

The Interpretation of Zoosemy in Research Works

U.S.Toirova

*A Teacher English of Linguistics Department
Bukhara State University*

Abstract. *This article clarifies the genesis, content and essence of the terms “zoosemy”, “zoonym”, “zoopoetonym” in English and Uzbek literature and language. Zoosemy identifies thematic types, universal and specific features, positive and negative behavior of a person through the symbolic, poetic, in English and Uzbek literature, both languages express human behavior or, conversely, compare human character to an animal.*

Key words: *Zoosemy, zoonym, zoopoetonym*

Introduction

J. Lakoff and M. Turner interpret the theory of zoosemy through the example of Achilles is a lion. The first metaphor in the sentence is considered of Achilles' courage to a lion, and the second is the interpretation of human character based on animal instinct. The perception of the instinctive behavior of lions as courage, the use of this characteristic in relation to Achilles, and the redirection of the relationship between the lion and its "courage" to the relationship between Achilles and his courage are directly related to each other. Here, the principle of immutability, which limits metaphorical schematization and zoosemy is used as a metaphor through animal names. [1]

G. Milich notes that the analysis of motivational factors alone is insufficient in understanding zoosemy. J. Lakoff and M. Turner interpret the metaphorical nature of the term zoosemy, ignore its metonymic role, although everything in nature also has a metonymic appearance of the people.

The term zoosemy (animal metaphor) can be worked in the works of G. Stern, D. Wilkins, F. J. Thornton and G. A. Kleparski, Kardela and Kleparski Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk.

B. McVinney notes that metaphor is associated with the category of man and a similarity between the features of humanity and the animal world.

F. J. Thornton uses the term animal in his semantic analysis “good and evil” to reveal the positive and negative features of humans. [2]

Thus, animal names are often used to express human qualities. The study show results of that the names of the large group of mammals were used in various metaphorical expressions and took the lead. In F.J. Thornton's study, mammals were used 51 times, insects 8 times, reptiles 8 times, birds 8 times, fish 7 times, arachnidis 3 times, amphibians 3 times, crustaceans 2 times.

As can be seen from the above data, mammals were used a lot in English historical zoosemy. According to F.J. Thornton, the reason for the most frequent use of the category of mammals is their similarity to humanity, and the closeness of animals to humans, which led to their domestication.

Animal names used in relation to humans are metaphors.

Domestic animals are divided into 3 main groups: mammals, birds, and anthropods (anthropods - bees and drones). Of these, the mammalian group is divided into the following families: equidae

(horse, foal, stallion), bovidae (cow, calf), canidae (dog), suidae (pig), felidae (cat), leporidae (rabbit), domestic fowl (poultry), meleagrididae (turkey), anatidae (duck), apoidea (bee, drone).

M. Johnson, M. Lakoff, and M. Turner have argued that metaphor is a much broader phenomenon than is usually imagined, namely, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). Conceptual metaphor shows that two domains correspond to each other and those elements are mapped. [3]

The Great Chain of Being Metaphor shows why and how metaphors are used in language. Animal names are widely used to describe human characteristics. Understanding human traits and behavior through animal attributes comes from the use of a general conceptual metaphor. G.A. Kleparski, Z. Kovacs, and S. Martsalar argue for the notion that “Humans are animals” as follows: gluttonous people are pigs, courageous people are lions, inconsiderate/ selfish people are hogs.

Researchers also conclude that metaphors related to human character traits and behavior .

G. Lakoff and M. Turner Theories related to the "Great Chain of Being" are based on the theories of Plato and Aristotle and are determined by the behavior that has survived to the present day. T. Krzeszowski “schematically represents the “great chain” of being: God, humans, animals, plants, inorganic thing. [4]

T. Krzeszowski emphasizes that not all metaphors have the same effect and puts forward the concepts of “human-animal and animal-human”. The scientist expresses the positive characteristic of a person at the bottom of the chain as “a faithful, friendly dog”, which is used in a derogatory or offensive way towards a person, while at the top of the chain he places the phrase “this man is a pig”.

G. Lakoff and M. Turner argue that the great chain of being is a metaphor and that this metaphor, as a powerful tool, allows us to understand the characteristics of a person and the poorly understood aspects of nature. G. Lakoff and M. Turner use the mechanism of the great chain in studying the meaning of the metaphor of Achilles' heel or the wolf. J. Lakoff states that an animal metaphor consists of a word, phrase, or sentence that expresses a similarity between a specific person and an animal.

Main part

According to G. Kleparsky's research, the semantic structure of the equine, canine, feline domains includes the following:

1. Domain of species - domain of species;
2. Domain of functions - domain of behavior;
3. Domain of origin/rank - domain of lineage;
4. Domain of age - domain of age;
5. Domain of character - domain of character;
6. Domain of behavior and morality - domain of behavior and morality;
7. Domain of physical characteristics and appearance - domain of physical characteristics and appearance;
8. Domain of abuse - domain of discrimination.

In the Equine domain, the equine zoosemy mare, jade, nag, filly, curtal, hilding, yaud, roil, mule mean “a worthless, frivolous woman”, in the Canidae domain the dog zoosemy bitch, puppy, minx mean “a woman with bad character”, in the Felidae domain the cat zoosemy cat, puss, pussy, gib mean “cunning and frivolousness”.

According to G. Kleparsky and Z. Kovacs, in the field of cognitive linguistics, animals constitute a metaphorical resource area and are widely recognized for conceptualizing humans.

As P. Shepard notes, people “predetermine human society through animal names, like a curved mirror that reflects the real image of funny, instructive, and terrible events”. From the same point of view,

according to Deignan's observations, animals are a source of similes that indicate human behavior, and this tendency is widespread.

According to A. Goatly, there are three ways to interpret the phrase human is an animal: [5]

1. Humans are part of the category animal. They are used as hyponyms.
2. Humans and animals are more or less alike.
3. Humans are like animals. It means metaphorically that humans are like animals.

When it is said that humans are part of the category of animals, the Darwinian idea of the struggle for survival between different creatures. Various forms of human behavior are widely used in the socio-biological environment, and humans are partly guided by animal instincts. When humans and animals are more or less similar, it represents a symbiotic way of living together between human and non-human forms of life. The metaphorical interpretation of the form "humans are like animals" is a linguistic form of zoosemy.

In general, based on the ideas presented in the research of J. Lakoff, M. Turner, G. Milich, it can be concluded that zoosemy is used as both metaphor and metonymy.

G. Milich, on the other hand, says that the most prominent features of animals in these subdomains are then compared with human appearance, intelligence, character and behavior, the main features are used in a cognitive model of the nature of things that lead to important actions, character is a broader field of morality. Therefore, the comparison of animal characteristics with humans is also zoosemy.

In their studies on zoosemy, scholars such as F. Fontecha and J. Catalan, S. Haynes and L. Rodriguez emphasize that semantic derogation is associated with the gender of the referent and is usually directed towards women.

F. Fontecha and J. Catalan, having studied the semantic derogation in two pairs of animal words in English (fox/vixen, bull/cow) and Spanish (zorro/zorra, toro/vaca), indicate that these words are used more often in relation to women in both languages.

Zoosemy is the process of semantic change of animal names used to designate human characteristics. As B. McWhinney noted, metaphors related to humans indicate a certain isomorphism established between the world of animal characteristics and the world of human characteristics.

R. Keiltika divides zoosemy in English into 1) profession and social function; 2) behavior and character; 3) social status and origin; 4) physical characteristics and appearance; 5) morality; 6) gender; 7) hatred and humiliation. [6]

Conclusion

Thus, zoosemy represent the metaphorical giving of a second name to a person, the naming of a person by zoonyms, and they consist of metaphorical zoonyms indicating human characteristics. It has been proven that the essence and use of terms that form a synonymous versions such as zoonym, zoosemism, zoopoetonym, zoometaphor, zoomorpheme, animalism, are formed in languages.

It has been determined that zoosemy occur in samples of literary works of different nations based on factors such as the lifestyle, manners, behavior, behavior, status, appearance, and character of that nation and are divided into categories known by Latin terms such as bovidae, suidae, equidae, canidae, felidae, leporidae, domestic fowl, meliagridae.

References

1. Kieltyka.R. Selected Aspects of Zoosemy: The Conceptual Dimension "Origin/Social Status". *Philologia Hispalensis Project: The Semantic Scope of English Animal-Specific Surnames.* – Poland: Rzeszów University. 2(24) December 2010. – pp. 167-189.
2. Ли Имо, Зоосемизмы в Русской и Китайской Лексикографии: Род и Пол. – Москва: Мир Науки, Культуры, Образование № 5 (84) 2020. – С. 289-295.

3. Grzaśko A. On Zoosemy, Foodsemy and Plantosemy: A Cognitive Approach to Selected Terms of Endearment. – Poland: Studia Anglica Resoviensia, 2017. – pp.29-43.
4. Lakoff G. and Turner. M More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989. – P. 22.
5. Lucija Kovačić. Zoosemy and Gender Stereotyping: A Corpus Analysis of Six Pairs of English and Croatian Lexemes. – Zagreb, 2018. – P.32
6. R.Kiełtyka and G.A.Kleparski. 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. – Slovakia, 2005. – P.34.