ba eghdamat e kesani ke hozeve effat va haya ra neshane gerefteand ra az zaruriati danest ke bayad mored e tavajoh e masulan gharar girad (Keyhan, 27/08/2016).

‘Jafari [Tehran’s Attorney General] condemned the attack on effat, morality, and Islamic culture in the form of fashion and beauty, calling for officials to pay attention to the necessity of taking action against those who have targeted the domain of effat and haya.

In example (44), two metaphors are employed to represent the allegedly devastating impacts of Western culture and social media on Islamic moral principles: The WESTERN CULTURE AND MEDIA (including SOCIAL MEDIA) ARE NATURAL FORCES, evoked by the phrase amvâj e sahmgin ‘massive tides’ and EFFAT (MORALITY) IS A BUILDING, evoked by the phrase ‘payehâye akhlâgh va effat ‘the foundations of morality and effat’. The EFFAT/MORALITY IS A BUILDING metaphor is a specific-level version of the more general COMPLEX ABSTRACT SYSTEMS ARE COMPLEX PHYSICAL OBJECTS metaphor (Kövecses, 2015, p. 126). In the EFFAT IS A BUILDING metaphor, the foundations of the building correspond to the basic principles on which effat/morality is based.
In recent years, satellite TV channels, especially Persian TV channels outside Iran (BBC Persian, Manoto, and Gem) have attracted a large number of Iranians by broadcasting Western-style programs and providing a completely different perspective on social and political events than that of Persian channels broadcast in Iran. The conservatives believe that the growing number of improperly dressed women and relationships outside marriage are the results of the influence of the media on Iranians’ lifestyle, warning that the trend would lead to the complete abandonment of Islamic values (www.tasnimnews.com, 24/07/2016, www.farsnews.com, 08/07/2014).

In example (45) morality is conceptualized as a BUILDING whose foundations (corresponding to the constituting elements of morality) are getting feeble by the destructive force of obscene photos and videos published online. On the other hand, the verbal phrase khadshe dâr kardan e effat omumi ‘scratching the public chastity’ assumes the metaphor EFFAT IS A GLASS OBJECT, which can be damaged by the previously mentioned factors. Fragility and transparency are the properties of glass objects that are projected to the target domain of EFFAT. Based on this metaphor, effat continues to exist so long as it is seen full-blown in public arena and protected against external threats. In the last clause of the extract, the officials are criticized for being inattentive to the current situation on social media via the INATTENTIVENESS IS SLEEPING metaphor.

(45) Dar fazaye majazi enteshar mataleb e mostahjan baraye sost kardan e payehaye akhlaghi e jame’e va makhdush kardan e effat e omumi dar hal e roshd ast va masulin marbute gui dar khab e amigh forou rafteand (Keyhan, 14/05/2016).

‘In virtual space, the publication of obscene content for the purpose of undermining the pillars of morality in the society and scratching [damaging] public chastity is growing and the officials in charge appear to be deeply sleeping.’
In example (46), religion and effat are both viewed as unspecified entities that can be erased through the attempts of presumed enemies. Zo'dudan in Persian means ‘to efface/erase/purge color, stain, and trace’. Given the literal usages of the verb, a possible interpretation could be that Iranian culture is viewed as an object covered with an outer layer (effat/religion) that gives it the shape or appearance that it has. Here, erasing religion and effat corresponds to secularization and cultural transformation.

(46) Rahbar e moazam e enghelab ba eshare be vojud e barnamehaye gostardeb baraye enheraf e zehn o del e mardom va javanan az asl e din, mohemtarin vazifeye rohaniyun ra moghabeleh ba naghsheye dinzodai va effat zodai khandand (Keyhan, 06/09/2016).

‘The supreme leader referred to the extensive plans [of the enemy] for averting people’s and the young’s heart and mind from religion, pointing out that countering the plans of the enemy to erase religion and effat is the most important duty of clerics.

HAVING EFFAT IS HAVING PURE/CLEAN CLOTHES: Purity and cleanliness are among the basic forms of experiential well-being that structure metaphors of morality across cultures and languages (Lakoff, 1996). The adjective pâk ‘clean’ appears in many conventional compound adjectives in Persian, such as dast-pâk ‘hand-clean’ [honest/chaste], del-pâk ‘heart-clean’ [honest], and cheshm-pâk ‘eye-clean’ [modest/trustworthy]. These expressions conceptualize various positive personality traits connected to morality. However, pâki ‘cleanliness/purity’, when occurring in the same linguistic context with effat, predominantly refers to one’s abstinence from taking illegitimate sexual pleasure and provoking sexual desire in nâmahrâm ‘non-intimates’ through immodest clothes, make-up, and speech. A conventional compound adjective that captures this aspect of effat is pâk-dâman literally ‘clean-clothes’ [pure/chaste], which collocates with effat in many linguistic contexts. This word is based on the metaphor BEING MORALLY PURE IS HAVING CLEAN/PURE CLOTHES. One possible motivation for the recruitment of CLOTHES as the source domain might be that clothes function to conceal the private parts and are directly involved in committing sins related to sex and sexuality. Hence, the impurity associated with the sinful act and the agent of the sin is transferred to clothes, leading to the formation of the conventional conceptual metonymy CLOTHES FOR PERSON (a realization of the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy). Example (47) points to the significance of khishtandâri ‘self-control’ and remaining pâkdâman ‘sexually pure’ until one manages to get married according to Islamic teachings.
(47) Ama dar eslam vaghti fard be bolough e jensi miresad bayad dar kenar e effat va pâkdâmani pishe kardan dar peye ezdevaj va tashkil e khanevade bashad (Keyhan, 07/10/2016).

‘But according to Islam, when a person reaches sexual puberty, he/she should observe effat and purity while being thinking of getting married and having a family.’

In example (48), the writer makes reference to romantic poems that contain erotic content or reflect a perspective on love and love relationships that violate the principle of effat. The conceptual metaphors MORAL HEALTH IS PHYSICAL HEALTH and MORAL HYGIENE IS PHYSICAL HYGIENE, evoked by the phrase be salâmati va pâkizegi sokhan goftan ‘to speak in healthy and hygienic manners’, show how effat is applied to the domain of speech to censor obscene utterances and prevent sexually exciting conversations.

(48) Motaghedam mishavad she’re asheghaneye tasirgozar baraye mokhatab e aam ba salighehaye gunagun sorud ama effat e kalam va hormat e eshgh ra pas dasht va be salamat va pakizegi sokhan goft (Keyhan, 24/09/2016).

‘I believe that it is possible to tell influential romantic poems for a common audience of various tastes while revering love and chastity of speech, and speaking in healthy and hygienic manners.’

In example (49) the MORAL CLEANLINESS IS PHYSICAL CLEANLINESS and THE HEART IS A CONTAINER metaphors are understood from the use of the verb pâk kardan ‘to cleanse/purify’. The logic of the container presupposes contents filling it, which in this case are seen as DIRT or POLLUTION. In the Quran, the heart is conceived as a CONTAINER that can be filled with both positive (faith and peacefulness) and negative (regret, rancor, hypocrisy, and sickness) feelings (Maalej, 2008, p. 400). In the second clause, the word âludegi ‘dirt/pollution’ metaphorically conceptualizes immoral activities/sins (adultery, drinking alcohol, and displaying the body) that can sicken the heart of humans. Also, the protection of the person against impurity is metonymically referred to through the word dâmân ‘clothes’ (the CLOTHES FOR PERSON metonymy).

(49) Payambar dast bar sineye ou nahad va chenin doa kard: khodaya! Ghalb e in javan ra pak gardan va dâmân e ou ra az aloudegi ve bieffati hefz kon (Keyhan, 04/01/2016).
‘The Prophet put his hand on his [the young man’s] chest and prayed: O’God! Purify the heart of this young man and protect him against impurity and lack of effat.’

Example (50) contains the phrase lakkedâr kardan e effat ‘staining the effat’, which is a conventional conceptualization of this concept. Here, effat is metaphorically seen as a clean entity or surface and sins or immoral acts of the others are viewed as stains on it. This clean object or surface represents the value that a woman possesses in society for which she has tried to her best to preserve it by keeping virginity, veiling, and refraining from having relationships with nâmahram men. The metaphors foreground both the impropriety of the actions taken by the others (e.g., rapists, enemies, and those who force women to unveil) and the negative social consequences of losing effat for women (i.e., losing âberu ‘face/public image’). In the following statement, mandatory unveiling enforced by Reza Shah in 1936 and the alleged attempt of the West to spread moral corruption in Iran through cultural products and the media are considered as different strategies to devalue women.

(50) Reza khan ba zur dar peye bardashtan e hejab az sare zanan bud amma emruz doshman az tarigh e jang e narm dar peye lakkedar kardan e effat va pakdamani e zanan ast (Keyhan, 06/01/2016).

‘Reza Khan [the king of Iran from 1925 to 1941] tried to force women to unveil but now the enemy seeks to stain the effat and purity of women through the soft war.’

EFFAT IS A PATH: Metaphors that conceptualize effat as a PATH are the specific-level realizations of the more general MORALITY IS A STRAIGHT PATH metaphor, which characterizes morality in many cultures (Lakoff, 1996, Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Robinson, 2016). The linguistic expressions that realize the EFFAT IS A PATH metaphor in the data provide either a positive evaluation of exercising effat after a period of interval or a negative evaluation of abandoning it by creating conceptual correspondences with the right and wrong paths that travelers would take on the way of reaching the destination.

In (51), effat and lack of it have been conceptualized as two PATHS, with effat being the right one and impurity/immorality as the deviant and the wrong one. A moral girl would stay on the path by refraining from having out-of-wedlock relationships with men and observing hejab in order to gain the satisfaction of her parents. On the other hand, engaging in sexual relationships and dressing immodestly are the behaviors that would drive her off the straight path. Nânajibi ‘impurity/indecency’, which is an offensive term, is conceptualized as
a location on the wrong path (the STATES ARE LOCATIONS metaphor). The verb *nazdik shodan* ‘to approach’ conveys the gradual process that leads a girl to abandon *effat* completely. The huge upset that a girl would cause for her parents through her immoral conducts is pictured by the adjective *delkhun* [heart-blood] ‘sorrowed/very upset’, whereby the heart is viewed as a CONTAINER filled up with blood. In this case, “being upset and hurt is conceptualized as having caused a wound in one’ *del* [heart], filling it up with blood” (Sharifian, 2008, p. 253).

(51) Pedar o madar agar agah shavand ke dokhtareshan az rah e effat barkenar va be nanaji bi nazdik shode afsorde va delkhun mishavand (Keyhan, 23/05/2014).

‘If parents realize that their daughter has strayed from the path of *effat* and approached indecency/impurity, they will be depressed and sorrowed greatly’.

Example (52) admires a person for demonstrating *gheirat* in his workplace, where he has shown sensitivity to the manner of interactions among his colleagues and advised them to observe Islamic norms of conduct. Here, the person is performing his religious duty known as *amr e be maruf va nahy az monkar* ‘promoting virtue and preventing vice’. The MORAL PERSON IS A GUIDE metaphor points to this responsibility. In this example, the travelers (persons working in that particular office) are already off the path (their conducts are considered immoral) and the guide attempts to bring them to the right path (advise them to correct their behavior and observe *effat*).

(52) Dar barabar e ravabet va tarz e goft va shonud e aghayan va khanomhaye karmand ba yekdigar hasasi va hameye inha ra ba hasasiyat mikushi be rah e effat va pakdamani biavari (Keyhan, 25/06/2014).

‘You are sensitive to the way male and female employees interact with and talk to each other and strive, with all your sensitivity, to bring them to the path of *effat* and purity.’

5.7 *Effat* as an idealized frame

A number of phrases in the data profile *effat* as an idealized frame with respect to which conducts of individuals in public and social events are evaluated. Such words and phrases as *khârej az* ‘outside of’, *barkhalâf elalyehe* ‘against’, *monâfiye* ‘negating’ precede the word *effat* and critically point to the complete deviation of certain acts and behaviors from what the principle of *effat* demands.
In (53), the phrase khârej az effat e omumi ‘outside public chastity’ depicts effat as a CONTAINER on the basis of which dressing modestly (covering up and wearing non-Western-style clothes) corresponds to being in the container and dressing immodestly (having an improper hejab and wearing Western-style clothes) to being outside the container. The logic of the container provides the basis for making judgments on whether a woman has violated the religious law or not.

(53) Agar nahveye pushesh e fardi ham mesdagh e badhejabi va ham mesdagh e estefade az lebashaye kharej az effat e omumi bashad in fard do jorm mortakeb shod east ke bayad be an residegi shaved (Keyhan, 02/09/2016).

‘If a woman’s way of dressing is both an instance of badhejabi [being immodestly dressed] and of wearing clothes incongruent with public chastity, she has perpetrated two offenses that should be dealt with’.

Within the past few years, dozens of concerts and cultural events have been disrupted or canceled by pressure groups despite the fact that these events are officially sanctioned in Iran (www.bbc.co.uk, 29/05/2015). The reason they would give for canceling the events is that in some of these performances effat is not observed, referring to female singing, dancing, the presence of men and women in the same place, and women’s improper dressing. In (54), the phrase khalâf e shar’ va effat e omumi ‘against/opposed to religious law and public chastity’ provides a sharp contrast between what is sanctioned by Islamic laws and conducts standing opposed to them.

(54) Nazar be savabeghe mojud, aksar gharib be ettefagh e in ghabil barnameha va marasem hamrah ba raghashi va eghdamat e khalâf e shar’ va effat e omumi bude va mojeb e narezayati e momenin va khanevadehaye shohada migardad (Keyhan, 17/07/2016).

‘Given the existing records, the majority of such programs and events [concerts] involve dancing and acts that are against the religious law and public chastity, causing the discontent of believers and the families of martyrs’.

It should be noted that in contexts in which instances of observing or violating effat are not specified and the observance and violation of this principle are generally referred to, the interpretation of the meaning of effat is facilitated by the CATEGORY FOR SALIENT
PROPERTIES conceptual metonymy, whereby effat provides mental access to conventional social scenes that define it.

Lakoff (1987) maintains that individual members who represent either an ideal or its opposite provide a basis for comprehending categories. Lakoff refers to these particular members as “paragons”. The paragon of the EFFAT category is Fatemeh, the Muslim Prophet’s daughter. She is the symbol of a chaste and pure woman among Muslims (Shahidian, 2002, p. 92) and many parents would name their baby girls after her. Effat e fatemi ‘Fatemeh-like chastity’ and hejab e fatemi ‘Fatemeh-like veiling’ are common expressions used by the conservatives to promote an ideal form of effat and hejab among Iranian women, as example (55) shows:

(55) Ma dokhtaran e hafez e hejab az hameye zanan va dokhtaran e dustdar e paki va esmat mikhahim ba reyat e hejab e eslami fazaye jeme’eyeman ra be effat e fatemi zinat bebakhshand (Keyhan, 06/05/2016).

‘We, the female guardians of hejab, want all girls and women who love purity and chastity to observe Islamic hejab in order to embellish the atmosphere of our society with the Fatemeh-like chastity.’

In the above text, the adjective Fatemi in the effat e fatemi ‘Fatemeh-like chastity’ defines the ideal type of chastity, which is expected of women to emulate and practice through covering up their hair and body. Moreover, the metaphor EFFAT IS AN ORNAMENT, evoked by the verb zinat bakhshidan ‘to embellish’, assigns a beautifying function to effat, providing a very positive evaluation of this ideal form of chastity and its manifestation, i.e., complete observance of hejab. The positive conceptualization of effat also reflects to what extent the outward appearance of society matters to the proponents of hejab, providing the interpretation that lack of effat and improper hejab would give an ugly appearance to the society.

5.8 Discussion and summary of the findings

Data analysis indicates that effat exclusively functions to discipline the body and set limits to bodily desires. The conceptualizations of effat demonstrate how the body becomes a striking site for the inscription of power and the encoding of culture (Combs-Schilling, 1991; Foucault, 1979; Outram, 1989). Foucault (1979) maintains that power relations have an immediate hold upon the body. Through the enforcement of power, the body is marked,
trained, tortured, and forced to perform ceremonies and emit signs (p. 25). Although effat is a primary means of social control, enforced and encouraged by political power, its application is not limited to the public realm. As a fundamentally religious concept, effat is supposed to contain human desire in private as well in order to minimize the possibility of transgressing moral values, though in private the discipliner is perceived to be an invisible observer who constantly monitors human conducts (i.e., God).

Studies on chastity across cultures, including Iranian culture (Farahani, 2002, 2006; Gilmore, 1987; Lindisfarne, 1998; Mahalingam, 2007; Paternostro, 1998; Weisfeld, 1993; Wikan, 1982) predominantly frame this concept as a tool of controlling or suppressing female sexuality. Despite the fact that effat in Iranian culture performs the same function (Milani, 1992; Mir-Hosseini, 1999; Najmabadi, 1993), being a prototypical feature of females, it nevertheless is not an exclusively female attribute as the analysis of the data indicated. In addition, effat targets not only sexual desire but also all bodily desires whose satisfaction would lead to breaking norms. Compared to chastity expectations in non-Muslim cultures (Giovaninni, 1987; Mahalingam, 2007; Paternostro, 1998), effat in Iranian culture draws on concealing and covering to execute control of sexuality (Farahani, 2006; Milani, 1992, Tizro, 2013), distinguishing it from the way chastity is applied and materialized in non-Muslim cultures. Another feature that effat in Iranian culture shares with its counterparts in chastity-demanding cultures is that it similarly results in heightening women’s sense of their bodies (Milani, 2011, p. 55). Mahalingam (2007) notes that since women are often under the male or social gaze they generally have a heightened sense of their bodies and “such self-monitoring and body awareness leads to several negative psychological outcomes” (p. 246). A large number of Iranian women constantly check their veiling in public or while talking to men and watch their physical distance with men to repel annoying social gaze and to ensure they would not unintentionally violate chastity (Milani, 1992, p. 25).

Metaphorical conceptualizations of effat provide significant evidence as to how embodied experience is informed and constituted by culture (Gibbs, 2006). Since the body is the site of effat’s operation, it turns into the target domain of some of the metaphorical conceptualizations. The BODY IS A COMMODITY, BODILY ORGANS ARE HUMANS, HYMEN IS A CURTAIN, and FEMALE BODY IS A HOLY TERRITORY metaphors are the ones that demonstrate the significance of the body in making sense of the functioning of effat. The body bears the imprint of effat; the veiled body, the virgin body, downward orientation of the body (the head), and modest (non-erotic) manner of walking are among the
principal symbols of effat reflected by the body (Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 1992; Najmabadi, 2000). This shows how culture constrains and simultaneously produces human bodies (Foucault, 1979; Gibbs, 2006; Maalej, 2004).

Embodied experience also demonstrates its role in meaning-making by providing source domains for the metaphorical conceptualization of abstract concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 1999; Maalej & Yu, 2011). Forms of experiential well-being (physical health, purity, and cleanliness) and image schemas (CONTAINER, BLOCKAGE, and SOURCE-PATH-GOAL) are the main metaphorical source domains that characterize different aspects of effat. Except for the heart and the body, which are metaphorically seen as the sites of effat, body part terms provide the source domains for the metonymic conceptualization of taboo bodily activities.

Metaphor is shown to be the primary means of representing the functions of effat. The EFFAT IS A CURTAIN and EFFAT IS A BARRIER metaphors mark the boundaries between individuals and prohibited areas of the culture, especially the extramarital relationship between men and women. Moreover, it is through the role of metaphor that the relationship between effat and its manifestations becomes evident. The EFFAT IS A CURTAIN provides the ground for understanding why the HYMEN IS A CURTAIN metaphor exists and what sort of moral principle hejab ‘veiling’ stands for. Overall, the conceptualizations of effat lend support to the view that metaphors constitute cultural models (Kövecses, 2005, Lakoff, 1987). The cultural model of EFFAT emerges out of experientially motivated conceptual metaphors (and metonymies) that provide content and structure to the model, define its functions, and link the model to its manifestations in social-physical reality.

The contextual usages of effat indicate that exhibiting effat necessarily entails displaying haya but not vice versa. This is because haya deals with more diverse types of social and religious taboos, overlapping with effat only in bodily desires, especially in regulating the sexuality of men and women. The evidence for the joint involvement of haya and effat in exercising control over sexuality comes from CURTAIN and BARRIER metaphors, which characterize both of the concepts. To put it simply, haya is a general barrier that is set up between the person and whatever which is regarded as taboo, unpleasant, and offensive but effat is a more specific barrier between the person and bodily-based desires, and it is thoroughly devoted to controlling desires through concealing and covering.
The study of *effat* shows important points as to how euphemistic meaning is motivated by a set of interrelated moral principles in Iranian culture and represented through linguistic metonymies. Studies dealing with the relationship between metonymy and euphemism demonstrate that metonymy is a perfect conceptual device to avoid making direct reference to distasteful, embarrassing, and face-threatening topics, emphasizing the role of linguistic and cultural context in motivating the use of euphemistic metonymies (Allan & Burridge, 2006; Crespo-Fernández, 2014; Gradečak-Erdeljić, 2005; Littlemore, 2015). The present study finds that the GENERIC FOR SPECIFIC and INSTRUMENT INVOLVED IN THE ACTION FOR ACTION (a realization of the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy) metonymies are at work in euphemizing taboo topics in Persian. Moreover, *Effat* is shown to be one of the main psychological forces motivating the construction of euphemistic metonymies. What is referred to as *effat e kalam* ‘chastity of speech’, highly emphasized in Iranian culture, demands camouflaging aspects of speech denoting sex, sexuality, and other taboo areas, such as dancing and drinking (Khosravi, 2008, p. 40).

A more accurate account of the use of euphemism in Persian would be considering it as the product of the joint operation of *haya, effat, gheirat, and âberu*. Euphemism, as a cognitive and pragmatic process, is mainly employed to avoid taboo (fear-based, shame-based, and politeness-based taboos) and save the face of interlocutors (Allan & Burridge, 2006; Casas-Gomez, 2009; Chamizo-Dominguez, 2009; Crespo-Fernández, 2006). The key cluster discovered in this chapter accounts for various types of taboos for which euphemism is used in Persian and captures face considerations in Persian communicative contexts. This cluster also contains the concept that is in charge of monitoring the observance of social and religious taboos, determining the reactions to taboo violations (i.e., *gheirat*). Another feature of this fundamental cluster is that it can account for both linguistic and non-linguistic interdictions and their euphemistic counterparts. It also shows how self-regulating forces systematically and consistently censor linguistic and non-linguistic behavior. Given that the cluster largely represents Islamic attitudes toward human relations, which is generally shared among Muslims cultures, it can be used to investigate the construction of euphemistic language in other Muslim cultures, as a majority of research on euphemisms in Muslim cultures (Ahmed et al., 2013; Al-Adwan, 2015) rely on lexical, cognitive, and pragmatic devices that are involved in the process of euphemization, ignoring the underlying restrictive moral principles that simultaneously control thought, language, body, and behavior.
5.9 Conclusion

*Effat* was shown to be embedded in a cluster consisting of *mahramiyat* ‘legitimate intimacy’, *gheirat* ‘moral vigilance’, *haya* ‘self-restraint’, *âberu* ‘face/public image’, *nâmus* ‘female family members’, *harim* ‘holy space/border’, and *hejab* ‘veiling’. Within this cluster, *effat*’s main task is to segregate men and women by creating a cover/barrier between them, blocking/concealing the ways through which sexual desire might be aroused. Hence, *effat* seems to be an important tool for performing the Islamic principle of *mahramiyat* ‘legitimate intimacy’, finding realizations in *hejab*, virginity, and the censorship of taboo subjects.

The analysis of *effat* demonstrates that metaphor and metonymy are central and indispensable to understanding the functions of this concept and are conducive to discovering the relationship between *effat* and its most related concepts (*GHEIRAT, HAYA*, and *HEJAB*). It is also through the representational role of metaphors that the connection and application of *effat* to the body is conspicuously revealed. The study of *effat* provides a more comprehensive picture of the way chastity exerts control over the body and behavior in social interactions than what is typically reported of this concept in sociological and anthropological studies. This research views *effat* as the result of the collaboration of bodily, cognitive, socio-cultural, and discourse factors (Kövecses, 2015) and reveals the main psychological forces that interact with it. The study also finds that the cluster embedding the concept of EFFAT can be used as a helpful conceptual template to investigate the construction of euphemisms across Muslim cultures.
Chapter 6: **Hejab ‘veiling’**

### 6.1 Introduction

The law of hejab in Iran requires women to cover up their hair and body (Nakanishi, 1998). Since 1981, when the first written law was passed to make hejab ‘veiling’ mandatory (Vakili, 2011, p. 69), attempts have been made to fully enforce the laws for proper hejab by setting up police units to ensure the proper observance of hejab in the form of the “Hijab and Chastity Plan” (www.iranhumanrights.org, 27/07/2015).

One major issue regarding the state-mandated hejab in Iran is the emergence of a category of Iranian women who are referred to as badhejab ‘having an improper hejab/immodestly dressed’. Such women represent the westernized, middle-class Iranian women who flout the state-sanctioned dress codes in order to display resistance to the compulsory hejab (Naghibi, 1999, p. 569). However, “misveiling [having an improper hejab] is not evidently or necessarily rooted in a rebellion against religion or even against the state” (Gould, 2014, p. 233). The hejab campaign mainly addresses the badhejab category of women through a comparison with properly covered up women.

State-mandated veiling in Muslim countries (in Iran and Saudi Arabia) and coercive unveiling in secular democracies or other ruling systems (e.g., the ban on the use of religious emblems in state schools in France, or mandatory unveiling in Iran in 1936 during Reza Shah Pahlavi’s reign) have been deployed to the ends of women’s emancipation, autonomy, and empowerment in public space (Naghibi, 1999; Gould, 2014). In contrast to the polarized views for and against the veil is the feminist perspective, which holds that coercive veiling in Iran and unveiling in France both ignore the agency and freedom of women in choosing what they wish to wear; in both Iran and France, the female body is commodified within the capitalist world-system, and both forms of coercion reinforce male authority (Gould, 2014, p. 233).
The *hejab* billboards put up in Tehran and many other big cities and *hejab* posters published online represent a continuing effort by political-religious conservatives\(^{10}\) to attract more women to the voluntary observance of *hejab* and to persuade *badhejab* women to observe *effat e omumi* ‘public chastity’ through pictorial and linguistic metaphors. *Hejab* billboards and posters, as part of the National *Hejab* and Chastity Plan, reflect the viewpoints of, and are fully funded by, conservatives in power (www.fararu.com, 25/04/2010). It should be noted that the current government of President Hasan Rouhani does not support the strict enforcement of veiling (www.hamshahrionline.ir, 03/12/2013).

The newly adopted strategy of maintaining a dialogue with the *hejab* violators relies heavily on metaphoric language. Some of the metaphorical ideas used in the *hejab* billboards and posters have raised criticisms in Iran. Ghahramani (2016) argues that contrary to what the promoters of *hejab* discourse have sought to achieve, i.e., promoting the moral and social status of women, the posters present a reductionist, sexual image of women by comparing women to edibles (sweets and fruits) or pieces of furniture (chairs), contributing to the reproduction and establishment of a very offensive social image.

The notion of veiling in Muslim and Western societies has been extensively researched from different perspectives (Ahmed, 1992; Farahani, 2002; Gould, 2014; Hessini, 1994; Hoodfar, 2003; Khir Allah, 2015; Milani, 1992; Mir Hosseini, 2007; Naghibi, 1999; Sedghi, 2007; Williams & Vashi, 2007). This chapter, however, aims to shed light on the role of conceptual metaphors in the characterization of the HEJAB concept in the statements on 56 pro-*hejab* billboards and posters in Iran. In addition to the conceptual metaphors abstracted from the linguistic instantiations, I would like to examine the role of contextual factors in the metaphorical conceptualization of *hejab*. My analysis of the construction of metaphorical meaning in context relies on Kövecses’s (2015) account of metaphor in context\(^{11}\).

A large body of research has focused on the persuasiveness potential and the affordances of metaphor in reflecting alternative ideological perspectives (Charteris-Black, 2004, 2007; Chilton & Lakoff, 1995; Deignan, 2005; Goatly, 2007; Lakoff, 1996; Zinken, 10. The term ‘conservative’ (*mohâfezehkâr* in Persian) refers to members of one of the two major political parties in Iran close in political-religious ideology to Ayatollah Khamenei, the supreme leader of Iran.
11. I have tried to be as objective as possible throughout and not present a personal pro-*hejab* or con-*hejab* opinion.
The common finding of most of the research adopting a metaphor-based approach to ideology is that each conceptual metaphor used imposes its own particular perspective through the metaphorical linguistic expressions chosen. The persuasive effect of hejab metaphors, as the analysis will demonstrate, is pursued by recruiting ideas from the domains of RELIGION, CULTURE, and POLITICS.

In what follows, I will first introduce the conceptual frame of HEJAB as it is perceived in Iranian society. Next, the interaction of metaphor with context will be examined. The main section of the chapter will offer an analysis of hejab metaphors and the way they are produced through interaction with contextual factors.

6.2 Cultural model of HEJAB

The Persian word for the veil is hejab. In Persian dictionaries (www.vajehyab.com), hejab, originally an Arabic word, is defined as (a) a curtain, cover or partition used for concealing, or separating two things, as in hejab e bein e ensan va khoda ‘the partition between God and humans’, (b) (as a generic term) pieces of clothing functioning to cover the hair and the body, such as the chador ‘a black outfit that covers up the whole body from head to toe’, rusari/maghnae ‘headscarf’ or neghâb ‘face veil’, as in hejab ro az saresh bardasht ‘she unveiled/she took off her hejab (the chador/rusari/maghnae)’ and (c) a set of moral principles (effat va pâkdâmani ‘chastity and moral purity’) or behavioral guidelines that women must adhere to, realized in different pieces of dress.

Based on the dictionary meanings, hejab in Persian can be defined as a set of clothing items used by women for covering their body on the basis of a set of moral and religious principles. To put it simply, religious principles such as efâf va pâkdâmani ‘chastity and moral purity’ are manifested in hejab, as a generic term, which is realized in various pieces of dress. Therefore, what exactly is meant by hejab is contextually specified through GENERIC FOR SPECIFIC metonymy. Alternative interpretations of the Quran have turned hejab into a non-specified term within and across Muslim cultures (Milani, 1992). Nonetheless, this generic term has visually been specified as the chador in the hejab billboards and posters in Iran, which clarifies the definition of proper veiling by the political-religious conservatives.

Veiling is a contested notion. Some scholars argue that in “none of the verses [of the Quran] is the word ‘hijab’ understood as a piece of clothing covering the head and entire body” and the command seems to have addressed the Prophet’s wives only (Sardar, 2011, p.
Furthermore, the Quran “does not command any specific styles nor specifically mention hijab, making room for much local variations [sic]” (Nanda & Warms, 2013, p. 211). Also, they suggest that the veil and chastity/modesty are not identical, meaning that “covering does not preclude immoral behavior, and modesty is a judgment that must be made on the basis of more than what is worn” (Sardar, ibid, p. 334). The other side of the debate relying on hadiths ‘religious sayings of the Prophet and Imams’ presents a different construal of the verses. Religious decrees (fatvâs) issued by some religious authorities in Iran, such as Ayatollah Makarem Shirazi and a few other countries, render veiling obligatory for all women, and deliberate unveiling is harâm ‘forbidden’ (www.makarem.ir/main.aspx?lid=0&typeinfo=21&catid=880). According to this view, women must cover up their hair and the entire body except for the face and hands (Milani, 1992, p. 21). Furthermore, the veil is believed to be suggestive of efâf ‘chastity’.

In order to know how the concept of HEJAB is generally interpreted or framed by religious and nonreligious people in Iran, we need to know what elements constitute the cultural model of HEJAB. Peculiar to the HEJAB conceptual category is a set of interrelated key cultural concepts that greatly influence the emergent metaphorical meanings. The cultural model of HEJAB roughly contains the following prototypical elements, though it certainly cannot be limited to these alone.

6.2.1 Mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’

In previous chapters, it was shown that gheirat, haya, and effat set up covers and barriers between men and women in order to maintain the principle of mahramiyat. It was also established that hejab materializes and operationalizes gheirat, haya, and effat. Although the word mahramiyat is not linguistically represented in the billboards and posters, no doubt, the principle of mahramiyat is conceptually present and the hejab statements attempt to encourage Iranian women to observe this Islamic principle through veiling.

6.2.2 Gheirat ‘moral vigilance’

Although the word gheirat has not been used in any of the billboards and posters, it is vividly represented in hejab slogans in which women are addressed as ‘daughter’ and ‘sister’, where men exhibit their gheirat by advising Iranian women to observe hejab. In fact, all the slogans should be seen as the expressions of religious gheirat as the slogans aim to persuade those women who violate the principle of hejab in public. Moreover, addressing Iranian women as
sister or daughter shows how the concept of NÂMUS ‘female family members’ is figuratively extended to a larger category of Iranian women via the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor, assigning responsibility to Iranian men to consider Iranian females as their own nâmus and be sensitive to their way of dressing.

6.2.3 Åberu ‘face/public image’

The concept of ÅBERU is realized in two ways: First, men advising women to observe hejab reflects men’s concern over the åberu of the family (and the nation as a family) since women’s chastity preserves the family’s honor. Second, slogans emphasizing the role of hejab in preserving the social value of women reflect the other dimension of åberu, i.e., the image of a woman as viewed by others in the society, which would lay the basis for women to assess how much åberu they possess.

6.2.4 Haya ‘self-restraint’

The concept of HAYA is not linguistically referred to in the hejab slogans, but no doubt it is a principal force realized by hejab. In previous chapters, several examples were provided to show the relationship between haya and hejab. As a reminder, haya sets up a barrier between the self and taboo or offensive behaviors and given that unveiling is a religious prohibition haya manifests itself through the veil.

6.2.5 Effat ‘chastity’

Efâf ‘the state of observing or demonstrating chastity’ is one of the main lexical collocates of hejab (hejab va efâf ‘hejab and chastity’) in Persian. EFFAT is the larger category of which HEJAB is a representative member and it defines what is socially and religiously expected of women, mainly in relation to men. Hejab is one of the chief manifestations of effat. In other words, veiling can be a criterion for identifying the existence of effat in a woman.

A hejab poster (example 1) metaphorically shows how hejab can be indicative of efâf:

(1) Hejab buye khosh e efâf va pakdamanist.

‘Hejab is the pleasant smell of chastity and purity.’

12. Effat and efâf are both translated as chastity though they profile relatively different aspects of the frame. Effat denotes a moral feature and efâf refers to the state of observing or demonstrating effat.
The phrase *buye khosh* ‘pleasant smell’ and the visual representation of flowers set up the metaphors *EFÂF IS A FLOWER* (chastity as the source of the pleasant smell) and *HEJAB IS THE FRAGRANCE OF A FLOWER*. The inseparability of *hejab* and chastity is the central idea conveyed by the metaphor. A further interpretation might be that chastity and sexual self-control are properties mostly found in modestly dressed women. *Pâkdâmani* ‘moral purity’, which collocates with *efâf*, is a moral virtue attributed to women who do not give in to illegitimate sexual temptations and restrict their relationships with *nâmahram* men.

Another poster (example 2) touches upon the relationship between *hejab* and *efâf* through poetic metaphors:

(2) *Vaghti morvarid e zibaihayat ra dar sadaf e hejab va effaf misepari, khodavand tora abi mikonad, anghadr abi ke aseman be to rashk mibarad.*

‘When you put the pearl of your beauties in the shell of *hejab* and *efâf*, God will dye you blue, so blue that even the sky will envy you.’

The BEAUTY AND ATTRACTION ARE OBJECTS, HEJAB AND EFÂF ARE PROTECTIVE CONTAINERS, THE SKY IS A HUMAN BEING, and MORAL PURITY IS BLUE metaphors underlie the above sentence. THE SKY IS A HUMAN BEING and MORAL PURITY IS BLUE metaphors could be integrated to give A MORAL PERSON IS A BLUE SKY. The metaphors hyperbolically elevate modestly dressed women to the highest level of spiritual purity, which is symbolized as blue. This purity is assumed to be achieved by remaining *afif* ‘chaste’ through veiling, which is a main indication of the existence of *effat* in women.

6.2.6 *Harim* ‘holy space/border’

In preceding chapters, we saw that female body is considered a holy space or territory which must be protected. In fact, *hejab* marks the holy boundaries of women’s bodies, impeding men from taking illegitimate pleasure through gazing and touching, and specifying the physical distance that *nâmahram* ‘non-intimate’ men should keep when communicating with women.

6.2.7 Clothes

From the point of view of Islam, the function of clothing is not to display the body, but to conceal it and to reduce sexual enticement (Milani, 1992, p. 21). This category includes the
chador, the manteau and a variety of headscarves (shâl, rusari, and maghnaeh). These pieces of clothing are ways of observing hejab, though they do not hide hair and body parts in the same way. A chador is a black outfit that covers up the whole body from head to toe. The advantage of this garment is that it completely conceals the hair and sexually provocative parts of the woman’s body, such as her breasts and hips while still revealing her whole face. The chador is the favorite garment of religious women (Hume, 2013, p. 70) and is officially recommended — though not enforced — by the Islamic Republic as “the superior form of dress” (Hume, ibid). In many governmental organizations, women are required to wear a chador. Chador wearers are stereotypically considered chaste and virtuous (Milani, 2011, p. 56). More specifically, a chador-wearing woman maintains her dignity by controlling illegitimate lust and sexual desire. A billboard (example 3) highlights the prominent features of the chador by making an allusion to Zorro and Batman, the fictional superheroes:

(3) Ta hala didi zoro ya batman shekast bokhorand? Na! chon hejabeshan kamel ast. Pas khaharam hejabat ra kamel kon.

‘Have you ever seen Batman or Zorro getting defeated? No, because their hejab is complete [proper]. So, you too complete your hejab, sister.’

The statement metaphorically compares chador-wearing women to fictional superheroes (Batman and Zorro). In the target domain, the idea is that the chador empowers women by providing protection against sexually charged looks and sexual abuse committed by corrupt men. This level of security/power is achieved once a woman conceals her beauty and attraction by wearing a chador. In the source domain, Zorro and Batman wear black clothes, very similar to the chador in color and shape. Moreover, it is assumed that what makes these two fictional characters undefeatable is that they cannot be identified because of their (appropriate) clothes.

The minimum level of covering up tolerated by the Iranian government is trousers, a headscarf, and a manteau (www.theguardian.com, 19/12/2013). A manteau, originally a French word, is a tunic or thin overcoat and is the preferred dress of a large number of young girls and women since it provides more freedom and a better way to show physical beauty. Wearing a manteau, they are able to loosen their headscarves and leave their hair out at the
front and in the back. Girls stopped by *gasht e amniat e akhlâghi* ‘moral security patrol’ belong predominantly to this category. There is another category of clothing which includes a *manteau* and a type of headscarf called *maghnae*, which has much more of a covering up function. It typically covers up the hair and extends to the chest. Under the *maghnae*, the hair cannot be seen. Moreover, it hides the breasts. The members of the latter category of *manteau* wearers are usually seen at schools, universities and many of the government offices. In relation to the *manteau*, two main characteristics should be taken into consideration: tightness and length. Girls dressed in tight and short (above-the-knee) *manteaus* are stopped and reprimanded by the morality police (http://latimesblogs.latimes.com, 25/05/2010). On the other hand, girls dressed in rather loose and under-the-knee *manteaus* are expected to feel more secure, and hence they are neither stopped by the police nor gazed at by men. A tight, short *manteau* makes the sexually attractive parts of a woman’s body (breasts and hips) stand out.

### 6.2.8 Make-up

The use of heavy make-up by women who do not dress modestly is referred to in some of the billboards and posters (the use of heavy make-up is depicted as a feature of immodestly dressed women) and hence can be seen an element in the overall evaluation of the *hejab* status of women by billboard and poster designers. Basically, the amount of make-up used by a woman is placed on a gradient ranging from no make-up to heavy make-up. This gradient is inversely correlated with chastity and modesty in the eyes of radical conservatives in society. The heavier the make-up worn, the more insecure the woman is thought to be (Shirazi, 2016, p. 143).

Lipsticks have visually been represented as bullets in one poster and linguistically referred to as bombs in another one, in order to highlight the allegedly destructive, social consequences of wearing make-up, namely arousing illegitimate sexual feelings in men and providing the grounds for sexual crimes. Furthermore, using make-up is depicted as a global issue threatening all societies:

---

13. *Gasht e amniat e akhlâghi* ‘moral security patrol’ is the official name for the branch of police in Iran which is in charge of enforcing Islamic dress codes by stopping immodestly dressed women on the streets. In Western media, it is conventionally referred to as the “morality police” (www.telegraph.co.uk, 13/11/2013).

‘A bomb exploded every second. Every second, 22 bombs. Every second, 22 lipsticks are sold in the world’.

6.2.9 Color

This concept also has a particular status in the conceptualization of hejab. Colors such as black, gray, dark blue, and brown constitute a category called ranghaye sangin ‘modest colors’. It is believed that these colors are suitable for women (www.huffingtonpost.com, 20/12/2013) mainly because they reflect less light than those of the opposite category, which in Persian are called ranghaye zanande ‘immodest colors’, including red, pink, yellow, and orange. In the folk theory of hejab, the latter colors are regarded as ‘improper colors’ for a Muslim woman in public. ‘Immodest/improper colors’ refer to those colors which emit or reflect more light and can catch the attention of men.

6.2.10 Sex, desire, and love

The HEJAB category includes the crucially important concept of SEX, in which the SEXUAL AROUSAL OF MEN is undoubtedly the most prominent aspect. The restrictions on women’s dressing in public aim to block all possible ways through which men’s sexual feelings (outside of marriage) might be aroused.

To understand how LOVE and SEX are construed in Iranian culture, one needs to take the concept of MARRIAGE as the conceptual background against which these concepts are comprehended. Outside the MARRIAGE conceptual category, love and sex are both frowned upon by some religious people, since they constitute sinful behavior and reduce one’s desire to get married (Haeri, 2014). Moreover, as far as women are concerned, extramarital relationships are, first and foremost, detrimental; a woman could only be a means of meeting a man’s sexual needs in such a relationship. On that basis, love and sex outside married life are readily categorized as components of an ‘aimless relationship’. Marriage is the only context with respect to which sexual desire has positive overtones since it is legitimately met and serves the purpose of reproduction.

The negative view toward illegitimate sexual desire is explicitly referred to in the billboards:
(5) Hejab yani man mojahaz be antivirus e havas va vasvaseh hastam.

‘Hejab means I’m equipped with the antivirus protection against lust and temptation.’

The LUST IS A VIRUS metaphor introduces illegitimate lust as a troublesome entity that endangers human health and disrupts its normal functioning. The metaphor might invite the interpretation that hejab acts to obliterate women’s illegitimate sexual feelings. However, it seems that the immunity to lust and temptation provided by veiling (the HEJAB IS ANTIVIRUS PROTECTION) centers the virus (lust) outside the female body and identifies corrupt men as the carrier of the virus via the CORRUPT MEN ARE VIRUS CARRIERS metaphor. Revealing one’s beauty to men may activate and transmit the viruses into the woman’s body, which may then further spread through the whole community of women. Therefore, hejab is conceived of as the only possible medicine prescribed by Islam. In Islamic laws, although men are strongly recommended to lower their gaze and restrict their social interaction with nāmahram females (Wahid Khorasani, 2014, p. 396), the folk theory of hejab identifies women and their behavior as the main cause of men’s sexual arousal. Nevertheless, the metaphor attempts to challenge this established idea by providing a negative image of corrupt men and blaming them more for the spread of the lust virus in society. Hence, women’s only responsibility would be to take preventive measures to protect themselves against the disease by wearing a chador.

The collocational expression havas va vasvaseh ‘lust and temptation’ contributes to augmenting the negative overtones of the LUST concept and creating a hard-to-handle image of it. Moreover, the personal pronoun man ‘I’ affects the level of persuasion of the discourse since it implies that the comfort and immunity that a woman feels by wearing a chador is expressed by a woman and is not dictated. Using this linguistic strategy (shifting the discourse narrator from third person masculine to first person feminine assists in defocusing the authoritative role of men in determining the dress codes for women and pictures the chador as an essential aspect of women’s lives demanded by women themselves.

In one of the billboards (example 6), the chador metaphorically plays the role of an attractor and a matchmaker:

(6) Yâdam bâshad! Chadore man râ be kesi ke dust daram va dustam dârad miresâad.

‘I should keep remembering that my chador will take me to the one who loves me and whom I love.’
In Persian, the idiom *be kesi residan* [literally ‘to reach someone’] means ‘to marry someone’, which is a linguistic realization of the LOVE IS JOURNEY metaphor. The verb *resândan* in the sentence literally means ‘to transport someone or something to a place’ and in this context means ‘to provide the means for two people to meet and get married.’ This role is figuratively attributed to the *chador*. The *chador* is personified as a matchmaker whose duty is to spark everlasting love between two people. *Vâsete kheir shodan* ‘matchmaking’ is religiously considered as a pleasant act and Muslims are recommended to arrange marriages among single young people in order to be blessed by God ([www.farsnews.com](http://www.farsnews.com), 20/08/2013).

The interaction of the concepts constituting the cultural model of HEJAB gives rise to a tripartite classification of women on the basis of which their *hejab* status is evaluated:

1. *Bâhejab* ‘modestly dressed / properly covered up’ refers to women who mostly fit in with the IDEAL WOMAN frame as conceived of by religious conservatives (Nakanishi, 1998, p. 86). *Bâhejab* is a compound adjective composed of the preposition *bâ* ‘with or possessing’ and the noun *hejab*. The MODESTLY DRESSED WOMEN category prototypically consists of:

   a) Women who wear a black *chador* with no hair seen (see [www.rajanews.com/news/153481](http://www.rajanews.com/news/153481) for a close illustration of the definition).

   b) Women who wear a rather long loose modest-color *manteau* with different kinds of headscarves, such as the *maghnae*, *shâl* or *rusari* (see [www.shikpars.com/islamic-model-shawl](http://www.shikpars.com/islamic-model-shawl)).

2. *Badhejab* ‘having a bad or improper *hejab*’: those girls or women who wear a short tight immodest-color *manteau*, leave part of their hair out of the headscarf and wear heavy make-up (see [www.arshnews.ir/vdcewv8n.jh8wvi9bbj.html](http://www.arshnews.ir/vdcewv8n.jh8wvi9bbj.html)). *Badhejab* is a compound adjective consisting of the adjective *bad* ‘bad’ and the noun *hejab*.

3. *Bihejab* ‘lacking *hejab*’: those girls and women who do not believe in veiling and hence do not care about covering their hair. *Bi* ‘without or lacking’ is a preposition and a constituent element of the compound adjective *Bihejab*. This category cannot be seen in public. Such women usually unveil themselves at parties and in private locations even in the presence of nâmahrams.
Women with a proper *hejab* are complimented and praised by the government and are given flowers on the streets by the morality police as a sign of appreciation ([www.asrehamoon.ir/prtguz9q.ak9zy4prra.html](http://www.asrehamoon.ir/prtguz9q.ak9zy4prra.html)). On the other hand, immodestly dressed women are stopped by the morality police; they are typically warned and advised to cover up their hair. If they do not follow the advice, or if their clothes and make-up radically deviate from the prescribed dress codes, they are taken to the police station and asked to sign a letter promising not to appear in those immodest clothes anymore ([www.thecommentator.com, 27/06/2012](http://www.thecommentator.com)). Praising modestly dressed women and fining immodestly dressed ones are the implementations of a Sharia law (canonical law of Islam) called *amr e be maruf va nahye az monkar* ‘promotion of virtue and prevention of vice’, which “calls for all Muslims to protect Islamic values by encouraging each other to do good and prevent each other from committing sins” ([www.farsi.khamenei.ir, 24/09/2014](http://www.farsi.khamenei.ir)).

### 6.3 Results

*Hejab* slogans extracted from the data (both metaphoric and non-metaphoric) were classified into seven categories based on the major target meanings of the conceptualizations. Table 7 summarizes the categories, the frequency of statements within each category, and the frequency of linguistic metaphors identified in each group:

#### Table 7. Categories of *hejab* slogans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of <em>hejab</em> slogans</th>
<th>Frequency of statements in each category</th>
<th>Frequency of linguistic metaphors in each category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protective role of <em>hejab</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Hejab</em> and family life</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Hejab</em> and spiritual life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National and political significance of <em>hejab</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The eyes and sexually charged looks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Hejab</em> slogans to refute anti-<em>hejab</em> arguments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Hejab</em> and <em>efāf</em> ‘chastity’ relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 provides a list of frequently occurring conceptual metaphors. The following list only includes conceptual metaphors abstracted from the linguistic statements. The list excludes the
WOMEN ARE EDIBLES (instantiated in 4 posters) and LIPSTICKS ARE DESTRUCTIVE WEAPONS (instantiated in two posters) metaphors, which have visually been represented.

Table 8. Frequency of hejab metaphors in the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual metaphors</th>
<th>Frequency of occurrence in linguistic statements</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE NATION IS A FAMILY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRUPT MEN ARE DEVILS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIRITUAL LIFE IS JOURNEY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN’S GAZE IS A POISONOUS ENTITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEJAB IS A WEAPON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL PURITY IS COLOR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEJAB IS FIGHTING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN ARE VALUABLE THINGS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODESTLY DRESSED WOMEN ARE ANGELS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Hejab metaphors

6.4.1 Metaphors representing hejab as a protective cover

Metaphors in this category constitute the largest group in the data. These metaphors are further grouped on the basis of the target meanings.

6.4.1.1 Metaphors representing the social significance of ‘hejab’

In a group of posters, the protective function of hejab is emphasized by a number of visually represented foodstuffs which metaphorically refer to women and sexual attraction. One billboard portrays, on the one hand, an unwrapped sweet with a lot of flies flying around it, and on the other side, a wrapped one with no flies around. Such an image gives rise to the CORRUPT MEN ARE FLIES and WOMEN ARE SWEETS/BEAUTY AND SEXUAL ATTRACTION ARE SWEETS metaphors. The metaphors find and offer hejab as a protective cover and as the only possible solution for such issues as rape, abuse, and sexual harassment.

In other posters, such fruits as apples and pomegranates have been pictorially represented perhaps to conceptualize women’s moral integrity and sexual attraction, which can be jeopardized by improper dressing (visually represented as a bitten apple or a peeled
pomegranate with visible seeds), but protected or concealed by proper hejab (pictorially realized as a complete apple or an unpeeled pomegranate).

Poster (7) visually represents a number of hard-shell nuts (almonds, walnuts, and pistachios) combined with the following piece of advice:

(7) dokhtaram in yek ghanun ast: Chizhaye baarzeshtar pooshesh e mohkamtari darand.

‘My daughter! This is a rule: More valuable things have stronger coverings.’

The address form dokhtaram ‘my daughter’ instantiates the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor, whereby the power relationship between political rulers and Iranian women takes the form of a kind father advising his daughter to observe hejab so as to remain valuable. The noun phrases chizhaye baarzesh ‘valuable things’ and poosheshhaye mohkamtar ‘stronger coverings’ stand in a metaphoric relationship with WOMEN and MODEST FORMS OF HEJAB respectively, giving rise to the WOMEN ARE VALUABLE THINGS and MODEST FORMS OF HEJAB ARE OBJECTS WITH STRONG COVERINGS metaphors. A main entailment of the metaphor is that individual and social values of women are determined by their level of hejab. HAVING STRONG COVERINGS seems to be the salient feature motivating the choice of hard-shell nuts as the visual source domain.

6.4.1.2 Metaphors representing the political-religious significance of ‘hejab’

The WAR domain is utilized to provide a negative characterization of Western culture and media, as poster (8) may indicate:

(8) Khâharam! Dar in bombbârânhâ e farhangi, barâye inke tarkeshi be shomâ esâbat nakonad châdorat râ mohkam va seft begir.

‘Sister! In the cultural bombardments if you do not want to be hit by the shrapnel, hold your chador firmly.’

In (8), women are attacked by an assumed enemy. The expression ‘cultural bombardment’ seems to refer to the effect of Western lifestyle and media on Iranians, particularly their dress codes. Cultural bombardment might be an entailment of the idea of tahâjom e farhangi ‘cultural invasion’ emphasized by the supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei (Hovsepian-Bearce, 2015, p. 338). The WESTERN CULTURE AND MEDIA AS A WEAPON AGAINST IRANIANS magnifies the threat of cultural metamorphosis according to which
women are targets to be shot. What can save women from the shrapnel of the bombs is wearing a protective cover (THE CHADOR IS A PROTECTIVE COVER). The alleged characteristic feature of this cover is that it can fully protect women against any western cultural impact.

In poster (9), wearing the chador and exercising taqvâ ‘piety and God-consciousness’, as salient features of a Muslim woman, are conceptualized as lethal defensive weapons with which women can fight against the presumed enemy:

(9) Khâharam! Shomâ bâ chador e siāh va taaghvâvetân doshman râ mikoshid.

‘Sister! You can kill the enemy with your black chador and taqvâ’¹⁴.’

Wearing the chador and adopting taqvâ (being obedient to God’s commands) lead to disappointing the enemy who tries to make women abandon their Islamic lifestyle and unveil. The eventual disappointment is hyperbolically seen as killing the enemy. The mental association between the black color (of the chador) and fear may also contribute to exaggerating the effect of wearing the chador on the presumed enemy.

The referent of the word enemy is vague in this context. It might refer to either corrupt men who want to take sexual advantage of women or to Western culture and media. What may turn western culture into an enemy is the sharp contrast between Western and Islamic lifestyles, that is, the version of Islamic lifestyle advocated by religious conservatives and the supposed fact that Westerners attempt to make Iranian women abandon their religious beliefs by means of Western cultural products and lifestyles (www.leader.ir, 15/12/2013).

Taqvâ acts as the appropriate weapon to fight the presumed enemy by the resistance that it presumably creates in Muslim women against accepting Western dress codes or, alternatively, against the illegitimate desires of corrupt men.

(10) Hejab e to sangar e tost. To az dâkhel e hejab doshman râ mibini va doshman to râ nemibinad.

‘Your hejab is your trench. You can see the enemy from within it while he cannot see you.’

¹⁴. Taqvâ is an Islamic term that denotes God-consciousness, mindfulness, and piety. Its basic meaning is to put a barrier between yourself and the wrath of Allah (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taqva).
In poster (10), the metaphor HEJAB IS A TRENCH encourages women to cover up their whole body except for their face by wearing a chador. The source domain of TRENCH and its properties such as protecting soldiers or leaving only a small hole through which to see the enemy, contribute to imagining the chador as the physical manifestation or the intended form of hejab. The domain of WAR reinforces the argumentation for a strict dress code for women. This metaphor, furthermore, metaphorically entails that any negligence in proper camouflage results in being identified and shot. Covering up the body with a chador provides maximum security as well as defeating the intentions of the enemy.

The word doshman ‘enemy’ may evoke the already existing metaphors WESTERN CULTURES AND MEDIA ARE OPPONENTS or CORRUPT MEN ARE OPPONENTS. The WESTERN CULTURE AND MEDIA ARE OPPONENTS metaphor seems to originate from the idea of tahâjom e farhangi ‘cultural invasion’ emphasized by the leader in his speeches (www.leader.ir, 15/12/2013).

6.4.1.3 Metaphors praising women and ‘hejab’

Metaphors in this group provide a positive evaluation of both women and hejab. In poster (11), a thoroughly gentle and upgraded image of women is offered by the metaphor WOMEN ARE PEARLS, whereby women are thought of as precious beings:

(11) Hejab: sadafi baraye morvarid

‘Hejab: A shell for a pearl.’

This metaphor does not have any aggressive overtones and the shell embracing women (HEJAB IS A SHELL/WOMEN ARE PEARLS) is considered as a natural cover for them. The success of the metaphor in gently advertising the chador is due to the conceptual associations between THE PEARL and THE SHELL in the source domain and the interpretations (the metaphorical/non-metaphorical entailments) that it provides; a woman needs to be cared for/taken care of due to being delicate and valuable. In other words, the metaphor excludes the interpretation that hejab might have been externally imposed or dictated. The precious being continues to live so long as it is protected, whereas unveiling equals losing one’s value in social life. The features of the source domain exploited in the conceptualization turn the metaphor into a peaceful, pro-woman, ideological tool.
In addition to the aforementioned properties, the white color of shells is also used to highlight the moral purity attributed to properly dressed women (pictorially represented), giving rise to the MORAL PURITY IS WHITE metaphor:

(12) Be range sadaf

‘Same as the color of shells.’

In poster (12), pictorial representation of a chador-wearing woman functions as the object of comparison (the target meaning), which is linguistically missing in the slogan. The preposition be ‘same as/like’ provides a metaphorical resemblance between a stereotypical property of modestly dressed women (moral purity) and the color of shells. Similar to example (2), here, the association between moral purity and hejab can be inferred by virtue of what the source domain provides, i.e., the inseparable link between the shell and its white color.

The positive conceptualization of women is seen in other metaphors as well, where the protective function of hejab is represented by a different source domain (poster 13):

(13) Agar hefâzi barâye gol nabud chenin bêtarâvat va zibâ nemimând.

‘If there wasn’t any protection for the flower, it wouldn’t remain refreshing and beautiful.’

The WOMEN ARE FLOWERS metaphor underlying this expression provides a highly positive image of women by bringing the salient features associated with flowers, namely BEAUTY AND SENSITIVITY/TENDERNESS, into correspondence with the target domain of HEJAB. As a result, the social-religious pressures exerted on women to dress modestly in accordance with Islamic guidelines is replaced by women’s inherent physical and psychological traits as the reasons for doing so. Using FLOWER as a source concept conceals any traces of religious motivation for pro-hejab language. Having attributed such features to women through the metaphor, the need arises to protect this tender and beautiful being against threats. This metaphor presents the chador as a protective garment that keeps away annoying gazes and sexual abuse.
6.4.1.4 Metaphors representing the significance of ‘hejab’ in family life

Some of the hejab statements in the data begin with khâharam ‘my sister’, which is a positive, polite, and free-from-sexual-feeling form of address. This form of address may provoke feelings of security and trust in women while talking to men (Esfandiari, 1997). Moreover, it gently reshapes the ideological goals and turns them into within-family pieces of advice.

The NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor underlies the figurative conceptualization of females as SISTERS. The metaphor highlights the role of the brother in the frame. The reason is that in Iranian culture, the boys in the family are traditionally considered as the main protectors of their mother and sisters (Moallem, 2005). They make sure that nobody will tease or molest them and they react to such situations, in at least some cases, by physically fighting with threateners/disturbers. The figurative brothers of Iranian women generalize the family role relationships to the whole community by the ANY IRANIAN GIRL IS A SISTER metaphor. Apart from hejab-related expressions, addressing a woman as such by any Iranian men, in order to offer help or make a request, communicates a sense of respect and security to the woman.

Poster (14) focuses on the significance of hejab in the context of married life:

(14) Adamizad ruye chizhaye bâ arzesh ramz migozarad. Hagh bede ke to ra ba chador bepasandam azizam.

‘Humans set a password on their valuable things. So, darling! You will agree with me why I like you with a chador.’

The noun phrase chizhâye bâ arzesh ‘valuable things’ metaphorically refers to women in married life (WOMEN ARE VALUABLE THINGS). In this statement, a husband addresses his wife. The protective function of the chador is emphasized by employing PASSWORD as the metaphorical source concept (THE CHADOR IS A PASSWORD). The metaphor shows the significance of a woman’s way of dressing for conveying the sense of love and loyalty to her husband i.e., the beauty and attraction of a woman should be concealed from others and only the husband should have access to it. The metaphor may also indicate, though less conspicuously, the extent to which a certain group of Iranian men can have authority over their wives by setting limits on the way they dress. Farahani (2002, p. 103) observes that
considering women’s bodies as men’s private property demonstrates the privatization function of *hejab*.

In poster (15), observing *hejab* is represented as a fundamental characteristic of women through a novel conceptualization:

\[ (15) \text{Zan e bedune hejab hamchon sandali ist bâ se páye.} \]

‘A woman without *hejab* is like a chair with three legs.’

Since the concepts of WOMAN and CHAIR are constructed in the context as belonging to two distinct domains, the comparison between them involves a cross-domain mapping. Hence, this simile is analyzed as a “direct metaphor” (Steen, et al., 2010). This conceptualization looks novel with respect to the source domain employed. The conceptual correspondence between the FURNITURE domain and the category of IRANIAN WOMEN is motivated by the representative properties of the IRANIAN WOMEN category functioning as the target domain. Such a conception of women may be considered as a motivating factor for the CHAIR concept and some of its constituting elements, i.e., its four legs. The DEFINING FEATURES OF A WOMAN ARE LEGS OF A CHAIR metaphor is involved in the conceptualization of an idealized Iranian woman in the poster. Although each leg of a chair has more or less the same function in making a chair what it is — maintaining balance — the defining features of the IRANIAN WOMAN category do not represent such an equal functioning. In other words, the metaphor transforms the functions of the chair legs to be able to assign more significance to one of the legs (observing *hejab*). The role of the other legs of the chair (and other defining features of a woman) is defocused. Instead, the target domain is structured in a way that only the HEJAB concept is foregrounded. A major interpretation of such a conceptualization is that women who do not observe *hejab* are unreliable and unsafe to be with.

6.4.2 Metaphors related to men’s gaze

In Iranian culture, men’s gazing at women for the purpose of sexual pleasure is socially condemned and is considered to be a negative attribute of men as well as insulting for women (Milani, 1992, p. 25). The social condemnation of men’s staring at women is represented in the language through the lexical item *hiz*, which refers to a man who habitually watches girls and zooms in on their sexually attractive parts. For Iranians, a prototypical feature of a nice man is having ‘pure eyes’. A *cheshm pak* ‘pure-eyed’ man, in Persian, means a man who
typically lowers or controls his gaze. The association of the look with purity or impurity derives from the PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY metonymy, by means of which positive properties of men such as trustworthiness and not being *hīz* stand for the person. The property of having pure eyes is extensively employed in social relationships. In order to qualify as a trustworthy person who can join a family or work in a place where women also work, this property is an important requirement (Milani, 2011, p. 80).

In poster (16), veiling has been conceptualized as an umbrella which protects women from men’s sexually charged gaze.

(16) *Dar in bārān e negāhhâye masmum, chatr e hejāb rā bā khod bardār.*

‘In this rain of poisonous gazes take the umbrella of *hejab* with you.’

The HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER interacts with MENS GAZE IS A POISONOUS SUBSTANCE. It follows that veiling is the only effective antidote and protection against the poison of men’s gaze. The RAINDROPS ARE POISONOUS SUBSTANCES, EYES ARE CONTAINERS FOR POISONOUS SUBSTANCES, THE INTENSITY OF POISON IS THE INTENSITY OF RAIN, and THE CHADOR IS AN UMBRELLA metaphors together contribute to forming a picture in which eyes containing poisonous substances fall on *chador*-wearing women with an umbrella in their hands. Furthermore, the rain is perceived as incessant. What can be inferred from the salience of the word *bārān* in the conceptualization of *hejab* is that a woman will never feel secure unless she covers up her hair and body. The prominence of men’s gaze in the HEJAB domain is shown in another poster (example 17):

(17) *Hejab mahdudiat ast! Baraye cheshmhaye sheitani*

‘*Hejab* is a restriction for devilish eyes.’

The statement implies that *hejab* is by no means a restriction for women, but rather, a restriction placed on the likelihood of getting sexual pleasure from women by looking (motivated by the BODY PART FOR PERSON, CATEGORY FOR PROPERTY metonymies, and the CORRUPT MEN ARE DEVILS metaphor). Some Iranian women, however, consider *hejab* as a restriction (www.haftingtonpost.com, 05/12/2014) and this statement seems to be a response to those who argue against compulsory *hejab*. 
6.4.3 Hejab and spiritual life

Metaphors of this category highlight the role of hejab in achieving high levels of spirituality (reaching God and heaven) and in demonstrating servitude to God.

(18) Par bezan! Châdorat to râ bâl ast va bedân to râ mibarad bâlâ.

‘Flap your wings! Your chador is your wings and will take you up.’

In poster (18), the visual representation of a chador-wearing, angel-like woman soaring to the sky plus a metonymic reference to angels in the sentence, through a salient feature of angels (having wings), form the CHADOR-WEARING WOMEN ARE ANGELS metaphor. The preposition bâlâ ‘up’ metaphorically makes reference to God (the GOD IS UP metaphor) and also evokes the SPIRITUAL LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor. Here, the chador stands for pious and pure women who, like angels, deserve to live in proximity to God. An entailment of the metaphors might be that the capability of reaching a high level of spirituality or being a true servant of God is exclusive to women wearing a chador.

In poster (19), hejab is considered as a prominent sign of showing one’s servitude to the Creator as a Muslim woman:

(19) Hejab taj e bandegist

‘Hejab is the crown of servitude.’

Bandegi ‘servitude’ means showing absolute obedience to God and His commands by living an Islamic life. Out of all behavioral signs which are held to demonstrate one’s commitment to Islamic teachings, such as praying regularly, fasting, and reading the Quran, hejab stands out as the most prominent, metaphorically represented as a crown. The other motivating element for the employment of the source concept CROWN might be that both hejab and crowns are placed on the head.

6.4.4 Hejab as a national and political symbol

The language of metaphor, however, can be replaced with more conspicuous forms of expression for directly reflecting the conservatives’ viewpoint about the proper clothes for women, as a billboard (example 20) in the data indicates:

(20) Chador: hejab e bartar
'Chador: The Superior/ preferred form of hejab.'

The official stance of the government excludes other possible ways of covering up, that is, wearing a manteau and a headscarf, which is the only alternative to the chador. Although using the comparative adjective leaves space for the existence of alternative forms of covering up, the official statement of certain organizations, schools, and universities about accepting only chador wearers (www.roozonline.com, 01/05/2011, 17/09/2012) cancels out the implications of the above statement. A hejab poster (example 21) demonstrates the official position of the government by quoting Ayatollah Khamenei, the supreme leader:

(21) Chador behtarin no’e hejab va neshan e meli e mast.

‘The chador is the best form of hejab and it is our national symbol.’

In poster (22), hejab is seen as a means of supporting the leadership of Ayatollah Khamenei:

(22) Hejab: jahâd dar hemayat az harim e velayat.

‘Hejab: fighting in support of the territory of velâyat.’

The word velâyat ‘guardianship’ is the shorter term for velâyat e faghih ‘guardianship of the jurist’, the cornerstone of the Islamic Republic. Velâyat refers to the leadership of Ayatollah Khamenei and hejab is seen as a symbol of showing obedience and support to the vali ‘guardian’ of Iranian Muslims. The word jahâd ‘fighting for the sake of God’ sets up the HEJAB IS FIGHTING metaphor and the word harim ‘holy space/border’ provides a metaphorical understanding of velâyat ‘guardianship’ (VELÂYAT IS A BOUNDED HOLY SPACE).

6.4.5 Hejab statements to refute anti-hejab arguments

A number of hejab-related statements attempt to respond to anti-hejab arguments in Iranian society, though these complaints are not reflected in the media. The hejab posters reflect three major criticisms leveled at compulsory hejab. These criticisms or arguments revolve around concerns about physical appearance, restrictions on performing daily activities, and the complaints on the mandatory hejab in Iran. As an example, the slogan ‘hejab: my life, my right, my choice’ on a poster presents hejab as a voluntarily adopted form of dress, which is a response to those who see hejab as being imposed and a tool of oppression.
In poster (23), the assumed negative effect of *hejab* on appearance is negated by giving prominence to an allegedly key function of *hejab*, i.e. protecting women from moral corruption, relying on the MORAL CORRUPTION IS ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION metaphor:

(23) Hejab mara zesht nemikonad faghat az aludegi hefz mikonad.

*Hejab does not make me look ugly. It only keeps me from pollution.*

### 6.5 Discussion and summary of the findings

While veiling in western countries is stereotypically seen as a static cultural practice, a constraining form of dress, and a tool of oppressing women within patriarchal cultures (Ahmed, 1992; Hoodfar, 2003; Watson, 1994), it is viewed by some Muslim women in at least some Muslim countries (e.g., Egypt and Morocco) and Western societies (the U.S., Britain, and Canada) as a tool of empowerment, liberation, and of resisting the impact of Western culture or resisting cultural integration. Furthermore, Muslim women wear the veil to assert their Muslim identity, preserve their modesty and feel protected (Ahmed, 1992; Farahani, 2002; Hessini, 1994; Khir Allah, 2015; Williams & Vashi, 2007). The *hejab* metaphors analyzed in this study highlight and present themes (by seeing *hejab* as a protective cover, a tool of demonstrating chastity, and a means of resisting the impact of Western culture) that are generally shared with some of the aforementioned motives of Muslim women in other social contexts. Some feminists argue that both veiled and fashionably dressed, *badhejab* ‘improperly dressed’ women in Iran are products of patriarchy and demonstrate the capitalist commodification of the female body (Gould, 2014, p. 232; Naghibi, 1999, p. 569). Nonetheless, the *hejab* slogans seem to introduce *hejab* not as a law requiring women to observe it but as a cultural-religious value that is strongly recommended to be preserved and is consciously and voluntarily chosen.

The analysis shows that moral purity, chastity, and social value of women are depicted (by the poster designers) as being determined by or correlated with their degree of veiling. The ideas conveyed by the MORAL PURITY IS COLOR, EFÂF IS A FLOWER, HEJAB IS THE FRAGRANCE OF A FLOWER, and MODEST FORMS OF HEJAB ARE OBJECTS WITH STRONG COVERINGS metaphors provide evidence for this argument. Examples of the relationship between *hejab* and codes of *haya* ‘self-restraint’ and *effat*
‘chastity’, which were provided in previous chapters, corroborate the observation in this chapter that the conservatives see hejab as the main indicator of possessing haya and effat.

The poster designers illustrate the role of hejab in creating a secure, private realm for women in public. According to this particular framing of hejab, proper veiling as a “portable barrier” (Farahani, 2002, p. 101) can protect women’s bodies against social threats, such as male gaze and sexual harassment. The conceptual metaphor HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER is extensively applied to stress this function.

**Hejab** metaphors in the data unanimously introduce and advertise the chador as the accepted and preferred garment for Iranian women. The conceptual metonymy HEJAB FOR THE CHADOR is instantiated in many of the hejab slogans. Pictorial representation of the chador in almost all the posters and occurrences of such metaphors as the CHADOR-WEARING WOMEN ARE ANGELS and THE CHADOR IS A PROTECTIVE COVER demonstrate the significance of the chador in the Hejab and Chastity Plan.

Chador-wearing women are shown to be the recipients of very positive conceptualizations, whereas immodestly dressed women are pictured as being subject to moral corruption and sexual objectification, and in many cases, responsible for disrupting social equilibrium and arousing illegitimate sexual feelings in men. Whether hejab prevents or causes the sexual objectification of women is a disputed matter and is one of the points which distinguishes advocates and critics of hejab (Farahani, 2002; Milani, 1992).

**Hejab** metaphors fulfill their persuasive function by negative conceptualizations of corrupt men as FLIES, DEVILS, and OPPONENTS, and of improperly dressed women or women lacking hejab as UNWRAPPED or DYSFUNCTIONAL OBJECTS. Also, emotionally loaded concepts such as FLOWER, PEARL, and ANGEL are used as source domains perhaps to influence a wider category of Iranian women.

The analysis of hejab metaphors reveals how conceptual metaphors serve to represent the dominant ideology in discourse which aims to persuade Iranian women to dress modestly. Political ideology provides a tripartite value system of hejab (modestly dressed/ immodestly dressed/ women lacking hejab), on the basis of which various metaphorical concepts are formed. Iranian culture (composed of various stereotypical interpretations of people and events, customs, and social practices) is found to be feeding the dominant political ideology which has its own specific properties, that is, specific political attitudes toward women. The
political ideology manifests itself in discourse on *hejab* as the brother and father of all Iranian women; a brother whose responsibility is to protect Iranian women against any sexual harassment or disturbance and a father who advises his daughters to protect their social value based on the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor.

Veiling as a general Muslim practice has taken on a political significance and is closely associated with movements against Western colonialism and imperialism, which attempted to secularize and liberate women (Ahmed, 1992, p. 130; Watson, 1994, p. 138). Some of the metaphors exhibit the national and political significance of *hejab*. Through such metaphors, *hejab* seems to turn into a symbol of resisting the impact of Western culture and of showing support to the leadership of the supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei. The metaphors HEJAB IS FIGHTING, HEJAB IS A WEAPON, and HEJAB IS A TRENCH (in one of the readings of the word ‘enemy’) present Western culture and media as a threat to the Muslim identity of Iranian women.

*Hejab* metaphors are shown to be the product of the interaction of a variety of factors as discussed below.

6.5.1 Situational context


The *mahram*/*nâmahram* distinction as a fundamental religious value physically distances men from women and is the basis for the “segregative function of *hejab*” (Farahani, 2002, p. 101), whereas the NATION IS A FAMILY metaphor attempts to bind Iranian men and women together socially and emotionally, licensing every Iranian to praise virtue and prevent vice. The HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER metaphor is motivated by the cultural-religious conceptualization of the proper social distance between men and women. Religion assigns responsibility to Iranian men to monitor the *hejab* status of their family
members in order to protect them from social threats (Eshaghi, 2006, p. 21). Advising women by addressing them as sisters and daughters in the posters fulfills these responsibilities.

6.5.2 Discourse context

The co-textual elements that surround *hejab* metaphors influence the construction of the metaphorical meanings. Using particular collocations (e.g., lust and temptation) to reinforce the negative image of illegitimate sexual arousal (the LUST IS A VIRUS metaphor), particular forms of address in discourse in which women are addressed as sisters and daughters (the NATION IS A FAMILY), and shifting the discourse narrator to a first-person female (in THE CHADOR IS A MATCHMAKER) constitute the major linguistic contexts for the *hejab* metaphors. For example, when the discourse narrator is shifted to a first-person female, the issue of *hejab* is pictured as a serious concern for Iranian women and not as an externally dictated matter.

The analysis of *hejab* metaphors explicitly demonstrates the influential role of the preceding discourse in motivating the source domains of some of the metaphors. It also indicates how the conventional conceptual metaphors WESTERN CULTURES ARE OPPONENTS/CORRUPT MEN ARE OPPONENTS, which are associated with preceding discourse, are recycled in the ongoing discourse and create intertextual coherence (Kövecses, 2014, p. 27). The idea of cultural invasion emphasized by the supreme leader seems to be applied in choosing the source domains of some of the metaphors such as HEJAB IS FIGHTING and HEJAB IS A WEAPON.

6.5.3 Cognitive-conceptual context

The conceptual metaphors (WESTERN CULTURES AND MEDIA ARE OPPONENTS, CORRUPT MEN ARE OPPONENTS), which are inferable from preceding discourses, give rise to the formation of novel *hejab* metaphors, such as THE CHADOR IS AN UMBRELLA and THE CHADOR IS A TRENCH.

Conceptual metonymy and categorization are also among the major construal operations involved in structuring the HEJAB concept. Conceptual metonymy facilitates the generalizations made within the *hejab*-related conceptual categories. Moreover, many of the features associated with these concepts are inferred via the application of metonymy. The conceptual metonymies HEJAB FOR THE CHADOR, HEJAB FOR EFÂF, and THE
CHADOR FOR MORAL PURITY/ MODESTY contribute to linking elements of the frame and highlighting the key components of the viewpoint of hejab protagonists in Iran.

Categorization also assigns Iranian women into conceptual groups on the basis of their hejab status. The concept of THE IDEAL IRANIAN WOMAN is represented through the application of this cognitive operation; OBSERVING HEJAB is the representative property of the category. Categorization paves the way for the application of hejab metaphors. The hejab metaphors are mainly targeted at the chador-wearing and immodestly dressed women by praising and encouraging the first category and degrading the second.

6.5.4 Bodily context

The eye is the main body part used as a source domain in some metaphors. The eye is seen as an important source of sinful behavior in Islamic laws (Milani, 1992). Social condemnation of men’s gaze is manifested in the MEN’S GAZE IS A POISONOUS SUBSTANCE and CORRUPT MEN ARE DEVILS metaphors. In a different sense, the role of the body is significantly highlighted when all these conceptualizations are seen as resulting from a certain attitude to women’s bodies. The ideology represented in hejab discourse seeks to place the woman’s body at the center of attention and the metaphorical conceptualizations reflect a serious concern about the threat of corrupt men and Western dress codes to the female body by merging women’s beauty, sex appeal, and social value.

6.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have introduced the complex concept of HEJAB as it is conceived by political-religious conservatives in Iran. The frame analysis of hejab provided a background for understanding the social-cultural properties of a specific category of Iranian women addressed by hejab slogans. Moreover, I have attempted to show how hejab metaphors used in pro-hejab billboards and posters recruit a variety of source domains to persuade Iranian women to dress modestly in public. Political relationships, key cultural concepts, and Islamic laws were found to be the main motivating elements in the selection of the metaphorical source domains.

The analysis of the hejab concept provides a more vivid image of the domain of SEXUALITY. While the interrelationship between hejab and the other self-regulating forces (i.e., gheirat, haya, and effat) is conspicuously illustrated, the larger conceptual network revealed in preceding chapters (the network consisting of the concepts of MAHRAMIYAT

Hejab metaphors provide significant evidence to support the context-based theory of metaphor. The metaphors examined in this chapter were shown to be jointly produced by the influential, monitoring role of the contextual factors that constitute the context model of the situation. The context model that seems to be involved in the construction of hejab metaphors in Persian has shown socio-cultural elements (global contextual factors) as the omnipresent constituents of context in each instance of conceptualization, which supports Kövecses’s (2015) account of metaphor in context. By and large, the discourse on hejab overwhelmingly utilizes metaphor to deal with extramarital sexual attraction and sexual arousal as the basis of individual and social corruption as well as a threat of cultural metamorphosis due to the influence of Western lifestyles.
Chapter 7: Discussion and findings of the research

7.1 The Persian conceptual cluster

The analysis of *gheirat*, *haya*, *effat*, and *hejab* led to the identification of a larger network consisting of at least eight concepts: MAHRAMIYAT ‘legitimate intimacy’, ÂBERU ‘face/public image’, GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, EFFAT ‘chastity’, NÂMUS ‘female family members’, HARIM ‘holy space(border’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’. The cultural model of SEXUALITY is shown to be founded on the Islamic principle of mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’, which segregates men and women physically and emotionally, setting limits to their social interactions. Mahramiyat defines the specific category of people toward whom one should maintain a certain physical and social distance. This principle pulls together a range of self-regulating forces to maintain the legitimate distance between men and women. Gheirat ‘moral vigilance’ monitors the conducts of individuals to ensure all moral and religious values are properly observed, prompting the person to react to cases of taboo violation. Haya ‘self-restraint’ sets up barriers between persons and cultural taboos in order to prevent causing or feeling shame. Effat ‘chastity’ conceals sexual desire and disciplines the body. Nâmus ‘female family members’ highlights the significance of women in preserving the honor of the family as well as the need to protect them against threats and insults. Harim ‘holy space:border’ marks the limits of the area containing moral and religious values, determining the extent to which one’s interaction with the opposite sex conforms to culturally specified norms and values. Áberu ‘face/public image’ is the value for whose preservation the whole cluster operates. Last but not least, hejab ‘veiling’ is the output or the product of the cluster, materializing the interactions among all the cluster members.

The first hypothesis of the thesis was that *gheirat*, *haya*, *effat*, and *hejab* are interrelated and jointly involved in restricting the sexuality of Iranians. The analysis of the four concepts reveals their interrelatedness and joint functioning, confirming the first hypothesis. Evidence for their interrelatedness is provided by a number of elements that connect the concepts together, giving rise to the formation of the cultural model of SEXUALITY in Persian. First, it was shown that at the linguistic level, *gheirat*, *haya*, *effat*, and *hejab* are linked together through collocational relationships. Lexical collocates also
indicated that these moral values interact with the same conceptual domains. *Gheirat, haya,* and *effat* interact with the conceptual domains of MORALITY, FAITH, ÅBERU ‘face/public image’, and REASON, demonstrating that they are moral values, components of Islam, protectors of one’s face or honor, and are indicative of possessing reason. Second, they were shown to be conceptualized by the same metaphors; they are conceptualized as POSSESSED OBJECTS, VALUABLE COMMODITIES, and SHOOTING TARGETS, source domain which address their significance, value, and vulnerability. Third, they are employed to categorize individuals using the same categorization system, that is, through the *bâ-bi* categorization. Fourth, they are recruited for the common purpose of keeping the sexes segregated (maintaining the principle of *mahramiyat* ‘legitimate intimacy’). Several examples were provided in previous chapters to show how each of the concepts played a role in segregating men and women (*gheirat* by policing the segregation and the conducts of individuals, *haya* by holding back the self, and *effat* by concealing the body and sexual desire). What is more, this joint task is highlighted by the BARRIER metaphor, which *gheirat, haya,* and *effat* share. Fifth, they are all realized in the body; the body is the meeting point and the main site for their operation as evidenced by examples that illustrated the relationship between these concepts and embodiment in preceding chapters.

In addition to collocational relationships, the link between the self-regulating forces (*gheirat, haya,* and *effat*) and *hejab* can be inferred from metaphors. The HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER, the most salient metaphor of *hejab* in the data set, could be taken as the metaphor simultaneously realizing the GHEIRAT IS A BARRIER, HAYA IS A BARRIER, and EFFAT IS A COVER metaphors. The findings prove that *hejab* materializes a complex system of “de-individualization, protection, and secrecy” (Milani, 1992, p. 23), functioning as an objective criterion to evaluate *gheirat, haya,* and *effat* (Eshaghi, 2006; Milani, 1992, 2011; Mir-Hosseini, 2007; Tizro, 2013). Overall, the cluster identified in the thesis signals and maintains Islamic order by combining self-regulation and external control (Khosravi, 2008, p. 48).

Data analysis shows that men-women relationship and, more specifically, the sexuality of men and women is the only theme that can bring together aspects of all the aforementioned concepts. In a culture in which religious beliefs play a pivotal role in shaping the normative behavior of individuals, this mechanism provides maximum authority over the thoughts and conducts of individuals both in private and public realms by controlling illegitimate desires (through applying *haya* and *effat*) and tackling cases of taboo violations.
via an efficient, cognitive policing system (gheirat), which can propel one to apply such restrictive forces as haya and effat.

The coalescence of haya, gheirat, and effat, and their role in preserving moral and religious values provide a more transparent image of āberu ‘face/public image’ in Iranian culture. The degree to which these self-regulating forces are applied is found to be a function of the degree of significance of the values for one’s āberu. Āberu seems to be relevant to, or encase almost all moral and religious values in Iranian culture. “It is hard to find something that one does or has that would not have any implications for or impact on one’s āberu” (Sharifian, 2011, p. 141). Protecting the āberu of the family is a major task for both sexes though men and women contribute to it differently. While men are expected to defend the āberu of their family or that of the social group with which they are identified by showing gheirat, women are expected to do their share by observing haya and effat. Anthropological studies of honor in collectivist cultures, particularly those focusing on the Mediterranean and Muslim societies (Moxnes, 1996; Gilmore, 1987; Delaney, 1987; Pitt-Rivers, 1997; Abu-lughod, 1986; Peristiany & Pitt-Rivers, 2005) show that, similar to Iranian culture, gender division as a dominant cultural value automatically pulls together honor, female chastity, positive shame, and defending the honor (by men), forming a conceptual network to jointly order the relationship between men and women. Moxnes (1996, pp. 25–33) observes that in the Mediterranean region, honor and shame are strongly associated with sexual roles and gender division, with honor being linked with men and (positive) shame and chastity with women. Moxnes views such associations among the aforementioned concepts as being peculiar to the Mediterranean cultures, hence a basis for distinguishing the morality system in Western culture where societies are built around individuals and the Mediterranean cultures where social structure is tied to families, clans, and lineages (ibid, p. 27). The conceptual cluster discovered in the present research exhibits a degree of similarity with the cluster revealed by the anthropological investigations of honor in collectivist cultures. This similarity generally involves common conceptual members of the cluster (concepts roughly corresponding to gheirat, āberu, haya, and effat in Iranian culture), cognitive and social functions of the cluster members, and conceptual associations among the members of the cluster. Therefore, it can be suggested that in cultures in which gender division is valued, such as in Muslim cultures and some Mediterranean cultures, this cluster can be expected to comprise the conceptual skeleton of morality systems. The differences in the way this cluster functions in Iranian culture and other similar cultural settings might pertain to the effect of
religion in specifying the particular social roles of men and women and also the extent to which concepts corresponding to such forces as *haya*, *gheirat*, and *effat* in Iranian culture are applied in compliance with religious guidelines.

The anthropological approach to analyzing positive shame (roughly *haya* in Persian) and righteous indignation at the violation of values (roughly *gheirat* in Persian) predominantly deal with these concepts in the context of sexuality, ignoring other equally important contexts where these concepts might exhibit distinct meanings and functions (Akman, 2002; Beeman, 1986; Fischer & Abedi, 1990; Mir-Hosseini, 2000). Furthermore, they tend to establish a rather fixed relationship between moral values and gender types. For example, positive shame (*haya* in Persian) is mainly attributed to women rather than men (Eshaghi, 2006; Milani, 2011; Tizro, 2013) or *gheirat* (or concepts corresponding to *gheirat*) is mainly seen as a male attribute (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014; Beeman, 1986; Eshaghi, 2006; Limbert, 1987). The analysis of *haya* and *gheirat* presented situations in which these two emotions were assigned to both sexes as necessary features. For instance, *gheirat* turns into a necessary feature of females when a woman observes *effat* and protects her own nâmus by veiling under any circumstances. Or *haya* becomes a defining feature of men when talking to nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ women by casting down the gaze or keeping physical distance. This is further evidence to the idea that prototypes of categories are not stable, abstract mental representations but rather variable structures defined in context given the goal of the situation (Barsalou, 1983; Gibbs, 2003; Kövecses, 2006).

From an anthropological perspective, *gheirat* is seen as indignation and prototypically a cause of social conflicts, such as honor killings (Beeman, 1986; Kazimova, 2011; Ruggi, 2000; Werbner, 2005), or *haya* is taken to be synonymous with shyness and shame (Ilkkaracan, 2008; Milani, 1992; Mir-Hosseini, 1999). The result is an inadequate description of concepts that are complex and multifaceted in nature. In contrast, my analysis shows the dynamicity of meanings and functions of these concepts; the study of *gheirat* reveals functions which have no association with anger (e.g., *gheirat* as a supplementary force motivating the self to achieve his desired goals or *gheirat* as a feeling triggering selflessness and benevolence), functions which are as conventional and culturally significant as the one which is predominantly suggested as the meaning of *gheirat* in anthropological accounts (Asadi, 1982; Beeman, 1986), that is, a strong feeling of anger when one’s nâmus ‘female family members’ or honor is threatened or insulted. The study of *haya* also indicated that *haya* significantly differs from shame, being a shame-avoiding concept, though closely
related to shame. Moreover, *haya* and concepts similar to *haya* in honor cultures function to preserve the dignity of people and stand opposed to feelings of shyness or timidity, which arise from lack of confidence (Khadem Pir, 2015; Pasandideh, 2004).

While narrative descriptions in anthropology, cultural studies, and gender studies, to some extent, illustrate how people think and talk about such culturally significant concepts, in most cases, one may not be able to distinguish some of the concepts merely on the basis of narrative descriptions and the representations of the concepts in social behavior. For example, in many studies on gender construction in Muslim cultures (Abu-Lughod, 1986; Ahmed, 1992; Farahani, 2002, 2006; Hélie & Hoodfar, 2012; Hessini, 1994; Hume, 2013; Milani, 1992) one cannot explicitly distinguish *haya* and *effat* as two relatively separate self-regulating forces and the way each of the forces individually affects women’s social acts and conceptions of their own bodies. A cognitive linguistic analysis of these concepts could compensate for this shortcoming by identifying the principal functions that each concept performs and demonstrates the coordination between mental representations, bodily effects, linguistic manifestations, and social behavior.

### 7.2 Emotion schema in Iranian culture

The key emotion concepts in Persian were found to be structured and motivated by both universal aspects of human physiology and social scenarios. In fact, these emotion concepts involve properties that are consistent with the findings of both the experientialist approach (Lakoff & Kövecses, 1987, Kövecses, 1990) and social constructionist approach to emotions (Lutz, 1988; Lutz & White, 1986; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990). The compromise between the role of universal features and functions of the human body and social factors triggering emotions has been reflected in the “synthetic view of emotion concepts” proposed by Kövecses et al. (2003):

> [t]his synthesis involves acknowledging that some emotion language is universal and metonymically related to the experience of the physiological functioning of the body. Once the universal emotion language is isolated, the numerous and important remaining differences in emotional linguistic expressions can be explained by differences in cultural knowledge and pragmatic discourse functions that work according to divergent culturally defined rules or scenarios. The two approaches should be regarded as complementary (p. 135).

Increased body heat and the protrusion of the jugular vein (in *gheirat*), and blushing (in *haya*) are the physiological aspects of emotion concepts in Persian that are metonymically and metaphorically conceptualized, providing evidence to the role of human physiology in
characterizing the meaning of emotion concepts. Another piece of evidence for the role of universal human experience is provided by the basic image schema of CONTAINER, which is a main metaphorical source domain for the conceptualization of prototypical emotion concepts (Kővecses, 1986, 1990, 2000). In both haya and gheirat, the body is metaphorically viewed as a CONTAINER, where haya and gheirat are seen as SUBSTANCES or FLUIDS within the metaphorical CONTAINER. The hierarchical organization of concepts in general and emotion concepts in particular could be considered as an alternative basis for examining the degree to which haya and gheirat might represent aspects of universality. If ‘providing protection and/or support to the other’ could be suggested as the basic meaning or function of gheirat and if haya could be defined as ‘a psychological mechanism for keeping humans from taboos’, irrespective of culturally specified domains which determine their specific linguistic and non-linguistic manifestations, it could be suggested that at a generic level these two emotions might be potentially universal emotions, given the fact that protecting or supporting the other (beloved ones or fellow beings) and abstaining from taboo acts are likely to be components of almost all cultures (Allan & Burridge, 2006).

On the other hand, haya and gheirat also represent properties of “culturally constructed emotion concepts” (Lutz, 1982, 1988). In many contexts, both of the emotions are triggered by social and political events rather than merely psychological inner feelings. One of the major differences between the culturally constructed emotion concepts that Lutz has analyzed in Ifaluk and those analyzed in this research is that unlike emotion concepts in Ifaluk, which rarely contain reference to the physiology of experience, haya and gheirat tend to make reference to physiological and behavioral responses when triggered by social or political events. Conversely, reference to bodily experiences is rarely encoded when these two emotions are experienced as psychological inner feelings in non-social situations. The reason might be that in social situations, these two emotions are interlocked with one’s āberu ‘face/public image’, meaning that negligence in exhibiting haya and gheirat would have highly negative outcomes for one’s social image (Eshaghi, 2006, 2009; Fischer & Abedi, 1990). Therefore, the metonymic reference to physiological and behavioral responses associated with gheirat and haya in social contexts seems to indirectly reflect the concerns of Iranians for maintaining their āberu. Physiological and behavioral manifestations of haya and gheirat and their metonymic conceptualizations point to the social nature of these concepts and the social pressure on individuals to indicate that they possess these moral values.
Since key emotion concepts in Persian demonstrate similarities to both individual feeling states and culturally constructed emotions, the emotion schema characterizing these emotions would be a blend of the schemas proposed by Kövecses (1990) and Lutz (1988):

Cause (psychological states/social-political events) → key emotion → (emotions) → response (physiological and behavioral response/social action)

The main characteristic of the above schema is that it takes into account the variation of the elements of emotion schema across contexts of use. Since meaning is culturally and contextually embedded (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 110), idealized models of emotion concepts should also represent this contextual embeddedness. The causal part of the schema consists of both psychological states and social-political events. This means that the context in which haya and gheirat are used determines the type of causal element. For example, haya in private and in the absence of a human observer might be triggered by the imagination of social situations (by perceiving a non-physical observer) rather than social events (Pasandideh, 2004), such as when a person refrains from having sexual intercourse in his/her parents’ place even in their absence, thinking that his/her parents pray in the house, hence, deciding to preserve the sanctity of the house and the parents. In social situations and in the presence of human observers, however, haya is predominantly caused by social events and under the influence of the addressee’s age, gender, social status, and the fear of losing one’s āberu (Pasandideh, 2004). One social scenario to exemplify this particular application of haya could be a situation in which a woman in plain clothes (not veiled) unexpectedly faces a nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ man, anxiously escaping the scene to put on a chador or headscarf.

Based on the analysis of gheirat, this emotion seems to be ontologically relatively distinct from the emotions that it gives rise to. Gheirat causes a range of feelings to emerge and is indirectly related to the ultimate responses. The other element distinguishing the key emotion concepts in Persian and prototypical emotion concepts is the role of the control aspect. The analysis indicated that the control aspect does not characterize haya and gheirat in Persian in the sense it does such emotions as anger and fear. Lack of control aspect in their semantic structure is justified, as the existence of the control aspect would disrupt the normal or expected functioning of these emotions. Since the ultimate goal of showing these emotions is to maintain control over desires and conducts (haya) and to protect values (gheirat), an unimpeded application of these emotions is expected of individuals. Therefore, in the conceptualizations of the intensity aspect in haya and gheirat, high levels of intensity are
thoroughly positively evaluated. The word emotion enclosed in parentheses in the above schema is used to differentiate *haya* and *gheirat* in terms of whether they give rise to other emotions. Whereas *gheirat* causes other feeling states in the course of its application, *haya* appears to be directly linked to its associated responses.

Other than being points of reference to emotions, reactions associated with *haya* and *gheirat* also provide a great deal of information on socially defined goals for which these emotions are recruited. The manifestations of *haya* and *gheirat* reveal the following goals:

*Maintaining interpersonal and social relationships*

Both of the emotions serve the purpose of taking care of one’s relationships with relatives, neighbors, friends, colleagues and any other social groups a person is identified with (Eshaghi, 2006; Fischer & Abdei, 1990). *Mardomdāri* ‘people keeping’ is the term that shows the significance of controlling desires and behaviors in keeping social relationships. In other words, the stability and durability of social relationships might be a function of the degree to which these emotions are applied in social interactions.

*Sending the message across to the addressee(s) that one possesses the values*

Behavioral reactions conventionally associated with *haya* and *gheirat* are important means of gaining social credit and promoting one’s social status (Eshaghi, 2006; Khadem Pir, 2015). Being categorized as *bâhaya* ‘having *haya*’ and *bâgheirat* ‘having *gheirat*’ would boost the level of trust that the others place in the person. Gaining trust would increase the likelihood of being accepted into families and workplaces. As an example, a boy who has sisters needs to ensure that his male friend possesses *haya* before letting him commute to the house. Casting down the gaze when seeing female members of the family and setting one’s posture, gesture, and tone of voice in compliance with *haya*, are among the chief clues assisting the host to come to the conclusion that the boy is trustworthy (i.e., he is ‘*cheshm pâk* ‘pure-eyed’) and that he would look upon the females of that family as his own sisters (Hooglund, 2011, p. 128). To put it simply, signs of possessing *haya* illustrate that the person has no sexual intentions toward the females of that family. Once these criteria are met, i.e., once the boy is viewed as *bâhaya* ‘having *haya*’, he would be reframed as *mahram* ‘intimate’ to the family despite the fact that, according to religious laws, a *nâmahram* ‘non-intimate’ man can turn into a *mahram* ‘intimate’ only through marriage (Haeri, 2014). Nevertheless, exhibiting *haya* has the power to make Iranians reconsider religious guidelines and figuratively frame a
person as mahram ‘intimate’ or a confidant (Milani, 1992, p. 23). The reframing brings changes to the way a family would normally treat a basically nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ man: females of the family may unveil before the boy or they may disclose their family secrets to him (Milani, ibid).

The observance of haya can also contribute to promoting one’s job or business in a neighborhood or city (Khadem Pir, 2015, p. 130). For example, a butcher who never overcharges people, nor does he sell stale meat to people, or sells meat at a cheaper price to poor people attracts many customers to his shop, for he has been able to present himself as a bâhaya ‘having haya’ and trustworthy person.

Now, let’s see how the behavioral manifestations of gheirat can help promote one’s social status in Iranian society. As pointed out in chapter three, gheirat is defined by sensitivity and reaction to the states of affairs in the world. More specifically, gheirat is a principal means of monitoring the situation and checking whether things in the world proceed in conformity with moral-religious values and social norms (Bakhtiar, 2015). This sensitivity translates into concrete actions aiming to provide protection and support to the self as well as the other. The aim of protecting or supporting the self and the other is in tandem with the aim of establishing or promoting one’s social status. For example, rushing to help a neighbor (especially women or elders) carrying heavy stuff, defending a female acquaintance against men’s persecutions in the street, sharing food with a poor neighbor, offering one’s house to a neighbor to hold wedding or mourning ceremonies in (mostly in small towns) would elevate the status of the person to the level of a chivalrous and a mardomdâr ‘people-keeping’ person (Adelkhah, 1999, pp. 31-34). Moreover, the person providing protection or support would receive an incredible amount of respect and social credit. Even the most internal occurrences of gheirat are linked with social aspects of life. When gheirat acts as a supplementary force to assist the self in accomplishing goals, the intended goals are typically the ones which are culturally praised. Achieving these goals mainly require doing hard work and tolerating hardships, such as winning a gold medal in Olympic Games and getting into a high-rank university in spite of tough conditions (Bakhtiar, 2015, p. 277). A person achieving such goals would benefit from social prestige and would be regarded as a role model. When such achievements are made, the person is first and foremost admired for his/her gheirat. The observations on the connection between the actional and purposive aspects of haya and gheirat show the culturally constructed nature of the knowledge about goals and the goals themselves (Lutz, 1987, p. 299).
Social pressure for demonstrating moral emotions in speech and behavior has affected the nature of the connection between these emotions and their associated responses in such a way that, in some situations, behavioral reactions are only ostensibly displayed, not necessarily indicating that the person is psychologically experiencing those emotions (Eslamirasekh, 2005). The investigations of emotion concepts primarily depict physiological and behavioral reactions as being unconscious and spontaneous signs of psychological feeling states (Kövecses, 1990; Tissari, 2006). While haya and gheirat share this feature with other emotion concepts, in some contexts, behavioral representations of haya and gheirat seem to be more consciously designed and displayed without even being connected to their corresponding psychological feelings. Three major factors may cause this variation in the demonstration of these emotions: 1) being aware of the social significance of exhibiting moral emotions and being concerned about one’s social image 2) speaker’s knowledge of the addressee’s attitudes, beliefs, and level of sensitivity toward the observance of moral values 3) social status of the addressee. For instance, when a person is aware of the fact that male members of a family are highly sensitive about their female members (i.e., their nâmus), especially about their interactions with other males, their hejab status, and the way other males address or talk to them, he would be forced to ostensibly exhibit haya in his speech and behavior so as to avoid a confrontation with the females’ father or brother(s). In such situations, addressing females as ābji ‘sister’ rather than uttering their names, casting down the gaze while seeing or talking to them, saying yâllâh literally ‘O God’ out loud to signal one’s presence, and request permission from the host to enter the place are the chief ways through which one may attempt to show respect and haya (Thumb, 2000, p. 139). The ostensible emotional reactions are more visible when the person exhibiting haya has a basically different viewpoint (i.e., a liberal viewpoint) toward interpersonal relationships between men and women from that of the addressee(s). In fact, the person may only locally align himself with the moral perspective of the persons to whom he displays haya, which results from the assessment of the situation, taking into account the factors mentioned above. In other situations, the same person may not cast down his gaze when talking to women or may not have to use euphemistic expressions to refer to females because of sharing similar moral perspectives with the addressees on the boundaries of physical and emotional intimacy between men and women (e.g., when the interlocutors do not believe in sex segregation and do not show it in their speech and behavior). Likewise, gheirat can be ostensibly displayed for making alignment with the moral-political perspective of the addressee(s) in a given situation with the ultimate purpose of retaining one’s social or political position. The realm of
politics provides proper examples for explaining this particular usage of *gheirat*. *Gheirat e siasi* ‘political gheirat’ is a popular term among Iranian conservative politicians, which refers to politicians’ prompt reaction to domestic and international political incidents when the incidents do not conform to the Islamic Republic’s norms and policies (Pouria, 2017). Political *gheirat*, as defined by the conservative politicians, is a yardstick for categorizing politicians and measuring their commitment to the fundamental values of the Islamic Revolution (www.irna.ir, 24/04/2017).

**Preserving or protecting one’s âberu ‘face/public image’**

Behavioral manifestations of *haya* and *gheirat* simultaneously represent that the person possesses âberu and is taking care of it. The analysis showed that both concepts are linguistically and conceptually linked to âberu. O’Shea (2000, p. 101) rightly observes that “Iranians measure themselves to a great extent by the honor they accumulate through their actions and social interrelations.” Áberu encompasses one’s pride, dignity, respect, credit, prestige, honor, and reputation as viewed by others. Sharifian (2007, p. 37) maintains that “[t]he core concept of âberu or how other people think about a person surfaces itself in the care that one should give to harf e mardom ‘people’s talk’. People are continuously reminded of the consequences of their thoughts, behavior, and appearance in terms of what others may say or think about them.” Given the importance assigned to people’s judgements and thoughts about one’s way of talking, behaving, and dressing and given the huge impact of such judgments on one’s âberu (i.e., leading to gaining, maintaining or losing âberu), it is not surprising that psychological forces for regulating social behavior or probably the entire self-control system function to safeguard âberu in one way or another.

The close interaction of *haya* and *gheirat* with âberu is implicit in the conventional uses of âberu in Persian. The following expressions are taken from Sharifian (2011, p. 141):

*Bâ âberuye kasi bâzi kardan* [to play with someone’s âberu] ‘threaten or endanger someone’s âberu’

*Áberu rizi kardan* [pouring âberu] ‘to disgrace’

*Áberu bordan* [taking âberu] ‘to disgrace’

*Áberu kharidan* [buying âberu] ‘saving face’

*Áberu dâri kardan* [maintaining âberu] ‘maintaining face’

*Biâberu* [without âberu] ‘disgraced’

*Áberu-dâr* [âberu-possessor] ‘respectable, decent’
The conventional association between self-regulating forces (haya and gheirat) and āberu provides a basis to trace gaining and maintaining āberu to the presence and application of haya and gheirat and disgracing the other or being a disgraced person to lack of these emotions.

The notion of face is also the cornerstone of the politeness model proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Research on politeness in Persian has shown that āberu is a crucial factor in motivating the strategies that Persian speakers use to demonstrate adab roughly ‘politeness, courtesy’ (Izadi, 2013; Sahragard, 2003; Sharifian & Teyebi, 2017). However, studies on politeness in non-Western cultures, including Persian indicate that Brown and Levinson’s definition of face and face wants is Anglo-centric and individualistic and that in collectivist cultures conformity to social conventions seems to be a stronger motivation for politeness rather than the individual desires to attend to his/her interlocutor’s face (Eslamirasekh, 2004; Koutlaki, 2002; Mao, 1994; Matsumoto, 1988; Mills, 2003). Research on politeness in Muslim cultures demonstrates that in addition to social conventions, Islamic teachings and the particular emphasis that Islam has placed on self-respect, dignity, and honor provide strong incentives for Muslims to demonstrate politeness (Ghounane et al., 2017). Persian language as shown in this study and evidenced by other scholarly works (Eslamirasekh, 2004; Koutlaki, 2002; Sahragard, 2003) reflects the strong influence of Islamic ideology on developing the mechanism for preserving the āberu and dignity of individuals.

Protecting common values and sanctities

The analysis shows that exhibiting haya and gheirat signals one’s commitment to protecting shared cultural and religious values. Both haya and gheirat were shown to be linked to religious faith and sanctities. What is more, degrees of haya and gheirat can specify the status of a person within the social or religious groups with which they identify themselves. These two moral virtues have the capability of defining the prototype of IDEAL MUSLIM IRANIAN category (Shahidian, 2002, p. 115). A large network of entities and relations constitute the domains to which haya and gheirat apply in order to protect them against any threat, insult, injury, and transformation. The following are among the major domains that haya and gheirat jointly deal with:
-the self

-Persons: The Prophet and the 12 Shia Imams, religious leaders and clerics, martyrs of the war, the deceased, women, parents, elders, neighbors, teachers, fellow humans.

-Places: Houses, mosques, holy shrines, cemeteries, country

-Objects: the holy book, any objects with Quranic inscriptions,

-Social institutions: religion, marriage and family, state

Ethnic group, race, and language should also be added to the above categories. When it comes to protecting values and sanctities, gheirat and haya perform their functions predominantly in relation to taboo areas in culture. Freitas (2008) suggests that taboo establishes limits to certain behaviors and at the same time provides the mental apparatus that will allow for the transgression to be punished and things to be put right again (p. 29). In this regard, haya corresponds to the avoidance aspect of taboo. It is a strong taboo reminder and a taboo-avoiding emotional force which keeps individuals from crossing the line (Pasandideh, 2004). Gheirat, on the other hand, corresponds to the punitive aspect of taboo; gheirat is activated mostly when a given taboo has been transgressed. However, extreme forms of gheirat may not put things right again but conversely, they may have huge disruptive and destructive effects on social order and social relationships (Akbari & Tetreault, 2014).

Overall, it seems that the key emotion concepts in Persian should be viewed as “body-based social constructs” (Kövecses et al., 2003) as embodiment and social situations are jointly involved in structuring and shaping the meanings of these emotions. Discovering what emotion concepts mean in social context and how they are structured would require paying equal attention to various bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors that are at work in the construction of emotion concepts. Hence, a reanalysis of emotion concepts surveyed from lexical semantic (Wierzbicka, 1999), cognitive linguistic (Kövecses, 1990) and social constructionist (Lutz, 1988) perspectives would possibly throw light on aspects or features of emotion concepts which, due to the particular methodologies adopted, have gone unnoticed and would modify some of the generalizations made of the nature and functioning of emotion concepts. Despite the fact that the lexical semantic and social constructionist approaches aim to demonstrate the culture-specific nature of emotion concepts and challenge the essentialist view to emotions without taking metaphors into account, the inclusion of metaphor analysis would assist scholars to achieve the goal they have been pursuing, as
metaphor analysis has the capability of showing not only the cross-cultural differences in understanding of emotions but also possible similarities that might exist among them (Kövecses, 1990, 2000; Kövecses et al., 2003).

7.3 Metaphor and morality in Iranian culture

The examination of the metaphors used to make sense of haya, gheirat, and effat shows that similar aspects of these concepts (possession, value, vulnerability, and sanctity) are systematically characterized by the same metaphorical source domains. The source domains that the concepts share are POSSESSED OBJECT, VALUABLE COMMODITY, SHOOTING TARGET, and HOLY SPACE, which address the aforementioned aspects. Employing the same source domain for the conceptualization of similar aspects of different moral values (as target domains) can be explained by the idea of “main meaning focus” (Kövecses, 2000). Kövecses holds that metaphors have a major theme or main meaning focus and each source domain highlights a limited number of aspects of the target domain. Moreover, the meaning focus of the source is “constituted by the central knowledge that pertains to a particular entity or event within a speech community” (P. 82). Although the Persian moral values have relatively distinct functions, they share with each other some characteristic properties and structural aspects that justify the recruitment of the same source domains for their metaphorical conceptualizations. The systematic use of the source domains helps postulate more general conceptual metaphors that characterize moral values in Iranian culture. These metaphors are MORAL VALUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS, MORAL VALUES ARE VALUABLE COMMODITIES, MORAL VALUES ARE SHOOTING TARGETS, and MORAL VALUES ARE HOLY GLASS SPACES.

Lakoff (1995, 1996) argues that metaphors of morality in American culture and politics are founded on experiential forms of well-being. Similarly, the metaphorical system for the Persian moral values in this study is patterned on some of the components of experiential well-being. According to Lakoff (1995, p. 4), a person is better off when he/she is happy, strong, healthy, rich, free, whole, cared for, clean, and beautiful. Out of these, the metaphorical system for the Persian moral concepts investigated draws on or gives priority to strength, health, care, wholeness, and cleanliness. The selection of these specific experiential domains is motivated by the emphasis that is placed on restricting individual freedom and promoting familial and social interdependence. Achieving these two is, in turn, dependent upon maintaining physical, social, and emotional distance between the person and whatever
elements that may damage or disrupt morality. The predominant use of COVER and BARRIER metaphors in the conceptualizations of *haya, effat*, and *hejab* lends support to this argument.

Moral strength requires being self-disciplined and self-denying (Lakoff, 1995, p. 7). Self-discipline is shown in this research to contribute to building moral strength by making the person distance from self-displaying, nudity, lust, greed, conceit, gluttony, envy, anger, extravagance, drinking alcohol, disrespecting the *nâmus* of others, endangering the *âberu* of others through backbiting, ridicule, humiliation, persecution, dirty words, and disclosing their sins and secrets. Self-denial, on the other hand, reinforces morality through altruism, generosity, and sacrifice. As the analysis indicated, *gheirat* is the principal psychological force that propels the person to promptly respond to the needs of others (family members, social group, and fellow human beings) for receiving support. The extra force generated by applying *gheirat* translates into courage once self-denial demands facing threats and tolerating hardships, such as saving the life of the other by jeopardizing one’s own or risking one’s own social or financial position in order to help the others get out of the plights they are in (Bakhtiar, 2015, p. 277).

According to Islamic guidelines, achieving *kamâl* ‘perfection’ and ultimately reaching God’s proximity, is considered as the aim of observing morality (Mesbah Yazdi, 2003). Reaching moral perfection is metaphorically conceptualized as MOVEMENT ALONG A VERTICAL AXIS. The phrases *ta’âli e akhlâghi* ‘moral elevation’ and *soghut e akhlâghi* ‘moral falling/collapse’ are the realizations of this metaphor in Persian. Mesbah Yazdi (ibid, 257–258) maintains that human beings seek *Kamâl* ‘perfection’ by nature. It is a thoroughly spiritual journey that a person consciously embarks on in the course of his/her life by means of constant piety and self-purification. *Kamâl* is a graded notion and each person can arrive at a level of perfection depending on the amount of control he/she gains over his/her desires and the degree with which one can perceive God’s presence in all aspects of life.

Measuring moral virtues is another metaphorically conceived aspect of morality in this study, which, to a large extent, determines the social status of the person and also sets the manner in which one is treated by others in social interactions. Given the MORAL VIRTUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS metaphor, moral virtues can be accumulated and construct the personality of the person in full compatibility with the social and religious norms of conduct. The adjectives *sabok* ‘light/lightweight’ and *sangin* ‘weighty/person of gravitas’ are used to
figuratively measure the moral virtues that a person is perceived to possess based on the **DEGREE OF MORALITY IS THE WEIGHT OF AN OBJECT** metaphor. *Sabok* ‘light’ is attributed to a person who does not observe the etiquettes of behavior and *sangin* ‘weighty’ describes a person who speaks and behaves in compliance with social and cultural norms and values (Fischer, 2004, p. 215).

Another notion connected to the structure of morality in Persian is *sheitân* ‘Satan’. *Sheitân* is an Arabic word literally meaning ‘distant’. It metaphorically refers to any internal or external forces or entities which tempt or lead humans astray. The **EVIL IS A PERSON** is one of the main metaphors for highlighting the ways in which desires cause people to defy religious guidelines, as in the following sentences taken from the Quran and the newspaper *Keyhan*:

(1) Ey kasani ke iman avardeid, az peye gamhaye sheitan maravid va harkas pay bar jaye gamhaye sheitan nahad bedanad ke u ra be zeshtkari va napasand va midarad (The Quran, Nour: 21).

‘O believers! Do not follow the footsteps of Satan. And whoever follows the footsteps of Satan. Surely, Satan bids indecency and wrongdoing.’

(2) Sheitan bar asas e barname gam be gam amal mikonad va intor nist ke yek shakhs ra mostaghim be gonah e kabire sogh dahad (*Keyhan*, 21/11/2016).

‘Satan acts step by step and according to planning. It is not that [Satan] directs a person straight to [committing] capital sins.’

(3) In ghanun va va’deye khodast ke ensan ra barha az dusti va etemad be sheitan va vadehayash bar hazar midarad (*Keyhan*, 05/12/2016).

‘This is God’s rule and promise that He has repeatedly cautioned humans of befriending and trusting Satan and his vows.’

As the above examples indicate, human physical and mental characteristics are attributed to Satan in order to reify the psychological force of illegitimate desires and to bolster the negativity attached to them.

In cases in which the word *sheitân* ‘Satan’ refers to external evils (mostly humans or acts of humans), evil plays the role of the source domain, whereby negative characteristics of evil are projected to human adversaries (HUMANS ARE EVIL). The conceptualization of the adversaries as EVIL is founded on the belief that the presumed enemy intends to change
the political system in Iran as well as the Islamic lifestyle of Iranians, where the U.S., Israel, and Western lifestyles are regarded as enemies by the state (Mehran, 2007, p. 110). After the establishment of the Islamic Republic in 1979, the U.S. government was named *sheitân e bozorg* ‘the great Satan’ by the founder of the Islamic Republic, Ayatollah Khomeini (www.theguardian.com, 16/08/2008). *Haya* ‘self-restraint’, *gheirat* ‘moral vigilance’, and *effat* ‘chastity’ are the countervailing forces to resist the force of both internal and external evils.

Lakoff (1996) introduces a group of metaphors that are linked with moral strength in American culture. These metaphors are also the ones which characterize moral strength in this study:

*Moral bounds:* As pointed out in previous chapters, the word *harim* ‘holy space/border’ metaphorically delineates the boundaries of moral values and sanctities in Persian, as in *harim e effat/hayaldin/velayatlahl e beit* ‘the holy space of *effat/hayal/religion/guardianship of the jurist/People of the House [the Prophet and his family including the 12 Imams]*’. This space should be guarded against immoral actions and threats. In some expressions, moral boundaries are represented through CONTAINER image schema, as in *khârej az effat* ‘outside of chastity’, where moral action is seen as moving within a container and immoral action as leaving the container or acting outside it. Transgressing moral values is depicted through the ACTION IS MOTION metaphor, as in *tajâvoz be harim e effat* ‘transgressing the space of *effat*’ or *ta’aroz be harim e din* ‘attacking the space of religion’. The VIOLATING MORALITY IS TREADING ON AN OBJECT metaphor is the other means of conceptualizing the manner in which moral values are violated, reflected in the phrase *zir e pâ gozâshtan e haya/effat/akhlâgâhîât* ‘stepping on *hayal/effat/morality*’. Generally, morality in Islam is viewed as a STRAIGHT PATH realized in the phrase *serât e mostaghim* ‘straight path’, used 43 times in the Quran (www.maarefquran.org/index.php/page,viewArticle/LinkID,4202), whereby moral action is seen as MOVEMENT ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH and immoral action as DEVIATION FROM THE STRAIGHT PATH. Morality is also measured in terms of one’s physical distance to a location in space, as in *be dura z adablakhlâgh/hayal/effat* ‘far away from politeness/morality/haya/effat’, whereby proximity to the metaphorical location in space would mean acting in compliance with moral values and increasing physical distance with the location would implicate further degrees of immoral action.
**Moral authority:** Whereas moral authority is understood in terms of parental authority in American culture (Lakoff, 1995, p. 8), in Iranian culture, it is metaphorically patterned on the male members of the family, i.e., father and brother (Khosravi, 2009, p. 593). The male members of the family protect the whole family against social threats and advise them on how to behave in accordance with social-cultural norms of conduct. A moral person is expected to obey the Quran, holy figures (the Prophet and the Imams), marâje ‘religious authorities’, and the supreme leader (Ahmadi & Ahmadi, 1998; Lankford, 2009). The study of *hejab* and *gheirat* provided ample evidence for the predominant role of the male members of the family in the conceptualizations of various aspects of Iranian culture and politics.

**Moral health:** PHYSICAL HEALTH and PURITY/CLEANLINESS are the source domains that structure moral health in the data. As the conceptualizations of *effat* and *hejab* indicated, surrendering to sexual desire, dressing immodestly, displaying physical beauty, and having an illegitimate relationship with *nāmahrams* ‘non-intimates’ are prime examples of immoral behavior viewed metaphorically as VIRUS, DISEASE, and DIRT/POLLUTION. What motivates the use of these metaphorical source domains is that immorality can spread to the whole society and result in transforming or eliminating moral virtues (Eshaghi, 2009; Pasandideh, 2004).

**Moral wholeness:** “Wholeness entails an overall unity of form that contributes to moral strength” (Lakoff, 1995, p. 9). Moral wholeness in the data is represented through MORAL VALUES ARE OBJECTS metaphor. The manner with which moral values (*haya*, *effat*, *gheirat*, and *hejab*) are violated specifies the type of metaphorical object involved: moral values can be scratched, teared up, broken, stepped on, and eroded. These verbs mainly evoke images of curtains and delicate objects (e.g., glasses) and present moral violations as tragic events.

**Moral essence:** According to Lakoff (ibid, p. 9), moral essence is structured by the knowledge we have of physical objects and the substances which constitute them. Lakoff observes that the logic of moral essence is that a person’s behavior reveals their essence. Similarly, in Iranian culture, moral virtues are innate, essential properties residing in the bâten ‘inside’ of humans, which are expected to manifest themselves in the zâher ‘outside’ (Beeman, 2005, p. 27). The MORAL VALUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS metaphor reflects the belief in the existence of moral virtues inside humans. On the other hand, in the data set, a great emphasis is placed on demonstrating these virtues in behavior, which is the
basis for categorizing individuals and specifying their social position. The mentality that is founded on the innateness of moral virtues may not recognize multiculturalism and multiple understandings of morality across cultures. It sets a unitary morality system with definitive moral bounds and authorities and views other morality systems in terms of the degree to which they conform to the elements and properties of the ideal frame of morality (Lakoff, ibid., pp. 9–10). Many examples in the data involved cases in which foreign governments were criticized for not observing or exercising *haya*, *effat*, and *gheirat*, or were expected to observe them as if these moral values are globally shared. In the conservative worldview in both Iranian and American politics, religion plays a crucial role in defining moral bounds and authorities (Groot, 2007; Lakoff, 1996). Despite these common features, the two seemingly similar worldviews contrast with each other in important respects: sex segregation enforced by the principle of *mahramiyat* ‘legitimate intimacy’ and the concept of ÂBERU, which are the pillars of morality system in Iranian culture (Haeri, 2014; Sharifian, 2011), do not characterize American culture and the conservative perspective in American politics.

### 7.4 Cognitive linguistics and the Persian conceptual cluster

The second hypothesis of the thesis was that cognitive linguistics is indispensable to the study of the Persian key concepts. The results of the study confirm this hypothesis, showing the unique way in which conceptual tools of cognitive linguistics contribute to defining, structuring, and understanding the Persian key concepts. In the following sections, I will show how each of the conceptual tools makes its own contribution to the formation of the cultural model of SEXUALITY in Persian.

#### 7.4.1 Metaphor and Persian key concepts

Metaphor is found to be essential to structuring and understanding the Persian key concepts. Highlighting principal cognitive-cultural functions of the key concepts can be said to be the most important contribution of metaphor to unraveling the complex structure of these concepts. Without metaphor, it would have been hard to distinguish *gheirat*, *haya*, and *effat* from concepts closely associated with, or synonymous with, them. Thanks to the representational role of metaphor, *gheirat* could be distinguished from anger, *haya* from shame, and *effat* from *haya*. Furthermore, postulating prototypical cognitive-cultural models for these concepts was facilitated by the metaphors that were used across contexts (e.g., *gheirat* as a SUPPLEMENTARY FORCE and *gheirat* as a CONTROLLING AUTHORITY). Metaphors also provided the ground for presenting more general, transparent definitions for
these concepts (e.g. *gheirat* as a notifier or alarm system, *haya* as a shame-avoiding mental device) in spite of the variety of meanings suggested for these concepts in Persian dictionaries and in psychological and anthropological studies. Given the hypothesis that these concepts constitute a functional cluster, metaphor performs its significant role by specifying the primary tasks of each of the concepts within the cluster, clarifying the conceptual status of each concept relative to other cluster members, and revealing the specific aspects of the concepts involved in the conceptualizations. These observations bring to the fore the inadequacy of the approaches that leave out metaphor of account in the analysis of culturally significant emotion concepts (Wierzbiczka, 1991, 1997; Lutz, 1988), reinforcing the idea that metaphors are constitutive of emotion concepts and that metaphor is a major tool in creating psychological and emotional worlds (Kövecses, 1990, 2002).

In the data, COVER and BARRIER are shown to be the source domains that characterize the internal structure and functioning of the psychological forces that are responsible for regulating the sexuality of Iranians. These metaphors mark the legitimate distance that should be maintained between a person and prohibited speech and behavior. Covering up hair and the body and separating men and women in ceremonies by accommodating them in separate rooms or buildings are prime examples of how COVER and BARRIER metaphors are materialized in social-physical reality (Bailey & Tawadros, 2003, p.139). In contexts other than morality and self-control, the metaphorical source domains of COVER and BARRIER profile negative aspects of entities that hinder understanding and social progress. Nevertheless, when they are used to represent the way self-regulating forces implement their functions (i.e. preserving values and maintaining social order), they receive thoroughly positive connotations.

Studies on emotions in cognitive linguistics and cognitive psychology show that human emotions, particularly intense emotions, are largely conceptualized via embodied metaphors due to the inadequacy of literal terms in expressing their complexity and intensity (Fainsilber & Ortony, 1987; Fussell & Moss, 1998; Gibbs, 1994; Gibbs et al., 2002; Kövecses 1990; Yu, 1998). The results of the analysis of the Persian emotion concepts are consistent with this finding, as *haya* and *gheirat* are complex, abstract, and intense, three major characteristics making the employment of metaphor inevitable for their conceptualization and expression.
The research also indicates the evaluative and persuasive functions of metaphors (Charteris-Black, 2004, 2007, 2011; Deignan, 2010; Koller, 2004; Musolff, 2004; Semino & Masci, 1996). Charteris-Black (2004, p. 11) states that metaphor is concerned with the articulation of points of view and feelings about the entities that the speaker or writer is talking about, which explains the relationship that exists between metaphor and evaluation. A fundamental way through which metaphor implements its evaluative function in the data is categorizing individuals in terms of whether they possess moral values (MORAL VALUES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS), which was indicated to be strongly emphasized and applied in Iranian culture. Metaphors of hejab also explicitly revealed the viewpoint of the conservative politicians toward women and showed that for conservatives, hejab is the main criterion for determining the individual, social, and religious statuses of women.

In the data, metaphors are extensively used to establish Islamic ideology and eliminate alternative points of view. This goal is pursued by presenting a negative representation of Western lifestyles (WESTERN CULTURE IS AN OPPONENT) and of Iranians who favor a non-Islamic lifestyle. The negative conceptualization typifies westerners and their Iranian advocates as “different, distant, or deviant relative to the norms and expectations” (Coupland, 2010, p. 245) of the conservatives. Simultaneously, Islamic moral values are pictured as being vulnerable and under constant threats (the ISLAMIC MORAL VALUES ARE SHOOTING TARGETS and ISLAMIC MORAL VALUES ARE HOLY GLASS OBJECTS metaphors), which might have an important role in provoking emotional responses in those who are influenced by the metaphors. As Deignan (2005, p. 130) puts it “making use of source domains that have strong emotional resonance for people is one of the means that makes a metaphor particularly persuasive”. The persuasive effect of these metaphors also lies in that they “tap into an accepted communal system of values” (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 12).

The metaphorical analysis of cultural key concepts in Persian provides significant evidence to support the context-based theory of metaphor (Kövecses, 2015). Metaphor is found to be the product of various elements of context (situational, bodily, conceptual-cognitive, and discourse contexts). Moreover, the analysis indicates that socio-cultural elements (“global contextual factors” in Kövecses’s terminology) are present in, and motivate, all instances of figurative conceptualizations. Several examples provided in the analysis showed a strong link between well-entrenched metaphors and novel metaphors produced in context. For example, metaphors emphasizing the protective function of hejab
(e.g., **HEJAB IS A TRENCH, THE CHADOR IS A BULLET-PROOF VEST, THE CHADOR IS A PASSWORD, and THE CHADOR IS AN UMBRELLA**) are shown to be motivated by the **HAYA IS A BARRIER** and **EFFAT IS A CURTAIN** metaphors, which represent the underlying self-regulating forces from which **hejab** emerges.

This study presented a type of cognitive linguistic analysis which pays special attention to context (particularly linguistic and cultural context) and did not limit itself to examining the cognitive aspects of linguistic practice. Hence, it could also be equally seen as a cultural linguistic investigation. Kövecses (2017) notes that “[c]onceptualisation rests on cognition (i.e., a variety of cognitive operations). When in the course of describing and explaining linguistic (or other symbolic) practice we focus on the cognitive aspects of this practice, i.e., we are doing Cognitive Linguistics. However, when we focus on the “cultural” aspects, we are doing Cultural Linguistics” (p. 308). My suggestion is that when sufficient attention is paid to various contextual factors (bodily, cognitive, linguistic, and cultural factors), the apparent border between Cognitive Linguistics and Cultural Linguistics will fade away. Applying Kövecses’s account of metaphor in context (2015) to the analysis of cultural key concepts is one step forward in abandoning making distinctions between these paradigms and in providing a more comprehensive image of cultural concepts.

Having analyzed the constituting elements of the cultural model of **SEXUALITY**, it can be suggested that the model seems to be metaphorically constituted. It became evident that the model is founded on the Islamic principle of **mahramiyat** ‘legitimate intimacy’, which attracts and recruits other elements of the model. The basic idea is that, according to Islamic teachings, men and women should be segregated and the level of intimacy between them should be controlled because unchecked relationships between men and women would promote moral corruption, promote cheating in family life, facilitate committing sins openly, discourage people to get married, destroy human dignity, damage one’s individual and social value, disrupt social order, and undermine social security (Farahani, 2002; Najmabadi, 1993; Shirazi, 2001). If we assume that this cultural model has emerged to keep men and women segregated, as the main proposition-schema of the model, we will have a seemingly literal cultural model and the group of metaphors representing **haya, gheirat, effat**, and **hejab** will only be means of explicating the ways in which gender segregation ought to be maintained. In other words, the **HAYA IS A BARRIER, GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY** (or **GHEIRAT IS A BARRIER** at a more specific level), **EFFAT IS A CURTAIN/COVER**, and **HEJAB IS A PROTECTIVE COVER** metaphors would only
function to indicate how the physical and emotional intimacy between men and women is controlled. Nevertheless, a closer look at the semantic structure of the term mahraniyat ‘legitimate intimacy’ indicates that the fundamental proposition-schema of the model is itself derived from a primary metaphor. The word mahraniyat ‘legitimate intimacy’ profiles emotional intimacy and physical proximity, which are correlated in human experience. This shows that the principle of mahraniyat deals with and operates on a basic entailment of the primary\textsuperscript{15} metaphor EMOTIONAL INTIMACY IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS. One of the main inferences of this primary metaphor is that we tend to physically approach the ones to whom we feel close, where the metaphor implicitly sanctions physical and emotional intimacy among all individuals regardless of their sex. This is the point at which the principle of mahraniyat intervenes to set limits on a possibly universal correlation in human experience by sanctioning physical and emotional intimacy toward one’s unmarriageable kin and one’s spouse (the category of mahrans ‘the intimates’) and prohibiting this intimacy toward men and women (depending on one’s sex) who are placed outside this category (the category of nāmahrans ‘the non-intimates’). Given this assumption, the cultural model of SEXUALITY in Persian can be said to be metaphorically constituted and the metaphors grouped around the model reveal how each of the elements of the model contributes to accomplishing the basic goal of the model, i.e., keeping a safe distance between men and women. The analysis also shows that without metaphors there is no way to identify the aspects of the concepts that are involved in the formation of the cultural model of sexuality. Furthermore, without metaphors, there is no way to account for the content and structure of such abstract concepts (Kövecses, 2005, 2015).

7.4.2 Persian key concepts and embodiment

Evidence for the role of embodiment in the conceptualization of the Persian key concepts comes from image schemas and body part terms. Moreover, these concepts have an impact on the way the body is supposed to function.

\textsuperscript{15} Primary metaphors are metaphors that are grounded in correlations in human experience, such as MORE IS UP, AFFECTION IS WARMTH, and PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS (Grady, 1997; Kövecses, 2010). Unlike similarity-based metaphors (e.g., IDEAS ARE FOOD and DEATH IS SLEEP), primary metaphors “do not offer a particular comprehension of the target domain. They do not in any substantial sense enable us to understand a more abstract concept” (Haser, 2005, p. 209).
CONTAINER, FORCE, VERTICALITY, SOURCE-PATH-GOAL, and BLOCKAGE are among the main image schemas that are employed for the metaphorical conceptualizations of the Persian key concepts and their various aspects. The CONTAINER schema is recruited in the formation of the BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and HARIM IS A CONTAINER/BOUNDED SPACE; The CONTAINER involved serves the purposes of keeping moral emotions inside it and protecting its content (moral values) against internal and external threats, functions which are vital to maintaining the form and power of moral values. Compared to the way the CONTAINER image schema is used and understood in the conceptualization of emotions in English (Kövecses, 1986, 1990), this schema has a more specific functioning in Persian. Given the significance attributed to moral virtues in Iranian culture, the protective role of the CONTAINER becomes the most salient feature of the schema used in the conceptualization of the moral emotions in Persian. This shows how universal, recurring patterns of physical experiences are assigned differential values and functions across cultures and languages (Gibbs, 1999; Kövecses, 2005).

The FORCE image schema characterizes the EMOTIONS ARE FORCES metaphor. It impels the rational-moral self to react to illegitimate desires, taboo behavior or face-threatening acts of others, and to react to the situations in which the other is in need of support/protection. A great deal of the force exerted upon the self is used to withstand various forms of taboo desires and behaviors (as in haya and effat) and to propel the self to tackle violations of moral values (as in gheirat ‘moral vigilance’). The FORCE schema applies in conjunction with the BLOCKAGE image schema. In fact, exerting force upon the self is supposed to result in a barrier placed between the self and taboo acts/desires (haya and effat) or in a barrier placed in front of others intending to violate taboos (gheirat). In addition to the HAYA IS A BARRIER, which is characterized by the BLOCKAGE schema, the metaphors GHEIRAT IS A CONTROLLING AUTHORITY and EFFAT IS A CURTAIN also imply this schema even though these metaphors mainly highlight the monitoring/authoritative role of gheirat and the concealing function of effat respectively.

The VERTICALITY image-schema is involved in the formation of the SPIRITUALITY/GOD IS UP and HAYA AND EFFAT ARE DOWN metaphors. This metaphorical understanding of the divine is not unique to Iranian culture. Cross-cultural studies indicate that metaphors for the divine consistently use descriptions of vertical space in both Christian and non-Christian religions (Haidt & Algoe, 2004; Previc, 2006). Experimental work in social psychology also reveals that representations of divinity rely on
metaphors related to vertical perception (Meier et al., 2007). Downward orientation pairs with *haya* and *effat*, forming the metonymy-based metaphor HAYA AND EFFAT ARE DOWN, which is consistently reflected in Iranians’ thought, speech, body and behavior (Khosravi, 2008; Milani, 1992, 2011). This is a primary metaphor in Iranian culture that indicates how culture makes use of spatial orientation to organize a cluster of key norms and values, establishing a reference point to facilitate making judgments on the personality and familial-social-religious status of people. Bourdieu’s (1977) ethnography of Kabyle similarly demonstrates how postures, cultural practices and social setting define OUTWARD and UP schemas as male and INWARD and DOWN as female (cited in Kimmel, 2008, p. 84).

The SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema is applied to both horizontal (MORAL ACTION IS MOVEMENT ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH) and vertical (REACHING MORAL PERFECTION IS MOVING ALONG A VERTICAL PATH) dimensions to depict morality, moral action, and the manner in which a person can achieve moral perfection or reach God.

The above findings are consistent with the claim that image schemas are inherently mediated and augmented by culture (Bernárdez, 2008; Kimmel, 2008) and that these cognitive forms do not only emerge out of universal kinesthetic experience or primary scenes as assumed in experiential realism (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). In Kimmel’s words:

> We need to recognize that image schemas are also acquired and refined by culture-specific practices throughout socialization. Bodily interaction with other bodies, social space or artifacts as well as bodily participation in rituals and everyday life, substantially flesh out each individual’s image-schematic inventory (2008, p. 83).

In cross-cultural studies, the body is regarded as a main source of metaphorical conceptualizations of abstract concepts (Kövecses, 2005; Maalej & Yu, 2011; Sharifian et al., 2008). The eye, blood veins, and *del* ‘heart/stomach’ are the bodily organs that are used as sources of figurative conceptualizations of moral concepts in Persian, lending support to the view that metaphors are grounded in the body (and culture). The conceptualizations also indicate the close relationship that exists between language, body, cognition, and culture.

In Persian, the eye is employed to conceptualize a variety of target meanings, such as emotions (love, envy, and greed) and character traits (willfulness, rudeness, and naiveté), as Sharifian’s (2011) study reveals. However, within the conceptual cluster investigated in this research, this bodily organ is seen as a potential source of committing sins and violating
social taboos. More specifically, the conceptualizations of the eye focus on the role of the eye in provoking sexual desire in men and women, reflecting the strong social condemnation of sexually charged looks at women. For this reason, lowering the head and casting down the eyes have turned into principal means of controlling sexuality and sexual desire in Iranian culture and a yardstick for evaluating the character of men and women (Milani, 1992, p. 25).

Blood veins are exclusively deployed as metaphorical CONTAINERS for gheirat, where gheirat is conceived of as the HEAT OF BLOOD or BLOOD COMPONENT. Furthermore, the jugular vein is an additional exclusive indicator of gheirat, which is manifested physiologically and metonymically conceptualized. In comparison with haya and effat, gheirat seems to recruit more varied types of metaphorical containers. In addition to blood veins, the body and del ‘heart/stomach’ are also conceived as containers for gheirat, whereas only the latter containers (the body and del) characterize haya and effat. The reason is that the body and del are general metaphorical containers for emotions in Persian (Sharifian, 2008) but the use of blood veins as containers is motivated by the characteristic properties of, and physiological responses associated with, gheirat. As the analysis indicated, gheirat is characterized by reaction, motion, and a sudden changeover to an intense emotional state, which involves an increase in blood circulation and the protrusion of the jugular vein. These physiological changes make blood veins and the jugular vein ideal sources of metonymic and metaphoric conceptualizations of this feeling, distinguishing it from haya and effat, which are characterized by a degree of passivity, and concealment.

As stated earlier, del is seen as a CONTAINER for the Persian moral concepts. Sharifian (2008) observes that the conceptualizations of del in Persian have originated from Iranian Traditional Medicine and the Sufi worldview, which is a spiritual belief system (p. 258). According to Iranian Traditional Medicine, the heart is the seat of ravân ‘soul/psyche’ and in Sufism the heart refers to the spiritual heart viewed as the site of knowledge and reason (ibid, pp. 259–260). In relation to haya, effat, and gheirat, del seems to reflect both of the above cultural models based on the evidence that conceptualizations of these concepts depict them as defining features of Iranians existing both in the body and psyche. Also, these moral values are believed to be indicative of possessing aghl ‘reason’. This conception differs from the way the heart is understood in English. In present-day English, the heart is regarded as “the center of feeling and the mind/brain as the center of thought” (Yu, 2008, p. 160), whereas in Iranian culture, this organ is simultaneously the seat of feelings, desires, character traits, and reasoning (Sharifian, 2008). A noteworthy point is that in Persian, the heart as the
seat of moral emotions is in harmony with the mind (common sense), which means that moral emotions are not in contrast with what the mind/brain commands. However, this harmony may only be peculiar to moral emotions because the other feelings and desires residing in the heart may go against what the mind sanctions and approves. Given the religious basis of moral emotions in Iranian culture, the impact of Islamic ideology in the conceptualizations of the heart cannot be overlooked. Maalej (2008) provides several examples from the Quran in which the heart does part of the mind’s work (the heart being the seat of understanding). Maalej observes that Islam does not dichotomize the heart and the intellect and in the Quran, the heart acts as a mediator between the body and the soul (p. 401). This religious model accounts for the coordination between the heart and the mind in the course of applying moral emotions in Iranian culture.

The other dimension of embodiment concerns the way socio-cultural models shape people’s physical experiences (Bernández, 2008; Maalej, 2004; Sinha & Jensen de López, 2000). The impact of cultural norms can be seen in the way the principles of haya and effat shape the manner of walking, looking, and even the tone of voice of Iranian men and women in various social contexts (Farahani, 2006; Khosravi, 2008; Naficy, 2000). The cultural models of HAYA and EFFAT have the effect of foregrounding the body, making it the object of awareness. This is particularly evident in the behavior of some Iranian women who check their headscarves and clothes to ensure that their body is properly covered up and their bodies would not catch the attention of men whatsoever when communicating with them. Milani (2011) illustrates the way haya shapes and impacts women’s movement and behavior in social space. She observes that

[a] woman who has hojb o haya maintains distance. When in public, she claims as little space as possible. Head downward, shoulders hunched, neck stiff, eyes modestly cast down, she blurs the outlines of her body and squeezes herself into a narrow space. She sinks into anonymity, disappears into her own shadow, fades into the background, remains silent, becomes generic, walking in small and measured steps that do not give her body the right to stretch out in space, holding herself close so that her hands do not swing freely in the air, she is the epitome of grace and poise, an aestheticized and eroticized image of self-containment (pp. 55–56).

Farahani (2006) explains how effat along with other social regulations defines the “normal body” for women in Iranian culture. She notes that a woman with a broken hymen (before marriage) is “defected, immoral, impure, and undesirable” (p. 197) and the demand for virgin status has led to the establishment of a dichotomy of chaste and honorable women on one hand and disreputable and non-honorable women on the other hand (p. 193). She adds
that collective moral imperatives (i.e., gheirat, haya, and effat) are enacted to maintain moral hegemony over women’s bodies and the intact hymen is a historically constructed sign of virginity that generates a monopoly on women’s sexual behaviors (p. 192).

Naficy (2000) maintains that hejab does not only veil the body and women must also veil themselves in more indirect ways. He observes that women must to some extent veil their voice, which includes using formal language with nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ men, “a decorous tone of voice, and avoidance of singing, boisterous laughter, and generally any emotional outburst in public other than the expression of grief or anger” (p. 562).

Khosravi (2008) notes that social control of the body through enforcing rules of modesty (collectively referred to haya and effat) “acts not only by covering hair and skin but also by de-sexualizing the body in public” (p. 48). He maintains that the modest body demonstrates the normative values of the social body, defines its social boundaries, and confirms its loyalty to the social order. He argues that through humiliating the self, the body and its desires, the social order is turned into a means of achieving self-abasement (ibi). Khosravi (ibid) holds that veiling does not only change the appearance of women but men also need to veil their bodies. Displaying the body, adorning the body by wearing ties, bowties, necklaces or earrings, having long hair, wearing short-sleeved shirts or shorts, and sexual gaze are against normative modesty for men (p. 45).

“Cultural embodiment” (Maalej, 2004) demonstrates a reversal in the direction of metaphorical mappings. El Refaie (2014) shows this process by analyzing visual and verbal metaphors of cancer in English. She concludes that when the body is foregrounded or problematized, it becomes the target of metaphorical conceptualizations such that “the direction of metaphorical mappings from embodied perceptions to more abstract experience is often reversed” (p. 119), instead fundamentally physical processes are understood in terms of WAR and JOURNEY source domains, which are less embodied than the symptoms associated with cancer. Maalej (2004) argues that many common anger metaphors in Tunisian Arabic referring to body parts (such as bones and testicles) do not show physiological changes when the person is angry. He notes that these body part terms have been associated with anger through cultural experiences and rituals. Likewise, metaphors of hejab demonstrate a reversal in the direction of metaphorical mappings. In this case, the body of women becomes the target of many of the metaphorical conceptualizations. The overarching metaphor WOMEN ARE PRECIOUS COMMODITIES is inferable from the
analysis of a variety of source domains that represent the conservatives’ attitudes toward the body of women and the functions that *hejab* is believed to perform to protect their bodies and preserve their social value. THE BODY AS A PRECIOUS COMMODITY metaphor justifies the recruitment of all major forces for keeping sexual desire under control.

Another way through which embodied imagination contributes to regulating social action is imagining what people might say or think when a given cultural taboo is to be violated. The fear, anxiety, or shame arising from such imaginations would give rise to *haya* and *effat* in individuals (Pasandideh, 2004, pp. 20–22). The conventional rhetorical question ‘what would people say/think about us?’ is often used to admonish the other of the outcomes of violating cultural norms. The rhetorical question reflects Iranians’ huge concern over the loss of their *äheru* in society (Fotouhi, 2015). The embodied imagination of people’s thoughts, speech, and reactions directs Iranians to avoid doing certain things and conceal some aspects of their lives from others. Fotouhi (2015) argues that “although censorship has always been externally imposed, gradually it has also become part of the Iranian discourse of communication” (p. 96). She adds that the fear of revealing too much information has led Iranians to self-censor (ibid). These observations corroborate the significance of paying attention to the role of the other individuals, the activities to be carried out, and the sociocultural component of the environment in shaping bodily experiences (Bernárdez, 2008, p. 150).

### 7.4.3 Metonymy and Persian key concepts

Metonymy plays at least four major roles in the construction and evaluation of the Persian key concepts. First, it links emotions with their physiological and behavioral responses via the EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy (Kövecses, 1986, 1990). The JUGULAR VEIN FOR GHEIRAT and LOWERING THE HEAD FOR HAYA are the realizations of this metonymy. Second, metonymy is involved in linking the key concepts with their most related concepts. The NÂMUS FOR GHEIRAT, GHEIRAT FOR CHIVALRY, SHARM ‘SHAME’ FOR THE IMAGINATION OF SHAME, HEJAB FOR EFFAT are among the main conceptual metonymies that fulfill this function. Third, motivated by the principles of *haya* and *effat*, metonymy becomes a major tool for censoring and camouflaging unpleasant, offensive, and taboo aspects of speech in Persian. *Effat e kalam* ‘chastity of speech’, which is a very important indicator of politeness in Persian (Khosravi, 2008), draws on metonymy to construct euphemisms. Fourth, metonymy provides a basis for categorizing and evaluating
women in terms of their hejab status (from the perspective of the conservatives). The HEJAB FOR THE CHADOR metonymy, which is a realization of the CATEGORY FOR MEMBER metonymy, is the one which fundamentally separates chador-wearing women from other Iranian women wearing other forms of hejab, assigning chador-wearing women with chastity, purity and social value, while viewing other forms of hejab as improper and framing improperly dressed women as lacking chastity and social value.

7.4.4 Categorization and Persian key concepts

Lexical items instantiate culturally constructed categories that demonstrate how cultural norms, values, and social relations are organized in different speech communities (Degani, 2017; Gaby, 2017; Sharifian, 2011, 2017). This research finds that mahram ‘intimate’ vs. nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ categorization constitutes the basis of interpersonal relationships between men and women in Iranian culture, restricting physical and emotional intimacy between them in social space. The bâ-bi ‘with-without’ categorization is the other fundamental principle that groups individuals in terms of whether they possess moral values, with significant outcomes for their social value and position. Prototypes which emerge from the categories of GHEIRAT, HAYA, EFFAT, and HEJAB also lend support to the idea that categories are not only embodied but also encultured, with prototypes acting as reference points in social cognition (Gibbs, 2003; Lakoff, 1987; Polzenhagen & Xia, 2015).

The relationship between the two forms of categorization could be that the latter (bâ-bi categorization) has evolved to maintain the former (mahram ‘intimate’ vs. nâmahram ‘non-intimate’ categorization). In other words, categorizing individuals according to perceived existence or non-existence of gheirat, haya, effat, and aberu, while indicating the high degree of importance that has been assigned to the separation of men and women in social interactions, provides the means to maintain the distance between them.

The binary categorization of people in terms of moral values (the bâ-bi categorization) works in conjunction with paragons defined for each of the values (Goldin, 2015, p. 34), that is, gheirat, haya, effat, aberu, and hejab as well as prototypes for the perceived categories (e.g., bâgheirat vs. bigheirat ‘having vs. lacking gheirat’, bâeffat vs. bieffat ‘having vs. lacking effat’). For example, Fatemeh, the Muslim Prophet’s daughter is the paragon of effat. She is a role model for many Muslim women who would adjust their conducts to the idealized moral features that have been assigned to her in Islamic texts (Shahidian, 2002, p. 92). As an example for the prototypical members of the binary
categories, a prototypical bàgheirat person would be a person who selflessly supports the others in need, promptly and fearlessly reacts to the violations of norms and values, and resists hardships on the way of achieving goals (Bakhtiar, 2015).

7.5 Concluding Remarks

This research investigated a cluster of cultural key concepts in Persian that jointly regulate the sexuality of Iranian men and women. The study focused on the concepts of GHEIRAT, HAYA, EFFAT, and HEJAB. It was hypothesized that these concepts are interrelated and jointly involved in restricting the sexuality of Iranians and that a cognitive linguistic analysis is indispensable to discovering the interrelatedness and cognitive-cultural functions of the concepts. To these ends, each concept was individually analyzed by paying special attention to the role of lexical collocates, categorization, figurative conceptualizations, and embodiment in the formation of the cultural models associated with each concept. The analysis of each of the concepts indicated that gheirat, haya, effat, and hejab are linguistically and hence conceptually interrelated. The interrelationship between the concepts was shown through lexical collocates and conceptual metaphors that these concepts share. Moreover, it was indicated that these concepts evaluate the morality of individuals by the same categorization system (i.e., the bâ-bi ‘with-without’ categorization). In addition, the body was indicated to be the meeting point and the main site for the joint realization of the Persian moral concepts. Last but not least, it was indicated that a larger conceptual network consisting of at least eight concepts (i.e., MAHRAMIYAT ‘legitimate intimacy’, GHEIRAT ‘moral vigilance’, HAYA ‘self-restraint’, EFFAT ‘chastity’, NAMUS ‘female family members’, ABERU ‘face/public image’, HARIM ‘holy space/border’, and HEJAB ‘veiling’) is involved in the emergence and operation of the cultural model of SEXUALITY in Persian.

The cognitive linguistic analysis of the Persian key concepts demonstrated that the interpersonal relationship between men and women in Iranian culture is restricted and controlled by the principle of mahramiyat ‘legitimate intimacy’, which pulls together gheirat ‘moral vigilance’, haya ‘self-restraint’, effat ‘chastity’, aberu ‘face/public image’, nâmus ‘female family members’, and harim ‘holy space/border’ in order to keep the sexes segregated. The analysis also indicated that hejab ‘veiling’ is the output or the realization of the interaction of the cluster members. This study finds that unraveling the complexity of cultural key concepts demands taking into account various bodily, cognitive, social-cultural, and discourse factors as well as concrete social actions that embody cultural models. The
cognitive linguistic analysis of cultural key concepts shed light on the dynamicity of the meaning of these concepts and revealed the inadequacies that pertain to their descriptions in anthropology, sociology, and gender studies. Moreover, metaphor was found to be indispensable to the structure of the Persian key concepts. Metaphor was indicated to be a crucial factor in representing the basic cognitive-cultural functions of the Persian key concepts, in highlighting their various aspects and in drawing distinctions between closely related concepts. Metaphor also provided the ground to show how culturally significant concepts are simultaneously and systematically represented in thought, speech, body, and behavior, which, in turn, can be taken as a solid proof to prove the keyness of the Persian key concepts.

This research attempted to show that cognitive linguistics has the capacity and the analytical tools to investigate aspects of culture. The cognitive linguistic framework can be used to complement the sociological and anthropological investigations of culture by illuminating the cognitive and linguistic processes that are involved in the construction of meaning in culture. The main feature of this type of cognitive linguistic analysis is that it pays equal attention to both cognitive operations and cultural underpinnings of conceptualizations, bringing it closer to the primary objective of cultural linguistics, which is exploring the cultural basis of conceptualizations that are encoded in features of human languages (Sharifian, 2017).

The cluster found in this study can be used as a conceptual template to compare mechanisms of self-regulation and controlling sexuality in other Muslim cultures as well as in cultures in which honor and chastity are significantly involved in the construction of people’s identity. The findings of the research can also be fruitfully used to research the motivations behind Islamic terrorism, intercultural miscommunication, the system of values Muslim immigrants in Europe live by, and the cultural roots of political conflicts between Muslim nations and the West.
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