UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of English

Lucija Kovačić

ZOOSEMY AND GENDER STEREOTYPING: A CORPUS ANALYSIS OF
SIX PAIRS OF ENGLISH AND CROATIAN LEXEMES

Diploma thesis

Advisor: dr. sc. Marina Grubišić

Zagreb, 2018

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse particular examples of zoosemy, i.e. animal lexemes that we figuratively use in order to refer to humans, in both Croatian and English. The paper focuses on six pairs of animal lexemes belonging to the category of pets, farm animals, and wild animals, and strives to investigate whether the gender of the referent impacts the frequency of their use in a negative sense. It also attempts to present potential motivational factors that underlie the construction of different figurative meanings. The data was gathered from two largest corpora of Croatian and English, and compared cross-linguistically. The results showed that speakers tend to direct derogatory zoosems at female addressees more often than male, and that the use of the lexemes depends on different cognitive and socio-cultural models, as well as many contextual factors.

Keywords: zoosemy, conceptual metaphor, Great Chain of Being, gender, corpus

Table of Contents

1.   Introduction

On a daily basis, people often refer to each other using various animal names in order to describe different aspects of human character, behaviour, and appearance. Those animal lexemes are instances of *zoosemy*, and represent specific and interesting metaphorical instantiations that this paper aims to explore within the field of linguistics. Due to the limited scope of our paper, we do not strive to encompass the entire phenomenon of zoosemy in Croatian and English, but we rather wish to analyse a limited sample of animal names in electronic corpora to investigate the possible influence of gender in the frequency of their use, and to describe their figurative meaning, along with motivational factors involved in semantic structuring. We were interested to see whether negative conceptualisation of humans in terms of animals is more commonly projected onto women rather than men in everyday communication. The paper therefore cross-linguistically examines 6 pairs of lexical items: *kuja/bitch, krava/cow, koza/goat, svinja/pig, konj/horse,* and *majmun/monkey*. The electronic corpora chosen for the analysis are hrWac (Hrvatski web korpus), and iWeb (the Intelligent Web-based Corpus).

The following section gives a theoretical overview that sheds light on the nature of zoosemy in linguistics, and serves as the basis for our study. Section 3 provides an account of the analysis - its aim, hypothesis, and methodology, followed by a presentation of the results and a discussion. The final section is dedicated to conclusions with suggestions for possible further research.

2. Theoretical overview

2.2. Zoosemy in Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy Theory

Zoosemy is defined by Rayevska (1979: 165) as nicknaming from animals, which means that animal names are often used to designate human characteristics. In fact, according to Kövecses, "much of human behaviour seems to be metaphorically understood in terms of animal behaviour" (2002: 124). Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson suggest that most of our ordinary conceptual system that governs the way we think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (1980: 3). So if we called our brother a pig because we were angry at him for leaving a mess in the kitchen, we employed a conceptual metaphor – a cognitive process of semantic structuring based on which we connect two concepts[1] so that we understand one (the *target domain*) in terms of another (the *source domain*) (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). In the process of metaphorical conceptualisation of people as animals, the concept of ANIMAL functions as a source domain targeted at the concept of HUMAN. Therefore, zoosemy can be regarded as a widely employed linguistic phenomenon that results from the conceptual metaphor HUMANS ARE ANIMALS. Kövecses (2002: 125) notes that most animal related metaphors convey negative meaning that refers to undesirable or objectionable human attributes or behaviour, with some exceptions, as indicated below in (d). Thus, he defines the HUMANS ARE ANIMALS metaphor as a highly general ontological metaphor that consists of at least the following submetaphors (2002: 125):

(a) OBJECTIONABLE HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR (e.g. His mother was *catty* and loud.)

(b) OBJECTIONABLE PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS (e.g. He is a complete *pig* to the women in his life.)

(c) DIFFICULT TO HANDLE PEOPLE ARE DOGS (e.g. It's going to be a *bitch* to replace him.)

(d) SEXUALLY ATTRACTIVE WOMEN ARE KITTENS (e.g. . . . French *sex kitten* Brigitte Bardot.)

---

[1] A *concept* or a *conceptual domain* is our conceptual representation, or knowledge, of any coherent segment of experience (Kövecses, 2005: 247).

The mechanism behind zoosemy is closely related to the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor proposed by Lakoff and Turner (1989). They describe the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor as a conceptual complex consisting of the following four parts (1989: 166-180):

- the Great Chain of Being
- the Nature of Things
- the GENERIC IS SPECIFIC metaphor
- the Maxim of Quantity (Grice 1975)

The Great Chain of Being represents a cultural model that involves a hierarchy of different forms of beings (humans, animals, plants, and inanimate objects) organised according to their perceived properties such as reason, instinctual behaviour, biological function, physical attributes, etc. Lower-level beings have "lower" properties, while higher-level beings have "higher" properties as well as all the properties of lower entities in the scale. Humans are considered to be beings of the highest order in the basic Great Chain, and are placed above animals, plants, and inanimate objects. So for instance, while a rock as an object is mere substance, a tree has both substance and a biological system, and a dog has instincts in addition. Humans have all these properties, but the higher attributes that distinguish us from other entities in the hierarchy are primarily our capacities for abstract reasoning, morality, aesthetics, and communication. Therefore, beings at any level of the Great Chain are characterised by the highest properties they possess. Each of the levels can be additionally divided into higher and lower sublevels, depending on the degree of complexity and power that entities have in relation to each other. Within the level of human beings for example, men are given higher status than women. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 169) further suggest that the Great Chain of Being is essentially a folk taxonomy that arises from a commonplace theory of the Nature of Things, based on which "things" or forms of being are considered to have an essence that leads to characteristic behaviour. Entities may or may not actually have particular essential attributes, but we perceive them as if they do. Folk theories are based on our general knowledge that is not necessarily scientific, and although they do not reflect subjective attitudes of an individual, they are commonly accepted as a way of conceptualisation: "Holding a commonplace notion is not the same as having a belief, but more like adopting an enabling convention" (Turner, 1991: 188). The Great Chain is largely subconscious and it may be universal, since it occurs not only in Western tradition, but in other cultures as well (Kövecses, 2002: 126). The Great Chain of Being combined with the Nature of Things forms a more complex folk theory of how things work in the world, and results in the following (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 171):

- HUMANS: Higher-order attributes lead to higher-order behaviour.
- ANIMALS: Instinctual attributes lead to instinctual behaviour.
- PLANTS: Biological attributes lead to biological behaviour.
- COMPLEX OBJECTS: Structural attributes lead to functional behaviour.
- NATURAL PHYSICAL THINGS: Natural physical attributes lead to natural physical behaviour.

However, the model of the Great Chain is not a metaphor by itself – it becomes metaphorical when one level in the scale is used to understand another. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 162-172) assert that this process is supported by the GENERIC IS SPECIFIC metaphor, a generic-level metaphor which maps a specific-level schema onto parallel specific-level schemas that have the same generic-level structure as the source-domain schema[2]. A common generic-level structure of the source and the target allows us to see "the human and the nonhuman as instances of the same thing" (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 172). The mapping in the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor is further limited by the Maxim of Quantity. It is a communicative principle established by Grice: "Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of exchange. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required" (1975: 41).[3] Lakoff and Turner (1989: 173) argue that the Maxim of Quantity has a restrictive role in the GREAT CHAIN based on the assumption that we map the highest-ranking properties that define a particular level in the chain. Since higher forms of being include all the properties of lower entities, when a speaker refers to something at one level of the hierarchy, we presuppose that they are aiming at the property that is characteristic of that level.

As Kövecses explains, the metaphorical mapping in the GREAT CHAIN can go in two directions: from a lower source to a higher target, or from a higher source to a lower target (2002: 126). In the case of HUMANS ARE ANIMALS metaphor, conceptualisation proceeds from a lower to a higher level. The mapping between those two domains can also go in the

---

[2] Lakoff and Turner (1989: 61) define conceptual *schemas* as our conventional knowledge about a particular domain, structured in a skeletal form. Specific-level metaphors have schematic structures that are filled in a detailed way, while generic-level metaphors lack specificity. Generic-level metaphors are instantiated by specific-level ones, e.g. HUMANS ARE ANIMALS is instantiated by SEXUALLY ATTRACTIVE WOMEN ARE KITTENS, etc.

[3] Other maxims include the Maxim of Quality, which requires the speaker to be truthful, the Maxim of Relation, which requires the speaker to be relevant, and the Maxim of Manner, which requires the speaker to be clear and brief. Together with the Maxim of Quantity, they form the Cooperative principle that describes how effective communication in conversation is achieved (Grice, 1975: 41-58).

opposite direction, which results in ANIMALS ARE HUMANS metaphor. In fact, in the metaphorisation of humans as animals, we first conceptualise animal traits in terms of human traits, and that personification reflects our tendency to understand the world around us through human-based notions. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 195-198) illustrate the process by analysing the expression *Achilles is a lion*. They state that we have conceptual schemas for animals that are partly already metaphorical. For instance, we commonly think of pigs as messy, and of lions as courageous, although in reality, their behaviour is guided by instinct and does not adhere to our social standards. Therefore, in the *Achilles is a lion* example, we first attribute courage as a human property to lions, and then "we understand the characteristic courage of Achilles in terms of something that is already metaphorically understood in terms of the human trait of courage" (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 195). Thus, there are actually two metaphors in this expression, but they go in opposite directions and cancel each other out. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 196) point out that the interesting part of this process is the interpretation of human character based on animal instinct. We perceive the instinctive behaviour of lions as courage, and since we also view instinct as something rigid, through the Nature of Things theory in our schema for lions that property becomes their quintessential characteristic. When we map this trait onto Achilles, we then also map the relation between the lion and his 'courage' onto the relation between Achilles and his courage, which we consider similarly fixed. Thus, Lakoff and Turner here refer to the *invariance principle* that limits metaphorical mappings so that the structure of the source domain is preserved in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain (Lakoff, 1993: 215). The given example illustrates that the GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor "allows us to comprehend general human character traits in terms of well-understood nonhuman attributes; and, conversely, it allows us to comprehend less well-understood aspects of the nature of animals and objects in terms of better-understood human characteristics" (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: 172).

But how do we choose which animal features will be mapped onto humans? Not everything can be a source domain for a particular target, so conceptual links we create between domains must be *motivated* by something. The general view on *motivation* or *grounding* of metaphors in cognitive linguistics is that "in addition to objective, pre-existing similarity, conceptual metaphors are based on a variety of human experience, including correlations in experience, various kinds of non-objective similarity, biological and cultural roots shared by the two concepts, and possibly others" (Kövecses, 2002: 69). In Grady's typology of metaphorical basis (1999: 80-95), *primary metaphors* are grounded in correlations in experience within recurring

experiential scenarios, and they can serve as the bases for other conceptualisations called *correlation metaphors*. In cases of *resemblance metaphors* there is no experiential correlation between the source and the target, so Grady argues that mappings are rather based on perceived similarity between the domains (1999: 94). Kövecses expands this view and notes that conceptual metaphors have a *main meaning focus* or major theme of the source domain, which he defines as "the basic and central knowledge about the source domain, inherited by the target, which is widely shared in a speech community" (2002: 110). The socially agreed-on main meaning focus of the source domain is repeatedly mapped onto different target domains (Kövecses, 2002: 110-112). However, the central knowledge about a particular domain can also be understood as a metonymically highlighted part of the domain, which points to metonymy as the basis of metaphor (Stanojević, 2009: 355). Barcelona defines metonymy as a conceptual mapping between the source and the target domain that are both in the same functional domain and are linked by a pragmatic function, so that the target is mentally activated (2005: 314). He further states that metonymy has a motivational role when it guides the development of a constructional meaning (2005: 317).

Milić (2013) argues that in case of zoosemy the analysis of motivational factors in the construction of meaning is scarce, and claims that Lakoff and Turner have overlooked the potential role of metonymy as a restrictive factor in metaphorical mappings. He further emphasises that the folk theory of the Nature of Things appears to be metonymical since it reduces our knowledge about a concept to a quintessential characteristic (2013: 202-203). Martsa broadly classified the culture-dependent knowledge we have about animals in several significant aspects or the so-called thematic parts: "habitat", "appearance", "behaviour", and "relation to humans", the latter being fundamental (2013: 153). The most salient animal features from those subdomains are then mapped onto human "appearance", "intelligence", "character", and "morals" (Milić, 2013: 202). If we apply the cognitive model of the Nature of Things in which essential attributes lead to essential behaviour, we could possibly consider "character" as a part of a larger domain of "morals". Halupka Rešetar and Radić offered slightly different thematic elements that they consider more relevant for mappings in Serbian: "appearance", "eating habits", "intelligence", and "character" (2003: 1896). 'Relation to humans' in Martsa's classification is close to Barcelona's functional experiential domains that guide "our behaviour and communication thanks to the detailed organized knowledge of specific areas of experience that they include" (2011: 41). Functional domains in case of zoosemy are based on the WHOLE

FOR PART metonymy, which reduces the general knowledge that we have of a concept to the most prominent subdomain of knowledge that is relevant in a certain context (Milić, 2011: 114).

Finally, we must briefly mention another potential view in the interpretation of the phenomenon of zoosemy. While metaphorical mappings in the Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy Theory we have discussed so far are unidirectional and involve a source and a target, the Conceptual Integration Theory proposed by Fauconnier and Turner (1994, 1996, 1998, 2000) makes use of a four-space model which includes two input spaces, a generic space, representing conceptual structure that is shared by both inputs, and the blend space, where elements from the inputs combine and interact. Kiełtyka and Kleparski adopt the view that the blending theory "is mainly used in the analysis of novel and unique examples (…), and the mechanism that is satisfactorily applicable as far as a cognitive approach to zoosemy is concerned, is CMT which explains conventional patterns of metaphorical conceptualisation" (2005b: 29). Milić (2011), however, employs the blending theory along with CMT to describe instances of zoosemy in Croatian and in English, and shares with Barcelona the view that metonymy has a crucial role in blending.

2.3.   Zoosemy and gender

As Kövecses (2002) observes, the main meaning focus of animal metaphors is mostly negative, hence we can say that zoosemes tend to involve a pejorative semantic change. Since the cultural model of the Great Chain is androcentric in nature, and as mentioned earlier, men and women have a different status within the same level of humans, we may assume that pejoration does not equally apply to both sexes. The notions of pejoration and semantic derogation are closely related to the issue of sexism in language, which Holmes defines as "negative and positive stereotypes of both sexes", but in practice it refers to "the ways in which language conveys negative attitudes to women" (1992: 305). She states that in metaphors, a higher number of derogatory images are used to describe women in comparison to those used to describe men, with animal imagery as an example of sexist bias:

"The chicken metaphor tells the whole story of a girl's life. In her youth she is a chick, then she marries and begins feeling cooped up, so she goes to hen parties where she cackles with her friends. Then she has her brood and begins to hen-peck her husband. Finally she turns into an old biddy." (1992: 305)

In their studies on zoosemy, authors such as Fernández Fontecha and Jiménez Catálan, Hines, and Rodriguez, also note that semantic derogation is related to gender of the referent and tends to be aimed at women. Fernández Fontecha and Jiménez Catálan (2003) explored semantic derogation in two pairs of animal words in English (*fox/vixen, bull/cow*) and Spanish (*zorro/zorra, toro/vaca*), and in both languages it occurred more often in terms referring to females. Hines (1999) deals with common animal terms for women that are sexually marked (*pussy cat, kitten, bunny, chick*) and are instantiations of the conceptual metaphor DESIRED WOMAN AS SMALL ANIMAL. According to her study, women are considered to be objects of sexual desire more often than men, and they are conceptualised as animals that are hunted and possessed. Rodriguez (2007) analysed the representation of women in teenage and women's magazines and concluded that they paradoxically contain many sexist images, such as those related to WOMEN AS ANIMALS metaphor among others.

Pejoration in animal metaphor reflects another important aspect of zoosemes and their semantic structure, and that is their axiological dimension which refers to the fact that in the process of conceptualisation we relate certain entities with certain values on a positive-negative scale (Milić, 2011: 78). Speakers in a particular discourse situation in which they employ zoosemes, do not only categorise the referents or addressees, but they also evaluate them in relation to context. Contextual factors include the physical setting in which a communicative exchange takes place, linguistic history in terms of what has been said before, social setting such as gender distinctions and power relations, cultural setting that involves dominant values of members of a group, etc. (Kövecses, 2017: 59). Thus, context generally plays an important role in the way we use, comprehend and create metaphors in actual communicative situations (Kövecses, 2002: 15). Our evaluations of a referent are therefore partly grounded in our background knowledge, which is socio-culturally dependent, but they also express *affective* or *expressive* meaning, which involves speaker's emotions and attitudes within communication context (Grubišić, 2014: 26). According to Jakobson's six communicative functions of language, we could state that the expressive function is relevant for zoosemic usage (Milić, 2011: 81).

3. Analysis

3.2. Aim and methodology

Our primary interest was to examine whether there is a difference in the frequency of invective metaphorical use between male and female animal lexemes in Croatian from a corpus-based perspective, and to contrast the given results with English. Based on the introspective studies on semantic derogation within the phenomenon of zoosemy (Fontecha and Catalán, 2003), we assumed that pejorative animal names will be aimed more frequently at women than at men in communicative interaction. Due to the limited scope of this paper, we chose to focus on animal terms that referred only to negative human features, since according to Kövecses (2002) that is their main meaning orientation. The pre-selection of lexemes we used in our analysis was done through a mini-survey among 10 native speakers of Croatian (5 female, 5 male, all between 25 and 27 years of age), whom we asked to state which animal names they would use to address people in everyday communication in order to assign them negative properties. We then chose three most common lexemes for each sex, which resulted in the following sample: *svinja, konj*, *majmun* for men, and *kuja*, *krava*, *koza* for women. The corpus we chose to work with was hrWac (Croatian Web Corpus) because it is the largest electronic corpus of Croatian language that contains 1.9 billion tokens collected from the .hr top-level domain, so unlike other Croatian corpora (Hrvatski nacionalni korpus and Hrvatska jezična riznica) that contain only written texts such as literary or newspaper texts, includes blogs, chat rooms, online comments and various other informal language settings that can be considered as approximations of everyday speech. We further limited our analysis by concentrating on vocative forms of given animal lexemes due to several reasons. Firstly, based on a study by Halupka Rešetar and Radić (2003), the prototypical morphosyntactic structure of their invective usage is the vocative. Secondly, the vast majority of animal lexemes in the corpus occur in their literal, primary meaning, and coding the query resulted in a high concentration of metaphorically relevant hits. Extracted examples were then further analysed with respect to the nature of figurative language use, and types of motivating factors argued to influence the construction of meaning. We also drew comparisons with English, in order to see possible similarities or differences in usage and semantic structure. We put our focus on Croatian and used it as a starting point rather than English due to the availability of Croatian speakers who could provide a list of animal lexemes in common usage. Given lexical items were run through iWeb (the Intelligent Web-based Corpus) as the newly released, largest corpus of English

language that contains about 14 billion words (about 25 times the size of COCA) from nearly 95,000 systematically chosen websites. Following the pattern previously established for Croatian, we also coded the query in order to get direct forms, and a maximum number of relevant hits. We are aware of methodological downsides of this approach, considering that the corpora substantially differ in size, and that native English speakers would possibly offer a different list of lexemes. However, Milić (2011), Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a) in their respective studies argue that domesticated animals, as the largest group in our sample, are a particularly productive source domain for animal metaphors in both languages.

Before proceeding to our analysis, we should also explain the way we classified animals in our sample. Firstly, we relied on the Social Space Position (Rakusan, 2004: 171), based on which we sort people as members of our immediate family, distant relatives, etc. These distinctions may be treated as analogies in the animal world, so that we categorise animals as 'pets' who live inside the house, 'farm animals' who live outside the house, and 'wild animals' who live in the wild (Rakusan, 2004: 172). Secondly, supported by Milić (2011), we further categorized farm animals as the largest group in our sample according to their function in relation to humans, namely for labour or as sources of food and fur.

3.3. Results and discussion

3.3.1. Kuja/bitch

Out of 158 hits for the lexeme *kuja*, 124 were eligible for our analysis. In 119 occurrences the referent was a woman, while in 5 occurrences the referent was male. The English corpus showed 1.361 hits for the lexeme *bitch*, with 1.013 metaphorically relevant instances. The majority of examples involved a female addressee (860), while the rest referred to male (100) or unidentified (53) addressees.

Dogs, as prototypical animals within the category of PETS, enjoy a privileged position in the animal world and have a reputation for being faithful and reliable (for instance in similes *faithful as a dog / vjeran kao pas*), but this positive symbolic capital is not reflected in their zoosemic usage. *Kuja* in Croatian, as well as *bitch* in English, is strongly axiologically charged and used as a term of abuse aimed at women, but as we will illustrate later, in certain cases it can be directed at men.

(1) ***Kujo***, dobrodošla. Gle, možda si imala loš dan, al kad dođeš u društvo od 12 ljudi, od kojih 10 ne znaš i izvređaš svih 10, hvališ se svojim materijalnim glupostima, rugaš se našim (tada) studentskim jadnim i siromašnim životima, prevrćeš očima, sve ti je "isse" i nagovaraš frendicu da nestanete odmah naglas...onda si ***kuja***.

(2) Odi u jednu stvar da odi, ti odurno jedno spletkaroško stvorenje, ti ***kujo bezosjećajna***, je li ti ikad u životu bilo stalo do ikoga osim same sebe????

(3) Drugarice Kosor, tocno da ste bili Sanaderova sjena, gdje se god on pojavio vi ste uvijek bili uz njega, njegova desna ruka njegova sjena. A danas ne znate nista sto je govorio sto se dogovarao, zar je nastupila kod vas totalna amnezija, pa koji ste vi to moral i karakter od zene?? svaka vam cast. A kao nisi s njime bila u istome toru, u istoj štali??? ***Kujo lažljiva***, je'l misliš da smo zaboravili kako si mu držala štangu na saboru stranke, pljeskala i navijala za njega? Ha,ha..

(4) ***Kujo jedna bezobzirna***, imam dečka, odjebi u troskocima : mad :[4] što si neki forumaši neće sve dozvoliti reći zauzetim poštenim forumašicama : rolleyes :

(5) Rob is MY MAN! MINE! I love him for who he is which is why we are together. Therefore it doesn't f***ing matter what you "Think" or "Want" him to be he's not for you ***bitch***! Wendy ***bitch*** you're cruisin' You go out there talking about my family like you just hit the pipe backstage! When I decided to do this show I knew I would be letting the world see us. But your horse face ass woke up on the wrong side of the stable and decide to go overboard with your f**k boy comments. ***Bitch*** f**k you! "

(6) See what hurts me the most you won't admit you was wrong, ***bitch*** do your song keep telling yourself that you was a mom but how dare you try to take what you didn't help me to get, *you selfish **bitch*** I hope you f****** burn in hell for this s***!

(7) You know what Fuck you ***bitch***! I and many other people are sick of you posting negative comments on this website and insulting everyone that comes on it! At least I have a life!

(8) that's what you get for cheating and then trying to get a huge back piece for free.... i think the tattoo he drew up suits you very well, you're a peice of shit... nasty slut you make women look bad. SHAME ON YOU ***BITCH***.

As shown in the examples above, the figurative use of *kuja/bitch* in Croatian and English predominantly refers to a malicious, treacherous woman. The negative valuation is often

---

[4] The comments often include digital icons used to express an idea or emotion in electronic communication (also called emojis), which were automatically transformed in text.

highlighted in the corpora with additional attributes as in (2), (3), (5), and (6). Possible motivational factors for the invective use of this lexical item in both languages could be rooted in culturally determined gender roles in which women are perceived as passive entities dependent on men. Female behaviour that is viewed as potentially active is consequently a deviance from the expected norm, and negatively valued. Therefore, a property in the domain of behaviour metonymically activates the (negative) conceptualisation of a character trait that can be further extended to a larger domain of morals, which is in part culturally related to sexual behaviour (Milić, 2011: 121). In that sense, *kuja/bitch* not only stands for a spiteful woman, but also for a promiscuous woman, as in the following examples:

(9) hahaha, engleska *kujo*, pokazala si svo svoje umjeće. jezik još možeš koristit jedino za felacio, ako ti netko ustupi motku na obradu. sve ostalo - za kuyac si. i ti i stranka koja te tamo poslala bez provjere, da nas blamiraš. fuj ....

(10)   Soldier: evo je na...jesi li počela jesi....mamicu ti na badnjak uz Francusku salatu.. Julie: Ja volin Francusku salatu isto

Soldier: Boli me kurac. Umukni *kujo*. Kurve smiju otvarat usta samo kad puše. Zato tišina. *Kujo*

(11)   For the last 2 months you have gone back and forth from apologizing, begging, pleading with me to talk to you - saying you would end your life if I didn't talk to you, saying you'd hang yourself, saying that you were afraid and alone to: "fuck you *bitch* you fucking whore, cock guzzling slut, you think a restraining order will stop me *bitch*, ect" and so much more.

(12)   *You bitch*, you hoe, you slut, I'll f -- your brains out!

The instinctual behaviour of female dogs during their copulation period is probably understood in human terms as an active search for sexual pleasure and regarded as contemptuous, by forming analogies between a woman and the female animal in a blended mental space (Milić, 2011: 120). As previously outlined, culturally determined norms allow sexually active behaviour to men only, while in case of women such behavioural pattern is considered unacceptable (e.g. in the Croatian phrase *kuja s lanca*, or similarly in the English phrase *like a bitch in heat*). In examples (9) – (12) we can assume that the goal of the speaker is to insult the addressee primarily as promiscuous and lewd, based on the immediate linguistic context within utterance that emphasises sexual connotation of the term ("…jezik još možeš koristit jedino za felacio…" and "Kurve smiju otvarat usta jedino kad puše", or "…you fucking whore/hoe, you slut, I'll f -- your brains out"). It can also be noted that the speaker wants to display his dominant

(sexual) role in relation to the referent. The use of the lexeme in this sense was very common in both corpora.

Furthermore, *kuja/bitch* was often accompanied by adjectives that modified the meaning, depending on the speaker's communicative intention within particular context. They emphasised a derogatory characteristic mostly in domains of intelligence and appearance:

(13) Naravno da imam stihove I. G. Kovačića, Jure Kaštelana i Vladimira Nazora. ***Kujo glupa ustaška***, da li znaš da su I. G. Kovačića ubili četnici, da je V. Nazor bio prvi predsjednik NR Hrvtaske? O čemu ti trabunjaš?

(14) Bogdanićeva homoseksualnost ne može i ne smije biti povod za takvo bezobrazno i bezobzirno ponašanje prema ženama. On urla na balerine frazama tipa: "Vi ste svi gamad koju treba jebati...Pišat ćete vi meni krv...Stisni te jebene noge da ti tampon ne ispadne...Svi ste glupi ko kurac od magarca...***Kujo kratkonoga***, diži noge jebem ti mater...

(15) A couple of weeks ago, she texted me letting me know she finally figured out my STBX has been cheating on her with a 21-year-old twink. She went to the house and saw them together. Well boo-fucking-hoo *you stupid* **bitch**. If he will cheat with you, he will certainly cheat on you!!

(16) He told me if u stop eating chocolate *you fat* **bitch** you would be able to save. Well, I turn to chocolate because I am so stressed.

When aimed at male referents, the relevant trait involved in the mapping is that of *weakness*. We can assume that negative axiological valuation is again culturally influenced. Obedience of dogs is not valued positively when projected onto men since their social roles are normatively dominant and active. Addressing a man as a female animal (and indirectly as a woman) is strongly insulting because it implies that he is downgraded even further within the animal level of the Great Chain. English data showed that this type of usage is particularly characteristic of hip-hop, rap, and gangsta related slang. Although it is not indicated in Croatian dictionaries (perhaps due to authors' potential emphasis on politeness), this sense was found in the corpus, which suggests that Croatian speakers may have borrowed it from English through dominant American pop culture:

(17) Koji si ti kurac da imaš pametovat? U 119. si 100% plakao od sreće, a sad si pametan? ma napuši se truskog kurca, *kujo* izdajnička. Olić se možda umara, ali trčao je ko manijak 110 minuta.

13

(18)　　　Meanwhile in May this year, Twitter closed Azealia's account after she referred to ex-One Direction singer Zayn Malik as a "*curry scented **bitch***." She added: " Imma start calling you Punjab *you dirty **bitch***.

(19)　　　I'm tired of you niggas fakin on the Internet talkin bout meet up somewhere well whenever you're around let me know and ima slap the shit outta you and rob you ***bitch***

It is interesting to note that in the hip-hop/rap slang, the lexeme *dog* is used in the sense of *friend*, which is, according to Milić (2011: 118), motivated by the metonymical highlighting of a positively evaluated trait of LOYALTY. However, the male animal is predominantly used in a negative figurative sense in English, and denotes a contemptible person, or, when applied to women, refers to negative aspects of their appearance. In Croatian, the negative valuation is related mostly to the lexeme *pseto.* Thus, we may assert that a higher degree of semantic derogation in the concept of 'dog' (concerning *dog/bitch* dichotomy) is applied to women because negative features referring to promiscuous sexual behavior have a stronger pejorative axiological charge (Fontecha and Catálan, 2003: 789).

Finally, *kuja/bitch*, as well as all other animal names in our sample, can also be used jokingly or affectionately among speakers who are in a close(r), friendly or intimate relationship. Mockery and sarcasm can serve to enhance rapport among friends and collegues (Haslam et al., 2011: 314). This type of usage was found in 5 examples in Croatian corpus, while English provided 21:

(20)　　　Volim kad je ljuta i udara me, a ustvari tad je sretna što me uopće može dirati.Volim kad joj kažem "***kujo***" a ona poludi na to. Sve je to od dragosti. Volim kad me dođe tješit kad mi bude teško.Volim da je tu.

(21)　　　My radio spit static, and Whitney said, surprised, "*You **bitch***! You are so sneaky!" She laughed, long and loud, and then said, "I think I like you."

3.3.2. Krava/cow

There were 159 hits for the lexeme *krava* in the corpus. We extracted 115 relevant examples, all of which involved a female referent. The English corpus query of the lexeme *cow* resulted in 128 hits, with 87 eligible examples.

The female animal metonymically stands for the generic representative within the functional category of CATTLE. The properties referred to in the figurative use of the lexeme belong to domains of intellect, appearance, and character.

(1) Faking **kravo**, ne znam iz kojeg se ti izvora napajaš, ali moji izvori govore o tome da u Rusiji danas jača srednji sloj. Za razliku od lijepe naše, i dičnog zapada. I nije bitna monetarna prikazana moć, nego realna. Googlaj malo "middle class in russia today", nemoj se sramotiti svojim podacima iz prošlog stoljeća .

(2) **kravo** glupa ko si sad ti da uvodis tu neka pravila ovdje se raspravlja o epizodama koje se pogledaju s neta i tocka i nek dobim ban zbog takvih idiotkinja se isplati vrijedati.

(3) Tko je u rujnu 1943. godine donio odluku o vraćanju Dalmacije, otoka i Istre u sastav Hrvatske i poništio Rimske ugovore, ako si ikada i čula za tako nešto *polupismena neuka* **kravo**

(4) *You fucking **cow***, can't you read?!

(5) Wow indeed, Eva. Way to patronize people in their own country, *you stupid **cow***.

(6) you are a racists low life with nothing to do with yourself go comitt suicide *you dumb* **cow**

In the examples above, the lexeme metaphorically denotes a stupid woman. The corpora showed that this is the most frequent figurative use of the term, since it was found in 33 Croatian, and 56 English occurrences. Speakers often used attributes that emphasised the lack of intelligence or education of the referent, as in the examples (2) – (5). Milić (2011) argues that the conceptualisation of stupidity in animal metaphors is based on cognitive models of POSSESSION and CONTROL that are inherent to the Great Chain and related to the functional role of the animal. Expressions in Croatian and English such as *Osjećam se iskorištenim / I feel used* reveal that we perceive possession as something positive as long as we are the ones who own, instead of being owned (Milić, 2011: 128). From an anthropocentric point of view, people have power and control over animals they possess and use for particular purposes. The submissiveness of animals in relation to people is therefore understood as a deviance from the desired state of control, and negatively marked as a lack of rational capacity and free will. But why do we perceive stupidity as a quintessential characteristic of cows, and not bulls? Although the Croatian lexeme *vol* can designate a stupid man, this usage is extremely rare and found in only one example of vocative use in the corpus. We would argue that this is due to the physical and behavioural properties of bulls as large, strong and aggressive. Being used for labor and breeding, bulls

are viewed as more active than cows. However, the large body of the animal is negatively evaluated as fatness in case of females:

(7) Lana *debela **kravo***, misliš da si neka faca s placa, ipk nisi jer imaš ružniju facu od moje bake

(8) Prestani mi se nametati, *glupa, debela **kravo***. Pojma nemaš o poslu i skini mi se, pusti posao onima koji znaju raditi, to jest, meni. Dosta mi je i tebe i ovih retarda koji ti ližu dupe, marš *stoko*

(9) I was always the big kid in class. I was bullied and people threw things at me while walking home from school and yelled "You should stop eating so many cakes *you fat **cow***".

(10)   Women have this ongoing internal voice. They'll look in the mirror and say,' Oh, *you fat **cow**.*' Well, I mean, if someone walked up to you and said,' Hi, *you fat **cow**,*' you would not accept that. So why would you accept it from yourself?

English data provided 11 examples of this usage, while the lexeme in this sense was found in 6 instances in Croatian corpus, and as in (7) it can simultaneously convey derogatory features in several domains. Incidentally, the same example includes the term *stoko*, a hyperonym of *krava/bik*, that is also pejoratively used for people in Croatian, as well as its equivalent, *cattle*, in English. The large size of cow's body is negatively perceived as corpulence because it contrasts with the culturally shaped, idealised image of desired female body. Obesity can be further interpreted as a result of physical inactivity or laziness, as illustrated in the following examples:

(11)   Ljudi su ovdje postali toliko letargični i go with a flow, da će opravdati i kad ti doktor na porodu kaže *lijena **kravo***.

(12)   oooo poor waitress, someone asked her for something and princess probably was too busy by eating some fries or finishing drink don't be so fucking lazy *you **cow***, bring the fucking box and turn around.

The large body of the animal therefore triggers chains of metonymies (see Barcelona, 2005), since we experientially relate a property of appearance (corpulence) with properties of behaviour (extensive eating and lack of physical activity), which in turn activate the negative evaluation of character (laziness). Pejorative evaluation of character is further emphasised in the corpus through different attributes, which modify the meaning depending on the context:

(13)   A kako to, *skojevska **kravo** jugonostalgična*, da te ne zanima koliko su teški tvoji pošteni ljevičari tj. komunisti i tzv " antifašisti "

(14)   Maaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaršššššššššš ***kravo** jedna isfrustriranaaaaaaaaaaaaa* , ne trebam teeeeeeeeeee , ako ti nije dobro tu pa tko te drži tu , odjebi odavde u skokovima

(15)   Awww... did we hurt your worthless neo-nazi feelings *you worthless **cow***?

(16)   At which point Ross Kemp the ex-EastEnders actor and her then husband said,' Shut up, *you homophobic **cow***'.

The data supports observations made by Fontecha and Catálan in their study, that semantic derogation in the case of *cow/bull* lexemes pertains to women (2003).

We also found 14 occurrences of the lexeme being used jokingly among speakers who are mutually close (3 in Croatian, and 11 in English):

(17)   A cuj...imam frendicu koja je komad predobar...guzu k'o jabuku, cice stoje, emancipirana, nikoga ne ferma...nesto pricamo i kaze ona meni...znas kaj ti, ***kravo***, (:zubo:), ja se jednostavno ne palim na lijepe frajere...j. . frajera bez mane..

(18)   OK, so even if you can get away with tiny shorts of the type a Barbie doll might wear (*you lucky **cow***), you've got to admit, Cameron Diaz is a sight for sore eyes.

3.3.3. Koza/goat

The corpus query of the lexeme *koza* resulted in 101 hits. 81 occurrences were eligible for further analysis, and their metaphorical usage was projected onto women. English corpus displayed 17 relevant instances out of only 26 overall hits, all involving a male referent.

(1) Nemoj ti kao danijela trb: Hura za eu, sad će moj lovro moć studirat u Beču....***Kozo** jedna* tvoj lovro je i prije mogao studirat u Beču, ako će mu mama to platit šta je to sada u eu postalo besplatno?

(2) I šta da tebi pričam o Sarajevu kad si ti Sarajevo prvi put vidjela kad su te tvoja braća srbi potjerali iz neke tamo vukojebine. Papanko glupa gdje ti je to tvoje "LJUBUŠKO". ***Kozo** zaostala* mjesto se zove LJUBUŠKI .

(3) A ti odjebi u tri pičke materine ***kozo** glupa*. Eto, da izbjegnemo sofisticirano spuštanje i da se razumijemo

(4) A to što ti *glupa **kozo*** svoja laprdanja smatraš argumentima samo dodatno pokazuje o kakvoj se nevjerovatnoj glupači radi. S tobom se ne može, niti smije razgovarati bez

vrijeđanja jer samo tvoje postojanje je uvreda za zdrav razum, možeš li barem to shvatiti glupačo?

The concept of 'goat' is not a rich source of metaphorical mappings in Croatian, and especially in English, the only property transferred to women in Croatian being that of stupidity. Motivational factors involved in the construction of meaning are the same as previously outlined for the concept of 'cow'. Goat as a farm animal used only for meat and milk is perceived as passive and submissive, which is figuratively understood as lack of intelligence when projected onto women. However, if we again reflect on why we perceive only female goats as stupid in Croatian, the motivation is less clear than in the case of cow/bull dichotomy. Since male goats are mainly reduced to the purpose of breeding, shouldn't they be viewed as less useful and by extension possibly less intelligent? However, based on the analogy with bulls, we can assume that their prominent sexual role is the reason why lack of intelligence as an interpretation of passivity is rather applied to female goats, and then women, instead. The same derogatory feature can be aimed towards men in English (albeit rarely, since we found only two examples in the corpus)[5], but the male counterpart of the animal is metaphorically instantiated primarily in the phrase *old goat / stari jarac*, denoting an old, unpleasant, lecherous man in both languages. Even though sexual agency is positively evaluated when applied to males, age obviously influences valuation since it is socially inappropriate for old men to seek or indulge in sexual act with younger women.

(5) When he was on the line she shouted, "*You old* **goat**, you have got me pregnant!" "Please," quavered the old man, "who did you say was calling?"

(6) So why don't you go back and spout your utter rubbish on those silly anti propecia websites rather than coming on this forum and upsetting people who are already distressed over their hairloss issues.
You silly **goat**. Merck already ****ed people over with Vioxx, and people are having their lives ruined by propecia.

Restricted lexicalisation in case of males in Croatian is possibly motivated by the fact that female goats metonymically stand for generic representatives of the animal. Thus, although according to Fontecha and Catálan (2003: 789) sexual promiscuity is evaluated as one of the most negative (if not the worst) behavioural features (see Chapter 3.3.1.), semantic derogation

---

[5] Motivation for this type of use can possibly be rooted in the phrase *scapegoat / žrtveni jarac*, a passive entity upon which an action is carried out (Milić, 2011: 144).

of 'goat' (in *koza/jarac* pair) in Croatian is stronger when applied to women because the sense of stupidity is highly conventionalised and much more common than the use of *old goat / stari jarac* for male referents.

Finally, we can remark that the lexeme was more frequently used in a friendly manner than other items in our sample, so its axiological charge is probably less negative than that of 'cow', and especially 'bitch'. We found 7 such examples in Croatian corpus.

> (7) JA IDEM U AMSTERDAAAAAAM! Da, da...Krajem mjeseca, seka dobila 4 slobodna dana i rekla: Mala, kam idemo? Hihihi, ja pametna rekla ajmo na more, a ona meni, ma ne ***kozo***, kakvo more, haha, idemo negdje u svijet, pa ono, dogovorile se ajmo u am-ster-dam

3.3.4. Svinja/pig

Out of 234 hits for the lexeme *svinja* in the corpus, we excerpted 112 relevant examples. 102 occurrences were aimed at a male referent, while 7 referred to a woman. In 3 occurrences we were unable to identify whether the referent was male or female. The English corpus provided 294 occurrences of the lexeme *pig*. We isolated 175 instances that involved metaphorisation targeted at men (in 141 occurrences), women (in 11 occurrences), and unidentified referents (in 23 occurrences).

The concept of 'pig' stands out in both Croatian and English as a particularly productive metaphorical source. Its axiological charge is highly negative. Rakusan states that "the most contemptible and vulgar is the person who behaves like any member of the porcine family" (2004: 176). Perceived salient properties of pigs that are most commonly projected onto people pertain to different aspects of character as a part of a larger domain of morals. In 77 Croatian, and 82 English occurrences, the lexical item was used to address a person as despicable, unpleasant, greedy, and corrupt, often accompanied by adjectives that reinforced the negative evaluation of the addressee, and modified the meaning according to speakers' emotions, attitudes, and communicative intentions in particular discourse situations:

> (1) I ne, nisam spavala s njim, tipična *muška šovinistička* ***svinjo***
> (2) Isuse - kaj si do toga došao? : rigo : : bljak : *Rasistička* ***svinjo*** : bljak : za ovo bi trebo ban dobit. Jebem ti mater.

(3) Kad se naločeš i napraviš sranje, nemoj sebi opraštati i vaditi se na vino; ono nije krivo već ti, *svinjo pijana*.

(4) *svinjo primitivna* - kak se ti tek nama gadiš i ti i tvoj pajdo bandić

(5) Hrvatska i Bosna su nezavisne drzave a RS (rusevine srpske) su na tudjem teritoriju A sada idi u materinu, ti i svi oni koji hoce prisvajat tudje , *svinjo jedna*

(6) Nice work man-splaining there Peter! I'm sure that a "dumb little girl" like Molly needs a "big strong man" like you to explain this to her!!! Yeah right!!! *You pig*!

(7) Michelle Obama is a woman you stupid c-nt. Show me a picture of michelle obama naked with a penis then I will believe you. Your probably just upset because they are BLACK and in the WHite House! *you racist pig*.

(8) People like you are a disgrace to the human race! Knocking a disabled person???? Come on! You don't have any idea what the disabled had been through *you pig*!!!

(9) I'd lend you mine but I don't want to catch your cooties *you disgusting pig*.

(10)   Divegester, I wouldn't piss on you if you were on fire *you ignorant pig*.

Speakers often condemned chauvinist or racist behavior or attitudes as exemplified in (1), (2), (6), and (7), but the lexeme was also used to insult disliked ethnic, religious, or social groups:

(11)   Idi u materinu, *srpska svinjo*. Mars u materinu, prljavi ciganine NIKADA vise ta bagra nece moci "ispljuvati otrov" na zapadni Jadran ...

(12)   Odi u Hrvatsku i vidi dali ces isto doziviti HR i BiH = Dvije zemlje, dvije kulture, dva mentaliteta..Samo prase jede prasetinu, krmuzino katolicka Moretu, *katolicka svinjo*, zivim na muslimanskoj zemlji

(13)   He spoke to his brother in Florida, an investment adviser, who had received a fax after the election that read, "Get the f--- out of my country *you Muslim pig*," and was moving to Canada.

(14)   Go check some history book that how Christian murdered millions of people in history. WW1 and WW2 were caused and fought by the christians, right, *you christian pig*?

(15)   After he was placed in the backseat of the patrol car he began kicking the door and when officers told him to stop he said " *f--- you pig* " and spit on one of the officers.

The last example illustrates the usage of *pig* as an offensive word for a police officer, specific to English slang.

This type of invective usage aimed at a person's character is actually experientially rooted in the appearance of the animal. The fat and dirty body of pigs is consequentially related to their behaviour, particularly their eating habits. As is similarly the case in the concept of 'cow' (see Chapter 3.3.2.), obesity is regarded as a result of gluttony because it triggers EATING TOO MUCH FOR GLUTTONRY metonymy (Barcelona, 2005: 337). Milić argues that our evaluation is based on the blending mechanism, through which we project an integrated mental space in which the fatness of both pigs and humans is negatively understood as an outcome of conscious overeating (2011: 141). But maybe even more essential for our negative valuation is the notion of filth that we associate with human morals, or rather the lack of it. The latter is grounded in the primary metaphor BAD/IMMORAL IS DIRTY (Milić, 2011: 139). The clean-dirty contrast is a major source domain for moral metaphors because they appear to be based on our experiences of well-being, especially physical well-being. For instance, it is better to be healthy than sick, and since pollution causes disease it is better to be clean than dirty. Hence, immorality is seen as a disease or contagion that can spread throughout society (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999: 290-291). The conceptualisation of people (particularly men) as pigs involves experientially correlated aspects of appearance, behaviour, character and morals, yielding semantic variation evident in the corpora. Thus, in addition to being characterised as immoral, in 83 occurrences (28 Croatian, 55 English) people were marked as fat, repulsive, gluttonous, and filthy:

(16)   Baš je bilo zabavno gledati BBB-ovce kako Niki K. Viču « *svinjo debela* », a ista se ta « *svinja* », čitam ja danas u dnevnim novinama naroljala u jednom ST kafiću skupa sa ostalim nogometašima Hajduka

(17)   Pristajem biti nekulturna u tom kontekstu, NE Ću kulturno, zagrebački šutjeti, niti ću bježati kao moj djed u Ameriku, reći ću ti ***SVINJO OD 130 kg*** kako si živio tako ćeš umrijeti – svinjski

(18)   Imamo velikih problema u školi, jer djeca znaju biti nemilosrdna - kaže majka. Tako su epiteti poput ***svinjo smrdljiva*** i kurvo debela nešto s čime se osjetljiva djevojčica susreće svaki dan.

(19)   I was openly laughed at by cab drivers. People rolled down their windows in the middle of -- of New York City and -- and sa -- one yelled,' *You fat **pig***,' and one yelled,' Oink.'

(20)   "You can't be hungry already," I say. "We just got here, *you **pig***." Niyi is the baby of the group, but bigger than all of us. The kid never stops eating.

(21)   Clean up that acne and oil all over your face *you **pig***.

Chosen instances demonstrate some interesting tendencies of usage. In example (16) we can see that the lexeme was mapped both metaphorically and metonymically, revealing the specific nature of zoosemic usage. *Svinja* in this case both refers to and stands for the person. Furthermore, we may note that in all occurrences with female referents the meaning was oriented towards their physical properties, as shown in examples (18), (19) and (21). This tendency is not surprising since female body is a subject of attention and scrutiny far more frequently and severely in comparison to male body.

3.3.5. Konj/horse

The corpus query resulted in 52 hits of the lexeme *konj*. We isolated 38 eligible occurrences involving a male referent.

Horse acquired a special status within the category of farm animals based on its utility and importance in domains of labour and travel, and close relation to people. In Croatian, the concept has undergone metaphorisation pertaining to the domain of intelligence:

(1) *Glupi **konju***, a sto ides u kulturu koja te ne zanima i koju ne razumijes? Ostani u svojoj prciji i zderi svoju janjetinu a ne blati tudje kulture.

(2) ***Konju** jedan*, Nemes, ***konju***, umjesto da tako se zabavljas u kuci, sa djevojkama ti se zapali za kuravu, nisi normalan, odljepi od nje mlad si nista ti nefali, sta ti treba njeno kopile pod sator, osvjesti se i uzivaj, a to gomno makni od sebe.

(3) Hrvatska nema budučnost...ovaj kradeze bude nas uništil, a ovaj Milanović je valda njihov trojasnki konj u SDPju....ta budaletina valja takve gluposti da je to strasno...pa sad kad su uhapsili ovog lopova su izgubili kredibilitet????..KAJ SU GA TREBALI PUSTIT DA POBJEGNE, ***KONJU RETARDIRANI***

As discussed earlier (see Chapter 3.3.2.), pejorative meaning development in this case is related to the cognitive models of CONTROL and POSSESSION. The fact that we have power over the animal is understood as a confirmation of our superior rational capacity. Lack of free will is viewed as a lack of intelligence, hence just like cows and goats, horses became a source domain for the conceptualisation of stupidity. However, the concept differs in certain aspects from the pattern we previously established for other farm animals. Namely, stupidity is perceived as a quintessential characteristic of both male and female horses, and according to

22

corpus results, *konju* is more frequently used to address a man, than *kobilo* to address a woman. We would argue that the gender distinction is not made because female horses are equally exploited for the purposes of labour and travel so they are not perceived to be as passive as other female farm animals that are kept for meat or milk. The submissive role of the animal in relation to people is therefore generically understood, and semantic derogation in the konj/kobila dichotomy in Croatian applies to both sexes. Furthermore, it should be noted that in English the lexeme does not have a figurative meaning (except in phrases such as *Trojan horse*, or *dark horse* we found in the corpus), probably due to great importance of horses in English culture. Out of 164 hits for the lexeme, we extracted only two metaphorically relevant instances referring to the addressee as a *dark horse*, but since the phrase does not convey a derogatory meaning, we could not include them in the analysis. Nonetheless, the concept is rich in zoosemic extensions such as *stallion*, or *stud*, that are related to the domain of breeding and positively evaluated based on social norms that accept and encourage male sexual agency.

3.3.6. Majmun/monkey

There were 87 hits for the lexeme *majmun* in the corpus, with 82 relevant occurrences directed at a male referent. Out of 216 hits for the lexeme *monkey*, we extracted 52 eligible instances.

The monkey stands apart from all other zoosemes in our sample since it belongs to the category of WILD ANIMALS. Wild animals are perceived as remote, and not subject to human control, but nonetheless, the concept of 'monkey' in both Croatian and English is a source domain for the conceptualisation of stupidity:

(1) Ovaj s nickom "Brainless" zasluženo nosi svoj nick. Kako se, ***majmune*** *jedan*, uopće usuđuješ u isti pasus stavljati Janicu i Draženа s ovim tzv. "sportašem" ???

(2) Diskutiraj si sa svojom babom i sebi slicnima, ***majmune*** *glupi*, *licemjerni* i *neotesani*

(3) Ma tko si ti, *seoski* ***majmune*** , da uokolo djeliš lekcije internet-bontona i usput, von oben, tj. s leđa svoje krave, pametuješ o demokraciji.

(4) You're actually such a fucking moron and you have no idea what you're talking about you faggot. Not everything on the dweb is illegal *you* ***monkey***.

(5) You look so stupid acting like you know what you're talking about, when the reality of the situation is that your pathetic and you CLEARLY don't know shit. Look at yourself. Get a fucking life, *you* ***monkey***.

(6) LOL what is this?? Who the fuck do you think you are? Is your life really that sad and pathetic that you have to get on perezhilton.com and act like the voice of reason? HAHA you're really cool! Keep it up, *you sad **monkey***!

Zoosemic development in the domain of intellect in this case clearly does not pertain to notions of power and possession since wild animals are not subdued by people. We would argue that the grounding of the metaphor in this case is related to the background knowledge we have about monkeys. Based on the evolution theory, they are viewed as our closest biological relatives, hence we perceive apes as a lower or primitive form of humans, which is metonymically narrowed to the domain of intellect and understood as lower or insufficient intellectual capacity. Example (2) illustrates that in our conceptual schema for monkeys, their prominent feature is also that of mischievousness, which we predominantly evaluate negatively (particularly in Croatian) as annoying, foolish, or harmful when it is projected onto adults. However, the trouble-making behaviour of children has a less negative axiological charge, so the concept in both languages can denote (rather affectionately) a lively, naughty child, the latter being coded in Croatian by the diminutive form (e.g. *majmunčiću jedan!*):

(7) "Stop climbing everything, *you little **monkey***," his mama would say, or "Its time to pick up your toys and get ready for bed," Nana would announce.

(8) *You cheeky **monkey***, you! I totally hear you on not reading other blogs - it isn't a preference thing, it's a time issue!

As Haslam et al. point out, simian metaphors may be cute when applied to children, but extremely offensive when used in interracial contexts (2011: 312). The corpora showed instances of the item being used as a racial slur aimed at a person with dark skin. We found 3 such examples in English corpus, and one in Croatian:

(9) Ironija je da je baš Suarez pogrdnim nazivima oslovljavao Evru sa '*crni **majmune***'.

(10)   Brazil is more black than people think either, only that the white racist Brazilians want to make the world believe that it is more white than black! They don't have shame in public to call you ***monkey***, ape, ugly and to make funny about your black face! Shame!

(11)   On a few occasions, cars of white men would drive by yelling at me the only African American there to' go back to Africa,' or' *you **monkey***,' or the racists would just drive by screaming' nigger!'

(12)   Britt allegedly told a guest to " go back to your country, *you **monkey***

In this sense, speakers strongly dehumanised the addressees, directly implying that the person is animal-like based on their perceived physical similarity to apes (due to darker skin tone, or specific facial features such as wider nose). Similarly, in Croatian it was directed at disliked ethnic groups, emphasising the 'primitive' nature of the referent:

(13)   Puši qurac i ti *retardirani **majmune** ciganski*, nabijem na qurac tebe i cijelu ti velikosrpsku politiku.

(14)   Vidim, koji god se Hrvat vrati u Travnik, vi ga koknete i prestrasite ostale da se ne vracaju I onda se cudite Srbima sto nece s vama u istom entitetu. ***Majmune** balijski* napusi se kurcine

Haslam et al. argue that psychological research has shown that many out-groups are denied attributes which distinguish humans from animals, and are implicitly associated with animals in general, or with apes in particular (2011: 313).

We may add that the female counterpart of the animal is not metaphorically conceptualised, again presumably due to the fact that it is the male that serves as the generic representative. Also, mischievous behaviour of monkeys is projected onto men rather than women due to our cultural perception of male agency. Finally, our experiential knowledge on monkeys as wild animals is not as rich as that of pets or farm animals with whom we have had daily interactions and who serve particular purposes important for our lives.

4.   Towards a conclusion

What do given zoosemes tell us about the way we conceptualise men and women? Salient features projected onto people most commonly pertain to the domain of intelligence. Men and women appear to be assessed as equally 'stupid', although there are some differences in the domains of character/morals and appearance. More specifically, negative valuation of human morals related to sexual behaviour is predominantly directed at women, and female appearance is more frequently critically addressed. Croatian and English mostly share the same socio-cultural models relevant for zoosemy, so figurative meanings and uses of lexemes greatly overlap cross-linguistically, with the exception of *horse*, which is not metaphorically conceptualised in a negative sense in English. The highest degree of correspondence is notably present in case of *bitch*, *cow*, and *pig*. As for *monkey*, there are differences in the degree of axiological charge, while the overlapping is only partial in the concept of *goat*, presumably due

to the existence of grammatical gender in Croatian, and separate linguistic coding for males and females. The GREAT CHAIN OF BEING metaphor (Lakoff and Turner, 1989), the main meaning focus (Kövecses, 2002), metonymically based functional domains (Barcelona, 2011), and anthropocentric models of CONTROL and POSSESSION (Milić 2011) offered us a very useful framework for the description of motivational factors argued to influence the construction of zoosemic meaning. On the other hand, zoosemes also give us an insight into our perception of animals, which is essentially explained by Rakusan:

"Animals, or rather the cultural construction of them, are in this sense used in two contradictory ways. Sometimes they are idealized, as for instance the Lamb who is in many cultures the model of what is considered the positive side of human nature. It carries attributes such as meek, quiet, patient, peaceful, pious, and innocent. By contrast, animals are also represented as the Other, the Beast, the model of disorder or the way as things should not be done." (1998-9: 219)

Finally, the Croatian corpus query provided results expected by our hypothesis. In overall, 322 occurrences involved a female referent, while in 227 occurrences the referent was male. English corpus also showed that metaphorisation was more commonly projected onto women (in 958 occurrences) than onto men (in 310 occurrences), which corresponds with Fontecha and Catálan's conclusions that semantic derogation occurs more in terms referring to women (2003). However, the results can be seen and understood only as *tendencies* extracted from a limited sample of animal names in a small-scale study. In order to establish potential generalisations, the hypothesis should be tested on a substantially larger sample of zoosemes in all morphosyntactic forms and in a more representative corpus, or through other testing methods. Corpus-based methodology in the analysis related to the role of gender in language is prone to oversimplification because it does not reveal important sociolinguistic aspects of usage. We must bear in mind that meaning construction and usage of a lexical item always depends on numerous contextual factors, such as the sociological, cultural and geographical properties of participants in communicative interaction, or characteristics of the speech situation itself. Linguistic choices of the speaker are influenced by specific or universal socio-cultural models, personal attitudes, beliefs, and emotions, degrees of formality, communicative intentions, etc. In addition, the meaning of an utterance can be conventionalised, but also a creative instantiation in a specific communicative situation. Therefore, our analysis merely suggests that zoosemes tend to be aimed at women more frequently than men, but the issue remains open for further investigation.

5.   Conclusion

The basic aim of this paper was to analyse particular zoosemic instances in Croatian and English with respect to their frequency, figurative meaning, and motivation argued to influence meaning construction. More specifically, we were interested to examine whether gender tends to play a role in the invective usage of animal names in terms of addressing a female referent more often than male in communicative interaction. The analysis was conducted using electronic corpora that provided relevant data. The results confirmed our hypothesis, and revealed common cognitive and socio-cultural models that affect the way we structure and use metaphors, along with many other contextual factors dependent on the speaker and the individual communicative situation. Since the analysis involved a small sample of lexemes, given results can be viewed only as tendencies in need of further research.

6.   Works Cited

Barcelona, A. (2005) The multilevel operation of metonymy in grammar and discourse, with particular attention to metonymic chains. In: Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. J. and M. S. Peña Cervel (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*: 313–352. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barcelona, A. (2011) Reviewing the properties and prototype structure of metonymy. In: Barcelona, A., R. Benczez and F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics: Towards a Consensus View*: 7–57. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Fernández Fontecha, A. and R. M. Jiménez Catalán (2003) Semantic derogation in animal metaphor: a contrastive-cognitive analysis of two male/female examples in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 35, pp. 771–797.

Grady, J. (1999) A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: Correlation vs. resemblance. In: Gibbs, R. W., and G. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*: 79–100. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Grubišić, M. (2014) *Jezično izražavanje ljutnje u hrvatskome i (američkom) engleskome*. PhD dissertation. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu.

Halupka-Rešetar, S. and B. Radić (2003) Animal names used in addressing people in Serbian. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 35, pp. 1891–1902.

Haslam, N., S. Loughnam and P. Sun (2011) Beastly: What Makes Animal Metaphors Offensive*? Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 30 (3), pp. 311–325.

Hines, C. (1999) Foxy chicks and Playboy bunnies: A case study in metaphorical lexicalization. In: Hiraga, M. K., C. Sinha, S. Wilcox (eds.), *Cultural, Typological and Psychological Perspectives on Cognitive Linguistics*: 9–23. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Holmes, J. (1992) *An Introduction to Sociolinuistics*. London: Longman.

Kiełtyka, R. and G. A. Kleparski (2005a) The scope of English zoosemy: The case of DOMESTICATED ANIMALS. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*. 3, pp. 76–87.

Kiełtyka, 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, pp. 22–41.

Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2017) *Where Metaphors Come From: Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. New York: Oxford Unversity Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Turner (1989) *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Martsa, S. (2013) *Conversion in English: A Cognitive Semantic Approach.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Milić, G. (2011) *Ljudi kao domaće životinje u engleskome i hrvatskome jeziku: Kognitivnolingvistički pristup*. PhD dissertation. Osijek: Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku.

Milić, G. (2013) Pristup zoosemiji unutar teorije konceptualne metafore i metonimije. *Jezikoslovlje.* 14 (1), pp. 197–213.

Rakusan, J. (1998-9) World of animals in an intercultural perspective (Slavic vs. Germanic metaphors). *Intercultural Communication Studies*. 8 (2), pp. 213–226.

Rakusan, J. (2004) Cultural diversity in crossing the boundaries between human and animal in language – Germanic and Slavic similes and metaphors. *Coll. Antropol*. 28 (Suppl. 1), pp. 171–181.

Rayevska, N.M. (1979) *English Lexicology*. Kiev: Vyšča Škola Publishers.

Rodriguez, I. L. (2007) The representation of women in teenage and women's magazines: recurring metaphors in English. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*. 15, pp. 15–42.

Stanojević, M.-M. (2009) Konceptualna metafora u kognitivnoj lingvistici: pregled pojmova. Suvremena lingvistika. 35 (68), pp. 339–371.

Electronic Sources:

https://corpus.byu.edu/iweb/

https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/

http://hjp.znanje.hr/

http://nlp.ffzg.hr/resources/corpora/hrwac/