Son of pigs, father of dogs: A cross-linguistic exploration of negative animal expressions

Loorbach, Lorenzo

Master Thesis

Faculty of Humanities

MA Linguistics

Son of pigs, father of dogs: A cross-linguistic exploration of negative animal expressions

Author: Lorenzo Loorbach

Supervisor: Dr. Felix Ameka

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

July 5th, 2021

Abstract

A number of different studies has demonstrated that animal expressions, often with metaphors as their basis, are a widespread phenomenon across the world's languages, and that they can be used to convey a wide variety of positive and negative meanings. This study investigates the negative connotations and metaphorical associations of five animals from a comparative and cross-linguistic perspective, to see if there are noticeable patterns among different languages. The factors influencing the development of metaphors and connotations are also explored. The data was collected from previous publications on the subject and compiled in an overview showing negative animal expressions from 61 languages. The results showed that genealogical relations increase the chances of connotations being shared between languages, and that geography and religion can also be of influence. The amount of internal variation also indicates that there is a degree of arbitrariness with regard to the development of metaphors.

Keywords: animal metaphors, connotations, negative expressions, swearing

Index

1. Introduction

The close relationship between humans and animals throughout the millennia has resulted in animals playing many different roles in both cultures and languages around the world. Many religions and mythologies feature or incorporate animal figures to varying degrees of extent, and with varying associations of good, evil, or both. Animals are often featured as symbols on flags or emblems, representing a nation, group, or society. Cultural perceptions of, and relationships with, different animals are therefore naturally highly divergent. These collective perceptions and associations are almost inevitably reflected in the language or languages used within a particular culture. Just as the cultural attitude towards a certain animal is often conveyed through actions or customs, it is similarly conveyed through language. Idioms, proverbs, phrases and other expressions which contain conceptualizations or metaphors relating to animals can be used in positive or negative ways, or sometimes both. For this study, the focus will be laid on the negative: phrases and expressions incorporating animal names or animal metaphors used to either swear and insult or otherwise express negative feelings.

1.1 Research goals

The present paper will attempt to produce a typological overview of negative animal connotations in languages and cultures around the world. While this is by no means the first study to look at animal expressions or metaphors – there are numerous studies investigating animal metaphors in a particular language, as well as some studies doing the same from a cross-linguistic perspective – the present study aims to take a more comparative approach, incorporating data from a greater variety of languages to identify possible underlying patterns. The research question for this paper, and a follow-up side question, are formulated as such:

- *What patterns can be observed in the cross-linguistic use of negative animal expressions with regard to cultural attitudes towards animals?*
- *Which factors are of influence to the development of animal metaphors within a language and culture?*

The aim of this study will thus be to explore the ways in which negative perceptions of animals in various cultures are reflected through expressions in different languages, and if there are noticeable patterns in terms of similarities or differences between them. These expressions come in many forms; by virtue of them being negative, a significant part of the data concerns different forms of swearing (in the sense of insulting or profane language, not in the sense of promising or oath-taking). Aside from that, the present study will also look at proverbs, sayings and other linguistic expressions that somehow convey negative connotations of animals. Since conceptual metaphors are the basis for many of these expressions, a part of the discussion will be centered around them. These topics will be approached from a typological and descriptive perspective. The data for this study were collected from a variety of academic and non-academic sources; many of them dealing with topics similar to that of the present study, mainly describing animal metaphors or swearing practices in one or more languages. Data collection also largely focused on those topics, although studies on metaphor in general and the role of animals in culture were also part of the consulted literature.

Although phrasal morphosyntax will occasionally be mentioned in passing during the discussion of the data, a comprehensive discussion of the morphology and syntax of different examples is not included here, as it would distract from the main topic. The same goes for a discussion of swearing terminology; as publication like Jay (2020) have stated, when discussing swearing and linguistic taboos across languages, it is important to distinguish different kinds of swearing, based on their manner of use or semantic themes. While this is certainly a good rule to adhere to for studies where swearing is the focus, in this study, it is only one aspect of the broader discussion; while swearing expressions in many languages will be discussed, it is the animals that are mentioned and the connotations and meanings that are attached to them that will be the focus of the discussion. Although different types of swearing are occasionally mentioned in passing during the presentation of the data, no further distinction between them will be made.

The rest of this chapter will give an overview of previous studies on animal metaphors and swearing, and goes into some of the issues that arose during research, and how these were dealt with. The next chapter will be devoted to metaphors and swearing, discussing how (animal) metaphors can arise and how they are often categorized by different authors, as well as how they can play an important role in the swearing practices of a language. In chapter 3, the results of the study are presented; various negative animal expressions are showcased and discussed. In chapter 4, these data will be discussed with regard to the patterns that may exist, in terms of either notable similarities or notable differences between the various languages and cultures that are represented by the data. The fifth and final chapter will try to make concluding remarks, with regard to the study in general and to the research questions, and ideas for further research will be proposed.

1.2 Previous studies

As several authors have pointed out (e.g. Deignan et al. 1997; Fontecha & Jiménez Catalán 2003), the study of metaphor within linguistics and other social sciences has increased significantly since the publication of books like Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors we live by* (1980) and Lakoff and Turner's *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor* (1989). More recent publications like Kövecses' *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2010) have kept the trend going. While metaphor is naturally a complex subject, many authors have focused on a particular area within the larger field of study, namely the presence of animal metaphors in language, and how they show cross-linguistic similarities and differences. In recent years, this has also been treated in conjunction with the study of swearing and insults in different languages. Animal metaphors are an important part of the swearing vocabulary of countless languages, and a variety of studies has dealt with these subjects from a range of perspectives.

The publications that were consulted for this study can be roughly divided into six categories: those that study metaphors and their role and use in culture and language in general; those that discuss swearing as a general topic; those that delve into animal metaphors as they appear in a particular language or language variety; those that study the swearing practices of a particular language or language variety; those that compare either animal metaphors or swearing practices – or both – in two or more different languages; and finally those that discuss animals with regard to human history (i.e. their domestication) or human culture, without going much further into their metaphorical representation as present in the respective culture. Because

the final category is of marginal importance compared to the others, the publications consulted for those topics will not be mentioned in the following section. It should be noted that these are not rigid categories; for example, the discussions of animal metaphors and swearing practices in a language often overlap, as well as how either or both of these are linked to the cultural practices of a language community.

Previous publications regarding metaphors include the aforementioned works by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff & Turner (1989) and Kövesces (2010). Deignan et al. (1997) highlight the importance of understanding metaphors and properly learning them while learning a second language, while Deignan (2003) offers an interesting perspective on the way in which metaphors can arise and diverge within cultures. Martsa (1999) takes this somewhat further by looking at how animal metaphors in particular can arise and how one can categorize them. Fraser (1981) touches on the topic of animals as swear words in study researching the possible difficulties of swearing in a second language. The study of swearing in general, often with English as the language in question and delving into a variety of subtopics, has led to publications like Allan & Burridge (2006a; 2006b) and Jay (2020).

Studies consulted for this paper that discussed the swearing practices of a particular language or language variety, without a specific focus on animals, include the following: Barus et al. (2018) who investigated different linguistic taboos among the Karo people of Indonesia; Hughes (2006), which is a comprehensive overview of swearing in the English language; Boudot-Lamotte (1974), Masliyah (2001) and Lakusta (2019) exploring the swearing practices of Maghrebi Arabic, Iraqi Arabic and Egyptian Arabic, respectively; finally, Senft (2010) has a chapter devoted to the swearing practices of speakers of Kilivila on the Trobriand Islands.

Previous studies that examined the use of animals names and metaphors in the expressions and proverbs of a particular language or language variety are quite abundant. Those that focused on animal metaphors that were consulted for this study include: Aliakbari & Faraji's 2014 study of animal metaphors in the Khezeli dialect of Kurdish; Halupka-Rešetar & Radić's 2003 paper on animal names used as forms of address in Serbian; Brandes (1984), discussing animal metaphors as a means of social control in the Mexican community of Tzintzuntzan; Howard & Rensel (1991), who investigate the use of animal metaphors in the Rotuman language; O'Donnell (1990) with a study on animal expressions in French; and finally Harjula (1994) and Ọlátéjú (2005) dealing with, respectively, Meru and Yoruba animal metaphors.

Several studies have taken a cross-linguistic perspective, taking into account two or more languages. These include Al-Kajela (2017), discussing language attrition with regard to animal metaphors for bilingual speakers of Canadian English and Neo-Aramaic; Rakusan (2004) exploring animal metaphors in Germanic and Slavic languages; Fontecha & Jiménez Catalán (2003) and Rodríguez (2009), who compared particular animal swear words in English and Spanish with regard to gender roles; Kleparski's 2002 study comparing Hungarian animal metaphors with those found in a variety of other European languages; Kiełtyka & Kleparski (2007) performing a similar study comparing Chinese and Indo-European animal metaphors; Chen & Chen (2011) and Hsieh (2006), comparing Chinese animal expressions with English and German animal expressions, respectively; Nesi (1995), who made a cross-linguistic comparison of figurative animal meanings; Barasa & Opande (2017), exploring animal metaphors as they occur in proverbs of the Gusii and Bukusu languages; MD Rashid et al.

(2012) explore the metaphorical use of farm animals in Malay and Arabic expressions; Talebinejad & Dastjerdi's 2005 study on animal metaphors in English and Persian; Haslam et al. (2011) investigating the offensiveness of animal insults in particular; Matusz's 2019 study on animal swearing in a number of different languages; and finally Ljung (2010) and Beers Fägersten & Stapleton (2017), two examples of large-scale cross-linguistic studies on swearing.

As was mentioned in the previous section, all of these publications taken together made significant contributions to the study of (animal) metaphors, animal expressions and swearing. This study aims to build on the data provided by them and combine those data to create an overview these topics, in order to discuss them from a comparative perspective. While publications like Kleparski (2002), Kiełtyka & Kleparski (2007) and Matusz (2019) have already made important progress in this aspect, the present study attempts to expand upon their work. The fact that animal expressions and metaphors are sometimes shared between languages and cultures has already been established, but any underlying patterns among them, or the reason behind them, has not been researched as much. That is where this study seeks to provide more insight.

1.3 Challenges of the study

An immediate challenge that arises when undertaking a research project of this sort is the seeming overabundance of supposed available data: there are hundreds if not thousands of animal species with which humans have had moderate to intense contact with over the millennia, and as a result of that, thousands of animal-related expressions exist in as possibly as many languages. Languages with a large number of speakers may also showcase dialectical or regional variation in terms of words and expressions used. While only a small portion of those has been documented for a number of languages, the combined data may still result in a substantial collection. An attempt to document these expressions with even a little regard for inclusivity in terms of different languages and animals is therefore a significant undertaking, the scope of which exceeds the one of this study.

With this issue in mind, similar to some other publications discussing this topic (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007; MD Rashid et al. 2012; Matusz 2019), the majority of the discussion will revolve around a select number of animals, which are deemed to be widespread enough amongst the world's cultures to have influenced them and their language(s), namely dogs, cats, cows, pigs, and donkeys. These animals have coexisted with humans in a domestic sphere for thousands of years, so their relationship with humans can be considered to be the strongest (Frantz et al. 2020: 1). Although cows and pigs, are not represented homogeneously throughout the world in terms of species or varieties, some of their region-specific types (e.g. buffaloes) will be included in the discussion for the sake of comparison. In addition, some animals that are usually considered 'wild' – i.e., existing largely outside of areas inhabited by humans, or falling outside of the domestic sphere – will also be discussed if their respective connotations in a particular culture or language serve as an interesting point of comparison.

Seeing as negative animal expressions often take on the form of swearing, sources about the swearing practices of particular languages were generally deemed quite useful. For some languages which have long been the subject of intense study, such as English, Spanish, or German, books showcasing the wealth of swear words in those languages have already been written (e.g. Hughes 2006; Munier & Eberhardt 2009; Munier & Tichelli 2008a, 2008b; Munier

& Martinez 2008; also worth mentioning is Sacher (2012) for a cross-linguistic but non-academic overview of swearing). However, sources like these usually treat animal-related swearing as one category of a larger swearing vocabulary; rarely is it the main topic of a publication. As has been pointed out by some authors (e.g. Fraser 1981, Matusz 2019), the topic of linguistic taboo and swearing has only recently been the subject of academic study, and while many interesting studies have been undertaken in the past decades, they tend to focus on specific sociolinguistic aspects of swearing; descriptive overviews of swearing practices in a language, similar to the books mentioned above, are less common. Fortunately, there are increasingly many studies investigating animal metaphors as they occur in different languages; these studies often contain useful data on animal-related swearing or other negative animal expressions.

An additional challenge is the small amount of documentation done on many smaller and/or endangered languages; even if a grammar or (partial) language description exists for such language, an overview of linguistic taboos or animal metaphors within that language is unlikely to exist, although there are exceptions to this (see e.g. Howard & Rensel 1991; Senft 2010). Many of these languages are spoken by communities that, relative to most speakers of larger languages, have historically spent (or still spend) more time in rural or remote areas, in closer vicinity to nature; it might be expected that such exposure to nature and biodiversity has led to a greater amount of animal-related expressions in those languages than in languages whose speaker communities have experienced industrialization or lived in larger societies for a longer time. In the end however, figurative expressions involving animals exist in all languages, big and small, so while an attempt has been made to use data from a diverse array of languages and cultures, they are all treated as equally valuable.

2. Metaphor, Swearing and Culture

Metaphor forms a major cornerstone of cultural concepts and practices, and the way they relate to language. This chapter will briefly discuss the ways in which metaphors can arise within a language, and how they can stand in relation to swearing practices. The particular topic of animal metaphors, similarly in conjunction with swearing, will also be discussed here without taking into account data from a particular language.

2.1 How metaphors arise

For some time now, various authors have stated that metaphors are a pervasive mechanism of discourse and cognition, structuring the way we think, and not just a collection of stylistic figures to embellish one's expressions (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Kövecses 2010; Chen & Chen 2011: 123). In most publications, a distinction is made between conceptual metaphors, which often take the form of the underlying formula of "A is B", "A" being a target domain and "B" being a source domain, and linguistic metaphors, which are the words and expressions in a language that result from the metaphoric models (Kövecses 2010: 4). Common source domains besides the animal kingdom include the human body, plants, buildings, cooking and food, temperature, and light and dark; some frequently used target domains are abstract concepts like emotion, thought, life and death, time, society, culture, and so on (Kövecses 2010: 18-26). With the enormous variety of cultures and languages that exists around the world, a corresponding divergence in conceptual and linguistic metaphors is unsurprising. Studies like Deignan et al. (1997: 353-355) and Talebinejad & Dastjerdi (2005: 139) have noted that there are a number of possible outcomes when comparing (animal) metaphors between languages: the same conceptual metaphor, along with the consequent linguistic metaphors, exists in two (or more) languages; the same conceptual metaphor exists in two or more languages, but is expressed through different linguistic metaphors; different conceptual metaphors are used to express the same concept in different languages; and finally, words and expressions with a similar or equivalent literal meaning in two languages are used to express different conceptual metaphors.

Although there are likely several parallels in the conception and development of, for example, building metaphors and animal metaphors, those based on animal are particular because they are often used to say something about humans themselves, but using non-human creatures as a medium of reflection and representation. There is often a case of bidirectionality in terms of the traits or connotations that are projected. As Kövecses (2010: 153) states, "humans attributed human characteristics to animals and then reapplied these characteristics to humans. That is, animals were personified first, and then the 'human-based animal characteristics' were used to understand human behavior". Animal metaphors are also based on folk genera, i.e. a culture's specific knowledge about and experience with certain animals (Martsa 1999: 74-76). These do not necessarily follow the "A is B" formula of conceptual metaphors, which points out particular attributes of a source domain, but rather they point to the salience of a source domain situation, i.e. situations with which the animal in question is often associated (Deignan 2003: 266). Martsa also points out that most animal metaphors, as a cultural and linguistic expression of folk genera, can be categorized under several thematic parts or properties: APPEARANCE, HABITAT, BEHAVIOR, and RELATION TO PEOPLE (Martsa 1999: 77). These thematic parts "can be said to conceived of as constituents of the

knowledge people possess about *folk genera*" (1999: 77, italics in original). As can be seen in the next chapter, the great majority of animal metaphors are based on the APPEARANCE and BEHAVIOR themes. Several publications base their research on, or otherwise address the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING, as it was formulated by Lakoff and Turner (1989). It is conceptualized as a hierarchy of things in the world, with humans taking the top position, followed by animals, plants, complex objects and natural physical things. Although it is not a metaphor in and of itself, it becomes a metaphor when a concept on one level of the chain is used to understand a concept on another level of the chain; in this case, animals (a lower-level concept) are used to understand humans (a higher-level concept) (Kövecses 2010: 154). This overarching system is also the basis for many animal-related swear words, as will be shown in the next section.

As was stated in the introduction, the variety of metaphors that exists across languages can be linked to the variety of cultures that exist in the world. While it may seem obvious that different cultures will develop different metaphors, the subtle similarities and differences that can be observed among them are worthy of more discussion. Deignan (2003) has provided a comprehensive exploration of the subject. As she states in the introduction of her article, all humans experience the same bodily sensations, but cross-cultural differences may cause them to be interpreted differently by different people, if they are acknowledged of differentiated at all (2003: 255-256). The same naturally applies to animals and how they are perceived. Even in relatively similar cultures in which an animal, e.g. the horse, has played a similar or identical role, there can still be many differences in terms of how metaphors related to this animal develop; in other words, a degree of arbitrariness has to be accepted. Two similar cultures may be aware of the salient aspects and attributes of a source domain and still develop different expressions based on the same concept or diverge in what they make expressions about (2003: 267). While it is tempting to treat the metaphors of a culture and language as relatively uniform, it is important to keep in mind that "conceptualizations of animal-based metaphors are shared, however not necessarily equally shared by all the members of a cultural group, because they are governed by individual experiences and predilections" (Al-Kajela 2017: 97).

2.2 Animals as verbal abuse

The ubiquity and utility of animals as sources for metaphors, as well as metonymy and swear words, is recognized by a variety of authors, including Kleparski (2002), Rakusan (2004), Chen & Chen (2011), Haslam et al. (2018), and Matusz (2019). This section will briefly discuss the ideas surrounding animal metaphors and how they are used as swear words.

Several studies have pointed out that animal metaphors are more often used in a negative sense, and mammals are by far the group that is most often referred to, seeing as they are genetically and socially closest to us, meaning that they are the prime group of animals to be ascribed certain qualities, by which they can then be used as a point of comparison, or a source of offensiveness (Chen & Chen 2011: 123; Talebinejad & Dastjerdi 2005: 135; Kleparski 2002: 25; Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 89). However, as Haslam et al. (2018: 313) note, comparing someone to an animal that is genetically further removed from humans than mammals, say an insect or a fish, may also be offensive because of the implied inhumanity of the addressee. A seemingly important aspect of animal-related verbal abuse is that there are preferred degrees of specificity: as Martsa (1999: 75) points out, calling someone an animal or a dog is more effective in insulting them than calling them a poodle or a corgi. The more well-

known a species term is, the more offensive weight it may carry. The great intercultural variety of metaphorical associations also has as a result that some concepts or things will have a strong negative connotation for some people, but a positive connotation for others. In situations where bilingualism is at play, this may lead to instances where someone complimenting their conversation partner in the latter's language actually insults them, or vice versa (Fraser 1981: 436).

Ljung (2010: 133) argues that certain animals, such as dogs, pigs and donkeys, carry too many metaphorical meanings to be classified as swear words as they are defined in his book, even though they are frequently used as insults in many languages. His criteria for what constitutes swearing are: the word(s) or phrase(s) must contain taboo words; these are used in a non-literal sense; they are subject to constraints on different levels, i.e. they are often formulaic in nature; the word(s) or phrase(s) should reflect the speaker's emotions or attitudes (2010: 4). It would seem, however, that the use of animal names in swearing only fails to adhere to the first criterium, namely that these words are generally not considered taboo. While it is true that in most languages, animal names are only considered negative or taboo in certain contexts, there is something to be said for how different certain animals are perceived depending on a culture and language. General negative perception of something, in this case a certain animal, does naturally not mean that all mentions in everyday discourse of that animal will be considered as negative or taboo, but it is not unthinkable that the underlying associations with the animal are of some influence. The fact that some animal names can be used, and *are* used, to insult people or add emotive strength to an expression, albeit often with some figurative connotation, would seem reason enough to consider them to be part of a language's optional swearing vocabulary. In addition to that, they often feature in formulaic expressions, and, by virtue of them often being metaphoric, they are virtually always used in a non-literal sense, so it would not seem inappropriate to label them as (optional) swear words. While it is certainly good to adhere to established definitions and categories when discussing subjects such as these, cases like these can be indicative of the fact that sometimes such a topic eludes the established definition to a degree.

It should be pointed out that, while both animal metaphors and swearing are under discussion in this paper, not all animal-related swear words are metaphors, and not all animal metaphors are insults. The latter is perhaps the most obvious; as can be seen in many of the publications consulted, a great deal of animals is ascribed positive metaphorical qualities. The former is more dependent on the way in which an animal is used in an expression: if someone is directly compared to, for instance, a dog or a pig, the associated traits of those animals are metaphorically ascribed to the addressee. But some of the swear words and insults that will be discussed in chapter 3 may follow formulae like 'you son of [animal]!' or 'go fuck a [animal]!'. In these instances, the source of offensiveness is the association with an animal in general; the speaker claims that the addressee is less than human or wishes that the addressee should dehumanize themselves in a way. This again follows the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor, where humans are the 'highest' beings, and the association with 'lower' beings as proposed by the insults is what makes them offensive. In summary, as Haslam et al. states, "offensiveness derives both from the transfer of reviled characteristics from taboo animals to metaphor targets and from the positioning of the target as literally less than human, even when the animal in question is not taboo" (2018: 318).

3. Negative animal expressions in different languages

The following chapter will delve into the great variety of animal expressions used by different languages. For each animal, a short introduction discussing their history and general relationship with humans will be given. Then, an overview of their various metaphorical conceptualizations and cultural connotations will be presented, grouped by language family. For some languages, only a small amount of relevant data – no more than a couple of words or phrases, often without connotations – could be collected; those languages with small amounts of data will be grouped together at the end of each section, disregarding their genealogical or geographical aspects.

An attempt will be made to discuss different languages with equal attention given to all, but not all publications consulted are equally detailed with their examples or the surrounding linguistic and/or cultural discussion, and some articles discuss the subject with a particular focus (such as gender-based distinctions or proverbs), so in some cases there will be a difference in the amount of data discussed per language or culture. Although morphology or syntax are not the focus of this discussion, if the examples taken from a particular publication have linguistic glosses provided alongside them, those glosses will be reproduced here. At the end of the chapter, the data will be compiled into tables which try to sort and categorize the various connotations and metaphorical meanings that have come up during the research, in order to create a relatively comprehensive overview. This will only be done for those languages for which the data include known connotations of animal names; data taken from sources like Sacher (2012), which generally do not include any information on the metaphorical value of the data, are excluded in that section.

In several languages under discussion here, one does not even have to refer to a specific animal if they want to insult someone or negatively remark on someone's behavior: calling them an 'animal' or a 'beast' already conveys the speaker's judgement, indicating an uncivilized, irrational or even cruel individual. This is the case for, among others, English, French (*bête* 'beast', also meaning 'stupid, silly'), and Spanish (*bestia* 'beast', *animal* 'animal'), but also for some African languages like Yoruba (*ẹranko* 'animal'), Ewe (*Gbe-me-lã* [bush-inside-animal] 'undomesticated animal' or just *lã* 'animal') and Akan (*aboa* 'animal') (O'Donnell 1990: 515; Rodríguez 2009: 81; Brandes 1984: 211; Ọlátéjú 2005: 370; Ameka 2020: 128).

3.1 Dogs

The domestic dog was the first wild animal to be domesticated from wolves by humans, possibly as early as 15,000 years ago, and has consequently developed arguably the strongest relationship and connection to humans out of all animals, both through time and across many cultures (Frantz et al. 2020: 1). Its ability to be trained in various skills and forms of aid and assistance has made the dog an important companion to humans. The great variety of dog breeds that exists today is testament to the degree with which humans interacted with dogs and treated them; different dog breeds have, both historically and in the present day, fulfilled a wide range of roles alongside humans, such as hunting companions, guard animals, assistants to people with disabilities, or simply as pets. Given their millennia long coexistence with humans,

it should come as no surprise that dogs feature frequently in cultural and religious canons around the world. Therefore, this animal will be the first under discussion.

In many parts of the Western world, dogs are kept as pets by humans; in addition to that, they may fulfill a variety of helping roles in different areas of human life. While this positive connection to humans is reflected in English phrases such as "loyal dog" or the nickname "man's best friend", words for dogs are, curiously, also some of the oldest and most frequently used ones to insult people or swear with, with a variety of similar connotations appearing in different European languages. In English, particularly the American and British varieties, the word *bitch* , meaning 'female dog', and the derived expression *son of a bitch*, are some of the most commonly used insults, having been in use since the 14th century, originally to denote promiscuous or mean women, but later becoming used for men as well. In recent times its meaning has become more generalized, as shown by expressions such as 'that couch will be a bitch to move', and the verb *to bitch* is now also used in the sense of 'to complain' (Hughes 2006: 23-24). The centuries-old practice of breeding dogs to produce specialized breeds fit for hunting or simply for aesthetic purposes has also led to words like *mongrel* and *cur*, both meaning 'degenerate' or 'half-breed', which were used to insult people who were perceived to be cowardly, surly, quarrelsome, uncivil, or a range of other negative qualities; both words fell out of use in the 18th and 19th centuries, however (Hughes 2006: 137).

German and Dutch, being closely related Germanic languages, also have very similar uses of the word for dog, *Hund* and *hond*, respectively. When used to address someone directly, *Hund*/*hond* take on the meaning of 'mean/strongly disliked person'. This can be combined with a variety of adjectives to give more nuance or impact to the phrase: German *blöder Hund* 'stupid dog' and Dutch *gore hond* 'dirty dog' (DWDS, "Hund"; Kleparski 2002: 14). In both languages it is possible to form compound swear words, combining a descriptor or modifier and a noun used for swearing, in this case *Hund*/*hond* (Matusz 155-156). German seems to have a predilection for scatological or other animal-related modifiers, whereas Dutch frequently employs words for diseases as swear words. This leads to a larger variety of possible insults in these languages; examples include German *Schweinhund* 'lit. pig-dog', *Dreckhund* 'filthy dog' and Dutch *rothond* 'rotting dog', *kankerhond* 'cancer-dog' (Sacher 2012, "Animals around the world"). Both German and Dutch also allow for the word for dog to be used in adjectival compound phrases indicating negative value, such as German *Hundearbeit* 'hard, unpleasant (lit. dog's) work' *hondenweer* 'bad (lit. dog's) weather' (DWDS, "Hundearbeit"). Both languages also use their respective words for dog as a substitute for 'nothing' or 'nobody': compare German *kein Hund war zu Hause* 'not a dog (= nobody) was home' and Dutch *dat kan geen ene hond wat schelen* 'that doesn't matter to a single dog (= anybody)' (DWDS, "Hund").

French employs dog-related insults and expressions similar to those found in English, German and Dutch. *Chien*/*chienne* 'dog/female dog' can both be used to insult others directly, with *chien* having connotations of meanness and selfishness, and *chienne* having more sexual connotations; being used in about the same way as English *bitch* or *slut* (C. Socroun, personal communication, April 19 2021). *Nom d'un chien* 'damn, hell (lit. 'name of a dog')', as a euphemistic form of *nom de Dieu* 'God's name', is used as an interjection in a similar fashion to *son of a bitch* in English (O'Donnell 1990: 517; Ljung 2010: 79). Two productive forms,

chien(ne) de [noun] and *[noun] de chien(ne)*, can both be used to add a negative load to the noun in question, comparable to the English phrase *a bitch of a …*, e.g. *temps de chien* 'bad weather', *vie de chien* 'dog's life', *chienne de grippe* 'a bitch of a flu' (O'Donnell 1990: 517, 521-522). Although Spanish seems to have less widely applicable forms of swearing that involve a word for 'dog', the masculine *perro* 'male dog' and feminine *perra* 'bitch' are frequently used insults, comparable in use to the equivalent words in English. *Perra* is used towards mean, spiteful or despicable women, as well as prostitutes, whereas *perro* appears to be used towards ugly women, a gluttonous person, or someone who is generally disliked. As with many other languages, *hijo de perra* 'son of a bitch' is consequently also used as an insult (Kleparski 2002: 11; Rodríguez 2009: 83, 85; Matusz 2019: 153-154; Brandes 1984: 211).

Some Slavic languages like Polish, Russian, and Serbian display some strong similarities in terms of the swear that are used by their speakers. Insults or swears involving dogs are no different. A widely used swear word in Russian is сука *cyka* 'bitch', which can be used towards both men and women, with an intended meaning of 'mean, impudent person'. The Polish cognate *suka* 'bitch' is equally widely used, with a similar meaning, although it is generally reserved for women. *Pies*, the Polish word for a male dog, is considered less profane, although it is still used in the sense of 'mean person' (Kleparski 2002: 12). A Polish expression showcasing the negative associations with dogs is *pies z kulawą nogą* 'a lame dog' > 'nobody' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 93). Polish also has the phrase *psa krev* 'dog's blood', which is used as an interjection similar to English *goddamnit* (Ljung 2010: 82). Other insults often involve the addressee's mother and her sexual relations with dogs: Polish *twoja stara ciągnie psu* 'your mother blows (lit. pulls) a dog' and Russian пёс ёб твою мать *pyos yob tvoyu mat'* 'a male dog fucks your mother' (Sacher 2012, ch. 1, "Your mother and her relations with the animal kingdom"). Like many other languages, insulting someone's ancestry is also frequently done by mentioning dogs: Polish has *psi syn* 'a son of a dog' and *sukinsyn* 'a son of a bitch' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 94). Interestingly, although Serbian uses a wide range of animal names as forms of address in both positive and negative senses, and with gender-based semantic differences, words for dogs are almost completely absent from Serbian vocatives (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1900). However, dogs are still used in insulting expressions such as *jebo ti pas mater* 'a dog fucks your mother' (sic) (Sacher 2012, ch. 1, "Your mother and her relations with the animal kingdom"; a more accurate translation would be 'fuck your dog mother'). Similar insults in other Slavic languages are mentioned below, in the list of dog-related insults taken from Sacher (2012).

In Persian, as in English, dogs have both positive and negative metaphorical associations. While their faithfulness is a characteristic for which they are praised in Persian folk literature, their perceived stubbornness is also reason for Persian speakers to call people with a die-hard attitude 'dogs' (Talebinejad & Dastjerdi 2005: 138-139). 'A dog('s) life' is a metaphor that is also known in Persian: *vaghti ba ou kar mikardam zendegim mesle sag boud* 'When I was working under him he led me a dog life' (2005: 145). A more direct insult using 'dog' is seen in the phrase *mardar sag* (sic) 'your mother is a dog' (Sacher 2012, ch. 1, "Your mother and her relation to the animal kingdom"; the Persian phrase would more likely be rendered as *madarat sag ast*). In the Khezeli Kurdish dialect spoken in western Iran, dogs can be used metaphorically to describe people in many different ways, with some connotations being based on physical appearance, but most of them on behavior. In terms of physical

appearance, someone with a big head and/or thin build is considered ugly, and will be compared to dog. Furthermore, perceived cruelty, bad-temperedness, shamelessness, worthlessness, arrogance, dirtiness, and talkativeness will also cause someone to be called a dog (Aliakbari & Faraji 2014).

On the island group of Rotuma in Polynesia, the cultural values of the inhabitants are reflected by a great variety of expressions in the Rotuman language (a member of the Austronesian family), some of which incorporate dogs (Howard & Rensel 1991: 129). Improper social behavior, such as staring at food while it is being served, or indiscriminately calling out to someone on the street, will cause the offender to be likened to a dog: *käm pa vär sui* '[the] dog wants to bite a bone'; *käm au sala* 'a dog that barks on the road' (1991: 131). A less frivolous metaphor is used when the bad behavior is related to sexual conduct; when a man emotionally toys with a woman, alternatively seducing and discharging her, he is compared to a 'dog [that] returns to its vomit': *käm ta ho'ien se 'on mumuaf ta* (1991: 132). In Kilivila, an Austronesian language spoken on the Trobriand Islands near New Guinea, men can be insulted by the expression *kukweya ka'ukwa* 'fuck a dog', although some other animals can also be used in the same place. People who have grown up fatherless, and who have thus not received the parental care their father is supposed to give them, may be called *latula ka'ukwa* 'child of a dog', implying that the person is bad or unfortunate (Senft 2010: 23-24).

Speakers of Gusii, a Bantu language spoken in western Kenya, have various proverbs in which the bad behavior of dogs is commented upon, using ill-behaved dogs as a metaphor for women that are perceived to be ill-mannered or a bad influence on men. These proverbs are strongly reflective of the cultural attitude towards women in Gusii speaker communities (Barasa & Opande 2017: 91-93).

- *Esese eaberi n'yarusetie entwoni Bogere* 'A female dog made the male dog come all the way from Luo land' (a region inhabited by the Luo, a Nilotic people). This proverb implies that a man's evil actions are provoked by a woman, and that a woman is thus ultimately responsible for bad things happening.
- *Esese embe teri na ande agiya* 'A bad dog has no good place'. This saying equates women to bad dogs, who are not welcome anywhere; a person with bad manners will not improve them based on where they are.
- *Esese entindi n'ya ngori ntambe* 'A vicious dog is tethered with a long rope', meaning that people who are ill-mannered or who have a bad temper should be avoided.
- *Tonkora buna esese ya mochie onde* 'Do not treat me like a strange dog'. Here a dog showcasing strange behavior is compared to a disregarded woman, since both are generally treated badly or chased away.

Among speakers of Yoruba, many different animals including dogs are ascribed a variety of metaphorical characteristics. Although animal names are not used frequently in everyday speech to directly insult people – they often appear in Yoruba poetry or as indirect forms of address – some animals carry negative connotations, sometimes in addition to positive ones. Dogs themselves (*ajá* in Yoruba) are mostly perceived as having negative characteristics; they are associated with promiscuity, are thought of as being uncritical followers, and as having no table manners. (Ọlátéjú 2005: 378, 380-381).

Whereas different European languages showcase various nuances with regard to the negative connotations attached to dogs, the different dialects of Arabic have a great degree of consistency with regard to meaning; dogs are considered impure by Islam, and their barking is supposed to scare away angels from houses (Boudot-Lamotte 1974: 60). Their strongly negative connotation of impurity and filthiness is also reflected in Arabic insults, where 'dog' is one of the most severe terms one can use (Masliyah 2001: 293-294). In Maghrebi Arabic, a dialect continuum spoken across Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya, several insults exist that directly label the addressee(s) as a dog (*Yā kəlb* 'dog') or the offspring of a dog (*Yā ulạ̄d əl-klạ̄b* 'son of a dog'), or that accuse them of being of detestable origin – i.e. a dog: *sās əl-kəlb* 'contemptible origin [from a dog]' (Boudot-Lamotte 1974: 60-61). In Iraqi Arabic, similar insults and expressions are found: *ibn il-kalb* 'son of a dog', *kalb ibn seṭṭaʿas kalb*, 'a dog and a son of a dog to the sixteenth generation', and expressions that also highlight other negative perceived aspects of dogs, such as *aṭmaʿ min il-çalib*, 'he is more greedy than a dog' and *mā yistiḥī mithl il-kalb*, 'he is unashamed like a dog' (Masliyah 2001: 294). The same goes for Egyptian Arabic; accusing someone of being descended from one (*ibn kelb* 'son of a dog') or more (*ya bni sittīn kilāb* 'son of 60 dogs') dogs is a common way to insult them. Additionally, similar to some of the French phrases mentioned above, the word for dog can also be used in combination with inanimate referents to state that the thing being referred to is unpleasant or of bad quality: *dī šerika bint kelb* "bad company"; *ṭaʿmu ibn kelb* "awful food" (Lakusta 2019: 1-2). The general contempt held for dogs is clearly visible in longer insulting expressions such as the Maghrebi Arabic əlli *zəddọ kəlb u-būh kəlb u-huwwa kəlb, kifāš yaṣfa baʿad əṯ-ṯlāṯạ?* 'The one whose grandfather is a dog, whose father is a dog and who himself is a dog, how could he after this tripling be straight and clean?' and the Iraqi Arabic proverb *il-çalib mā-yiṭhar*, 'the dog [never] becomes pure' (Boudot-Lamotte 1974: 61; Masliyah 2001: 294).

In Mandarin Chinese, dogs also carry a variety of connotations, virtually all of which appear to be negative. Like a number of other domesticated animals, they are associated with, among other things, stupidity, as seen in the following phrases: *bèn gǒu* 笨狗 'a stupid dog' > 'a stupid person'; *gǒu tóu jūn shī* 狗頭軍師 meaning literally 'a stupid dog' > 'a stupid, brainless advisor' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 92). Chen & Chen (2011: 138-141, 142-143) present a variety of phrases and proverbs in Mandarin Chinese that highlight the negative perception of dogs in Chinese culture, as opposed to the both positive and negative connotations that exist in English. Some of these are listed below:

- *lǎo gǒu* 老狗 'old-dog; cunning person'
- *mǔ gǒu* 母狗 'female-dog; bitch'
- *láng xīn gǒu fèi* 狼心狗肺 'wolf-heart-dog-lung; as rapacious as a wolf and savage as a cur'
- *gǒu yǎnkàn rén dī* 狗眼看人低 'dog-eye-look-human-low; to look down upon people like a dog (damned snobbish)'

- *gǒu zuǐ tǔ bu chū xiàngyá* 狗嘴吐不出象牙 ‘dog-mouth-vomit-not-out-ivory; a dog’s mouth (filthy mouth) cannot utter ivory (decent language)’
- *gǒu gǎi bùliǎo chī shǐ* 狗改不了吃屎 ‘dog-change-not-eat-shit; a dog cannot change the habit of eating shit, implying it is hard to mend one’s way’

Sacher (2012, “Animals around the world”) lists a number of dog-related insults from a variety of languages representing several language families, some of which follow the trend of the ‘son of a dog’ insults mentioned above. Some examples from this list have already been mentioned previously, so they are excluded here. As can be seen in the list, Turkish puts an interesting spin on this formula by labeling the addressee as the father of the dogs instead of the other way around. The translations provided by Sacher sometimes appear to be approximations rather than literal translations, so the exact meaning may be somewhat different in some cases. Lists like these also lack any linguistic or cultural context, so while there is not much that can be said about any further connotations attached to dogs based on these insults, they do show that words for dogs are frequently employed as a means of verbal abuse.

ALBANIAN	*Kak oudelic shoon!*	‘You shit-eating dog!’
CZECH	*Syn psa!*	‘Son of a dog!’
FRENCH	*Tête de chien!*	‘Dog-face!’
HINDI	*Paagal kutha!*	‘Mad dog!’
INDONESIAN	*Anjing kurap!*	‘Ringworm-infested street dog!’
ITALIAN	*Brutto cane!*	‘Butt-ugly dog!’
JAVANESE	*Djancuk!*	‘You fucking dog!’
TAGALOG	*Tae pagkain aso!*	‘Shit-eating dog!’
TURKISH	*Altmış köpeklerin Siz babası!*	‘You father of sixty dogs!’
TURKISH	*Kancik!*	‘Dog bitch!’
UKRAINIAN	*Syn sobaky!*	‘Son of a dog!’
VIETNAMESE	*Thằng chó đẻ*	‘Son of a bitch!’

(Sacher 2012, “Animals around the world”)

Further examples from different languages of words for dogs that are used as insults or swear words include: Welsh *gast* ‘bitch’ (used towards women); Hungarian *szuka* ‘bitch’ (borrowed from a Slavic language); Basque *txakur emea* ‘a bitch’ > ‘an evil-minded, spiteful woman’; Ewe *avǔ* ‘dog’; Hindi *khuti ka bacha* ‘son of a dog’; Karo *biang* ‘dog’ (Kleparski 2002: 17, 20; Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 96; Ameka 2020: 128; Ljung 2010: 75; Barus et al. 2018: 417)

3.2 Cats

Similar to dogs, cats have been a part of human domestic and social spheres for nearly 10,000 years. However, whereas dogs have fulfilled a variety of social functions throughout history, cats have seemingly served two general roles. They were mainly kept as pets, both for their companionship and their ability to hunts rodents like rats and mice, and they have featured in different religions, both as venerated animals (e.g. in Ancient Egypt) and, for example, as symbols for witchcraft in medieval Christianity. Their relative lack of social usefulness in comparison to dogs, or perhaps instead their natural capability and resourcefulness, has also

led to a far smaller amount of breeding, certainly compared to dogs (Driscoll et al. 2009; Scanes & Chengzhong 2018: 262-263). While there is generally less data on cats than on other animals discussed here, the connotations ascribed to them are varied enough to warrant their inclusion in the discussion.

English does not appear to widely employ words for cats in a negative sense. The word *cat* itself, when used in a non-literal sense, usually refers to women, with a meaning of 'vicious/malicious/loose woman; prostitute', while the informal *pussy* is used disparagingly towards homosexual people or people perceived to be effeminate, and also as a slang word meaning 'vagina' (Allan & Burridge 2006b: 79; Rodríguez 2009: 84).

While the German *Katze* 'cat' can have both positive and negative connotations, there are a variety of expressions that highlight how cats can be perceived negatively. Its use is generally directed at women, and similar to dogs, one can combine *Katze* with a variety of adjectives to give more nuance to the general insult, denoting for example treacherousness or maliciousness: *sie ist eine falsche, boshafte, alte Katze* 'she is a treacherous, malicious old cat' (DWDS, "Katze"). Other associated characteristics of cats in German include laziness (*eine faule Katze* 'a lazy cat'), pugnaciousness (*katzbalgen* 'cat's scuffle; to scrap'), cowardice or uncertainty (*wie die Katze um den heißen Brei drehen* ('[speak] like a cat turning around the hot gruel', like someone who dares not get to the point), as well as, with varying degrees of frequency, weakness, ill-temperedness, worthlessness and intolerability (Hsieh 2006: 2210). As with dogs, Dutch shares some of the associations and expressions attached to cats with German. They are similarly appreciated as pets, but also have the connotation of 'girl with a mean character', as in *valse kat* 'wretched cat'. The connotation of uncertainty, as well as the German expression signifying it mentioned above, also exists in Dutch: *eromheen draaien als een kat om de hete brij* 'like a cat turning around the hot gruel; to be reluctant to address or engage a difficult topic or question' (Van Dale, "Kat").

French metaphorical expressions involving cats do not appear to be overtly negative or positive, unlike some other languages. Similar to English however, the word *chatte*, meaning 'female cat', is also used in the sense 'vagina'. Just like German and Dutch sometimes substitute the phrase 'nothing' or 'nobody' for a phrase like 'not a dog' (see above), French uses the phrase 'not a cat': *il n'y a pas un chat* 'there's not a soul (lit. a cat)' (O'Donnell 1990: 516, 520). Spanish *gata* 'female cat' usually denotes 'a surly woman, a servant and a prostitute', while the diminutive *gatita* has the connotation of 'promiscuous woman' (Rodríguez 2009: 84-85).

As can be seen in the following Mandarin Chinese expressions, cats are also generally viewed negatively in Chinese culture, being associated with gluttony, dishonesty and lechery (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 91, 96). Hsieh (2006: 2210) also mentions that *māo* 猫 'cat' is additionally associated with the semantic molecules 'weak' and 'prostitute'.

- *māo* 猫 'a cat' > 'a gluttonous person'
- *māo kū lǎoshǔ* 猫哭老鼠 'cat-cry-mouse' > 'the cat weeping over the dead mouse; shed crocodile tears' > 'dishonesty'
- *jiào chūn māo* 叫春猫 'cry-lust-cat' > 'a lecherous man'

Some other examples of cats being used in insults or negative expressions in different languages include:

- the Khezeli dialect of Kurdish, where people who display cruel behavior are likened to cats, due to their association with cruelty (Aliakbari & Faraji 2014).
- Kilivila, which has the insulting phrase *kukweya pusa* 'fuck a cat' (Senft 2010: 23).
- The Gusii proverb *kemoni ki'e magona mabe gesogia mbeba koria* 'a cat that snores badly denies itself a rat'; in this proverb women perceived to be loose-tongued or ill-behaved are ascribed the characteristics associated with cats, namely undependability, low intelligence and laziness (Barasa & Opande 2017: 93).

Nesi (1995: 278) lists a number of metaphorical associations of cats as they exist in different languages and countries. Although no further linguistic data are provided, the list provides a good overview of different connotations as they occur across many parts of the world. Where necessary, the country where each language or language variety is spoken is specified in parentheses.

- Arabic (Bahrain) = ungratefulness
- Arabic (Palestine) = quietness, not speaking
- SeTswana (Botswana) = dirtiness
- Yambasa (Cameroon) = hypocrisy
- Limbum (Cameroon), Bidiya (Chad) = slyness
- Chinese = evilness
- Turkish (Cyprus), Japanese = capriciousness
- Greek = dishonesty (as in predicting the future of a politician: 'the man is a cat')
- Malay (Indonesia, Malaysia) = shyness

3.3 Cows

Cows, otherwise referred to by the general term cattle, also share a long history with humans, first having been domesticated in western Asia in the 9th millennium BC (Scheu et al. 2015). Cows differ from cats, and to a lesser degree from dogs, in that they have no social function like companionship; instead, they have been used as sources of meat, milk and leather for millennia, as well as serving as draft animals in agriculture. While this is the case for most species of cattle across the world, South Asia is relatively unique in that some religions, like Hinduism and Buddhism, consider cows to be holy, although slaughter of cattle still occurs in some parts of India (Scanes & Chengzhong 2018: 264). Cows have also featured in various other religions around the world, although their veneration has generally been restricted to South Asia.

The English *cow* is generally used to refer to disliked women who are perceived to be doltish and/or fat, while *bull* can be used for a big or clumsy man (Allan & Burridge 2006b: 79-80). Other Germanic languages show similar patterns: German *Kuh* 'cow' has the connotation of 'overweight, often unintelligent woman', while *Kalb* 'calf' has the metaphorical meaning of 'an immature, inexperienced, possibly stupid person' (Matusz 2019: 154). Dutch *koe* 'cow' is sometimes used as an insult meaning 'clumsy person' (Kleparski 2002: 14).

In French, the word *vache* ‘cow’ can be used in a variety of different ways. When used as an insult, it has connotations of ‘obese, slow-moving female’ or ‘nasty person’ (Kleparski 2002: 11). Another known insult is *peau de vache* ‘bastard, bitch (lit. skin of a cow)’. However, as is the case with some other animals, *vache* can also be used as part of set phrases of expressions, which can serve as interjections or intensifiers. Examples of this are *la vache!*, which literally translates to ‘the cow’ but is used in the sense of ‘hell! damn!’; *vachement*, which is the word for cow with an adverbializing suffix *-ment* added on to it, and which carries the sense of ‘very’, *vachement* grand ‘big as hell’; *une vache de*, another intensifier that is used in the same way as English *a bitch/hell of* …, as in *une vache de problème* ‘a hell (lit. a cow) of a problem’ (O’Donnell 1990: 518-519, 523). Spanish *vaca* ‘cow’ can be used for women who are considered overweight and/or unintelligent, while *becerro* **‘**calf’ is used pejoratively in the sense ‘stupid or stubborn person’. Additionally, *buey* ‘ox’ carries the connotation of ‘dim-witted, hardworking man’, or, in Mexican Spanish (specifically in the community of Tzintzuntzan) ‘cuckold, husband of a promiscuous woman’. Finally, *toro* ‘bull’ is used for argumentative and aggressive men (Matusz 2019: 154; Kleparski 2002: 11; Brandes 1984: 211).

As is the case with some other animals, Slavic languages have very similar insults and negative expressions referencing cows or cattle, with the animal generally being associated with fatness or stupidity, especially if women are the target. Russian корова *korova* ‘cow’ is used with reference to ‘a clumsy, sluggish or stupid woman’, while Polish *krowa* ‘a cow’ has the secondary meaning of ‘overweight, often unintelligent woman’. Another Polish insult reserved for women is *cielę* ‘a calf’ > ‘an immature, inexperienced, possibly stupid person’; derived from that is the expression *cielęce spojrzenie* ‘a bovine look’, alluding to someone’s unintelligent appearance (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 92-93; Matusz 2019: 154). Some Polish pejorative terms referencing cows that are used specifically for men include *byczek* ‘dim. bull’, *bydlak* ‘pej. cattle’, *(stary) byk* ‘an old bull’, and *wół* ‘ox’ > ‘dim-witted, hardworking man’ (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 93-94; Matusz 2019: 154). The same patterns show up in Serbian, where women who are considered fat, clumsy or stupid will be called *krava* ‘cow’, while *asvo* ‘ox’ is used for stupid and rude men. This can be seen in phrases like *kravo smotana!* ‘you clumsy cow!’, as well as the insult cited below (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1896, 1900). Some other examples of cow-related insults can be seen in the list taken from Sacher (2012) at the end of this section.

Kravetino *debela!*
cow.AUG.VOC fat.FEM
‘You fat cow!’ (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1894)

Like in many other languages, cows also have a connotation of stupidity in Persian. When referring to a stupid person, one would use the phrase *mesle gaw* ‘like a cow’. Another phrase emphasizes this even more: *gaw dar moghabelash professor ast* ‘lit. a cow in comparison with him is a genius’ (Talebinejad & Dastjerdi 2005: 136, 143). As with dogs, the Khezeli Kurdish dialect ascribes several different qualities to cows, both in terms of appearance and behavior. Someone who is fat, or who has a big and therefore ugly nose will be compared to a cow, as well as a person who is deemed slow, stupid, thoughtless or gluttonous (Aliakbari & Faraji 2014).

Malay also ascribes several negative qualities to cows, which are expressed through a variety of phrases or proverbs. One of these is *lembu kenyang* 'lit. a full cow', used to refer to lazy, stubborn or unbothered people, in reference to a cow that will not be very active after it has eaten. People who appear fierce but who are in fact cowards are also compared to cows by means of the proverb *laksana lembu kasi: galak saja tiada melawan* 'lit. like bull neutered: fierce but does not fight back'. The fact that cows are exploited to the fullest degree by humans, while also considered highly beneficial and profitable, is still seen as negative: the phrase *jadi lembu* 'lit. become cow' alludes to the practical enslavement of cows by humans, and is used when someone is considered to be servile and weak (MD Rashid et al. 2012: 37).

Although dogs and pigs are clearly the most frequently used animals in insulting expressions in Arabic language varieties, cows are another type of animal that are sometimes used to express negative feelings towards someone. While less data was collected on expressions involving cows than on dogs, a number of expressions still show that cows are associated with several negative characteristics, mostly stupidity (Maghrebi Arabic *ā uḏān l-ʿəžul* 'oh cow ears' > 'imbecile'; Egyptian Arabic *gāmūs wi lābis badla* 'cow wearing a suit'), fatness (Iraqi Arabic *faḥl*/*dhakar il-jāmūs* 'a male buffalo' > 'obese person'; Egyptian Arabic *baʾra* 'cow' > 'fat person') and immorality (Egyptian Arabic *tays* 'bull' > 'human without morals') (Boudot-Lamotte 1974: 61; Masliyah 2001: 293, 295; Lakusta 2019: 2). According to MD Rashid et al. (2012: 37) cows also symbolize women who are perceived to be 'lesser' than other women, particularly in situations where a man chooses to take a new woman as his wife, due to not being satisfied with his first wife. This is expressed with the Arabic phrase *al Ziba ala al baqar* 'I choose a deer (rather than) a cow' (MD Rashid et al. 2012: 37).

Chinese also associates cows with a variety of both positive and negative traits. A prominent negative one is stupidity, as evidenced by phrases like *dà niú* 大牛 'a big ox' > 'a big and stupid person', *dá bèn niú* 大笨牛'a big and stupid ox' > 'a big and stupid man', and *niú yǎn* 牛眼 'bovine eyes' > 'big and silly-looking eyes' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 93). Another connotation of cows is stubbornness, which can be seen in the expressions *niú er bù hē shuǐ bùnéng qiáng wèn tóu* 牛兒不喝水 不能強搵頭 'when an ox doesn't drink water, one cannot bend its head down by force' > 'one cannot force stubborn people to do anything' and *niú pí qì* 牛皮氣 'a stubborn ox' > 'a stubborn person' (2007: 93). *Niú* 牛, when used as a static verb, can also mean 'to boast, to brag', while *huángniú* 黃牛, literally translating to 'yellow cattle', has the meaning of 'to break one's promise' (Chen & Chen 2011: 127-128). A Chinese equivalent of the English 'to cast pearls before swine' is *duìniútánqín* 對牛彈琴 "towards-cattle-play-zither; to play the Chinese zither to an ox", although the ignorant animal in question is thus a cow, not a group of pigs. The perception of cows as stupid, especially in comparison with horses, is also evidenced by the expression *niú jì gòng láo* 牛驥共牢 'cattle-[fast horse]-same-fence; an ox and a winged steed are fenced together (to imply treating the simpleton and the sage the same way)' (2011: 130, 134).

In the study by Nesi (1995: 278), various connotations for cows as they appear in different languages and countries were collected. These are listed below, in the same format as in the section on cats above.

- Yambasa (Cameroon) = heaviness, slowness
- Chinese (China) = foolishness (you'd be wasting your time 'playing the piano to a cow' if you spoke to a layman in technical terms)
- Chinese (Taiwan) = stubbornness
- Turkish (Cyprus) = dullness ('of those who study too hard and don't enjoy life')
- Hungarian = fatness ('to cow' = what fat people do when they take up a lot of space)
- Japanese = slowness, stupidity (people who eat and sleep without working, as in 'you will be like a cow if you lie down as soon as you have finished eating')
- Malay (Malaysia) = laziness, stupidity
- Swedish, Dutch, German = stupidity

Another list provided by Sacher (2012, "Animals around the world") shows that many different languages use the word for 'cow' to insult others. Almost all the insults listed below are phrased as 'dumb cow, stupid cow'. It is, however, unknown how frequent these particular insults are in each respective language; it is possible that they have been formulated in such a way for the sake of uniformity.

AFRIKAANS	*Dom koei!*	ITALIAN	*Vacca muto!*
CATALAN	*Vaca tonta!*	NORWEGIAN	*Dumme ku!*
CROATIAN	*Nijem krava!*	POLISH	*Krowa!*
CZECH	*Hloupá kráva!*	PORTUGUESE	*Vaca burra!*
DANISH	*Dumme ko!*	ROMANIAN	*Mut vacă!*
DUTCH	*Domme koe!*	SERBIAN	*Glupa krava!*
FINNISH	*Tyhmä lehmä!*	SPANISH	*¡Vaca tonta!*
FRENCH	*Vache bête!*	TAGALOG	*Pipi baka!*
GERMAN	*Dumme Kuh!*	UKRAINIAN	*Nimyý korovy!*
HUNGARIAN	*Hülye tehén!*	YIDDISH	*Behaimeh!*

(Sacher 2012, "Animals around the world")

Other examples of languages that use 'cow' as an insult or swear word include: Hungarian *ökör* 'ox' > 'foolish, silly person' and *tehén* 'cow' > 'fat woman'; Welsh *buwch* 'cow' (used towards women) (Kleparski 2002: 16, 20); Yoruba *àgbò* 'bull' > 'pugnacious' (Ọlátéjú 2005: 379).

3.4 Pigs

Compared to dogs, cats and cows which were discussed above, pigs have relatively little use to humans, aside from their meat, which is widely consumed in many parts of the world. Pigs were domesticated around 9,000 years ago (Giuffra et al. 2000), and although they have not been of great religious significance compared to cats or cows – aside from pork being prohibited for consumption in Islam and Judaism – they have often been featured in art and

literature. They are also frequently used in metaphorical expressions, some of which will be discussed here.

According to Allan and Burridge (2006b: 80), the English word *pig* is generally used for "someone rude, uncouth, slovenly". From the past century onward, especially in American English, it has also been used as an insulting term for policemen (Hughes 2006: 11). *Sow* and *swine*, although less frequently used today, were also used to disparagingly talk about women who were considered stupid or fat (Allan and Burridge 2006b: 79, Hughes 2006: 11). A phrase derived from the New Testament, found in many languages besides English, highlights the view of pigs as lower, ignorant or unworthy animals: *(to cast) pearls before swine*, i.e. to present or teach something to someone who will not know how to appreciate it. As with other animals, German and Dutch have similar connotations for pigs. German *Schwein* 'pig, swine' is used with the meaning 'trustless, mean person', while the feminine *Sau* 'sow' denotes a 'nasty, dirty and uncultured person'. Similarly, Dutch *varken* 'pig', is metaphorically used in the sense 'dirty person' (Kleparski 2002: 14; Matusz 2019: 154). *Perlen vor die Säue werfen* and *parels voor de zwijnen (werpen)* are the German and Dutch versions of the expression 'to cast pearls before swine' mentioned above.

Pigs generally feature negatively in French expressions. The word *cochon* 'pig' itself is used as an insult in the sense of 'dirty, sloppy person' or 'mean, base person' (Kleparski 2002: 11). It is also used in a number of expressions, which further highlight some negative perceived traits of pigs, such as *caractère de cochon* 'nasty disposition'. Just like with dogs and cows, the word for pig can be added to a noun (*... de cochon*) to give it a negative of intensified value, e.g. *temps de cochon* 'nasty weather' (O'Donnell 1990: 517). Negative traits like fatness or gluttony are also ascribed to pigs, as can be seen in these expressions: *gros comme un cochon* 'fat as a pig', *manger comme un cochon* 'to eat like a pig' (1990: 521). The Spanish *cerdo* 'pig' similarly has negative connotations; it is used for people who are considered to be ill-natured, gluttonous, dirty or uncultured (Kleparski 2002: 11; Matusz 2019: 154). When directed at women specifically, *cerda* 'sow' has connotations of fatness, dirtiness, ugliness and promiscuity (Rodríguez 2009: 88). The Mexican Spanish terms *cochino* and *puerco*, both meaning ;pig', also connote filthiness (Brandes 1984: 211). Italian has a number of vulgar exclamations combining the themes of pigs and religion: *porco Dio!*, *porca Madonna!*, *porca Miseria!*, all of which roughly translate to 'that pig of a God/lady/misery', but which are used in a way similar to English 'holy shit' (Ljung 2010: 42). According to Sacher (2012, "Animals around the world"), *porco*, when used as an insult, has the connotation of sexual perversion, instead of the dirtiness or gluttony that are found as associations more often.

In Russian, свинья *swin'ja* 'pig' is used in reference to people who are perceived to be evil-minded or unethical (Kleparski 2002: 12). Polish uses, amongst others, the terms *wieprz* 'a hog' (specifically used towards men), *świnia* 'swine', with the connotation of 'nasty, dirty, uncultured person' or 'evil-minded, mean person', and the diminutive form *świnka* which has a secondary meaning of 'sloppy, untidy person' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 94; Matusz 2019: 154; Kleparski 2002: 12). Czech has a number of expressions which indicate several negative traits ascribed to pigs. These include fatness (*těžký jako prase* 'heavy as a pig'), gluttony (*žrát jako prase* 'devour like a pig'), slowness (*být pomalý jako prase* 'as slow as a pig') and general ugliness (*mít prasečí ksicht* 'face like a pig'). Other insults include *ty prochlastaný kanče!* 'you

drunken boar!', *ty svině zatracená!* 'you bloody swine!' and *ty studená svině!* 'you cold swine!' (Rakusan 2004: 181). In Serbian, pigs are negatively associated with vulgarity, dirtiness and gluttony. As in some other languages, different words are used for men and women who are considered to have these traits. While the male form *svinja* 'pig' can be used for both men and women, the female form *krmača* 'sow' is reserved for women. Some examples are *svinjo* 'you pig' and *svinjo (h)alava* 'you gluttonous swine', and the phrase cited below (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1893, 1896, 1900).

E, baš si prava svinja!
E, baš *si* *prava* *svinja!*
oh really be.2SG real.FEM pig
'Oh, you are a real pig' (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1895)

In Rotuman, chronic offenders of public peace are likened to pigs: someone who often commits interpersonal or communal offences and constantly promises to better themselves without ever doing so, will be negatively referred to with the expression *tinanam ta ho'ien se 'on kakauag ta*, 'the sow has returned to her wallow' (Howard & Rensel 1991: 131). As mentioned above in section 3.1, speakers of Kilivila on the Trobriand Islands have some insults referencing animals. Pigs can also be used in insulting expressions: *kukweya bunukwa* 'fuck a pig' and *latula bunukwa* 'child of a pig' are in the same vein as the ones referring to dogs, with the former insult being used exclusively towards men (Senft 2010: 23-24).

As with dogs, pigs are almost universally perceived as impure and filthy in Arabic dialects (and some other languages whose culture has been influenced by Islam), an image which is in concordance with the Islamic prohibition of the consumption of pork, as imposed by the Qur'an (Masliyah 2001: 294). Maghrebi Arabic has a number of harsh insults referencing pigs, which either directly label someone as a pig, or as its offspring: *yā ḥallūf* 'pig' > 'bastard, disgusting person', *yā bən ḥallūf* 'son of a pig', *b-kullhum ḥlālləf* 'they are all pigs' > 'bastards' (Boudot-Lamotte 1974: 61). Egyptian Arabic uses the phrases *ḫanzīr* 'pig' and *bağidu ḫanzīr ātfūūūūh* 'he is a pig!', among others (Lakusta 2019: 2). Given the rather homogeneous views on pigs in Arabic culture, other varieties of Arabic likely have similar expressions in use. Although it is unrelated to Arabic, Khezeli Kurdish, being spoken in a region with strong Islamic cultural influence, also uses *beraz* 'pig' as an insult meaning 'dirty person' (Aliakbari & Faraji 2014).

In Mandarin Chinese, pigs are known by a variety of connotations. Someone considered to be fat may be called *féi zhū* 肥猪 'a fat-pig' > 'a fat person', while stupid people can be called *bèn zhū* 笨猪 'a dumb pig' > 'an idiot' or *sǐ zhū* 死猪 'a dead pig' > 'a stupid, dull-witted person'. (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 90, 92). Other expressions that show the association of pigs with stupidity include: *xiàng zhū yīyàng bèn* 像豬一樣笨 'like-pig-same-stupid; as stupid as a pig' and *zhū tóu* 豬頭 'pig-head; to be stupid, to be unaware of the present situation'. Because pigs eat with watering mouths, they are also seen as being lustful, as evidenced by the expression *zhū gē* 豬哥 'pig-elder brother; to be lustful', which is only used

for men (Chen & Chen 2011: 123, 127, 129). Cantonese knows the insults *jyū gāu* 豬尿 pig prick' and *jyū hai* 豬閪 'pig cunt' (Ljung 2010: 137).

Sacher (2012, "Animals around the world") also provides a list of insults referencing pigs in various languages, with the examples of the latter part all following the formula of 'fat pig' epithets. As mentioned in the section on cows, it is unclear if these are all frequently used insults in the respective languages, or if they have all been formulated as such to show uniformity.

GERMAN	*Du alte Sau!*	'You dirty pig!'
	Die Saubande!	'You pack of filthy swine!'
ITALIAN	*Sei uno vero porco!*	'You are a real pig!'
YIDDISH	*A chazzer bleibt a chazzer!*	'Once a pig, always a pig!'
ALBANIAN	*Derr pista!*	'You fat pig!'
FRENCH	*Tu gros porc!*	'You fat pig!'
ICELANDIC	*Þú feitur svín!*	'You fat pig!'
NORWEGIAN	*Du feit gris!*	'You fat pig!'
SPANISH	*¡Chancha!*	'You fat pig!'
SWAHILI	*Wewe mafuta nguruwe!*	'You fat pig!'
VIETNAMESE	*Bạn mỡ lợn!*	'You fat pig!'

(Sacher 2012, "Animals around the world")

Other examples of languages in which 'pig' or a similar word can be used as a swear word or in a negative sense are mentioned here. For the Nahuatl and Otomi languages, no translation of the word 'pig' was provided alongside the connotations; the translations mentioned below are therefore not entirely certain.

Welsh *hwch* 'sow' (used towards women), Nahuatl (possibly) *pitzotl* 'pig' > 'drunken person', Otomi (possibly) *ts'udi* 'pig' > 'immoral person' (Kleparski 2002: 20); Karo *babi* 'pig' (Barus et al. 2018: 417); Yoruba *ẹlẹ́dẹ̀* 'pig' > 'dirty, irrational anger, high fertility' (Ọlátéjú 2005: 378); Basque *ahardia* 'a sow' > 'a dirty, despicable woman' (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 93); Sranan Tongo *hagu* 'pig' > 'idiot, stupid' (J. Soemoredjo, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

3.5 Donkeys

Donkeys, also known by the increasingly less common term asses, are closely related to horses, and have, like the other animals discussed here, coexisted with humans for several millennia. It is thought that they were domesticated from African wild donkeys in northeastern Africa some 6000 years ago, after which they have continuously been used as draft and pack animals in many parts of the world, due to their ability to carry heavy loads and survive in arid environments (Rossel et al. 2008). Seeing as donkeys, as well as their hybrid relatives mules, have perhaps the most homogeneous range of metaphorical associations out of all animals discussed here, and because they are not discussed extensively in most publications consulted, most of the data regarding them will be presented in list form similar to the final parts of

previous sections, with their connotations in some languages being treated more extensively if the data allows for it.

- English *donkey* and *mule* are both associated with stubbornness (Allan & Burridge 2006b: 80).
- Dutch *ezel* 'donkey' has the connotation of 'stupid person' (Kleparski 2002: 14). Some expressions and proverbs that signify this include *een ezel stoot zich geen tweemaal aan dezelfde steen* 'a donkey doesn't hit his leg on the same stone twice' > 'only someone more stupid than a donkey would make the same mistake twice' and *men vindt menige ezel met twee benen*/*zonder lange oren* 'you will find many donkeys with two legs/without long ears' > 'there's plenty of stupid people around' (Van Dale, "Ezel")
- French *âne* 'donkey' is associated with stupidity. This can be seen in the term *ânerie* 'donkey-like behavior' > 'stupidity, stupid remarks' (Kleparksi 2002: 29; O'Donnell 1990: 515).
- Spanish *burro* 'donkey' is also used in the sense 'stupid, uncouth person', as well as with the connotation of stubbornness. *Mula*, meaning '(female) mule', is used to indicate women who cannot bear children (Kleparski 2002: 11; Brandes 1984: 211).
- Russian осёл *osioł* 'ass, donkey' is metaphorically used in the sense 'silly and/or stubborn person' (Kleparski 2002: 12).
- Polish *osioł* 'ass', as well as *muł* 'mule', have the metaphorical meaning of 'silly, stupid person' (Kleparski 2002: 12; Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 94)
- Serbian *magarac* 'donkey' and *mazga* 'mule' are both associated with stupidity, as can be seen in the examples below:

Magarčino	*(jedna)!*			*Koji*	*si*	*ti*	*magarac!*
donkey.AUG-VOC	(one.NEUT)			which	be.2SG	you	donkey
'You jackass!'				'What a jackass you are!'			
K'o	*mazga*	*si!*		*Ispao*		*si*	*magarac!*
like	mule	be.2SG		turn.out.PPF		be.2SG	donkey
'You are like a mule!'				'You have become a jackass!'			

(Halupka-Rešetar & Radić 2003: 1894-1895)

- Donkeys and mules have, like many other animals, a large variety of associated characteristics in the Khezeli Kurdish dialect, again based on appearance and behavior. People whose physical features, such as their nose, chin, ears and feet, are perceived to be large to the point of ugliness, or whose hair is unpleasantly coarse, will be compared to mules. The same goes for people who are considered bad-tempered and/or worthless. Similar traits will earn people the title of 'donkey', although there are some subtle differences: large eyes, big teeth, a thick neck and a big head are negatively associated with donkeys, and a person possessing any of those features will be labeled as such. Furthermore, slowness, a bad voice and an obstinate personality are also cause to call someone a donkey (Aliakbari & Faraji 2014).
- Sarnami Hindustani *gadaha* 'donkey' has the connotation 'idiot, stupid person' (J. Soemoredjo, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

- Irish *asal* ‘donkey’ is metaphorically used in the sense ‘foolish person’ (Kleparski 2002: 14).
- Hungarian *szamár* ‘ass, donkey’ has the secondary meaning of ‘foolish, silly person’ (Kleparski 2002: 16).
- Interestingly, donkeys also feature in what might be the oldest recorded instance of swearing: a curse written on an Ancient Egyptian *stela* (a stone slab with commemorative inscriptions) dating from the 12th century BC (the New Kingdom period of Ancient Egypt) threatens that the person who fails to properly execute the daily offerings to the god Amon-Re will be mortally punished by Amon-Re, and that “a donkey shall copulate with him, he shall copulate with a donkey, [and] his wife shall copulate with his children” (Ljung 2010: 45). While this does not reveal any specific traits that may have been associated with donkeys at the time, the way the curse is formulated is similar to some other insults that have been discussed here; i.e. those that announce or wish upon someone their or a family member’s copulation with an animal, which generally seems to be motivated by the perception of the respective animal as being of lower status than the addressee.
- Arabic has some expressions which ascribe to donkeys the traits of stupidity and harmfulness. Some examples are *ajhal min himar* ‘more stupid than ass/donkey’ and *urbuth himarak fainnahu mustanfir* ‘fasten your donkey, surely it is wilder’. The second expression is used for people who have harmful tendencies and who thus need to be restrained in some way (MD Rashid et al. 2012: 38).
- Tarifit Berber *aɣyuř* ‘donkey’ is also used to mean ‘idiot’ (G. El Hachimi, personal communication, January 14, 2020).
- Malay associates donkeys with stupidity and ignorance. This is visible in a number of expressions, such as *keldai hendak dijadikan kuda* ‘ass want to be made horse’. This proverb denotes a stupid person who wants to be treated as someone intelligent. An ignorant person can be referred to with the expression *keldai membawa kitab* ‘ass/donkey carries a book’; someone who carries around a book but does not apply the knowledge it provides is seen as ignorant (MD Rashid et al. 2012: 37).
- Mandarin Chinese has several expressions that highlight the perceived stupidity of donkeys. The noun *lǘ* 驢 ‘donkey’ can also be used as a static verb with the meaning ‘to make oneself look stupid’, while the phrase *ǎi luózi* 矮騾子 ‘short-mule’ signifies ‘a hooligan’ (Chen & Chen 2011: 128, 145). Furthermore Chinese has the expressions *chǔn lǘ* 蠢驢 ‘a stupid donkey’ > ‘a stupid person’ and *zhēn lǘ* 真驢 ‘a real ass’ > ‘an utter idiot’ (Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 92-93).

Finally, Sacher (2012, “Animals around the world”) lists some other languages in which ‘donkey’ can be used as an insult. Compared to the other lists provided in his book, the one below is rather sparse in terms of diversity, containing only four languages and two types of expressions, but it is indicative of the cultural attitudes of the speakers of these languages against donkeys. As Sacher points out, donkeys are also seen as impure in Islam, and someone’s prayers will be void if a donkey or dog passes during prayer.

ARABIC	*Hemaar!*	‘Donkey!’
HINDI	*Gadhā!*	‘Donkey!’
PERSIAN	*Khar!*	‘Donkey!’
TURKISH	*Eşek!*	‘Donkey!’
ARABIC	*Ibn il-hemaar!*	‘Son of a donkey!’
HINDI	*Gadha da khurr!*	‘Son of a donkey!’
PERSIAN	*Kor-e khar!*	‘Son of a donkey!’
TURKISH	*Eşşoğlu eşek!*	‘Son of a donkey!’

(Sacher 2012, “Animals around the world”)

3.6 Overview of connotations

In total, animal swear words or negative animal metaphors of 61 languages from 10 major language families, as well as one isolate and one creole, have been recorded in this paper. For 34 of those languages, the accompanying connotations are also present. For some languages, both swear words and animal metaphors are known, while for others either only swear words or only connotations are known. Here follows a summary of the connotations for animal names as they have been discussed in section 3.1-3.5. About 78 different connotations have been recorded in the following tables, although this number may be set somewhat lower depending on the accuracy of all the connotational terms, as will be discussed below in the next chapter. Connotations marked with (m) or (f) are only used for men or women, respectively.

Dogs

Language	**Family**	**Region**	**Connotation**
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Surliness, degeneracy, rudeness, cowardice, meanness (f), promiscuity (f)
German	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Meanness, dirtiness
Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Meanness, dirtiness
French	Indo-European (Romance)	Western Europe	Meanness (m), selfishness (m), promiscuity (f)
Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	Southwestern Europe	Meanness (f), spitefulness (f), dislike, ugliness (f), promiscuity (f), gluttony
Polish	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Meanness, impudence
Russian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Meanness, impudence
Persian	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Stubbornness
Khezeli Kurdish	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Ugliness, cruelty, bad-temperedness, shamelessness,

			worthlessness, arrogance, dirtiness, talkativeness
Basque	Isolate	Southwestern Europe	Evil-mindedness (f), spitefulness (f)
Hungarian	Uralic (Finno-Ugric)	Eastern Europe	Promiscuity (f)
Rotuman	Austronesian (Oceanic)	Melanesia	Rudeness, abusiveness, cowardice
Arabic	Afroasiatic (Semitic)	North-Africa, Western Asia	Impurity, filthiness, shamelessness, greediness
Gusii	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	East Africa	Being ill-mannered (f), bad-temperedness (f)
Yoruba	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	West Africa	Promiscuity, thoughtlessness, rudeness
Mandarin Chinese	Sino-Tibetan (Sinitic)	Eastern Asia	Stupidity, cunning, snobbishness, savageness, rudeness

Cats

Language	**Family**	**Region**	**Connotation**
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Viciousness, maliciousness, promiscuity, effeminacy
German	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Treacherousness, maliciousness, laziness, pugnaciousness, cowardice, uncertainty, weakness, ill-temperedness, worthlessness, intolerability
Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Meanness, wretchedness
Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	Southwestern Europe	Surliness (f), servility (f), promiscuity (f)
Greek	Indo-European (Hellenic)	Southern Europe	Dishonesty
Khezeli Kurdish	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Cruelty
Turkish	Turkic	Western Asia	Capriciousness
Malay	Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian)	Southeast Asia	Shyness
Arabic	Afroasiatic (Semitic)	North Africa, Western Asia	Ungratefulness, quietness

Bidiya	Afroasiatic (Chadic)	Central-North Africa	Slyness
Gusii	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	East Africa	Undependability, low intelligence, laziness
SeTswana	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	Southern Africa	Dirtiness
Yambasa	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	Central-West Africa	Hypocrisy
Limbum	Niger-Congo (Grassfields)	Central-West Africa	Slyness
Mandarin Chinese	Sino-Tibetan (Sinitic)	Eastern Asia	Gluttony, dishonesty, lechery (m), weakness, prostitution, evilness
Japanese	Japonic	Eastern Asia	Capriciousness

Cows

Language	**Family**	**Region**	**Connotation**
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Doltishness (f), fatness (f), clumsiness (m)
German	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Fatness, stupidity, immaturity
Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Clumsiness, stupidity
Swedish	Indo-European (Germanic)	Northern Europe	Stupidity
French	Indo-European (Romance)	Western Europe	Obesity, stupidity, nastiness
Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	Southwestern Europe	Fatness (f), stupidity, stubbornness, cuckoldry, aggressiveness
Polish	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Fatness, stupidity, immaturity
Russian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Clumsiness, sluggishness, stupidity
Serbian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Fatness (f), clumsiness (f), stupidity, rudeness (m)
Persian	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Stupidity
Khezeli Kurdish	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Fatness, slowness, ugliness, stupidity, gluttony
Turkish	Turkic	Western Asia	Dullness

Hungarian	Uralic (Finno-Ugric)	Eastern Europe	Foolishness, silliness, fatness (f)
Malay	Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian)	Southeast Asia	Laziness, stubbornness, cowardice, servility, weakness, stupidity
Arabic	Afroasiatic (Semitic)	North-Africa, Western Asia	Stupidity, fatness, immorality
Yoruba	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	West Africa	Pugnaciousness
Yambasa	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	Central-West Africa	Fatness, slowness
Mandarin Chinese	Sino-Tibetan (Sinitic)	Eastern Asia	Stupidity, stubbornness, boastfulness, dishonesty
Japanese	Japonic	Eastern Asia	Slowness, stupidity

Pigs

Language	**Family**	**Region**	**Connotation**
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Rudeness, uncouthness, stupidity, fatness
German	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Dishonesty, meanness, dirtiness, being uncultured
Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Dirtiness
French	Indo-European (Romance)	Western Europe	Dirtiness, sloppiness, meanness, fatness, gluttony
Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	Southwestern Europe	Ill-naturedness, gluttony, being uncultured, fatness (f), dirtiness (f), ugliness (f), promiscuity (f)
Italian	Indo-European (Romance)	Southern Europe	Perverseness
Polish	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Dirtiness, being uncultured, evil-mindedness, meanness sloppiness, untidiness
Russian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Evil-mindedness, unethicality
Serbian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Vulgarity, dirtiness, gluttony

Czech	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Fatness, gluttony, slowness, ugliness, drunkenness, coldness
Khezeli Kurdish	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Dirtiness
Sranan Tongo	English creole	Caribbean	Stupidity
Basque	Isolate	Southwestern Europe	Dirtiness (f), despicability (f)
Hungarian	Uralic (Finno-Ugric)	Eastern Europe	Rudeness, sloppiness
Rotuman	Austronesian (Oceanic)	Melanesia	Disturber of peace
Arabic	Afroasiatic (Semitic)	North-Africa, Western Asia	Impurity, filthiness
Yoruba	Niger-Congo (Bantu)	West Africa	Dirtiness, irrational anger
Mandarin Chinese	Sino-Tibetan (Sinitic)	Eastern Asia	Fatness, stupidity, lustfulness (m)
Nahuatl	Uto-Aztecan (Nahuan)	Mesoamerica	Drunkenness
Otomi	Oto-Manguean (Oto-Pamean)	Mesoamerica	Immorality

Donkeys

Language	**Family**	**Region**	**Connotation**
English	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Stubbornness
Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	Western Europe	Stupidity
French	Indo-European (Romance)	Western Europe	Stupidity
Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	Southwestern Europe	Stupidity, uncouthness, stubbornness
Polish	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Stupidity, silliness
Russian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Silliness, stubbornness
Serbian	Indo-European (Slavic)	Eastern Europe	Stupidity
Irish	Indo-European (Celtic)	Western Europe	Foolishness
Khezeli Kurdish	Indo-European (Indo-Iranian)	Western Asia	Ugliness, bad-temperedness, worthlessness, slowness, obstinacy
Sarnami Hindustani	Indo-European (Indo-Aryan)	Caribbean	Stupidity

Hungarian	Uralic (Finno-Ugric)	Eastern Europe	Foolishness
Malay	Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian)	Southeast Asia	Stupidity, ignorance
Arabic	Afroasiatic (Semitic)	North-Africa, Western Asia	Stupidity, harmfulness
Tarifit Berber	Afroasiatic (Berber)	Northwest Africa	Stupidity
Mandarin Chinese	Sino-Tibetan (Sinitic)	Eastern Asia	Stupidity

4. Discussion

Now that the widely varying connotations for the animals treated above have been presented, an attempt will be made to highlight any underlying patterns. As has been touched upon in the introductory chapter, the amount of representation that some languages or language families get in comparison to others is rather unbalanced – as is often the case, European languages have been studied significantly more with regard to this topic than non-European ones – so in some cases assumptions have to be made based on data consisting of just a couple of words that are not accompanied by substantial surrounding linguistic or cultural data. For some languages, the fact that a certain animal name can be used as an insult or in a negative expression is all the information that could be retrieved, in which case no connotations or metaphorical meanings are attached. It should be kept in mind that the connotations discussed here are taken from the sources consulted for this study; for many languages, there is almost certainly more to be said about the metaphorical associations of animals than what has been presented here.

4.1 Analysis of connotations

Out of the five main animals discussed, donkeys certainly showcase the greatest homogeneity in terms of connotations, of which there are 12 in total across 15 languages, with stubbornness and stupidity being by far the most frequent ones. Cows appear to come in second place in that regard, being most often associated with fatness, stupidity, and clumsiness or slowness out of 25 total connotations across 19 languages. Dogs and pigs showcase a greater variety of connotations while maintaining some trends. Pigs are mostly associated with dirtiness, gluttony, and meanness out of a total of 29 connotations across 20 languages. Dogs have a slightly larger variety of associated traits, 30 in total across 16 languages, although meanness seems to be a consistent trend, with traits like dirtiness or rudeness also being recurring connotations. Cats, though being less frequently discussed in the consulted sources and therefore boasting less data overall than the other four animals, nevertheless showcase the widest range of metaphorical associations, numbering 34 in total across 16 languages, with only a small number of connotations like dishonesty, laziness, and maliciousness appearing more than once.

Regarding dogs, cows, pigs and donkeys, a case can be made for how genealogical relations have an influence on the development of animal connotations. Generally, non-European languages showcase a wider variety of connotations, although there are certainly cases of overlap between those languages and European languages. For European languages in particular, which in this study are best represented by the Germanic, Romance and Slavic branches of Indo-European, there are a number of connotations that are shared between the majority of the languages. Dogs are almost universally associated with meanness in languages of the aforementioned branches, while traits like dirtiness, promiscuity or shamelessness occur both there and in languages from other families. As was pointed out before, donkeys are very uniform in terms of their connotations. The same can mostly be said for cows, which are associated with fatness and/or stupidity in all European languages as well as some non-European ones, in addition to some specific connotations in a few particular languages. Pigs

are associated with dirtiness in many different languages, though the distribution is less uniform in European languages than is the case with dogs, cows and donkeys. Cows and pigs are roughly the same with regards to the distribution of other connotations, however. It is more difficult to draw conclusions regarding the connotations that are found for cats, because there are barely any connotations that appear in more than one language; virtually every language appears to have appointed different perceived traits of cats as salient. In marked contrast with donkeys, the behavior of cats is apparently reflective of significantly more character traits to warrant so many different associations by different cultures.

When discussing the diversity of connotations, it is of course important to keep in mind that they all originate from the highly variable human perception and interpretation; the behavior of two animals of the same species living in different regions is not likely to be so distinct that it leads to different connotations in the cultures of those regions. Instead, different cultural values and perspectives have shaped and influenced how an animal's behavior will be understood by humans. As may be suggested by the data on donkeys, stupidity and stubbornness are examples of this. However, one may expect that cats around the world are also quite uniform in their behavior, but as has been shown above, different cultures and languages have different interpretations of that behavior.

The greater degree of connotational homogeneity that is observed with donkeys, cows and pigs may be due to the fact that they have historically served less varied purposes, having mostly been used as beasts of labor and as a source of milk, meat, hides and other materials. Cats have not been domesticated for similar purposes as the animals mentioned above, having generally served as pets or companions, with arguably their only functional use being their ability to hunt mice and rats. Dogs have fulfilled the widest range of functions within human society, as has been stated before. Their role as pets is generally limited to countries in the Western world, while in other parts of the world they are more often kept as guard dogs or other assistants, without being kept in high regard as a companion. The fact that cats and dogs have existed alongside humans in different environments, or in other words, were not limited to stables, fields and roads where cows, pigs and donkeys would usually be found, and the fact that their roles in human society have either been more ambiguous (in the case of cats) or more varied (in the case of dogs) might explain why the connotations attached to them are somewhat more varied than those found with the other animals.

Overall, it is difficult to establish any solid patterns with regard to the connotations presented above. The languages with the most data all belong to the Indo-European family, and their respective cultures are, despite internal differences, still part of a general European culture sphere, which shows more contrast with cultures from other regions than with parts of itself. Some other major cultures or culture spheres, like China or Islamic culture, are also less well-represented than European culture, mostly just by one language or language variety (i.e. Mandarin Chinese and Arabic). While the data on European languages do suggest that genealogical relations may cause an increase in shared animal connotations, the lack of data on other families makes it less easy to solidly establish this. A conclusion that can be drawn more easily is that there are character traits that are recognized across many different cultures, something which is visible in the data on cows, pigs and donkeys.

4.2 Factors influencing metaphorical divergence and development

As may be expected, there are a variety of parameters that determine to what degree metaphorical expressions will be similar or different across languages. These include geography, religion and mythology, human migration and subsequent cultural diffusion, and perhaps above all, time.

As has been shown by some publications cited above, as well as the previous section, close genealogical relations between languages do not guarantee shared animal metaphors, as might be initially expected in certain cases. Howard & Rensel (1991: 134-136), in their study on Rotuman animal expressions, found that there are significant differences in which animals are used (and to which degree) in metaphorical expressions in Rotuman, Samoan and Hawaiian, three closely related Polynesian languages spoken in a region with a strong shared cultural identity and similar biodiversity. Conversely, as Kleparski (2002: 15, 23, 27) points out, Hungarian shows a great deal of similarity in terms of animal metaphors and connotations with its neighboring languages, despite being a Uralic language whose speakers settled in an Indo-European-dominated region in the 9th century. Since Hungarian has coexisted with its unrelated neighboring languages since that time, the cultural identities with regard to metaphorical perceptions of animals have merged to a great degree, resulting in similar animal metaphors visible in the languages discussed in Kleparski (2002). As can be expected, geography was a far more important factor in this process than genealogical relations; the same may be said for the situation regarding Rotuman, Samoan and Hawaiian. While those languages are close relatives, their geographical distribution is markedly different from Hungarian and other European languages; they are spoken on islands separated by hundreds or sometimes thousands of kilometers of ocean. Such geographical isolation can certainly be considered an important factor for linguistic and cultural divergence, as evidenced by the results of Howard & Rensel's (1991) study. Conversely, as evidenced by Hungarian, close geographic proximity to other cultures can also lead to convergence of certain cultural aspects, such as conceptual metaphors. Another example of this is Basque: an isolate language that has been surrounded by Indo-European languages for far longer than even Hungarian, but with connotations recorded for dogs and pigs that are quite similar to those found in Spanish. However, Basque and Hungarian on the one hand and Rotuman on the other are just two rather particular examples; it is not unthinkable that other instances of different cultures coexisting in one region have not resulted in such convergence of cultural aspects, or, inversely, that geographically separated but genetically related languages show similar developments in said cultural aspects. In summary, geography can play a significant role in what aspects of a source domain are taken as salient, and thus the development of metaphors (Deignan 2003: 259).

Although this study looks at negative animal connotations as they exist in languages of today, it is important to consider the historical context through which many of those connotations have arisen. Religion and mythology have often played a large role in this. Polytheistic religions around the world have often featured animals in their pantheon or canon, while monotheistic ones like the Abrahamic faiths are generally more anthropocentric, which partly explains the overall more negative attitudes towards animals in those religions (Waldau 2006: 70; Menache 2006a: 77). The Bible and the Qur'an appear to have had a strong influence on historical and modern perceptions of animals. While no one language discussed here is

particularly connected to the Bible, the widespread presence of Christianity in Europe may well have played a role in the development of animal connotations in European languages. In the Bible humans are generally considered to be distinct from or higher than animals; dogs are associated with stupidity and impurity due to their consumption of carrion, while animals like donkeys and cats are declared unclean (Menache 2006a: 77; 2006b: 497). Arabic, being the language of the Qur'an, is closely tied to the Islamic faith and culture, and its expressions can therefore reflect Islamic beliefs about animals. These beliefs label dogs and pigs as impure; dogs are said to be emissaries of the devil, and the consumption of pigs is forbidden due to their being associated with uncleanliness, likely stemming from the fact that they sometimes consume dung (Abou El Fadl 2004: 500; Menache 2006a: 77; Scanes & Chengzhong 2018: 264). However, cats are mostly regarded in a positive light, due to their association with the prophet Muhammad (Nizamoglu 2007). Harjula (1994: 76) notes that in a variety of African mythologies, myths on the origins of life and death often incorporate animals. For example, a chameleon is seen as a messenger of life sent by the Creator, but due to its slow movement it is overtaken by a dog or another fast animal, which is seen as the messenger of death; because of this, the message of death arrives earlier, and people inevitably die as a result. It is however unknown whether these mythological roles have a strong influence on the perception and metaphorical value of these animals within the mythologies and respective cultures in question, although as evidenced by the discussion above, Christianity and Islam are cases of religion having such an influence. There are of course many other religions and belief systems that may have a cultural influence on the perception and treatment of animals. Shahar (2019) discusses the Horse King deity that is worshipped in Shaanxi Province in northern China; among the rural population it is (or was) worshipped as the protector of equines, the horses, donkeys and mules that were essential to the agrarian lifestyle. However, as Shahar states, it is unclear whether the population's veneration of the horse god was also reflected in their treatment of the equine animals in their environment (2019: 386).

An aspect of animal metaphors that is less easy to explore is the possible development and change that they have experienced as a result of human migrations through history. While the historical domestication of the animals discussed here has only been mentioned in passing, it should be pointed out that those animals have not been part of all the societies of the languages under discussion here in equal measures. Some language communities in more remote regions, such as those of Rotuman or Kilivila, have historically had far less exposure to pigs or cows than most European cultures, for example. A detailed discussion of human-mediated animal migration would be outside of the scope of this study (cf. Boivin 2017 for more on that subject), but the consequences of non-native animals being introduced into new areas for the indigenous culture's animal metaphors is certain a topic worth investigating. There are naturally many different factors at play here, including the nature of the human migration (e.g. trade, colonization, warfare, settlement), the impact of the animals introduced, and the degree and type of contact between the migrating and indigenous populations. If the migrants remained active in the new region, their metaphorical associations of the newly introduced animals may have influenced the indigenous population. Conversely, if the migrants departed after some time but left some of the new animals, the indigenous population could develop their own perceptions and metaphors. A slightly different but nonetheless interesting perspective on this, namely the migration of already existing animal metaphors to a new place,

has been provided by Al-Kajela, whose study on immigrants from Neo-Aramaic-speaking communities to Canada showed that exposure to a new culture can lead to change or attrition of conceptualizations of animals (2017: 97). It is important to remember that metaphors change and diversify over time, just like the languages and cultures which they are a part of.

4.3 The spectrum of connotations

A slight issue that comes along with the collection of all the data mentioned above is that there are many words used for negative traits that can be said to describe the same characteristic or quality, but with a possible subtle difference in meaning. For example, cows and donkeys are cross-linguistically often associated with stupidity, foolishness, and ignorance. However, one should keep in mind that terms like 'stupidity', 'foolishness' and 'ignorance' may be translations from another language, chosen by the author of a particular paper, and repeated here. While these terms have subtle differences in meaning in English, a language with a particularly large and nuanced vocabulary, they may mean virtually the same thing in the language that was translated. The same goes for terms like filthiness, dirtiness, sloppiness and vulgarity. By some definitions these may be almost identical in meaning, while by others they have subtle differences in their semantics. While the author will not attempt to define major categories among the connotations, as this might interfere with those connotations that are more specific, the ambiguity of the aforementioned terms should be taken into consideration. The previously stated number of 78 recorded connotations may thus be projected as somewhat lower, for example around 70. While there is certainly a great degree of overlap across languages in terms of the connotations assigned to different animals, this is still a remarkable number of connotations for just five animals.

The nuances in connotations for the same animals that are found in many related or neighboring languages, besides being a slight issue as discussed above, are also a noteworthy aspect of the data. The fact that different languages from the same general region ascribe similar but subtly different characteristics to the same animal is indicative of how cultures and languages that have similar experiences and exposure to that animal end up highlighting different aspects of the same overall quality. For example, pigs are often associated with gluttony and sloppiness, as well as dirtiness or impurity. While these traits are not necessarily restricted to a particular language or region (with the exception of impurity, a connotation only found in Arabic out of the languages discussed here), they do show that one culture might focus on the wide-ranging eating habits of pigs in terms of diet when developing metaphors, while another culture might highlight the pigs' manner of eating, i.e. sloppy or vulgar, while another might focus on the mess that is made while eating, therefore deeming dirtiness a salient characteristic. This is another example of the arbitrariness that can occur within the development of metaphors and metaphorical expressions.

While studies like these attempt to explore the reasons behind metaphorical diversity across languages and cultures, one should keep in mind that some aspects of the subject under study, like language change or cultural diversification, can never be fully explained. As Deignan remarks – with regard to the positive perception but a rather negative metaphorical representation of dogs in many western cultures – the existing difference between literal and metaphorical meanings for a word means that "the existence of different cultural values and

attitudes will not always provide an explanation for cross-linguistic differences in metaphorical meanings" (2003: 258-259).

5. Conclusion

This study set out to find out whether there are any patterns that can be discerned among the data of connotations in animal expressions from around the world, and what factors may be of influence in the development of these connotations. These research goals were pursued with expressions relating to dogs, cats, cows, pigs and donkeys as a starting point. The data, though not equally representative of all language families to which the languages discussed here belong, did show that genealogical relations between languages do increase the likelihood of connotations being shared between those languages. Indo-European languages were represented the best among all the languages under discussion, and the data coming from three different branches of the family showed significant overlap in terms of animal connotations. A number of these connotations was also found in languages from other families, while some were quite unique to particular languages, demonstrating that while there are some universally recognized traits across languages and cultures, the similarities and differences are arbitrary in some cases. Besides genealogy, other factors were also shown to be of some influence with regard to how similar or different connotations for animals are in different languages. Geography can increase or decrease the similarity of connotations significantly, both between related and unrelated languages. Religion as a source of cultural norms and beliefs can also have a lasting influence, as was visible from data on Christian and Islamic beliefs and practices.

Although this study aimed to be inclusive and diverse with regard to the languages that were used for the data, the format and scope of the paper also meant that some aspects have received less attention. Previous publications have often focused on one language or language variety (e.g. Aliakbari & Faraji 2014), or perhaps compared a small number of languages (e.g. Kleparski 2002), which also meant they were able to give a relatively in-depth overview of many different animals and their associated metaphorical traits. Although some authors have pointed out that mammals are by far the most common kind of animal to be used in animal metaphors, due to their social and biological proximity to humans (Kleparski 2002: 25; Kiełtyka & Kleparski 2007: 89), other types of animals – most often birds, but also less frequently reptiles, amphibians, fish and insects – also feature as source domains for human expressions. However, the animals that were treated in this paper are all mammals, and while the amount of data on these animals may be sufficient for the purposes of the study, the absence of data on other kinds of animals in this paper should not go unmentioned. Future publications that treat similar topics, but which can afford to assume a greater scope can hopefully discuss the subject with a considerate balance between language diversity and animal diversity.

Another aspect of the subject that may be worth exploring is the distinction between so-called domestic animals and wild animals. As has been pointed out before, different animals may fall under each category depending on the region or culture, but there is a general consistency in which animals are kept in domestic spheres and which are not. The current paper has only treated domestic animals, and merely mentioned wild animals in passing, so the representation of the latter category's metaphorical associations is practically absent in this

study. Future publications could explore this side of the topic further, for example examining whether there are notable patterns in positive and negative connotations for domestic animals versus wild animals. Previous publications that include a wide variety of animals in the discussion, such as Howard & Rensel (1991) and Aliakbari & Faraji (2014) are already a good start for this.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the historical side of animal metaphors – how they arose through time in different cultures, and how they may have changed – has received only a marginal role in the discussion of this paper. As with the aforementioned topics, this would also seem to be an interesting and valuable subject, both within the fields of linguistics and historical anthropology. It is however a subject that might prove more difficult to study than those mentioned before, seeing as the majority of data would have to be historical records, which leaves even less languages and cultures open to investigation than there are today. Even if a language is attested in an older form in historical documents or writings, it is rather unlikely that the metaphors existing in that older form would be represented in the records. Another possible source of information would be oral traditions of different cultures; however, any historical events in those traditions are often intertwined with mythological narration or other cultural artistic media which may complicate research. Nevertheless, despite the inevitable obstacles, it is another interesting subject that deserves more study in future academic projects.

As has been demonstrated by this paper, the way in which animals are perceived in various languages, and thereby how they are used in swearing or in metaphorical senses is an important insight into the workings of different cultures. While this study attempted to be diverse and inclusive with regard to the languages and cultures discussed, there are likely still many areas of the subject that have received little to no academic attention. It appears that the topic of animal metaphors within language, possibly in conjunction with swearing, has been recognized as one of great value for linguistic and cultural studies. It is the hope of the author that future studies will expand upon it, either by exploring animal metaphors in languages that have thus far not been studied in that regard, or by finding new perspectives for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison.

References

Abou El Fadl, K. (2004). Dogs in the Islamic Tradition. In *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature* (pp. 498-500). Continuum. Retrieved from https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/view/10.1093/acref/9780199754670.001.0001/acref-9780199754670-e-260

Aliakbari, M., & Faraji, E. (2014). Conceptualization of Man's Behavioral and Physical Characteristics as Animal Metaphors in the Spoken Discourse of Khezel People. *Linguistik Online, 59*(2), 3-41. https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.59.1141

Al-Kajela, A. (2017). Language attrition in bicultural bilinguals: Evidence from Neo-Aramaic animal metaphors. *Journal of Languages and Culture, 8*(8), 95-109. https://doi.org/10.5897/JLC2017.0437

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006a). Sweet talking and offensive language. In *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (pp. 29-54). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511617881.002

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006b). Bad language? Jargon, slang, swearing and insult. In *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language* (pp. 55-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511617881.003

Ameka, F. (2020). 6. "I sh.t in your mouth": Areal invectives in the Lower Volta Basin (West Africa). In N. Nassenstein & A. Storch (Ed.), *Swearing and Cursing* (pp. 121-144). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/9781501511202-006

Barasa, M. N, & Opande, I. N. (2017). The use of animal metaphors in the representation of women in Bukusu and Gusii proverbs in Kenya. *The Journal of Pan African Studies, 10*(2), 82. http://www.jpanafrican.org/docs/vol10no2/10.2-7-Barasa%20(1).pdf

Barus, J., Sibarani, R., Saragih, A., & ., M. (2018). Linguistic Taboos in Karonese Culture. *KnE Social Sciences*, *3*(4), 411–421. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1952

Beers Fägersten, K. & Stapleton, K. (2017). *Advances in Swearing Research* (Pragmatics & beyond new series). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Boivin, N., R. Crassard, & M. Petraglia (Eds.) (2017). *Human Dispersal and Species Movement: From Prehistory to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316686942.002

Boudot-Lamotte, A. (1974). L'expression de la malédiction et de l'insulte dans les dialectes arabes maghrébins: Recherches lexicographiques et phraséologiques. *Arabica, 21*(1), 53-71. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4056082

Brandes, S. (1984). Animal Metaphors and Social Control in Tzintzuntzan. *Ethnology, 23*(3), 207-215. doi:10.2307/3773747

Chen, L.-C. & Chen, S.-F. (2011). What Animals Reveal about Grammar and Culture: A Study of Animal Metaphors in Mandarin Chinese and English. *Journal of National Taiwan Normal University: Linguistics and Literature*, *2*(56), 121-152. https://www.academia.edu/44231114/What_Animals_Reveal_about_Grammar_and_Culture_A_Study_of_Animal_Metaphors_in_Mandarin_Chinese_and_English

Deignan, A. (2003). Metaphorical Expressions and Culture: An Indirect Link. *Metaphor & Symbol*, *18*(4), 255–271. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1804_3

Deignan, A., Gabryś, D. & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal*, *51*(4), 352–360, https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1093/elt/51.4.352

Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. (2021). Hund. In *Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Accessed at May 23rd, 2021 from https://www.dwds.de/wb/Hund#1

Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. (2021). Hundearbeit. In *Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Accessed at May 23rd, 2021 from *https://www.dwds.de/wb/Hundearbeit*

Driscoll, C. A., Clutton-Brock, J., Kitchener, A. C., & O'Brien, S. J. (2009). The Taming of the cat. Genetic and archaeological findings hint that wildcats became housecats earlier--and in a different place--than previously thought. *Scientific American*, *300*(6), 68–75. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5790555/pdf/nihms906007.pdf

Fontecha, A. F. & Jiménez Catalán, R. M. (2003). Semantic derogation in animal metaphor: a contrastive-cognitive analysis of two male/female examples in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(5), 771-797. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00127-3

Frantz, L.A.F., Bradley, D.G., Larson, G. & Orlando, L. (2020). Animal domestication in the era of ancient genomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 21**,** 449–460. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-020-0225-0

Fraser, B. (1981). Insulting Problems in a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *15*(4), 435-441. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3586484

Giuffra, E., Kijas, J. M., Amarger, V., Carlborg, O., Jeon, J. T., & Andersson, L. (2000). The origin of the domestic pig: independent domestication and subsequent introgression. *Genetics*, *154*(4), 1785–1791. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1461048/pdf/10747069.pdf

Halupka-Rešetar, S. & Radić, B. (2003). Animal names used in addressing people in Serbian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(12), 1891-1902. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00052-3

Harjula, R. (1994). Animals, birds and insects as metaphors in Meru proverbs. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, *3*(2), 76-91. http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol3num2/missing-pages.pdf

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., & Sun, P. (2011). Beastly: What Makes Animal Metaphors Offensive? *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *30*(3), 311–325. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X11407168

Howard, A. & Rensel, J. (1991). Animal as metaphors in Rotuman Sayings. In: Pawley, A. (ed.), *Man and a Half: Essays in Pacific Anthropology and Ethnobiology in Honour of Ralph Bulmer* (pp. 127-137). Auckland:Polynesian Society. http://www.jps.auckland.ac.nz/docs/Memoirs/mem_048/manandahalf019.pdf

Hsieh, S. C. (2006) A corpus-based study on animal expressions in Mandarin Chinese and German, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*(12),2206-2222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.08.007

Hughes, G. (2006). *An Encyclopedia of Swearing : The Social History of Oaths, Profanity, Foul Language, and Ethnic Slurs in the English-speaking World*. Routledge.

Jay, T. (2020). 2. Ten issues facing taboo word scholars. In N. Nassenstein & A. Storch (Ed.), *Swearing and Cursing* (pp. 37-52). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/9781501511202-002

Kiełtyka, R. & Kleparski, G. Aj. (2007). On the Indo-European Nature of Non-Indo-European Animal Metaphor: The Case of Chinese Zoosemy. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia, 4*(47): 88–99. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/14525438.pdf

Kleparski, G.A. 2002. "Lusta, mint a disznó: A hunt for 'correlative' zoosemy in Hungarian and English". *Studia Anglica Resoviensia 1*(6), 9–32. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/14525522.pdf

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago [etc.]: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakusta, V. (2019). Ways of Expressing Verbal Aggression in Egyptian Arabic. In: Miller, C., Barontini, A., Germanos, M., Guerrero, J., & Pereira, C. (Eds.), *Studies on Arabic Dialectology and Sociolinguistics : Proceedings of the 12th International Conference of AIDA held in Marseille from May 30th to June 2nd 2017*. Aix-en-Provence: Institut de recherches et d'études sur les mondes arabes et musulmans. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.iremam.4496

Ljung, M. (2010). *Swearing: A Cross-Cultural Linguistic Study*. Springer.

Martsa, S. (1999). On exploring conceptual structure of folk knowledge: The case of animal terms. *Linguistica e filologia*, 9, 73-87.

Masliyah, S. (2001). CURSES AND INSULTS IN IRAQI ARABIC. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, XLVI(2), 267-308. https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/XLVI.2.267

Matusz, Ł. (2019). On dogs, cows, and donkeys: The use of animal metaphors in linguistic insults. In: P. Biały, M. Kuczok & Marcin Zabawa (eds.), *A contrastive perspective on figurative language* (pp. 145-160). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego. https://www.ceeol.com/search/chapter-detail?id=847675

MD Rashid, S., Hajimaming, P., & Nadia Muhammad, N. (2012). 'Farm' Animal Metaphors in Malay and Arabic Figurative Expressions: Implications for Language Learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1*(7), 33-39. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.127

Menache, S. (2006a). Animals in the Bible and Qur'an. In *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature* (pp. 76-78). Continuum. Retrieved from https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/view/10.1093/acref/9780199754670.001.0001/acref-9780199754670-e-38

Menache, S. (2006b). Dogs in the Abrahamic Traditions. In *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature* (pp. 497-498). Continuum. Retrieved from https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/view/10.1093/acref/9780199754670.001.0001/acref-9780199754670-e-259

Munier, A., & Eberhardt, K. (2009). *Talk dirty German: Beyond schmutz - the curses, slang, and street lingo you need to know when you speak Deutsch*. Avon, Mass: Adams Media.

Munier, A., & Martinez, L. (2008). *Talk dirty Spanish: Beyond Mierda - the curses, slang and street lingo you need to know when you speak Español*. Avon, Mass: Adams Media.

Munier, A., & Tichelli, E. (2008a). *Talk dirty French: Beyond Merde - the curses, slang and street lingo you need to know when you speak Français*. Avon, Mass: Adams Media.

Munier, A., & Tichelli, E. (2008b). *Italian: Beyond Cazzo: the Curses, Slang, and Street Lingo You Need to Know When You Speak Italiano*. Avon, Mass: Adams Media.

Nesi, H. (1995). A modern bestiary: a contrastive study of the figurative meanings of animal terms, *ELT Journal*, *49*(3), 272–278. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.3.272

Nizamoglu, C. (2007, April 16). *Cats in Islamic Culture.* Muslim Heritage. https://muslimheritage.com/cats-islamic-culture/

O'Donnell, P. (1990). Entre chien et loup: A Study of French Animal Metaphors. *The French Review, 63*(3), 514-523. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/394496

Ọlátéjú, A. (2005): The Yorùbá Animal Metaphors: Analysis and Interpretation. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 14*(3), 368–383. http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol14num3/olateju.pdf

Rakusan, J. (2004). Cultural diversity in crossing the boundaries between human and animal in language - Germanic and Slavic similes and metaphors. *Collegium Antropologicum, 28*, 171-181. https://core.ac.uk/reader/14400703

Rodríguez, I. (2009). Of Women, Bitches, Chickens and Vixens: Animal Metaphors for Women in English and Spanish. *Culture, Language and Representation, 7*, 77-100. https://www.raco.cat/index.php/CLR/article/view/226358/307958

Rossel, S., Marshall, F., Peters, J., Pilgram, T., Adams, M. D. & O'Connor, D. (2008). Domestication of the donkey: Timing, processes, and indicators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 105*(10), 3715-3720. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0709692105

Sacher, J. (2012). *How to Swear Around the World.* Chronicle Books.

Scanes, C. G. & Chengzhong, P. (2018). Animals and Religion, Belief Systems, Symbolism and Myth. In: Colin G. Scanes, Samia R. Toukhsati (eds.), *Animals and Human Society*, Academic Press, Pages 257-280, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-805247-1.00017-4

Scheu, A., Powell, A., Bollongino, R., Vigne, J-D., Tresset, A., Çakırlar, C., Benecke, N. & Burger, J. (2015). The genetic prehistory of domesticated cattle from their origin to the

spread across Europe. *BMC Genet 16*(54), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12863-015-0203-2

Senft, G. (2010). 3 'Biga bwena', 'biga gaga' and 'matua' – 'Good speech', 'bad speech' and 'insults, curses, swear words'. In *The Trobriand Islanders' Ways of Speaking* (pp. 17-25). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1515/9783110227994.17

Shahar M. (2019) The Chinese Cult of the Horse King, Divine Protector of Equines. In: Kowner R., Bar-Oz G., Biran M., Shahar M., Shelach-Lavi G. (eds) *Animals and Human Society in Asia* (pp. 355-390). The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24363-0_12

Talebinejad, R. & Dastjerdi, H. (2005). A Cross-Cultural Study of Animal Metaphors: When Owls Are Not Wise!. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *20*(2), 133-150. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2002_3

Van Dale. (z.d.). Ezel. In *Van Dale*. Accessed on June 13th, 2021, at https://www.vandale.nl/gratis-woordenboek/nederlands/betekenis/ezel#.YMYCiPn7SUl

Van Dale. (z.d.). Kat. In *Van Dale*. Accessed on June 6th, 2021, at https://www.vandale.nl/gratis-woordenboek/nederlands/betekenis/kat#.YMNUP_n7SUm

Waldau, P. (2006). Animals. *In The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature* (pp. 66-73). Continuum. Retrieved from https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/view/10.1093/acref/9780199754670.001.0001/acref-9780199754670-e-36