

Robert KIEŁTYKA, Grzegorz A. KLEPARSKI

ON THE INDO-EUROPEAN NATURE OF NON-INDO-EUROPEAN ANIMAL METAPHOR: THE CASE OF CHINESE ZOOSEMY

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to outline the mechanism of **zoosemy**¹ (animal metaphor) operating in Chinese in the context of its operation in Indo-European languages. In the existing literature, the issue of animal metaphor in Chinese has been touched upon in, among others, Hsieh (2000, 2002, 2003), Domínguez and Li (2004) and Kiełtyka (forthcoming).² In their cognitively-couched analysis of the metaphorisation of animal terms, Domínguez and Li (2004) concentrate on the semantics of water animals in Spanish and Chinese, yet there is an evident lack of any in-depth study of zoosemic developments of other subcategories of the macrocategory of **ANIMALS**, such as, for example, **MAMMALS**, **BIRDS**, **AMPHIBIANS** or **INSECTS**. To meet this need, we intend to trace certain zoosemic developments involving the members of the category **DOMESTICATED ANIMALS**. We envision a later attempt will be made to expand the scope of the issue to further historical analysis. Quite rightly, this paper concentrates mainly on the question *what* has happened, rather than attempting to formulate definite answers to the questions of *why* or *under what conditions* zoosemic developments, and – in particular – zoosemic shifts in Chinese have taken place.

¹ Zoosemy is understood in current semantic literature (see Rayevska (1979:165)) as *nicknaming from animals* which means that *names of animals are often used to denote human qualities*.

² Kleparski (1990, 1996, 1997, 2002), Kiełtyka (2005a, 2005b), Hsieh (2000, 2002, 2003), Domínguez and Li (2004) and Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a, 2005b) analyse selected animal terms in various languages with special reference to English, Hungarian, Chinese and Spanish, with the aid of both componential and cognitive mechanisms.

Chinese zoosemy: The case of DOMESTICATED ANIMALS

Thornton (1989), in her semantic analysis of the field **GOOD AND EVIL** in English, proposes a study in which the semantics of animal terms used for good and evil people is scrutinised. Among others, the results of the study show that out of a large group of animals whose names are used in various metaphorical expressions referring to people, **MAMMALS** take the definite and unchallenged lead. The results of Thornton's (1989) research, where the figures stand for the number of animals involved, are as shown below (Thornton (1989:443)):

MAMMALS51
INSECTS8
REPTILES8
BIRDS8
FISH7
ARACHNIDIS3
AMPHIBIANS3
CRUSTACEANS2

The above figures clearly indicate that the lexical items linked to the category **MAMMALS** dominate quantitatively in English historical zoosemy. Thornton (1989) argues that **HUMANS** are most often represented by the category **MAMMALS** mainly due to their widely-understood similarity, familiarity and closeness to mankind. On the contrary, the smallest number of animal terms used with reference to **HUMANS** is derived from the class which is probably least similar, familiar and close to the human species, that is to say **CRUSTACEANS**. In the context of other zoosemic developments in other Indo-European languages one may draw an obvious conclusion that users of natural languages tend to apply to other people most often the names of those animals to which they are the closest and/or which they are most familiar with (see Thornton (1989), Kleparski (2002) and Kiełtyka (forthcoming). One finds evidence that, judging by the results of Thornton's (1989) analysis, domesticated animals, owing to their ritual closeness to people, should be a category particularly richly represented in metaphorical developments targeted at the category **HUMANS** in various languages and cultures. Indeed, as we will try to demonstrate below, domesticated animals play an important role in the rise of zoosemic shifts in various directions (amelioration, pejoration, etc.), and their role in the process of zoosemy in Chinese is basically comparable to that played by the relevant animals in English and other Indo-European languages.

In most general terms, Chinese domesticated animals belong to three major classes of animals, i.e., **MAMMALS**, **BIRDS** and **ARTHROPODS**.

The category **MAMMALS** includes the following families: **EQUIDAE** (e.g. *lǚ* 驢³ ‘a donkey’), **BOVIDAE** (e.g. *niú* 牛 ‘an ox’), **CANIDAE** (e.g. *gǒu* 狗 ‘a dog’), **SUIDAE** (e.g. *zhu* 豬 ‘a pig’), **FELIDAE** (e.g. *mao* 貓 ‘a cat’) and **LEPORIDAE** (e.g. *tù* 兔 ‘a rabbit’). On the other hand, **DOMESTIC FOWL** (e.g. *ji* 雞 ‘a chicken’), **MELEAGRIDIDAE** (e.g. *tǔ shòu jī* 吐綬雞 ‘a turkey’) and **ANATIDAE** (e.g. *e* 鵞 ‘a goose’) belong to the class of **BIRDS**. Finally, **ARTHROPODS** are represented by the family **APOIDEA** (e.g. *mì fēng* 蜜蜂 ‘a bee’).

Notice that – to a considerable extent – our observations on the nature of zoosemy in various languages are largely in accord with Hsieh’s (2000) findings who, in her extensive study of animal metaphor in German and Chinese, argues that the mechanism of zoosemy closely reflects the ways of thinking and the cultural peculiarities of particular societies as implied in the metaphors which are subconsciously used on a daily basis; these *metaphors we live by* (see Lakoff and Johnson (1980)), emerge from literary works, mass media or contact with other languages. One of the observations made by the author is that the majority of animal metaphors are constructed either with regard to the conceptual dimension of appearance, conduct or character of respective animals.

It turns out that the conceptual dimension *APPEARANCE/PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS* seems to play a crucial role in the process of zoosemic extension in Chinese (e.g. *wu ke gua niu* 無殼蝸牛 ‘no-shell-snail’ > ‘people who are not capable of purchasing houses’; *gua niu zu* ‘snail-tribe’ > ‘people who do not possess real estate’; *shui she yao* 水蛇腰 ‘water-snake-waist’ > ‘a slender waist’;⁴ *shen qing ru yan* 身輕如燕 ‘body-light-like-swallow’ > ‘as light as a swallow’⁵; *fei zhu* 肥豬 ‘a fat-pig’ > ‘a fat person’; *shou pi hou* 瘦活 ‘thin-skin-monkey’ > ‘a bag of bones’;⁶ *biao xing da han* 彪形大漢 ‘young tiger-big-man’ > ‘a husky fellow’; *hu dan* 虎膽 ‘tiger-gut’ > ‘great braveness’; *sheng long huo hu* 生龍活虎 ‘living-dragon-lively-tiger’ > ‘full of vigour’; *hu jiang* 虎將 ‘a tiger’ > ‘a brave man’).

Another group of Chinese animal metaphors are clearly triggered via the activation of various attributive values specifiable for the conceptual dimension *BEHAVIOUR/CHARACTER* (e.g. *ru yu de shui* 如魚得水 ‘feel just like fish in water’ > ‘be in one’s element’; *nei zhi mao er bu tou xing*

³ All Chinese examples, unless otherwise indicated, have been borrowed from Hsieh (2000, 2002, 2003) and Domínguez and Li (2004).

⁴ Compare German *Wespentaille* ‘wasp waist’ > ‘slender waist’.

⁵ Cf. German *schlank wie ein Reh* ‘slender-like-a-deer’ > ‘slender person’.

⁶ Compare German *Schwer wie ein Elefant* ‘heavy like an elephant’ > ‘very heavy person’, *Schultern wie ein Huhn* ‘shoulders like a chicken’ > ‘having slim shoulders’, *pudeldick* ‘poodle fat’ ‘very fat’, *stark wie ein Tiger* ‘as strong as a tiger’.

哪隻貓兒不偷腥 ‘which cat wouldn’t steal the fish’ > ‘which man wouldn’t like the wife of another man’; *mao* 貓 ‘a cat’ > ‘a gluttonous person’;⁷ *ren sheng bu du shu huo zhebu ru zhu* 人生不讀書 活著不如豬 ‘people-life-not-read-book-live-not-as-pig’ > ‘people living in the world would be ignorant if they did not study’; *fang niu ban* 放牛班 ‘release-cow-class’ > ‘classes where the students’ school performances are inferior’; *shang ke xiang tiao chong* 上課像條蟲 and *xia ke xiang tiao long* 下課像條龍 ‘up-class-like-a-worm down-class-like-a-dragon’ > ‘students acting dully in class and dynamically out of class’; *diao yu* 釣魚 ‘fishing-sleepy’ > ‘to fall asleep out of tiredness in class’; *wen ji qi wu* 聞雞起舞 ‘hear-chicken-up-dance’ > ‘to rise up upon rooster; diligent and full of enthusiasm’; *li ba za de jin* 籬笆紮得緊 ‘fence-basketry-tie-get-tight and *huang gou zuan bu jin* 黃狗鑽不進 ‘yellow-dog-drill-not-inside’ > ‘man should work hard to prevent a contingent disaster’; *shu dao hu sun san* 樹倒猴孫散 ‘when the tree falls, the monkeys scatter’ > ‘when an influential person falls from power, his hangers-on disperse’⁸; *ben zhu* 笨豬 ‘a dumb pig’ > ‘an idiot’⁹; *gen pi chong* 跟屁蟲 ‘follow-butt-worm’ > ‘to cling to someone like a leech’; *hu ben* 虎賁 ‘tiger-energetic’ > ‘bold fighter’; *hu dan* 虎膽 ‘tiger-gut’ > ‘great braveness’; *hu xiao feng sheng* 虎嘯風生 ‘tiger-shout-wind-blow’ > ‘great men appear in response to the call of the times’¹⁰; *mu lao hu* 母老虎 ‘female-tiger/tigress’ > ‘fractious woman’; *bai hu xing* 白虎星 ‘white-tiger-star’ > ‘a jinx; a woman who brings bad luck’; *chu sheng zhi du bu wei hu* 初生之犢不畏虎 ‘newborn calves are not afraid of tigers’ > ‘young people are fearless’).

Hsieh (2000) provides ample evidence that in Chinese the quality of being (AFRAID/FEARFUL) may be expressed in a variety of ways, including among others, the following syntagmas involving animal names: *suo tou wu gui* 縮頭烏龜 ‘to move one’s head like a tortoise/turtle’ > ‘a coward’, *dan xiao ru shu* 膽小如鼠 ‘as fearful as a mouse’ > ‘timid and chicken-hearted; a coward’. In turn, the conceptual elements of (GREEDINESS) and (BESTIALITY) clearly emerge from the following contexts: *shi zi da kai kou* 獅子大開口 ‘a lion opens its mouth widely’ > ‘one demands a lot of money’, *hu shi dan dan* 虎視眈眈 ‘to ambush somebody like a greedy tiger does’ > ‘to stare at something in a lurking way’ *ru lang si hu* 如狼似虎 ‘like wolves and tigers’ > ‘bestial, beastly’, *lang*

⁷ Interestingly, English *tomcat* is a metaphorical designation for a man who pursues women sexually, while its German equivalent *Kater* ‘a tomcat’ is used in the sense ‘hangover’.

⁸ Cf. German *die großen Fische fressen die kleinen* ‘the-big-fish-eat-the-small’ > ‘the great fish eat up the small; the strong overwhelm the weak’.

⁹ Notice that in German the context *sich zum Affen machen* ‘make a monkey of oneself’ is rendered as ‘to make a fool of oneself’.

¹⁰ See German *Tigermutter* ‘a mother tiger’ used in the extended sense ‘an overprotective mother’.

tun hu yan 狼吞虎嚥 ‘to devour something like a wolf and tiger’ > ‘to eat quickly or greedily’.¹¹

In turn, the behavioural attributes of being (WILD), (WICKED) and (ANGRY) are expressed by means of the following Chinese syntagmas (see Hsieh (2000:200)): *lang zi ye xin* 狼子野心 ‘wolf-young-wild-heart’ > ‘wild ambitions’, *pi zhe yang pi de lang* 披著羊皮的狼 ‘a wolf in sheep’s clothing’,¹² *jiu wei hu* 九尾狐 ‘a vicious fox’ > ‘a wicked man’; *hu li jing* 狐狸精 ‘a vixen’ > ‘seductress’.¹³ The conceptual value of (LACK OF EXPERIENCE) is conveyed by means of *cai niao* 菜鳥 ‘a bad bird’ > ‘a greenhorn/tenderfoot’.

Hsieh’s (2000) study shows that in Chinese – similarly to a number of Indo-European languages – such domesticated animals as the pig, dog, goose, donkey, ox and cow are frequently put to use in evaluatively negative senses and in particular – they come to stand for the concept of (STUPIDITY). And so, Chinese *zhu* 豬 ‘a pig’ is used in the following contexts: *ben/chun zhu* 笨/蠢豬 ‘a stupid pig’ > ‘an idiot’, *si zhu* 死豬 ‘a dead pig’ > ‘a stupid, dull-witted person’.¹⁴ Chinese *gou* 狗 ‘a dog’ appears in *ben gou* 笨狗 ‘a stupid dog’ > ‘a stupid person’,¹⁵ *gou tou jun shi* 狗頭軍師 meaning literally ‘a stupid dog’ > ‘a stupid, brainless advisor’, *shu quan fei ri* 蜀犬吠日 ‘when the sun shines in Sichuan even dogs bark’ > ‘to be astonished by somebody’s ignorance’. In a likewise manner, *e* 鵝 ‘a goose’ may be found in *dai tou e* 呆頭鵝 ‘a blockhead goose’ > ‘a stupid man’ and *ben e* 笨鵝 ‘a stupid goose’ > ‘a stupid woman’;¹⁶ *lü* 驢 ‘a donkey’ is used in *chun lü* 蠢驢 ‘a stupid donkey’ > ‘a stupid person’.¹⁷

¹¹ Hsieh (2000:200), draws some parallels between Chinese zoosemy and German animal metaphor and points out that in the latter the concept of greediness is rendered by the following idioms of comparison involving animal terms: *gierig wie ein Geier/Aasgeier* ‘as greedy as a vulture’, *wie ein Wolf runterschlingen* ‘to eat quickly or greedily like a wolf’, *hungrig wie ein Wolf* ‘as hungry as a wolf’. Compare Polish *głodny jak wilk* ‘as hungry as a wolf’ and *wilczy apetyt* ‘wolf-like hunger’.

¹² Compare Polish *wilk w owczej skórze* ‘a wolf in sheep’s clothing’.

¹³ Compare English *vixen* ‘wild, sexually promiscuous female’. Notice that similar character/behaviour conceptual values are represented by the following German contexts: *der böse Wolf* ‘a vicious wolf’ > ‘a wicked man’, *Wolfsbrut* ‘as brutal/beastly as a wolf’, *ein Wolf im Schafspelz* ‘a wolf in sheep’s clothing’.

¹⁴ Notice that Hungarian *disznó* ‘a pig’ is used secondarily in the sense ‘a person who cannot behave oneself’ while Hebrew *hazir* ‘a pig’ is often applied in the sense ‘a miser’.

¹⁵ Compare English *dog*, German *Hund* and Polish *pies* that are secondarily employed as disapproving terms with reference to men.

¹⁶ Notice that Polish *gęś* ‘goose’ and English *goose* are restricted to females in their metaphorical application.

¹⁷ Similarly, Russian *ocël* ‘a donkey’ has acquired the secondary sense ‘a stupid, obstinate person’ while Russian *корова* ‘a cow’ is used with reference to ‘a clumsy, sluggish or stupid woman’.

zhen lü 真驢 ‘a real ass’ > ‘an utter idiot’.¹⁸ Additionally, the attributive element (STUPIDITY) clearly emerges from the following metaphorical contexts containing animal terms: *da niu* 大牛 ‘a big ox’ > ‘a big and stupid person’, *da ben niu* 大笨牛 ‘a big and stupid ox’ > ‘a big and stupid man’, *niu yan* 牛眼 ‘bovine eyes’¹⁹ > ‘big and silly-looking eyes’, *ma bu zhi lian chang hou zi’bu zhi pi gu hong* 馬不知臉長 猴子不知屁股紅 ‘a horse does not know that it has a long muzzle; a monkey does not know that its backside is red’ > ‘people are not aware of their faults’.²⁰

Likewise, the Chinese material shows that the conceptual behavioural values (COWARDICE) and (STUBBORNNESS) may be encoded not merely by animal terms linked to the subcategory **DOMESTICATED ANIMALS**, but also other animal names related to other subcategories of **ANIMALS**, for example, *ruan jiao xia* 軟腳蝦 ‘a soft-legged crab’ > ‘a weak, cowardly person’, *gou xiong* 狗熊 ‘a black bear’ > ‘a coward’.²¹ The quality of being (STUBBORN) emerges from the following Chinese contexts where animal names are integral parts (see Hsieh (2000:202)): *niu er bu he shui bu neng qiang wen tou* 牛兒不喝水 不能強擡頭 ‘when an ox doesn’t drink water, one cannot bend its head down by force’ > ‘one cannot force stubborn people to do anything’, *niu pi qi* 牛脾氣 ‘a stubborn ox’ > ‘a stubborn person’, *ding niu* 頂牛 from *niu* 牛 ‘an ox’ > ‘a stubborn person’.²²

Another category of Chinese zoosemy clearly emerging from the material available includes those zoosemic metaphors that are coined somewhat arbitrarily with no clear reference to a relevant animal. These may be referred to as terms of abuse related to the conceptual sphere **CONTEMPT/OPPROBRIUM**²³ (e.g. *lang dao chu chi rou* 狼到處吃肉 ‘wolf-

¹⁸ Likewise, Hungarian *szamár* ‘an ass, donkey’ has acquired the metaphorical sense ‘a foolish, silly person’.

¹⁹ Compare Polish. *cielęce spojrzenie* employed in the metaphorical sense ‘bovine look’.

²⁰ Notice that in German *blöde Ziege* ‘a silly goat’, *diese Schnepfe* ‘these snipes’, *blöder Hund* ‘a silly dog’, *blöde Kamel* ‘a silly camel’ are all used in the extended sense ‘a silly person’.

²¹ Compare English *chicken* used in the sense ‘a coward’. Likewise, German *ein Esel in der Löwenhaut* ‘an ass in a lion’s skin’, *feiger Hund* ‘a coward dog’, *Sei kein Frosch!* ‘don’t be a frog’ (cf. English *don’t be a chicken*, Polish *nie bądź tchórzem* literally ‘don’t be a polecat’), are all used as designation for cowardly people. Interestingly, in Hebrew the lexical category *šafan* ‘a rabbit’ has acquired the secondary sense ‘a coward’.

²² In Yorùbá the lexical item *ewuré* ‘a goat’ is used secondarily in the sense ‘a stubborn person’ (see Olatéjù (2005)).

²³ Polish terms for domesticated animals which through the process of animal metaphorisation are targeted at various locations of the conceptual category **HUMAN BEING** and are at the same time related to the conceptual dimension **CONTEMPT/OPPROBRIUM** include the following items used with reference to women: *krowa* ‘a cow’, *cielę* ‘a calf’, *suka* ‘a bitch’, *gęś* ‘a goose’, *kobyła* ‘a hack’, *szczeniara* ‘fem. puppy’/*koza* ‘a goat’ > ‘a young girl’; and the following ones applied with reference to men: *pies z kulawą nogą* ‘a lame dog’ > ‘nobody’, *baran* ‘a ram’,

everywhere-place-eat-meat’ and *gou dao chu chi shi* 狗到處吃屎 ‘dog-everywhere-place-eat-dung’, both of which may be translated as ‘you can take the commoner out of the gutter, but you can’t take the gutter out of the commoner’, *shen ru lan chan* 身如爛蠶 ‘body-like-rotten-silkworm’ and *cui ru tie qian* 嘴如鐵筊 ‘mouth-like-iron-tongs’ both meaning ‘to blame someone who does not admit his mistake’).²⁴

Although cases of Chinese animal metaphor – like most of their equivalents in Indo-European languages – are often employed as terms of opprobrium and abuse (e.g. Irish *asal* ‘a donkey’ > ‘a foolish person’, German *Schwein*, Polish *świnia*, English *pig* all meaning primarily ‘a pig’, and – secondarily – ‘a mean person’), some of them are used with a positive evaluative charge (e.g. as such terms of endearment as English *bunny*, Polish *żabka* ‘dim. frog’, French *canari* ‘a canary’ all applied in the sense ‘a beloved woman’; German endearments for children: *Frosch/Fröschlein* ‘a frog/little frog’, *Mäuschen/Mausi* ‘a little mouse’, *Schäfchen* ‘little sheep’, *Spatz/Spätzchen* ‘a sparrow/little sparrow’, *Würmchen* ‘a little worm’; German endearments for women: *Lamm/Lämmchen* ‘a lamb/little lamb’, *Schmusekatze* ‘a flattering she-cat’, *Kätzchen* ‘a little cat’, *Hase/Hasi* ‘a rabbit/little rabbit’, *Mäuschen/Mausi* ‘little mouse’, *Spätzchen* ‘a little sparrow’, *Täubchen* ‘a little dove’, *Vögelchen* ‘little bird’; German endearments for men: *Bärchen* ‘a little bear’, *Knuddelbär* ‘a cuddle-bear’, *Brummbar* ‘a growling bear’²⁵).

One may put forward a claim²⁶ that apart from the groups of metaphors analysed by Hsieh (2000) which evidently mirror the involvement of the conceptual spheres posited here, other conceptual dimensions are also a common triggering factor in the rise of animal-based metaphors, for example the conceptual sphere *PROFESSION/SOCIAL FUNCTION* clearly involved in the rise of many zoosemic shifts in a number of Indo-European languages (e.g. English *water-dog* ‘a dog trained to the water’ > ‘a sailor, a good swimmer’, Polish *piesek* ‘dim. dog’ > ‘an informer’, German *Kettenhund* ‘a dog kept to guard against trespassers or thieves’ > ‘one that guards against loss, waste, theft’, *Bulle* ‘a bull’ > ‘a bobby, rozzer, fuzz’).

byczek ‘dim. bull’, *bydlak* ‘pej. cattle’, *samiec* ‘male’, (*stary*) *byk* ‘an old bull’, (*stary*) *koń* ‘an old horse’, *mul* ‘a mule’, *psi syn* ‘a son of a dog’, *sukinsyn* ‘a son of a bitch’, *sukinkot* ‘euph. a son of a bitch’, *wieprz* ‘a hog’.

²⁴ Consider German *Sauigel* ‘sow-hedgehog’ > ‘a person telling indecent jokes; a dirty person’; *dummes Kamel* ‘stupid camel’ > ‘a stupid person’; *er geht nicht mit kleinen Hunden pinkeln* ‘he does not go pissing with small dogs’ > ‘he is not interested in insignificant people’.

²⁵ Cases of evaluatively positive zoosemy in Chinese are relatively scarce but, for example, Chinese wives refer to their husbands as *lao bu si de* 老不死的 ‘old but not yet dead’. In this respect Hsieh (2003:13) points out that cultural background is required to understand such a term of endearment.

²⁶ See Kiełtyka (forthcoming).

The body of Chinese animal names involving domesticated animals which entered the metaphorical path embodying the conceptual dimension *PROFESSION/SOCIAL FUNCTION* include such cases as, for example, *gou* 狗 whose primary sense is ‘a dog’ while – secondarily – the word may be employed in the sense ‘a bondsman, serf’ and this may be documented by its use in the following combinations: *zou gou* 走狗 ‘a watchdog; flunkey (servant); dogsbody’;²⁷ *gou tui* 狗腿 ‘a flunkey; abettor; rogue; brown-nose; arselicker’; *gou tui zi* 狗腿子 ‘abettor’.²⁸ The conceptual zone *ORIGIN/SOCIAL STATUS* is yet another sphere through which animal metaphors are construed in Chinese. As pointed out by Hsieh (2000:88–89), in Chinese canine names and names of domesticated birds are commonly employed to designate inferiority and/or low social status. To illustrate this let us quote the above-mentioned lexical item *gou* 狗, whose primary sense is ‘a dog’, but which is secondarily employed in the metaphorical sense ‘a bondsman, serf’. Likewise, Chinese *ji* 雞 meaning primarily ‘a chicken, hen’ represents metaphorically the concept of (INFERIORITY) and (LOW SOCIAL STATUS). Secondarily, the word may be used in the sense ‘a low, unimportant person’ and also ‘an unimportant thing/mere nothing’.²⁹

The conceptual dimension *MORALITY* is yet another source of numerous animal metaphors in Chinese.³⁰ For instance, *hu li jing* 狐狸精 ‘fox-spirit’ > ‘a

²⁷ In Polish the lexical category *pies* ‘a dog’ is secondarily used to denote ‘a policeman’ while *kot* ‘a cat’ is employed in the sense ‘an infidel’ and in military slang ‘a young soldier in the army’. However, Polish *piesek* ‘dim. dog’ designates an informer while German *Bulle* ‘a bull’ is secondarily applied with reference to a bobby, rozzer, fuzzi.

²⁸ Notice that in many Slavic languages, such as, for example Polish *pies* ‘dog’, the word for dog was in the past frequently employed in the sense ‘uncouth man, barbarian’. It appears that Slavic languages are abundant in zoosems related to the conceptual sphere *PROFESSION/SOCIAL FUNCTION*. Consider, for example, Polish *orzel* ‘an eagle’ which in thieves’ slang is applied in the sense ‘an experienced thief’, *ptak* ‘a bird’ – secondarily ‘a criminal’, *kanar* ‘aug. a canary’ and metaphorically ‘a ticket inspector’, *bocian* ‘a stork’ and also ‘a slow player’, *jelen* ‘a deer’ and secondarily ‘inexperienced player’, *papuga* ‘a parrot’ and secondarily ‘informally a lawyer’, *pajak* ‘a spider’ metaphorically ‘a policeman with a radar’, *biedronka* ‘lady-bird’, *ćma* ‘a moth’, *kuna* ‘a marten’, *mewka* ‘a (little) sea-gull’ – all terms used in the sense ‘a prostitute’, *jelen* ‘a deer’ in its extended sense functions as ‘a prostitute’s client’; Russian *крыса* ‘a rat’ > ‘a clerk’, *заяц* ‘a hare’ > ‘a passenger without a valid ticket: a stowaway/a fare dodger’, *бабочка* ‘a butterfly’ > ‘a prostitute’ and Slovak *straka* ‘a magpie’ > ‘a thief’. When we take into consideration zoosemic data from another non-Indo-European language such as, for example, Hungarian we find the following zoosems embodying the conceptual dimension *PROFESSION/SOCIAL FUNCTION*: *gólya* ‘a stork’ > ‘a first year student’, *gorilla* ‘a gorilla’ > ‘a bodyguard’, *héja* ‘a hawk’ > ‘an extremist in politics’, *nagykutya* ‘a big dog’ > ‘an influential person’.

²⁹ Consider also English *jade* ‘a sorry, ill-conditioned horse of inferior breed’ > ‘a low or shrewish woman’ and Polish *kobyła* ‘an old mare of low origin’ > ‘a contemptible female’.

³⁰ Among other non-Indo-European languages the following non-domesticated animal terms are used figuratively to embody the conceptual dimension *MORALITY*: Basque *ahardia* ‘a sow’ >

woman of easy virtue; an enchantress', *wu ye niu lang* 午夜牛郎 'a mid-night-cowboy' > 'a male prostitute', *mao ku lao shu* 貓哭老鼠 'cat-cry-mouse' and *jia ci bei* 假慈悲 'false-mercy' > 'the cat weeping over the dead mouse; shed crocodile tears' > 'dishonesty'³¹, *jin si mao* 金絲貓 'gold-hair-cat' is a semantic innovation that is used in the sense 'a blond girl, blond prostitute', *hu gu po* 虎姑婆 'tiger-aunt' > 'evil woman'. Finally, the syntagma *jiao chun mao* 叫春貓 'cry-lust-cat' > 'a lecherous man'³² clearly exemplifies the conceptual dimension *SEXUALITY*.³³

We have grounds to support the views expressed by many (see, among others, Miller and Swift (1976), Mills (1989), Hsieh (2000) and Kochman-Haładaj (this volume), who maintain that human language expresses the thoughts of human beings and – as part of this expression – there arise animal metaphors based on chauvinism and the criticism of human conduct. One could generalise here and say that animal metaphor fulfils both semantic and sociolinguistic functions in human communication. This is due to the fact that – in a way – animal metaphors may be said to mirror both our social/aesthetic/behavioural/moral and other values as well

'a dirty, despicable woman', *txakur emea* 'a bitch' > 'an evil-minded, spiteful woman'; Hungarian *patkány* 'a rat' > 'a base, mean person', *tetű* 'a louse' > 'a base, mean person', *görény* 'a polecat' > 'a cunning, sly, dishonest person'.

³¹ Cf. German *Schmeichelkatze* 'a flattering cat' > 'a flattering woman'.

³² See also English *stallion* 'a male horse' > 'a begetter; a lascivious man' Polish *pies na kobiety* 'a dog for women' > 'a women-mad man' and French *coq* 'a rooster' > 'a macho, sexually active man'.

³³ According to Baider and Gesuato (2003:26), in Italian and French one encounters a number of animal terms used for women connoted sexually, e.g. Italian *pollastra* 'a pullet-(fem/sing)' > 'a young woman considered as an object of sexual desire', *colombella* 'a stock dove-(fem/sing)' > 'a tender and loving girl', *piccioncina* 'a young pigeon-(fem/sing)' > 'a love-bird, a term of endearment for a woman', *coniglietta* 'a rabbit-(dim-fem)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *pollastrella* 'a pullet-(aug/pej-dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *cavallina* 'a horse-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *poltra* 'a filly-(fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *puledra* 'a filly-(fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *puledrina* 'a filly-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *giovenca* 'a heifer-(fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as as an object of sexual desire', *micia* 'a kitty-(fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as object of sexual desire', *micetta* 'a kitty-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *gattina* 'a cat-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *cagnetta* 'a dog-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire', *piccioncina* 'a pigeon-(dim-fem/sing)' > 'a term for the immature animal representing the woman as an object of sexual desire'; French *ma colombe* 'a dove' > 'a tender and loving girl', *ma biche* 'a doe' > 'a term of endearment for a woman'.

as the scalar nature of these values, which – ultimately – must be viewed as developing from the shape of culture and society and reflect the way we think of and perceive either individuals or groups. In other words, it seems that the process of zoosemy mirrors human relations and the way we assess society's demands and expectations set upon us and, in this sense, social/aesthetic/behavioural and moral values and norms are manifested in our choice of as well as use of animal metaphors.

Cognitive interpretation and conclusions

In the view of many linguists working in the cognitive spirit of linguistic analysis, semantic structures may be characterised relative to cognitive domains, which in the works of Kleparski (1996, 1997, 2002), Kiełtyka (2005a, 2005b) and Kiełtyka (forthcoming) are understood as **CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS**, viewed as sets of attributive values specified for different locations within the attributive paths of **CDs** (see Kleparski (1997:35–36)). According to such linguists as Taylor (1989) and Kleparski (1997), a lexical category gets its meaning by the process of **highlighting** (or **foregrounding**) a particular location within the attributive path of a **CD** or a number of different **CDs**. Likewise, for historical linguists, metaphorical transfers of meaning may be characterised and formulated relative to the attributive paths of **CDs** associated with a particular conceptual category. Notice that while some **CDs** tend to be category specific, others are more general and – therefore – more frequently employed in the analysis of different sectors of lexical material.

Let us illustrate briefly the cognitive approach to the analysis of semantic change on the basis of the metaphorical extension of Chinese *zhu* 豬 ‘a pig’ > ‘a silly/stupid person’. The historically primary sense of *zhu* 豬 is that of ‘a mammal of the family *Suidae*’. With the aid of the cognitive theoretical apparatus, the primary sense of the word may be characterised relative to the process of the highlighting of the attributive value (SUIDAE) within **DOMAIN OF SPECIES [...]**, as well as the activation of the element (EPICENE) specified for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF GENDER [...]**. With the passage of time, the word started to be used with reference to people (male or female) as a term of abuse in the sense ‘a silly/stupid person’. Therefore, secondarily, the Chinese *zhu* 豬 started to be applied with reference to humans which – on our interpretation – resulted from the foregrounding of the attributive element (HUMAN) within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF SPECIES [...]**. The semantics of the metaphorically extended sense of *zhu* 豬 exhibits links to the attributive paths of a number of **CDs** specifiable for the conceptual macrocategory **HUMANS**. Thus, the metaphorical sense of *zhu* 豬 results from the process of actuation of such attributive values as

(SILLY)^(STUPID) presupposed for the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOUR AND CHARACTER** [...] and a gender-specific value (EPICENE) within the attributive path of **DOMAIN OF GENDER** [...].

In this paper an attempt was made to outline and shed some light on the scope of Chinese zoosemy, mainly on the basis of the animal terms related to the conceptual category **DOMESTICATED ANIMALS**. Our findings confirm the observation made earlier by such authors as Stern (1931), Rayevska (1979), Wilkins (1981), Thornton (1989), Kleparski (1990, 1996, 1997, 2002), Kiełtyka (2005a) and Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a) that the animal kingdom is one of the most powerful centres of metaphorical expansion where most of the cases of animal metaphor are projected at the conceptual category **HUMANS**. Kleparski (2002) provides evidence for the biased Indo-European scope and nature of Hungarian zoosemy and here we have attempted to provide partial evidence for the weighted Indo-European nature of animal metaphor in non-Indo-European Chinese.

Obviously, this paper merely reveals a representative fragment of the process of zoosemy in Chinese and makes no attempt to give any definite answers to many questions pertaining to the heart of the matter. However, one is justified in saying that there is much isomorphism between both the scope and nature of Chinese animal metaphor and the relevant zoosemic developments that have taken place in many Indo-European languages. Also, similarly to the process of animal metaphor in many Indo-European languages, one is intuitively justified in saying that Chinese metaphorical transfers involving animal names are not entirely unmotivated. In general, one feels that in those semantic developments which involve metaphor there is a need for some, however tenuous, relation between the broadly understood derivational base and the derived meaning. Hence, the ultimate goal of any full-fledged analysis targeted at zoosemic developments should be to shed some light on the nature and cognitive basis of such metaphoric derivations.

References

- Domínguez, P.J.Ch.** and **Th.F. Li.** 2004. "Zoosemy in Spanish and Chinese: A semantic and cognitive analysis". *Research in Foreign Language and Literature* 4/1, 78–84.
- Hsieh, Sh.Ch.** 2000. "Tiermetaphern im modernen Chinesischen und Deutschen: Eine vergleichende semantische und soziolinguistische Studie." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Tübingen. www.210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2001/209/.
- Hsieh, Sh.Ch.** 2002. "The corpora of Chinese and German animal fixed expressions: A cognitive semantic application". www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~mgl/cl2003/papers/shelley.pdf.
- Hsieh, Sh.Ch.** 2003. "The Corpus of Mandarin Chinese and German animal expressions." [In:] D. Archer, P. Rayson, A. Wilson and T. McEnery (eds.), *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2003 Conference*. Lancaster: Lancaster University, 332–341.

- Kardela, H.** and **G.A. Kleparski.** 1990. *Approaching Diachronic Semantics: The Componential vs. Cognitive Account*. Umea: Printing Office of the Umea University.
- Kieltyka, R.** 2005a. "The axiological-cognitive analysis of the evaluative developments in the domain of EQUIDAE: A pilot study". *Studia Anglica Resoviensia* 3, 59–75.
- Kieltyka, R.** 2005b. "Zoosemic terms denoting FEMALE HUMAN BEINGS: Semantic derogation of women revisited". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 41, 167–186.
- Kieltyka, R.** and **G.A. Kleparski.** 2005a. "The scope of English zoosemy: The case of DOMESTICATED ANIMALS." *Studia Anglica Resoviensia* 3, 76–87.
- Kieltyka, R.** and **G.A. Kleparski.** 2005b. "The ups and downs of the Great Chain of Being: The case of canine zoosemy in the history of English". *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2, 22–41.
- Kieltyka, R.** forthcoming. "Towards a Historical Account of English Zoosemy: The case of Middle English and Early Modern English DOMESTICATED ANIMALS." Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Rzeszów.
- Kleparski, G.A.** 1990. *Semantic Change in English: A Study of Evaluative Developments in the Domain of HUMANS*. Lublin: The Catholic University of Lublin Printing House.
- Kleparski, G.A.** 1996. "Semantic change in onomasiological perspective." [In:] G. Persson and M. Ryden (eds), *Male and Female Terms in English: Proceedings of the Symposium at Umea University, May 18–19, 1994*. Umea: The Printing Office of the Umea University, 41–91.
- Kleparski, G.A.** 1997. *The Theory and Practice of Historical Semantics: The Case of Middle English and Early Modern English Synonyms of GIRL/YOUNG WOMAN*. Lublin: The Catholic University of Lublin Printing House.
- Kleparski, G.A.** 2002. "*Lusta, mint a disznó*: A hunt for 'correlative' zoosemy in Hungarian and English". *Studia Anglica Resoviensia* 1, 9–32.
- Kochman-Haladyj, B.** (this volume). "On derogation of women terms and its cultural conditioning".
- Lakoff, G.** and **M. Johnson.** 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, C., K. Swift.** 1976. *Words and Women*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- Mills, J.** 1989. *Woman Words. A Vocabulary of Culture and Patriarchal Society*. London: Virago Press.
- Murray, J., Ch.T. Onions, W. Craige** and **F.J. Furnivall.** 1976. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olátéjú, A.** 2005. "The Yorùbá animal metaphors and interpretation". *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 14/3, 368–383.
- Ожегов, С.И.** and **Н.Ю.Шведова.** 1998. *Толковый словарь русского языка*, 4-е изд. Москва.
- Rayevska, N.M.** 1979. *English Lexicology*. Kiev: Vysca Skola Publishers (4th edition).
- Stern, G.** 1931. *Meaning and Change of Meaning with Special Reference to the English Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Taylor, J.R.** 1989. *Linguistic Categorisation: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thornton, F.J.** 1989. *A Classification of Semantic Field 'Good and Evil' in the Vocabulary of English*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Glasgow: The University of Glasgow.
- Wilkins, D.P.** 1981. "Towards a Theory of Semantic Change." Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.