

A Socio-Cognitive Analysis of Animal Metaphors in Egyptian Arabic

Prepared by

Nada H. M. Helmy

Department of English, Faculty of Al-Asun, Minia University

Abstract

Language analysis is a well-established method of reaching concepts and attitudes underlying user's language either written or spoken. Cognitive analysis of language aims to reveal underlying conceptual structures in the mind of language users. Social analysis tries to uncover possible effects of social factors e.g. gender, age, etc. on language use and what these effects imply about social strata, social roles, and privileged and derogated groups. The current study carries out a socio-cognitive analysis of animal metaphors in colloquial Egyptian Arabic. It examines sociolinguistic factors of gender and frequency of use through a four-point Likert questionnaire.

Key words: Egyptian Arabic, animal metaphors, cognitive analysis, gender, frequency of use.

1. Introduction

The Conceptual Metaphor Theory is one of the most influential theories in cognitive linguistics. It was proposed by Lakoff & Johnson (1981) in their book *Metaphors We Live By*. They argue that our conceptual system in which we both think and act is metaphoric in nature. Conceptual metaphors are different from literary metaphors found in literary texts. According to the cognitive approaches, a metaphor is understanding one abstract target domain in terms of another concrete source one. For example, according to Lakoff & Johnson (1981), understanding argument in terms of war, ARGUMENT IS

WAR¹, or life in terms of journey, LIFE IS A JOURNEY. There are so many abstract target domains that are understood in terms of other more concrete domains that are mapped into them in our everyday language.

Common target domains include time, life, emotions, mind, people, etc. while source domains include journeys, animals, plants, buildings, containers among various others. The target domain of people is understood in terms of many source domains including that of animals. When the source domain of animals is mapped into the target domain of humans, the conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS is formed with its submetaphor WOMEN ARE ANIMALS. What is interesting about this conceptual metaphor is that it is highly productive, which means that it has many linguistic realizations or linguistic examples.

Animal imagery has both cognitive and social aspects. The cognitive side is related into understanding people characteristics, one domain, in terms of animalistic ones, another domain, which sometimes reflects approval and acceptance and other times reflects objectionability and undesirability. As for the social aspect, animal metaphors reflect expected social roles of both males and females based on the animal in question and the attitude society has towards it.

Animal metaphors not only have a cognitive basis but also are closely related to social factors such as culture and gender. Animal imagery is culturally specific; it differs from one culture to another. An animal can be seen as good, thus carrying positive implications, for one culture while the same animal may be harmful, thus capturing negative traits of people, for another.

¹Conceptual metaphors are written in the form A is B; A is the source domain and B the target domain. They are written in capital letters to differentiate them from linguistic metaphors that are found in language. ARGUMENT IS WAR is not found in language as it is, rather it underlies linguistic expressions such as "your claims are indefensible. You disagree, ok shoot. If you use that strategy, he will wipe you out" (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003).

For example dogs (but not bitches) generally capture positive traits of people in western countries while in Arab countries dogs are inferior animals, they capture negative characteristics of people, to describe someone as a dog is an insult. Even if a certain animal carry negative traits in two different cultures; these negative traits are culturally specific and different e.g. turkey in English is used to conceptualize a stupid person. In contrast, turkey refers to a hypocrite and an opportunist in Persian (Talebinejad & Dastjerdi 2005). According to Rodriguez (2009), "metaphor is one of the main mechanisms that contribute to the diffusion and ingraining of folk beliefs" (p.78). People's traditions and folk beliefs and the geographical place people of a certain culture live in determine a large part of their experience of animals and, thus, their attitude towards them. Not only do animal metaphors differ from a culture to another but also they differ from a group to another e.g. men's attitude towards women vs. women's attitude towards themselves.

Gender differences are always clear in the use of certain animals by the speech community to refer to specific groups. Animal metaphors usually reflect gender differences as "the choice of the animal name does not seem arbitrary, but, on the contrary, may shed some light onto the expectations and beliefs society holds about males and females" (Rodriguez, 2009, p. 82 & 83). Animal metaphors help to capture a picture of social roles and attitudes of men and women. Animal metaphors in particular are rarely neutral, rather they are charged with negative characteristics which may reflect a bias towards some groups in society e.g. women.

Dealing with animal metaphors referring to women, WOMEN AS ANIMALS is divided into three categories: pets, farmyard animals and wild animals (Rodrigues, 2009, p. 83). The nature of animals in each category of these reflects the social role supposed to be played by women. For example, WOMEN AS PETS depicts women as keeping man's company and

entertaining him. WOMEN AS FARMYARD ANIMALS gives the women the role of begetting children, preparing food and serving men. Both PETS' and FARMYARD ANIMALS' metaphors usually carry positive connotations for women as, similar to their animals, they represent women as domesticated, tamed, inferior to men, and in need for protection (but not all pets and farmyard animals carry positive implications as bitch and cow, for example, carry negative connotations to the degree that they are used as insults). WOMEN AS WILD ANIMALS usually capture negative characteristics of women as wild animals are free, dangerous, neither need men's protection nor are subject to his control. More generally "weakness in an animal appears to be a favorable trait for crediting the animal name with positive connotations (e.g. chicken) whereas the names of strong animals are loaded with negative associations (e.g. vixen)" (Rodriguez, 2009, p. 95). Thus, animal metaphors give a hint of desirable and undesirable traits in women, how a certain society views women and what role are accredited to them.

The current study aims to examine PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS conceptual metaphor in Egyptian Arabic (EA). This topic has not been investigated before in EA, to the researcher's best knowledge. To conduct sociolinguistic analysis, the researcher uses a four-point Likert questionnaire to examine gender and frequency of use effects on using these metaphors.

2. Review of Literature:

The work on animal metaphors developed over time. According to Fontecha & Catalan (2003), it starts with lexicographic work represented in compiling animal metaphors in dictionaries e.g. (Ammer, 1989; Layman, 1983). A further step was identifying the self in animal metaphors (Craddick & Miller, 1970), followed by examining males and females relationships reflected in women as animals metaphor (Whaley & Antonelly, 1983). As for

sociolinguistic studies, Holmes (2013) claims that animal metaphors reflect sexism in language as "animal imagery is one example of an area where the images of women seem considerably less positive than those for men" (p. 325). Sutton (1995) investigated women place in slang language through WOMEN ARE ANIMALS metaphor, which yields discrimination against females. These studies focus mainly on English and they are not built on a cognitive model, meaning that they are not cognitive studies.

Recently, studies that examine animal imagery cognitively and socially have increased. These studies vary in many aspects: some on them are comparative while others are not; data sources include written sources such as dictionaries or magazines or spoken resources e.g. colloquial language metaphors collected by the researchers themselves; some studies, especially those that investigate gender and semantic derogation, usually use a questionnaire. Consequently, purposes of studies differ.

Halupka-Resetar & Radic (2003) examine the use of animal names to address people in Siberian. A questionnaire was given to 100 university students of linguistics. It contains 40 animal names and participants are asked to decide whether they would use the given names to address a male or a female, to determine if they would use the name abusively or affectionately, to say how frequently they would use the name, to give the morphosyntactic structure in which they would use the name, and to describe a concrete situation in which they would use the name. Results show that the vocative is the most frequently used form and that animal names are more frequently used abusively rather than affectionately.

Fontecha & Catalan (2003) examine specific metaphors in English (fox/vixen and bull/cow) and Spanish (zorro/zorra and toro/vaca). They aim to examine the conceptualization of these animals in the two languages and to

investigate if there is semantic derogation against either sexes. An advantage of this study is that it provides a good history of the beginning of animal metaphors research.

Rodriguez (2007) examines the use of linguistic metaphors to represent women in teenage and women's magazines. She discusses different metaphors such as: WOMEN AS DESSERTS, WOMEN AS ANIMALS, WOMEN AS BABIES, WOMEN AS ARISTOCRATS and WOMEN AS SUPERNATURAL CREATURES. As for the ANIMAL metaphor; Rodriguez (2007) divided WOMEN AS ANIMALS into three categories: WOMEN AS PETS e.g. bitches (a malicious, spiteful or bossy woman), cats (sly, independent and even treacherous woman) and kittens (a sexual desirable woman), WOMEN AS FARMYARD ANIMALS e.g. hens (a middle aged or old woman), chicks (a sexually desired young woman) and WOMEN AS WILD ANIMALS e.g. fox (intelligent and sexually attractive woman that hunts men) and vixen (ill-tempered or quarrelsome woman).

Rodriguez (2009) study tries to explore perceptions of womanhood through animal metaphors used in both English and Spanish. The study importance lies in its cognitive and social sides: dividing WOMEN ARE ANIMALS metaphor into submetaphors (WOMEN ARE PETS, WOMEN ARE FARMYARD ANIMALS and WOMEN ARE WILD ANIMALS) and linking it to the expected social roles, gender differences and cultural specifics in the animalistic conceptualization of men and women. The researcher concluded that names of certain pets and farmyard animals (e.g. kitten/gatita, chicken/pollita) carry positive connotations as they present women as domesticated and tamed. As for their social role "pet and farm animals stress the idea that women are conceived to entertain and provide company in the case of the former, and to render service to man either by providing food or begetting children, in the case of the latter" (Rodriguez, 2009, p. 96). All the

animals within the wild category (e.g. vixen/zorra) transmit undesirable connotations as these animals are not subject to man's control and are dangerous and menacing.

Rashid, Hajimaming & Muhammad (2012) investigate farm animal metaphors in Malay and Arabic figurative expressions. They focused on describing the images and connotations, i.e. positive or negative, associated with farm animals, such as horse, cow, donkey and goat. Horses are associated with positive values in Arab society such as loyalty (e.g. $\text{\textcircled{a}}\theta\text{wa}$ 'min faras, wa min kalb "more loyal than horses and dogs") and fast movement (e.g. $\text{\textcircled{a}}\text{sjad}$ min faras "more than the speed of a horse"), however horses are linked to negative characteristics also e.g. quick temper ($\text{\textcircled{y}}\text{ad}\text{\textcircled{s}}\text{abu}$ $\text{\textcircled{?}}$ l xail' $\text{\textcircled{?}}$ la $\text{\textcircled{?}}$ l-ludzum "horse anger upon its bridle"). As for Donkeys, they are characterized by both positive values such as patience (e.g. $\text{\textcircled{a}}\text{as}\text{\textcircled{s}}\text{bar}$ min $\text{\textcircled{h}}\text{imaer}$ "more patient than a donkey") and negative traits such as stupidity (e.g. $\text{\textcircled{a}}\text{d}\text{\textcircled{z}}\text{hal}$ min $\text{\textcircled{h}}\text{imaer}$ "more stupid than ass/donkey").

Silaški (2013) investigated semantic derogation of women with Siberian university students of both sexes since "this choice of animal names used to refer to a woman seems not to be "arbitrary, but, on the contrary, may shed some light onto the expectations and beliefs society holds about males and females" (p. 329). The researcher uses a questionnaire that includes different animal metaphors (domestic and wild, diminutive were excluded). Participants were asked to circle the name they use to describe a woman and to mention the physical and mental characteristic of the female person they refer to using the chosen animal name. Questionnaire results include the following: Animal names which males use to refer positively to a woman are *riba* 'fish' and *tigrica* 'tigress' (to refer to an attractive, pretty, sexy, seductive woman) and *lavica* 'lioness'(to refer to a strong, ambitious, persistent, self-confident, and self-sacrificing woman). The only animal that are used by both

males and females neutrally without any evaluative stance is žirafa ‘giraffe’ (to refer to a tall woman).

Differences between men and women use are present in some adjectives: while men use the word kuja ‘bitch’ to refer to a playful woman who enjoys and readily engages in promiscuous sex, women use the same word to refer to shallow, conceited, or frivolous woman. Women use Svinja ‘pig’ to refer to a fat woman, whereas men use svinja ‘pig’ metaphorically to describe an untidy and sloppy woman. Silaški (2013) concluded that: "Serbian exhibits a particular tendency towards downgrading a specific social group that is regarded as inferior or marginal" (p.329).

Muhammad & Rashid (2014) examine cat metaphors in English and Malay proverbs in light of Lakoff and Johnson's (2003) Conceptual Metaphor Theory. They investigated the validity of Lakoff & Turner's (1989) claim that cats are "fickle and independent". Some meanings of cat proverbs are common in English and Malay including: cat as authoritative (e.g. When the cat is away, the mice will play), cat as fierce/dangerous (e.g. Play with cats and expect to be scratched) and cat as untrustworthy/pretentious (e.g. Beware of cats that lick from the front and claw from behind). As animal metaphors are greatly influenced by culture, there are some differences between English and Malay. Meanings that are found only in English are the following: cat as cowardly (e.g. A shy cat makes a proud mouse), cat as useless (e.g. Keep no more cats than will catch mice) and cat as lazy (e.g. All cats love fish but hate to get their paws wet), while the Malay-exclusive meanings include (Cat as opportunist, Cat as insignificant, Cat as shameless). Muhammad & Rashid's conclusion is that:

The use of cat and other animals in the source domain of specific proverbs convey meanings that are related to the hierarchical order of the respective animals within the Great

Chain", however; "the examined data related to cats do not conform to the common proposition of cat proposed by Lakoff and Turner (1989), i.e. cats are fickle and independent. (p. 341)

3. Methodology

The current study is a socio-cognitive analysis of animal metaphors in EA. The data to be examined in this thesis is drawn from everyday spoken EA; the dialect you hear in urban areas and around Cairo, the Egyptian capital, on television, songs, TV series, etc. As a researcher I belong to the same speech community of EA and thus collect and analyze the data with awareness of how it is used. I collect the data based on my observation and on being a native speaker of EA.

To examine the sociolinguistic aspects of metaphors and euphemisms, I use a questionnaire with two variables: gender of participants and frequency of use. The questionnaire, consisting of 26 expressions, is given to a sample of 200 participants of university students of both genders who are users of EA. Initially, participants are requested to provide their gender, age, faculty and university, but not their names; their identities are anonymous. They are presented with a number of animal metaphors either masculine, feminine or gender-neutral to which they are to determine how frequent they use in everyday speech (always, often, sometimes, and rarely). The questionnaire also gives participants the opportunity to add other expressions that are not listed. The researcher performs necessary procedures of eliminating invalid copies, counting answers, statistical treatment and considering relevant additions. Since the questionnaire is used as a mean to verify the data, expressions rated as "rarely used" are excluded from analysis. The researcher then reads the data in terms of gender and frequency of use.

4. Analysis of metaphors

According to the target domain, animal metaphors can be divided into masculine, feminine and gender-neutral based on grammatical gender and the person they refer to. According to source domain, the used animals are classified into farmyard animals, wild animals and pets. These metaphors reflect the effect of social and cultural factors on understanding personal traits in terms of animal characteristics. The Egyptian society holds a negative view towards certain animals such as dogs, monkeys, snakes, donkeys, oxen, sheep, scorpions and insects, and has a positive attitude towards others e.g., bees, deer, broodmares, etc. Thus, likening one to either groups reflects objectionability and undesirability or approval and acceptance.

The following are instances of animal metaphors that refer to males

1. فُلَانٌ دَا حُمَارٌ شَعْلٌ.

/fulæn dæ huma:r fuyl/

This person is a donkey of work.

2. رَى الثَّوْرُ فِي السَّاقِيَةِ.

/zaii-ittuwr f-ssa?yah/

Like ox in waterwheel.

3. تَعَلَّبٌ.

/taflab/

Fox.

4. يَا خَرُوفٌ.

/jæ xaruwf/

Oh, sheep!

5. فُلَانٌ ثَوْرٌ لَاهِي فِي بَرَسِيمُهُ.

/fulæn tuwr læhii f-barsii Muh/

This person is an ox distracted in his grass.

6. دَا تَعْبَانٌ.

/dæ tiʃbæn/

He is a snake.

7. دَا عَقْرَبٌ .

/dæ ʕaʔrab/

He is a scorpion.

8. بَعْلٌ .

/bayl/

Mule.

All the above expressions refer exclusively to males and are included in the questionnaire except (2, 3 & 8) which are added by participants. The used animals are under two categories: farmyard animals e.g. donkey, ox, sheep and mule or wild animals e.g. fox, snake and scorpion. Masculine animal metaphors are used abusively to criticize negative characteristics (4-8) or affectionately to praise positive characteristics (1-3). Positive metaphors include: a donkey of work (1) and an ox in a waterwheel (2) (hard working person) and fox (3) (a cunning person, in a positive sense); it is worth mentioning that if donkey is used alone it refers to a stupid person. Negative masculine animal metaphors are: snake (3) (a person who is unpleasant and cannot be trusted); sheep (4) (easy to be guided and directed; in a negative sense); scorpion (7) (an evil person); an ox distracted in grass (5) (a stupid unaware person); and mule (8) (a fat stupid person). It is worth noting that describing someone as an ox can carry both positive (2) and negative connotations (5). The expression in (5) is sometimes mispronounced by some Egyptians as نُورُ اللَّهِ فِي بَرَسِيْمُهُ / tuwr-alla:h f-barsiiimuh/ The ox of god in his grass. The reason beyond that may be that the /r/ sound in /tuwr/ is heavy or pronounced with a full mouth which affects the sound following it, making it easier to be heavy than light; e.g. /tuwr alla:h/ is easier to pronounce than /tuwr læhii/.

The frequency of use is slightly higher for males than females. Both males and females rated ox (5) and scorpion (7) as "sometimes" used and snake (6) as "usually" used. The difference between the two genders is in donkey of work (1) and sheep (4). Males use the former "usually" while females use it "sometimes". A significant difference is in the use of "sheep" as males use it "usually" while females use it "rarely". The word "sheep" itself as an insult criticizes a male who is easily guided. After 25th of January Revolution, the word was used to refer to those belonging to Muslim Brotherhood by people who believe that they follow leader's command without thinking.

The following are instances of animal metaphors that refer to both males and females

9. فُلَانٌ دَا عِنْدُهُمْ فَرْخَةٌ بِكِشْكٍ.

/fulæn dæ ʕinduhum farxah bikiʃk/

This person is a chicken with kishk.

10. زَيْ الْقُطْطُ بِسَبْعِ أَرْوَاحٍ.

/zajj ʔilʔutʔatʕ bisabaʕ ʔarwa:h/

Like cats with seven souls.

11. ابْنُ الْمَوْزِ عَوَّامٌ.

/ʔibn ʔilwizz ʕawwæm/

The son of a duck is a swimmer.

12. فُلَانٌ دَا كَلْبٌ/ةٌ فُلُوسٌ.

/fulæn dæ kalb fulus/

This person is a dog of money.

13. يَا حَشْرَةً.

/jæ haʕarah/

Oh, insect!

14. الْوَرْدُ فِي عَيْنِ أُمِّهِ عَزَّالٌ.

/ʔilʔird f-ʕinʔ umuh ʔazal/

The monkey is a deer in his mother's eye.

15. حَدُّ عُلُقَّةٍ مَيَّخُدْهَاشِنْ حُمَارٍ فِي مَطَّلَعٍ.

/xad ʕalʔa hmajaxudhæʃ ʔhuma:r f-matʕlaʕ/

He was beaten worse than a donkey in a hillside.

Gender-neutral animal metaphors are ones that are used to refer to either males or females without grammatical appropriation which is the case with all the above examples except (12) which is modified into /kalbah/, bitch, when referring to a female. All the above expressions are questionnaire items. The source domain animals are farmyard animals e.g. chicken, duck and donkey, wild animals e.g. monkey and insect, and pets e.g. cats and dogs. Examples (9-11) are positive while (12-15) are negative. Positive gender-neutral animal metaphors include: a chicken with kishk² (9) (favored and preferred); a cat with seven souls (10) (able to endure difficult harmful situations); and son of a duck (11) (clever and skilled as his/her parents). Negative gender-neutral animal metaphors are: a dog of money (12) (a person who seeks money as a priority regardless of other ethical considerations), monkey (14) (an ugly person who is seen as beautiful by his/her loved ones); a donkey in a hillside (15) (humiliated and beaten violently); and insect (13) (a degraded and despised person).

As for frequency of use, gender-neutral animal metaphors are used with a similar frequency among males and females. Both genders rated cats (10), donkeys (15) and monkeys (14) as "usually" used and they rated chicken (9) as "rarely used". However, duck (11), dog of money (12), insect (13) are used by males more frequently than females; usually, always, sometimes vs. sometimes, usually, and rarely respectively. This minor difference is not significant as these metaphors are gender-neutral; they refer to both males and females.

²A dish made from white sauce.

The following are instances of animal metaphors that refer to females

16. عَزَالَةٌ.

/ʔazælah/

Deer.

17. فُطَّةٌ.

/ʔutʕah/

Cat.

18. هِزَّ يَا وَزَّ.

/hizz jæ wizz/

Shake, goose.

19. بَطَّةٌ.

/batʕʕah/

Duck.

20. زَيْ النَّحْلَةِ.

/zajj-innaħlah/

Like a bee.

21. كَتُّوتَةٌ.

/katkutah/

Chick.

22. فَرَسَةٌ.

/farasah/

Broodmare

23. بَقْرَةٌ.

/baʔarah/

Cow.

24. عَامِلَةٌ زَيْ الْعِجْلَةِ.

/ʕæmlah zajj ʔilʕiglah/

Doing like a calf.

She is like a calf.

25. جَامُوسَةٌ.

/gæmuwsah/

Buffalo.

26. عَقْرَبَةٌ.

/ʕaʔrabah/

Scorpion.

27. حُرْبَايَةٌ.

/hirbæjah/

Chameleon.

28. بُومَةٌ.

/bumah/

Owl.

Mare.

29. حَلُوفَةٌ.

/ħalluwfah/

Sow.

All of the above expressions are questionnaire items except (18, 19 & 29) which are added by participants. In EA, negative women animal metaphors are under two metaphors: WOMEN ARE FARMYARD ANIMALS: cow (23), calf (24) and buffalo (25), all of them refer to a fat ugly woman, and sow (29) (referring to an insensitive woman who does not care about others), and WOMEN ARE WILD ANIMALS: scorpion (26) (a harmful untrusted women), chameleon (27) (a woman who changes according to the situation and who tries to make people angry at others) and owl (28) (an ill-omened woman) as birds goes under the animal category. WOMEN AS FARMYARD ANIMALS, particularly those of heavy weights and big sizes, refer negatively

and critically to an undesired characteristics of women, fatness and insensitivity.

As for positive women animal metaphors, they are under two metaphors WOMEN AS FARMYARD ANIMALS: chick (21) (a young women), broodmare (22) (a sexually attractive woman), duck (19), and goose (18) (a women with a desirable weight, who is neither too fat nor too thin). It is worth mentioning that farm animals in these metaphors are ones with a relatively small sizes and light weights. WOMEN AS PETS has only one linguistic realization, woman as cat (17) which refer to a young attractive woman. Belonging to the pets' category, this metaphor implies that a woman referred to as a cat is expected to entertain men. Another metaphor that refers positively to a woman is deer (16) (a slim attractive woman). It is worth noting that the deer belongs to the wild category, thus, to WOMEN AS WILD ANIMALS metaphor. The expression in (20), bee, (an active woman) is used affectionately and, as birds, can be included under the wild animals category or can be listed alone and form a unique conceptual metaphor of EA, namely WOMEN AS INSECTS. Rodrigues (2009) claims that the wild category usually carries negative characteristics as its animals are not under man's control, however, these two linguistic examples are exceptions as "deer" refers positively to a slim attractive woman in EA and "bee" refers to an active woman. Thus, WOMEN AS WILD ANIMALS in EA does not confirm to Rodriguez's claim that wild animals carry negative connotations as they are dangerous and not under man's control. These positive metaphors reflect desirable female characteristics, namely youth, playfulness, sexual attractiveness, average weight and being active.

Differences in frequency of use between males and females are found in some metaphors rather than others, namely broodmare (22), chick (21), deer (16) and cat (17) which are used "usually" by males and "sometimes" by

females. A close look at these animalistic metaphors can justify males more frequent use of them. These metaphors are related to the shape of feminine body and desirable young age: "deer" ; reflects young age and slimness "chick" and "cat" reflect young age and playfulness while "broodmare" reflects sexual attractiveness and young age. All these are characteristics that men found necessary or attractive in women, based on their high frequency of use. Expectedly, females use these expressions at a lesser degree as, of course, slimness, young age or sexual attractiveness are not the first thing women see in their peers. Abusive women metaphors; chameleon (27), cow (23), calf (24), buffalo (25) and scorpion (26) are used "sometimes" by both genders. The only positive metaphor that is used equally by both males and females is "bee" (20) praising an active woman. The only animal metaphor that is used "usually" by females is the owl, it is the most frequently used metaphor for them. This linguistic metaphor reflects a negative characteristic that women hate in other women, namely ill omen and envy.

5. Conclusion

Animal imagery either masculine, feminine or gender-neutral reflects social roles of each gender and the way every gender looks at itself and the opposite gender. Males and females use masculine and gender-neutral metaphors similarly in terms of frequency which may imply that males are not semantically derogated either by themselves or by women. Such a case is expected as males are privileged in a patriarchal society such as the Egyptian society. On other hand, certain women's animal metaphors, those dealing with sexual attractiveness and young age, are used more frequently by males. Women's attitude towards themselves differs from that of men. However, males' attitude towards females might not be judged as semantically derogating as males' more frequently used expressions carry positive traits, even if they have sexual implications. Being a less privileged group, women, surprisingly,

are not biased against, either by males or by themselves, unless we see masculine interest in sexual attractiveness, young age, slimness and playfulness as humiliating for women. Animal metaphors give a hint of desirable and undesirable traits in both women and men; how a certain society views both sexes and what roles are accredited to each of them.

Arabic Transliteration Symbols

Consonants			
Arabic letters	IPA symbols	Arabic letters	IPA symbols
ا	a: / æ	ط	tʰ
ب	b	ظ	ðʰ
ت	t	ث	ʈ
ث	θ	ذ	ɣ

ج	g	ف	f
ح	h	ق	q
خ	x	ك	k
د	d	ل	l
ذ	ð	م	m
ر	r	ن	n
ز	z	ه	h
س	s	و	w
ش	ʃ	ي	j
ص	s ^ç	ء	ʔ
ض	d ^ç		
Vowels			
ا	a: / æ	اَ	a:
ي	i:	يَ	u:
ى	a: / æ	يِ	ii
و	u:	يِ	a: / æ
يِ	aj	يِ	ijj
وِ	aw	وِ	uww
Diacritic marks			
اَ	a	اَ	an
اِ	i	اِ	in
اُ	u	اُ	un

References

- Ammer, C., (1989). *It's Raining Cats and Dogs*. Dell Publishing: New York.
- Craddick, R., & Miller, J. (1970). Investigation of the symbolic self using the concentric circles method and animal metaphor. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 31, 147-150.

- Fontecha, A. F., & Catalán, R. M. J. (2003). Semantic derogation in animal metaphor: a contrastive-cognitive analysis of two male/female examples in English and Spanish. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(5), 771-797.
- Halupka-Rešetar, S., & Radić, B. (2003). Animal names used in addressing people in Serbian. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(12), 1891-1902.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed). Routledge: USA.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: a practical introduction* (2nded.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyman, D. (1983). *The Animal Things We Say*. Jonathan David Publishers: New Jersey.
- Muhammad, N. N., & Rashid, S. M. (2014). Cat Metaphors in Malay and English Proverbs. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 335-342.
- Rashid, S. M., Hajimaming, P., & Muhammad, N. N. (2012). 'Farm' Animal Metaphors in Malay and Arabic Figurative Expressions: Implications for Language Learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(7), 33-39.
- Rodríguez, I. L. (2007). The representation of women in teenage and women's magazines: recurring metaphors in English/La representación de las mujeres en las revistas de adolescentes y femeninas: metáforas recurrentes en inglés. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 15, 15-42.
- Rodríguez, I. L. (2009). Of women, bitches, chickens and vixens: Animal metaphors for women in English and Spanish. *Cultura, lenguaje y representación: revista de estudios culturales de la Universitat Jaume I*, 7, 77-100.

- Silaški, N. (2013). Animal Metaphors and Semantic Derogation—Do Women Think Differently from Men?. *Gender Studies*, 12(1), 319-332.
- Sutton, L. A., (1995). Bitches and skankly hobags: the place of women in contemporary slang. In K. Hall & M. Burholtz (Eds.), *Gender Articulated* (pp. 279-296). London: Routledge.
- Talebinejad, M. R., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2005). A cross-cultural study of animal metaphors: When owls are not wise!. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 20(2), 133-150.
- Whaley, C., & Antonelly, G. (1983). The birds and the beasts—woman as animal. *Maledicta*, 7, 219–229.