People as animals : an analysis of English zoosemic compounds

Mikulić, Andrea

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
ACADEMIC YEAR 2023/2024

Andrea Mikulić

People as animals: an analysis of English zoosemic compounds

Master's thesis

Thesis advisor: dr. sc. Janja Čulig Suknaić

Zagreb, 2024

Summary

The purpose of this study is to analyze compounds referring to people that contain words for animals in order to bring to light the metaphors and metonymies that affected their creation. This study consists of a theoretical and practical part. In the theoretical framework the study gives a brief overview of compounds and their classification as well as metonymy, metaphor, and its subcategory crucial for this study, zoosemy. the study takes a closer look at zoosemy, and which elements are combined in order for the HUMAN AS ANIMAL metaphor to work; namely the Great Chain of Being, the Nature of Things theory, the GENERIC IS SPECIFIC metaphor, and the communicative Maxim of Quantity. This part is followed by methodology which briefly describes how this study was approached. The practical part consists of an analysis which will delve into each chosen compound and try to show how metaphors and metonymies affect the constituents of each compound and the semantic link between them in order to get to the meaning that the compound contains. The study will offer an explanation behind the choice of each constituent of the compound. The conclusion will finally highlight the patterns of compound creation that will be uncovered in the analysis.

Key words: compounds, zoosemy, metaphor, metonymy

Contents

1. Introduction

Animals have always played a very important role in people's lives. From providing companionship and help with everyday tasks to being a source of food, animals can be considered crucial to human existence. It is no surprise then that they have made their way into human culture and language, even going so far as to represent people. This study will focus on such representation in noun compounds. In order to support my hypothesis that exocentric compounds are metaphorically and metonymically based, and that zoosemy is used predominantly with animals that are culturally closer to people, primarily pets, this study will investigate 36 exocentric noun compounds referring to people and analyze them through the cognitive linguistic view to show the processes behind their formation. The examples that will be analyzed are compounds that refer to people and contain words for animals such as *top dog* or *bookworm.* The compounds will be organized in 2 categories; pets, and farm animals, depending on how close they are to peoples' everyday life. My expectation is that the first category, pets, will have the most examples as pets, such as dogs and cats, are extremely common and people in general, and in Anglo-American cultures specifically, encounter them daily and are a lot more familiar with them than they are with farm animals, such as cows. Since compounds can be divided into endocentric and exocentric ones, based on "the presence vs. absence of a head constituent" (Bisetto and Scalise 2005: 321), many authors have favored endocentric compounds due to them being seen as transparent as opposed to headless exocentric compounds which were described as opaque. This study will attempt to describe the compounds on the basis of being equally understandable as endocentric compounds and find some systematicity in their creation by seeing if they follow the same patterns for creating meaning.

2. Theoretical frameworks

In order to fully understand the processes which were involved in the creation of noun compounds that refer to people and use words for animals, it is important to establish a theoretical framework within which this study will operate. This part of the study will give a brief overview of compounds, metaphor, zoosemy, and metonymy.

In order to analyze exocentric compounds, it is necessary to first have a more thorough understanding of what a compound is and what types of compounds exist. Authors often debate what the best definition of a compound would be as the "intersection of defining criteria is fundamental in order to obtain a descriptively adequate classification" (Bisetto and Scalise 2005: 321) and although there is not a singular best definition this study cannot be done without at least a working definition of a compound and the one chosen is that "a compound is a word

that consists of two elements, the first of which is either a root, a word or a phrase, the second of which is either a root or a word" (Plag 2003: 135). One of the most important aspects of a compound is that it "is characterized by a high level of semantic density" (Špiranec 2015: 213) so it provides a lot of information while using very few words.

Compounds can be classified in many ways, one of which is dividing them into endocentric and exocentric compounds, which make up the majority of the analyzed compounds in this study. This type of classification divides "compounds on the basis of the presence vs. absence of a head constituent" (Bisetto and Scalise 2005: 321). For endocentric compounds, such as *sheepherder*, "the semantic head of these compounds is inside the compound" (Plag 2003: 145) which means that these compounds contain two constituents where "the left-hand member somehow modifies the right-hand member" (Plag 2003: 135), the full breakdown of this compound will be shown in the analysis part. These types of constructions belong to the "group of fully compositional items" (Benczes, 2004: 5) which means that "the two components A and B combine on the basis of a regular syntactic rule (ADJ + N) to give the composite element C" (Benczes, 2004: 5). The meaning of endocentric compounds is therefore a "hyponym of the head element" (Benczes 2005: 174) so a *sheepherder* is a type of herder.

Exocentric compounds, such as *waterdog*, on the other hand, "do not modify any word within their construction, but rather modify a separate entity that is not overtly expressed" (Mikulić 2022: 3) so the meaning of exocentric compounds is not simply contained in their constituents as is the case for endocentric compounds. Instead, exocentric compounds are a "result from the semantic creativity, i.e. the working of metonymy/metaphor" (Nagano 2014: 313) so that they can combine their constituents and use them to talk about an entity outside of them. Benczes (2004: 14) goes on to explain that "the composite elements motivate the meaning of the compound by providing access to semantic networks" so it in not just the words used in the construction but all the connected meanings that they possess that play a part in the creation of a compound's meaning.

Consequently, the analysis of exocentric compounds necessitates the consideration of the compound as a whole, instead of simply analyzing the constituents. The meaning of the composite structure is "not the simple sum of the meanings of the components" (Benczes 2004: 14). as is the case with endocentric compounds. When creating exocentric compounds, they are "interpreted with a quite rich contextual and specified meaning, therefore C≠[AB]" (Benczes 2004: 6). As already stated, the components provide access to various semantic domains which work together and mix to create such a semantically dense word.

Since exocentric compounds rely on metaphors and metonymies for their meaning it is necessary to delve into the workings of those rhetorical devices. Metaphor is "a fundamental scheme by which people conceptualize the world and their own activities" (Gibbs 2008: 3). It is so "pervasive in everyday life" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 3) that oftentimes people do not even notice it since "our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4). Metaphors can simply be defined as "extended structure mappings between domains" (Gibbs 2008: 7) which allow us to "comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 10) thus it can be concluded that the source domain and the target domain have something similar for the metaphor to work, but "the source and the target domain must be distinct and distant from one another" (Egorova 2019: 22) for metaphor to take place.

Since the focus of this study is "[t]he comprehension of human attributes and behavior through animal attributes and behavior [which] results from the application of the highly general conceptual metaphor, that is humans are animals" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25) also called zoosemy, it is necessary to take a closer look at the systems in play behind this subcategory of metaphor.

Zoosemy, or the HUMAN AS ANIMAL metaphor, is, according to Milić (2013: 198), very productive, especially when used with domesticated animals which will be the focus of this study. Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005b: 86) concur that animal metaphors are very common and productive communication elements, pointing out that "the animal kingdom is one of the most powerful centers of metaphorical expansion where most of the cases of animal metaphor are projected at the conceptual category HUMAN BEING."

In this study, zoosemy will be analyzed through the lens of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) which "treats metaphor as a conceptual rather than a purely linguistic entity which involves systematic projection between two mental representations (conceptual domains)" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 24). It claims that metaphor operates in terms of relationships between different concepts so the mechanisms behind the working of zoosemy involve "stable and systematic relationships between two conceptual domains" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25).

Milić (2013: 199) claims that zoosemic conceptualization of human behavior and characteristics is actually a product of two metaphors working at the same time; specifically conventional cases of the Great Chain of Being metaphor that go in opposite directions; the ANIMALS ARE PEOPLE metaphor and PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS metaphor.

The Great Chain of Being is "defined by attributes and behaviors, arranged in a hierarchy" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). Egorova claims that it is not simply a metaphor but "a metaphorical conceptual complex consisting of four elements: (1) the Great Chain of Being cultural model, (2) the Nature of Things theory, (3) the GENERIC IS SPECIFIC metaphor, (4) the communicative Maxim of Quantity" (2019: 13).

Since this structure of the Great Chain of Being is arranged and depends on hierarchy it is clear that mapping between domains can happen in two directions; "upward and downward" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). Upward mapping happens when "the source domain occupies a lower position on the Great Chain than the target domain" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 26) which can be seen, for example, in the analysis of the compounds *pussycat* or *workhorse*. Downward mapping, on the other hand, inverses the positions of the source and target domain so it represents "the transfer of features/attributes from the source domain which occupies a higher position on the Great Chain than the target domain" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 39), an example offered by Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a: 26) is "*a faithful, friendly dog*". Since this study deals with compounds that use words for animals, who are lower on the Chain, to represent people, who are higher on the Chain, only upward mapping will be shown.

The second part constituting the workings of the Great Chain of Being Metaphor, the Nature of Things theory, asserts that "behavior and/or function of things in the world arise from their respective natures/attributes" (Egorova 2019: 14). This theory claims that because of certain attributes that things have, such as dogs having a keen sense of smell, they behave in a particular way, dogs will often be sniffing things. Animals in general have certain instincts that lead them to certain behaviors and humans, being a step above animals in the Great Chain, "have all the attributes that animals have with the addition of reasoning and character" (Egorova 2019: 14). This nicely shows how every level on the Great Chain contains the attributes of the level below. This inclusion is one of the reasons why this metaphor works so well as zoosemy often employs "mappings from the source domain of instinctual attributes and behavior onto the target domain of human character traits" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). As Milić (2013: 202) stated, the subdomain of behavior is one of the most common sources of knowledge about the concept of a certain animal which is mapped onto and used to conceptualize the traits of character as one of the key subdomains in the concept of man. Milić (2013: 200) points out that this instinctual behavior in animals is often used to explain and show human character. Therefore, people can, through observation and evaluation of the animal's behavior, attribute certain characteristics which can then, on the basis of the Nature of Things theory, become their defining characteristic or "quintessential property" (Milić 2013: 200). This connection between the animal and the

rigidity of its behavior is, through zoosemy, mapped onto people and their quintessential property (Milić 2013: 200).

As "various properties characterizing animals may be highlighted and metaphorically mapped on the human" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 27) it is not enough to just use the word for the animal to describe a person. The modifiers that are chosen play a vital role in determining which aspect of the animal we are focusing on as they highlight and bring to focus the specific behavior of the animal that is used in the compound. Therefore, the "underlying cognitive mechanism conditioning the formation" (Egorova 2019: 45) of these compounds is a combination of metonymy and metaphor. Egorova (2019: 45) claims that ANIMAL FOR AN ATTRIBUTE OF THE ANIMAL metonymy affects the constituent first, which is then followed by the HUMANS ARE ANIMALS metaphor. Due to this, all these compounds can be classified as "metaphor-and-metonymy-based compounds" (Nagano 2014: 316). In these cases, metaphor and metonymy apply "in tandem to the compound constituent" (Nagano 2014: 316).

Another important element for understanding the Great Chain of Being is the GENERIC IS SPECIFIC metaphor. This metaphor "singles out the general conceptual structure or *schema* of the source domain […] and implants it into the target […] resulting in the restructuring of the original elements of the target domain" (Egorova 2019: 16). This metaphor would then take the instincts of an animal and map them onto people, which will be shown in the analysis of e.g. *lovebirds* where a lovebird's instinct to be close to another bird is restructured to represent a romantic couple whose behavior is as unalterable as an animal's instinct is.

The Maxim of Quantity basically refers to how much information can be shared through a compound. The compound is therefore informative enough to give all the necessary information to establish clear communication and nothing more because if too much information is packed into a single compound, it would become too confusing for the listener to understand (Egorova 2019: 17). In the context of the Great Chain, the communicative Maxim of Quantity "assures that only the highest-ranking properties at each level of the hierarchy take part in the metaphorical process" (Egorova 2019: 17). Since every level on the Great Chain includes the levels below it, it is only their higher properties that separate them from the lower level so it makes sense to metaphorically refer to a human through an animal using only the qualities that refer to the animal specifically and not the ones that can also refer to lower-level organisms such as plants.

Another rhetorical device relevant for this study is metonymy which some authors consider to be "a more fundamental cognitive phenomenon than metaphor" (Gibbs 2008: 249) and Milić (2013: 207) goes as far as to say that metonymy is a cognitive precondition for metaphor.

Metonymy at its core serves as a referencing tool as it uses “one entity to stand for another” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) which “is based on a contiguity between ideas” (Koch 1999: 144). Metonymy basically uses concepts which are close to the target concept to refer to it. Therefore, metonymy can be described as “a trope that takes its expression from near and close things and by which we can comprehend a thing that is not denominated by its proper word” (Koch 1999: 141). Metonymy can occur in many different forms and the one most important for this study is the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy which is also often called synecdoche. As the name suggests, this metonymy uses a part of a whole in order to represent it, therefore it is important to consider how this metonymy is executed as “which part we pick out determines which aspect of the whole we are focusing on” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) as shown in the analysis of the compounds *birdbrain* and *cowhand* where the profile determinants used this metonymy to put an emphasis on the aspect of people that was most important for the meaning of the compounds.

3. Methodology

In order to conduct this study, we first searched for compounds containing words for animals in the Free Dictionary online through its search words containing function and made a list with all compounds regardless of word class. After collecting about 50 such compounds it became evident that the majority of them were nouns so those were the ones chosen for this study while the rest were discarded. The meaning of the compounds and their usage were checked in the Merriam and Webster online dictionary and the Corpus of Contemporary American English. The compounds were then divided into two main categories: pets and farm animals with some subcategories depending on the type of animal mentioned in the compound. The only pets that were used were cats and dogs so that was the only subcategory in that category while the farm animals category had multiple subcategories based on the type; mammals and birds, which was again divided into specific animals categories as there were multiple compounds that used the same animal word, for example, there were five compounds that contained the word horse, and a final subcategory of marginal members.

After gathering and selecting which compounds would be analyzed in the study, the analysis could begin. We first looked at each compound, starting with the animals that are culturally closest, pets, and tried to see how metaphor and metonymy affected it in order to produce the given meaning. Each compound was dissected so that both the constituents on their own and the compound as a whole could be considered. From here the workings of metaphor and metonymy became clearer and we were able to offer an explanation of how and why the

particular tropes affected the compound. The results of this analysis will be shown in the following section.

4. Analysis

4.1.Pets

This section is dedicated to analyzing compounds containing profile determinants that are words pertaining to animals that are kept as pets in the average Anglo-American household, specifically cats ("a carnivorous mammal (*Felis catus*) long domesticated as a pet and for catching rats and mice[1]") and dogs ("a highly variable domestic mammal (Canis familiaris) closely related to the gray wolf"). This category contains a total of 11 words.

4.1.1. Cats

The profile determinant *cat* is found in five compounds: *pussycat* ('one that is weak, compliant, or amiable'), *wildcat* ('a savage quick-tempered person'), *copycat* ('one who imitates or adopts the behavior or practices of another'), *hellcat* ('a violently temperamental person'), and *scaredy-cat* ('an unduly fearful person'). The overall meaning of the shown compounds is negative as they generally refer to a bad temperament which aligns with Egorova's (2019: 24) claim that "the great majority of animal metaphors are negative and pejorative".

All the selected examples use the "highly general conceptual metaphor, that is humans are animals" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25) on the profile determinant *cat*. Since the zoosemic metaphor is "developed either from the animals' appearances, habits and relation to people observed from different cultural backgrounds" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 38) it is important to look at the chosen animal and determine which aspect influences the compound's meaning in order to analyze the compound fully. The animal chosen here is used due to its behavior and relationship with people which, as Milić (2013: 202) concurs, are some of the most common sources of knowledge of the concept of the particular animal which is then mapped onto the person. Cats have a lot of different characteristics prescribed to them, some of which also vary by breed, but they are mostly seen as independent, excitable, and agreeable. These traits are used in the compounds to describe similar behaviors in people and the modifier is the one that dictates which trait is in focus.

Pussycat is a compound that contains two words that can mean cat and as such it can also mean simply "cat"; however, it can also refer to 'one that is weak, compliant, or amiable'. Here

[1] All definitions are taken from the online Merriam and Webster Dictionary: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

the “Great Chain of Being Metaphor” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 24) comes into play. This zoosemic metaphor is an example of upward mapping because “the source domain occupies a lower position on the Great Chain than the target domain” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 26). Since metaphors and metonymies are “grounded in bodily experience” (Gibbs 2008: 247) it is necessary to look at human’s interaction with the animal in order to analyze the meaning of the compound. Humans have observed cats to be mellow, and at touch they are very soft. This softness can metaphorically be extended to also represent a softness of character. Through this connection the conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS created “a mapping between distinct conceptual domains” (Nagano 2014: 316), creating an image of a person as a cat which, as Milić (2013: 200) explains helps people understand themselves and the world around them.

Similarly, the compound *wildcat* has metaphor “affecting the compound as a whole” (Nagano 2014: 316) to equate a ‘savage, quick-tempered person’ to a wild animal. Wildcat can more literally refer to a non-domesticated cat such as the lynx which in human experience is not friendly and can quickly and unexpectedly attack. As Egorova (2019: 48) points out when dealing with zoosemy, animal behavior “is the most common attribute selected in the animal frame”. This compound can also be analyzed as involving metonymy first as we first make a “metonymic selection of certain components of the respective folk model as coded by the WHOLE ANIMAL FOLK MODEL FOR SOME ELEMENT OF THE ANIMAL FOLK MODEL metonymy” (Egorova 2019: 26) where the animal behavior is selected in the first metonymic step which is then metaphorically transferred to human behavior in the second step of this “metonymy-motivated metaphorical process” (Egorova 2019: 26). Due to a wild cat’s natural disposition of being more aggressive than a domesticated cat, it is used to describe a savage person and the animal’s behavior is the “generic space, a space in blending that emerges from the common property of the input spaces” (Nagano 2014: 317).

Copycat uses zoosemy on the profile determinant to portray a person as a cat. This compound is an example of “metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound” (Benczes 2005: 184). The profile determinant “stands in a metaphorical relationship to the modifier” (Benczes 2005: 190) therefore we see the cat, or, more precisely, the person, as a copy. The word copy was chosen to highlight a certain aspect of cat’s behavior, that is, their supposed tendency to mimic the people around them that they care about. For example, cat owners often report that when they sit at the computer, their cat sometimes comes and sits on their computer in, what they consider, an attempt to copy their owners. Since people use a “mental enactment of the very action referred to in the metaphor” (Gibbs 2008: 162) they image a similar situation, and the blending process is very clear. The compound *copycat*

motivates the creation of a mental image of cat copying someone else which finally creates the meaning of "one who imitates or adopts the behavior or practices of another".

Scaredy-cat can be analyzed in a similar manner, where the modifier "stands in a metaphorical relationship" (Benczes 2005: 190) with the profile determinant and this blend affects the mental image evoked by the words. As Nagano (2014: 317) points out "[t]his type of compound is interpreted by mapping to the head concept an image evoked by the modifier" thus we see the cat as scared and fearful. This image is then metaphorically mapped onto the domain of people through zoosemy.

Hellcat represents a compound with a "metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184) which stands for "a violently temperamental person; especially: an ill-tempered woman". This example of zoosemy on the word cat is used in a degrading manner as it transfers features "from a lower level to a higher one" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005: 26) of the Great Chain of Being and creates an "upward mapping" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005: 26) which brings the referent a step lower on the Great Chain and, in a way, strips them of their humanity. We can tell that this compound has a negative meaning through the modifier used which used the PLACE FOR PEOPLE metonymy as only bad people, who exhibited bad behaviors such as aggression and violence, go to hell. Hell is therefore metonymically used to represent all the people who behave poorly and in order for the blend of meanings in the compound to work there "must be something perceived as similar in the two domains" (Benczes 2004: 11). The cat is often described as a temperamental animal and is often used as a symbol of evil in Anglo-American culture, which then makes a connection to hell and bad people. Through this connection we can imagine violently temperamental people as "cats from hell".

4.1.2. Dog

This part will analyze compounds with the profile determinant *dog*. There are six compounds that use this profile determinant: *watchdog* ('one that guards against loss, waste, theft, or undesirable practices'), *water dog* ('a person (such as a skilled sailor) who is quite at ease in or on water'), *sea dog* ('a veteran sailor'), *underdog* ('a loser or predicted loser in a struggle or contest; a victim of injustice or persecution'), *overdog* ('one that is dominant or victorious'), and *top dog* ('a person, group, or thing in a position of authority especially through victory in a hard-fought competition'). This group of compounds have a more neutral meaning than compounds with the profile determinant *cat*. Three compounds are neutral, two are positive and two are negative.

Dog is used as the profile determinant in all the compounds, and it metaphorically stands for a person. Since zoosemy is "developed either from the animals' appearances, habits and relation to people observed from different cultural backgrounds" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005: 38) it is important to look into the habits and behaviors of dogs and their relation to people in terms of a Western, English-speaking culture. In western culture dogs are perceived as man's best friend. They are often considered members of the family and viewed more favorably than cats. However, there are also some negative associations with dogs, especially certain breeds which are often abused and used for harmful activities such as dog fighting. Dogs are more often used for benign, useful things such as therapy, security, hunting, or just companionship. All these uses for dogs influence the meanings of the compounds and because "the very systematicity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another […] will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 10), we can focus on different aspects of dogs, and through them people, in different compounds. Which aspect will be in focus is determined by the modifier.

Watchdog focuses on a dog's role as guardian. This is an example of "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based modifier" (Benczes 2005: 184). The metonymy at work is a PART FOR THE WHOLE metonymy, ACTION FOR ROLE, where we take watch to metonymically refer to the broader scope of actions that come with watching over something. Since "metaphor understanding is done imaginatively" (Gibbs 2008: 162), we imagine a dog watching something, a guard dog. This image is then transferred onto people, and we can imagine a person guarding something or watching over someone or something.

Waterdog and *sea dog* have similar meanings and follow the same pattern of creation. These compounds are examples of "metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). Both water and sea use a PLACE FOR ACTION metonymy which mediates between the source domain, water/sea, and the target domain, action that can be taken in and on water, such as sailing so that the modifier in each compound symbolizes the act of sailing. Both compounds refer to a person that is at ease on water, while *waterdog* is more general, *sea dog* refers specifically to sailors. This is also obvious through their chosen modifiers. While water is more general and can refer to many different bodies of water, the sea is a very particular type of body of water, hence the second compound being more specific. For these metaphors and metonymy to work there "must be something perceived as similar in the two domains" (Benczes 2004: 11), a domain shared by both inputs. In this case the "generic space" (Benczes 2004: 11) is a dog that enjoys water and is trained to hunt in water. The dog

metaphorically stands for a person through the "highly general conceptual metaphor, that is humans are animals" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25), simply called zoosemy. As mentioned in theoretical framework, there needs to be something similar between the source and target domain in order for metaphor to work. In this case, dogs were chosen to represent humans due to their closeness to humans and because both "can be trained to do the greatest variety of jobs" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 27), one of which is handling water well.

The analysis of *underdog* and *overdog* is connected as they refer to opposite concepts and their modifiers are opposites. They are examples of compounds where metaphor is "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316). Both compounds imply a conflict and refer to a loser and victor respectively. Since "metaphor understanding is done imaginatively" (Gibbs 2008: 162) the analysis of these compounds necessarily includes the mental images that they invoke. These compounds evoke images of dogfighting so we can see the dogs fighting and ultimately one getting the upper hand and winning by being on top of the other. It is through this image that the compounds get their meaning. The modifiers then determine which dog in a fight we are focusing on. *Underdog* puts the focus on the dog that is under, the one that is being beaten and is the loser of the fight, while *overdog* focuses on the dog on top that appears as the winner of the fight. Due to the fact that both compounds use words for relative position as modifiers, they can be seen as orientational metaphors which organize "a whole system of concepts with respect to one another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14) and "give a concept a spatial orientation" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14). Therefore, we can see *under* as bad and weak and *over* as powerful and victorious. As seen from the image evoked by the compound, these orientations "have a basis in our physical and cultural experience" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14) and since everyone has experienced being under and over something or someone, we understand which position is connected to vulnerability and which with power.

Top dog can be analyzed in a similar way as *overdog*, given that they are synonyms. The meaning of *top dog* can be viewed as being more precise as it refers to a more professional position of power and authority. This compound also follows the imagery of dog fighting and uses orientational metaphor on its modifier. Since metaphorical understanding is "shaped by cultural understanding" (Gibbs 2008: 247) it is necessary to look at western work culture in order to analyze this compound. In western work culture the bosses usually work on upper floors of a building while their subordinates work on the floors below them and it is because of this "physical and cultural experience" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 19) that the compound can use top to refer to the people in power.

All three compounds use dogs to refer to "human attributes and behavior through animal attributes and behavior" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). The compounds refer to power struggles so the behavior that is used as a "generic space which maps onto both input domains and the blend, and which makes the cross-space mappings between the two domains possible" (Benczes 2004: 12, 13) is the need for dominance and tendency to fight. Dogs can fight each other and try to establish dominance and this behavior is then used in "upward mapping, in which the source domain occupies a lower position on the Great Chain than the target domain" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 26). Humans are therefore lowered on the Great Chain of Being as their traits are portrayed as simple animal instincts, instead of intentional rational behaviors.

4.2.Farm animals

This section will analyze compounds that contain words for farm animals. There is a total of 25 compounds analyzed in this part. The animals included will be common farm animals, such as cow or chicken, as well as more marginal members that can be seen at a farm but are not necessarily domesticated or purposefully kept at the farm, such as worm or bird. These marginal members are included in this category because they are often seen on farms and around them, and they would not be as foreign to a Western person as much as typical representatives of the wild animals' category would be, such as lion.

4.2.1. Mammals

This category contains all animals that can be seen at a farm that belong to the biological category of mammals. This category contains 13 compounds, the biggest category so far, which supports the claim that "HUMANS are most often represented by the category MAMMALS because of their similarity and familiarity to mankind" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005b: 77).

4.2.1.1.Sheep

This section will analyze three compounds containing the word *sheep*: *sheepherder* ('a worker in charge of sheep especially on open range'), *sheepman* ('a man engaged in the handling, raising, or breeding of sheep: such as: obsolete : SHEPHERD, SHEEPHERDER: an owner or rancher of sheep especially when specializing in sheep to the exclusion of other activities'), and *black sheep* ('a disfavored or disreputable member of a group').

Sheepherder and *sheepman* have very similar meanings thus it can be concluded that the system behind the creation of the compounds is the same. The modifier can be seen as having metonymy working on it as it does not only refer to sheep but also all the work that goes into caring for them, especially in the compound *sheepman* which is broader in meaning. This can

be seen as a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy where sheep stands for the animal as well as the care it requires.

Sheepherder uses a more specific profile determinant that appears to have no rhetorical devices working on it. Herder refers to 'one that herds'[2] and when combined with the modifier sheep, it becomes clear that the compound simply refers to a person who herds sheep. This is an example of an endocentric compound as the "the semantic head of these compounds is inside the compound" (Plag 2003: 145). On the other hand, in *sheepman* the profile determinant man is a form of a common PART FOR WHOLE metonymy where man is taken to represent all people regardless of gender or age. This particular metonymy is so ingrained in the English language that it can easily get overlooked, but it is another instance of metonymy as it "allows us to use one entity to stand for another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36), in particular, it allows us to use man to represent all of humanity. This compound has a more extensive meaning which might be due to the use of the more general profile determinant. The profile determinant on its own does not express any particular action, it is through the semantic link between the modifier and the profile determinant that the compound gets its meaning. As was shown in the theoretical framework, "the meaning of the composite expressions is not the simple sum of the meanings of the components; instead, the composite elements motivate the meaning of the compound by providing access to semantic networks" (Benczes 2004: 14). The final meaning of the compound is not only the sum of the meanings of the components, but they provide access to their respective semantic domains which are then used as "input spaces to the blending process by which the composite meaning can be unraveled" (Benczes, 2004: 14). It could be concluded that this is an example of "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based profile determinant" (Benczes, 2005: 184).

Black sheep has a "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound" (Benczes, 2005: 184). This compound can simply describe a sheep that is black, in which case this construction would belong to the "group of fully compositional items" (Benczes, 2004: 5) which would make it an endocentric compound. There are no rhetorical functions affecting the compositional items, so the meaning of the words is directly derived from the sum of the elements. However, *black sheep*, as a compound meaning 'a disfavored or disreputable member of a group' has "partial compositionality because even though the composite structure C is a combination of the meanings of its components, it has undergone a specification of meaning" (Benczes, 2004: 5). The meaning of the compound here is not a mere

[2] Merriam and Webster https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/herder

sum of its units, instead, rhetorical devices act upon the compositional items and the semantic relationship between them.

Since "metaphor understanding is done imaginatively" (Gibbs 2008: 162) the analysis of this compound necessarily includes the mental image that it invokes. Naturally, the image that first comes to mind is that of a sheep that is black. However, when people imagine sheep, they might be more inclined to imagine a white sheep. This typical representative of the category stands in a stark contrast to the image that the compound is invoking. Therefore, the image the compound evokes is not following the imagined rule of how sheep should be represented.

Black is a metaphorical modifier from the domain of COLOR. Black is often associated with evil, wickedness, and rebellion, even one of the definitions of black that Merriam and Webster online dictionary provides is "thoroughly sinister or evil"; as opposed to white which is associated with purity and goodness; "free from moral impurity". Since the typical representative of the word sheep that most people might imagine is a white sheep, a black one would be seen as deviation from the norm that harshly stands out and is therefore looked down on and disfavored.

Sheep is an example of zoosemy based on behavior which is "the most common attribute selected in the animal frame" (Egorova 2019: 48). Sheep are generally timid creatures that naturally live and travel in herds. They have often been used in PEOPLE AS ANIMALS metaphors to describe "a person who is as stupid, timid, or poor-spirited as a sheep" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005b: 81). This kind of behavior can be interpreted as them being a tight-knit group where everyone follows each other and does not rebel against the status quo. It is exactly this mild and submissive behavior that is pivotal to the meaning of the compound. Here, it is important to look back to the choice of the modifier because the "overall meaning is motivated by the meaning of its constituents" (Špiranec 2015: 213). Since black is connected to evil and is the opposite of white it can be concluded that the choice of color is supposed to subvert the behavior symbolized by the sheep. Submissiveness and gentleness are seen as positive, almost pure qualities that would be in line with the symbolism of the color white. The color chosen for the modifier is the opposite of white, so this opposition inverts the positive qualities, corrupting them and choosing their opposites. The symbolism of the color black can also be seen as corrupting the good qualities of sheep and resulting in a corrupted member of the herd that does not follow the status quo which ultimately makes them despised and pushed to the outskirts of the social circle.

4.2.1.2. Goat

There are two compounds using the word *goat*: *goatherd* (‘a person who tends goats’) and *scapegoat* (‘one that bears the blame for others; one that is the object of irrational hostility’).

The analysis of the compound *goatherd* is similar to that of *sheepherder* and *sheepman*. The compound might be viewed as using metonymy on the modifier so goat would refer to goats as well as all the care and upkeep they require. The difference between this compound and the previously analyzed compound *sheepherder* is the profile determinant, as *sheepherder* uses a clear noun referring to a person whereas in *goatherd* the profile determinant alone can be used as both a verb and a noun. Although the difference might seem miniscule, it opens up possibilities in the analysis of the background work that went into the formation of the compound. Since *herd* can be both a verb and a noun it can hold more meaning than *herder*. As a verb, it contains the actions of leading and controlling animals in many ways such as putting them in groups and moving them together. As a noun it can refer to a group of animals kept together as well as a group of people that stick together and have a common goal. There is a whole spectrum of meanings that herd includes, from controlling and taking care of animals to being part of a community. All these meanings play a part in the creation of the compound, but they are all literal, and no metaphor or metonymy has been used on the profile determinant. The modifier thus simply states what kind of herder the compound is referring to so it can be concluded that this is another example of an endocentric construction as “the compound is the hyponym of the head element” (Benczes 2005: 174) which represents a “subcategory of the entity expressed by the head noun” (Benczes 2005: 194).

Scapegoat is another example of an exocentric compound that uses zoosemy on the profile determinant. Goats can be seen as “meek, gentle, innocent” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005b: 81) which could make them easy targets for those seeking to take advantage of them. This compound refers to “human attributes and behavior through animal attributes and behavior” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25) so it maps animal behavior onto human character which is one of the most common conceptualizations in zoosemy according to Milić (2013: 202). People who are generally gentle and trusting can be represented as goats which are used by other people who hold power over them.

The modifier is a form of the verb escape so it can refer to those people who managed to escape taking blame by placing all of it on the *scapegoat*. It could also be seen as symbolizing a goat that escaped the herd and is therefore an outcast of sorts and is not welcomed back.

4.2.1.3.Cow

This part will analyze compounds containing the word *cow*. There are three such compounds; *cowhand*, *cowpoke* and *cowboy* which all share the same meaning of 'one who tends cattle or horses'.

All these compounds refer to the same concept, but they use different profile determinants. It could be argued that each of these compounds emphasizes a particular aspect of the job, hence the different profile determinants with the same final meaning. *Cowboy* is the most general and common one and the compound to which Merriam and Webster send the people who look up the other two compounds.

Cow is a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy where cow stands for all livestock, usually cows and horses. The representative of the category that is being referenced is chosen due to the fact that cows are the most common large livestock that people in western culture have.

In the compound *cowhand*, the profile determinant is a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy HAND FOR PERSON. Hands can be considered as extensions of people's competence and coordination as hands are used in almost all types of physical labor. As metonymy is primarily a "referential device" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) and any part of the whole can be used, it is important to consider which words are chosen when analyzing the compound as "which part we pick out determines which aspect of the whole we are focusing on" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36). Picking any random part to represent the whole will not work as the part chosen needs to be connected to a "particular characteristic of the person" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) that needs to be emphasized. Here hands might have been chosen as they are essential for physical labor and taking care of cattle requires a lot of physical labor, strength, and general physical competence.

The compound *cowpoke* is an example of a compound with a "metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). Since metaphors are understood through an "automatic construction of a simulation, whereby we imagine performing the bodily actions referred to in the language" (Gibbs 2008: 8) *cowpoke* creates an image of a person poking a cow. This mental image is likely used to reference the branding of cattle that is often done on farms to mark the cattle as belonging to certain people. It is because "people understand metaphors by creating an imaginative simulation of their bodies in action that mimics the events alluded by the metaphor" (Gibbs 2008: 162) that the word poke was chosen to spark the creation of the mental image of cow branding which forces people to also imagine a cowboy.

In the compound *cowboy*, the profile determinant uses a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy BOY FOR PEOPLE. The MAN FOR PEOPLE metonymy is so frequent that it is hardly even

recognized as a metonymy and the subcategory of it, BOY FOR PEOPLE, follows the same pattern of creation with one extra layer added and that is a marker for youth. Because metonymy "may be a more fundamental cognitive phenomenon than metaphor" (Gibbs, 2008, p. 249) it might be hard to unravel the ways in which it was formed as they are so natural, they might appear to not be there at all. These types of metonymies are part of the "general metonymic concepts in terms of which we organize our thoughts and actions" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 39) so they can easily be overlooked as just literal words instead of metonymic expressions. Since any part of the whole can refer to it, it is important to consider what words are metonymically used when analyzing the compound as "which part we pick out determines which aspect of the whole we are focusing on" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36). This compound uses the word boy likely because the task of caring for cattle requires a lot of physical strength and endurance which are qualities that are often associated with young man.

Cowhand and *cowboy* could be seen as examples of "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). The profile determinants, *hand* and *boy*, metonymically stand for the whole person while their connections to the modifier, *cow*, is overall metaphorical as metaphor works on both constituents together.

4.2.1.4.Horse

There are five compounds containing the word *horse*. Those are: *clotheshorse* ('a conspicuously dressy person'), *horseplayer* ('one who habitually bets on horse races'), *horseman* ('a rider or driver of horses, especially: one whose skill is exceptional: a person skilled in caring for or managing horses; a person who breeds or raises horses'), *workhorse* ('a person who performs most of the work of a group task: a hardworking person'), and *warhorse* ('a person with long experience in a field especially : a veteran soldier or public person (such as a politician)').

Clotheshorse is another compound which uses zoosemy on the profile determinant. Horse metaphorically refers to a person. Since "particular elements of the source and target domains are highlighted through a combination of the source language used and the relevant conceptual metaphor" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 24) it is important to consider which elements are highlighted in order to understand "how elements in the two domains line up with each other" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 24). In this compound, horses were chosen to represent people because horses are seen as elegant animals which require a lot of grooming and command attention due to their size and appearance. Humans are conceived as horses when they take pride in their appearance and put effort into their looks so that it is obvious that they take good

care of themselves and care about their clothes and style, so this is another example of "comprehension of human attributes and behavior through animal attributes and behavior" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). *Clothes* is a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy which "allows us to use one entity to stand for another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36), here clothes refer to fashion and physical upkeep in general.

Horseplayer might be another example of an endocentric compound as "the left-hand member somehow modifies the right-hand member" (Plag 2003: 135). In this example the modifier signifies what type of games or races the person is betting on. As was shown in the theoretical framework, endocentric compounds have "the semantic head […] inside the compound" (Plag 2003: 145). The head element is player as "the head of a compound specifies the class of entities to which the compound belongs" (Benczes 2004: 2). This part stands for the gambler, someone who plays with their money and in a sense, plays with horses by betting on the races. The modifier simply narrows down the meaning of the compound to give the final meaning of someone betting on horses.

Horseman is not an endocentric compound as the meaning of the compound "is not the simple sum of the meanings of the components" (Benczes 2004: 14). This compound can be seen as employing the same logic behind its creation as *cowboy*. It also uses the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy MAN FOR PEOPLE. As is the case with *sheepman*, this compound also uses man to refer to all people that could be dealing with horses despite their age or gender to give a more general meaning than a more limiting word such as herder or carer could provide. The use of the word man for the profile determinant and the prevalence of the MAN FOR PEOPLE metonymy in compounds that refer to activities that require a lot of physical strength and labor could also be due to traditional division of labor in the past where those kinds of jobs were seen as men's tasks and they were more often than not done by men therefore leading to the name for the person doing the job containing the word man.

The modifier appears to have no rhetorical elements working on it directly. Instead, there is metaphor working on the semantic link between the constituents of the compound which makes it "less apparent and insufficient to see which subcategory the meaning of the compound involves" (Benczes 2005: 179) as the compound does not refer to a horse-man hybrid but a man who works with horses. This compound is therefore an example of "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). What happens in this compound is that "the profile determinant […] stands in a metaphorical relationship to the modifier" (Benczes 2005: 190). The order in which metaphor and metonymy affect the compound is not always important for

the final meaning however “it is important to note that the sequence of the metaphor and the metonymy acting upon the compound in this case is definitely relevant to the meaning of the expression” (Benczes 2005: 190). This compound can therefore be seen as having metonymy affecting the profile determinant first and then metaphor affecting the semantic relationship between the modifier and profile determinant. This order produces the meaning of a horse person, someone who deals with horses.

Workhorse is an example of a “metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant” Benczes 2005: 184). The modifier brings the focus of the whole compound onto the laboring aspect of the animal and refers to all types of work that can be performed by a person, whether it be physical or mental. The profile determinant *horse* uses zoosemy to refer to a person in a degrading manner through the transfer of features “from a lower level to a higher one” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005: 26) on the Great Chain of Being Metaphor and creates a “upward mapping” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005: 26) which strips the referent of their humanity, and brings them a step lower on the Great Chain equating them to an animal. The choice of the animal is likely because of how horses are used on Western farms. Horses are often used to pull carriages, help with transportation of people and goods, and do hard physical labor in order to help the farmer and make their lives easier. What is “perceived as similar in the two domains” (Benczes 2004: 11) is the hard work performed by both the animal as the source domain and the person as the target domain. The “generic space which maps onto both input domains and the blend, and which makes the cross-space mappings between the two domains possible” (Benczes 2004: 12, 13) is the exploitation of the animal and the person by the people around them.

The last compound in this section is *warhorse* which follows a similar pattern of creation as the previous compound. It also uses metaphor on the profile determinant to zoosemically refer to a human through the source domain of horse, and metonymy on the modifier.

Since, as previously stated, “zoosemic terms targeted at the conceptual category HUMAN BEING are developed either from the animals’ appearances, habits and relation to people” (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 38) it is useful to look at which part of the animal is mapped onto the human. In this example, horses were used to represent humans because of their relation to people, specifically how they are used by people. Horses were used in war times a lot throughout history, both in battle and for transportation of soldiers, weapons, and other goods, in a way no other animal was. This closeness to war and soldiers is what sparked the use of horses as representatives for people in this context because “the mechanism of zoosemy is viewed as one involving stable and systematic relationships between two conceptual domains”

(Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 24) and the relationship between horses and humans at war times in deeply ingrained in world history.

The modifier *war* uses metonymy to refer to all the work that a person does at times of war, from developing strategy to using weapons which lead to them becoming very experienced in all areas connected with battle. The compound can further be analyzed as using metaphor "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316) where it employs the WORK IS WAR metaphor to also include all other fields so that the term could be used to describe anyone who has spent some time doing a particular job and has gained valuable experience from it.

4.2.2. Birds

This part will analyze compounds whose modifiers are names of birds that are commonly held as farm animals, namely *gooseherd* ('one who tends geese').

Gooseherd follows the same patterns as *sheepherder* and *goatherd*. It is also an example of an endocentric compound as "the concept designated by the compound represents a subcategory of the entity expressed by the head noun" (Benczes 2005: 194). Although it was initially expected that all compounds would use some sort of metaphor, particularly zoosemy, to use the animal component to refer to people, it is not surprising that there are multiple endocentric compounds in this study as "most compounds of English are endocentric" (Benczes 2005: 194). The pattern that can be extracted here is that when the animal component is used as a modifier, the compound does not use zoosemy, but when the profile determinant is the one that uses an animal then it is often zoosemy.

4.2.3. Bugs

The compounds that will be analyzed in this part are *beekeeper* ('a person who raises bees'), and *busy bee* ('one who is very busy and active').

Beekeeper ('a person who raises bees') is another example of an endocentric compound. It is created in the same way as *gooseherd* and *sheepherder,* the other endocentric compounds that were previously analyzed. Unlike exocentric compounds where "the meaning of the composite expressions is not the simple sum of the meanings of the components" (Benczes 2004: 14), here the compound simply gets its meaning from connecting the two concepts so that the final "compound is the hyponym of the head element: apple tree is a kind of tree" (Benczes 2005: 174). Here, a beekeeper is a type of keeper, one who keeps bees.

Busy bee is an exocentric compound which "result[ed] from the semantic creativity, i.e. the working of metonymy/metaphor" (Nagano 2014: 313). This is another example of metaphor "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316). It uses zoosemy on its profile

determinant to reference a hard-working person. As Egorova (2019: 48) points out when dealing with zoosemy, animal behavior "is the most common attribute selected in the animal frame". Bees are often associated with hard work and represent "a busy worker" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005b: 86) as they are often seen flying around from flower to flower during the warmer months in order to collect pollen and make honey which could be interpreted as diligence being their "quintessential property" (Milić 2013: 200). The "generic space which maps onto both input domains and the blend, and which makes the cross-space mappings between the two domains possible" (Benczes 2004: 12, 13) is this defining characteristic, the perceived diligence of bees, which is mapped onto a person and the person is compared to a bee. The modifier further drives home the notion of diligence of a bee and "allows us to focus more specifically on certain aspects of what is being referred to" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 37).

4.2.4. Marginal members

The study will now analyze compounds that contain words for animals that are not necessarily domesticated and kept on farms for a purpose, but can be seen there, nonetheless. These animals will be regarded as marginal members of the farm animal category as they do not fully belong in the category as horses and geese do, for example, but would also not be the typical representative of the wild animal category in the eyes of the typical Western citizen the way a lion might be.

4.2.4.1. Worm

This paragraph will be dedicated to the analysis of the compound *bookworm* ('a person unusually devoted to reading and study') which is an example of a "metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184).

Bookworm can also be used to describe any insect that damages books by perforating them, and it is likely that this meaning also influenced the creation of the compound as referring to a well-read person.

The modifier is a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy that "allows us to use one entity to stand for another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 37). Here, book is used as a representative for all literature regardless of form, digital or paper, and the knowledge stored in books. This modifier was possibly chosen as it goes well with the habits of worms. Since they eat leaves and books are, in a way, made of leaves, and they are used to store and share vast amounts of knowledge, it makes perfect sense to choose exactly this word for the compound.

This compound uses zoosemy on the profile determinant. This is a case of "mappings from the source domain of instinctual attributes and behavior onto the target domain of human character traits" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25) which was discussed in the theoretical framework as one of the most common sources of knowledge about the concept of a certain animal (Milić 2013: 202). The behavior that is used is the eating of leaves which worms need to survive. Since metaphors often motivate the creation of a mental image because "people understand metaphors by creating an imaginative simulation of their bodies in action that mimics the events alluded by the metaphor" (Gibbs 2008: 162) it is useful to look at what kind of image the compound creates. This compound conjures up an image of a person devouring books which is then understood to symbolize someone who greatly enjoys books and by extension reading.

4.2.4.2.Birds

This section will analyze eight compounds that contain the word *bird*. The compounds are: *scarecrow* ('a skinny or ragged person'), *birdbrain* ('a stupid person'), *jailbird* ('a person confined in jail *especially* : a habitual criminal'), *yardbird* ('a soldier assigned to a menial task or restricted to a limited area as a disciplinary measure; an untrained or inept enlisted man'), *lovebirds* ('people who are lovers **:** people who are in a romantic relationship'), *railbird* ('a racing enthusiast who sits on or near the track rail to watch a race or workout'), *night owl* ('a person who keeps late hours at night') and *early bird* ('an early riser; one that arrives early and especially before possible competitors').

Scarecrow is an example of metaphor "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316). Another meaning of scarecrow is 'an object usually suggesting a human figure that is set up to frighten birds away from crops' and we can analyze the meaning of 'a skinny or ragged person' as being taken from the first meaning. The compound uses the image of a scarecrow in a field, a skinny human figure usually made of straw or some branches and uses it as a comparison to a real human who is skinny and raggedy, so "the analysis of the compound's meaning involves two steps" (Benczes 2005: 183); first analyzing the more common meaning and then seeing how that has influenced the meaning of 'a skinny or ragged person'. When analyzing the compound with its first meaning, it could be stated that it is an example of "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). The profile determinant "stands in a metaphorical relationship to the modifier" (Benczes 2005: 190) therefore we see the crow as scared. The profile determinant uses the PART FOR WHOLE basic conceptual metonymy, MEMBER OF THE CATEGORY FOR THE CATEGORY as it uses crow to refer to all birds.

The reason crows were chosen as the representative of the category could be because they are fairly common in those areas, and they can interfere with people's agricultural efforts so they might be seen as the main birds that farmers are trying to scare away. The second meaning, the one this paper is interested in comes from applying metaphor on the whole compound and then seeing a person as the doll used to scare animals. This compound, unlike the ones analyzed so far, does not use zoosemy on its profile determinant.

Birdbrain is an example of a "metaphor-based modifier and metonymy-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 195) compound. The analysis of this compound will be similar to that that Benczes (2005: 183) did for "schapenkop" ("sheep's head") which also means a 'dumb person'. This compound differs from the others analyzed so far as the word for animal is used as a modifier and not a profile determinant which was so far only seen in endocentric compounds, but this one is exocentric as it "does not denote a subset of the set of objects denoted by the head noun" (Benczes 2005: 175). Since bird is not the word that refers to a human it can be concluded that zoosemy is not used in this compound. Instead, to refer to a person this compound uses a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy, specifically, BRAIN FOR PERSON, on its profile determinant. As was explained in the theoretical framework, picking out just any part of the whole would not give the desired result; it is necessary to choose the part which is connected to a "particular characteristic of the person" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) that is important for the final meaning of the compound. A person's intelligence comes from the brain, so it makes sense to choose that word to represent a person when talking about a person's intellect or lack thereof. Whether the compound is referring to intelligence or a lack of if now depends on the modifier, because, as was mentioned in the theoretical framework, when analyzing exocentric compounds, it is not enough to look at the constituents separately, but also how they function together. In this case, bird can be seen as having negative connotations as it has a tiny brain compared to a human's and birds are generally considered as not intelligent which can lead to the conclusion that this compound refers to someone with a bird-sized brain, which through metaphor refers to a weaker intellect. This compound is an example of metaphor and metonymy working together so "the analysis of the compound's meaning involves two steps" (Benczes 2005: 183). Metaphor works on the compound so that *birdbrain* represents 'a human brain like a bird brain, a stupid brain', then, metonymy is used through the profile determinant to refer to a person to get the final meaning of 'a person with a brain like a bird, a stupid person'.

Jailbird is an example of a compound with a "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based modifier" (Benczes 2005: 184). The profile determinant "stands in a metaphorical relationship to the modifier" (Benczes 2005: 190)

therefore the bird is seen as jailed. Since "metaphor understanding is done imaginatively" (Gibbs 2008: 162) the analysis will necessarily include the mental image the compound invokes, in this case it is a jailed bird, one in a cage. This is another example of zoosemy, where a person is represented as a bird as "we are accessing the concept of a prisoner through the image of a caged bird" (Benczes 2004: 10). This can also be seen as an example of "upward mapping" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 26) as "the source domain occupies a lower position on the Great Chain than the target domain" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 26). The essential loss of freedom that is caused by incarceration can be seen as a loss of humanity, hence the degradation from the human level to the animal level in the Great Chain of Being metaphor. The same way a bird loses its essence when it is caged and cannot fly and is seen as more of an object than an animal, therefore, again, lowered on the Great Chain, the person loses some of their essence and is seen as less human.

Jail can be seen as not having any rhetoric devices acting upon it directly as the meaning of the compound refers to 'a person confined in jail'; however, it can also be seen as a PART FOR WHOLE metonymy where jail stands for any type of confinement and the justice and criminal system in general hence the further explanation in the dictionary 'especially: a habitual criminal'.

For this metaphor to work there "must be something perceived as similar in the two domains" (Benczes 2004: 11), a domain shared by both inputs. In this case the "generic space" (Benczes 2004: 11) between the image the compound invokes, and its meaning is the confinement against one's will, as Benczes (2004: 11) puts it; "the shared generic structure is CONTAINMENT WITH CONSTRAINT. An imprisoned person and a caged bird are both contained in a prison cell and a cage respectively against their free will".

The analysis of the compound *yardbird* is similar to the previous compound. This compound also uses "metaphor-based semantic relationship between the constituents of the compound and metonymy-based modifier" (Benczes 2005: 184). Here again the profile determinant "stands in a metaphorical relationship to the modifier" (Benczes 2005: 190) so in this compound the bird is confined to a yard. Since *yard* has no negative connotations such as jail has and is in practice less confining and more spacious than jail, it can be safe to conclude that the meaning of this compound is not so negative. The meaning also involves some sort of punishment, but it is not so severe. Yard might have been chosen because it has elements of both freedom and confinement in it as yards are open spaces but still limited and strictly separated from other spaces. Yards also require a lot of physical labor to be maintained which can be difficult and repetitive. Zoosemy is also used here in a way that is "lowering the human being one step down

the scale" (Egorova 2019: 16) as this compound also draws on the small brains of birds and equalizes it to a lack of intelligence and competence in humans which inspired the second meaning of the compound. This compound plays with the idea that there is a "sharp demarcation line between humans and animals, with humans being placed on the one end the superiority-inferiority pole and animals on the other" (Egorova 2019: 22). It uses the zoosemic metaphor in a way that is demeaning to the referent and puts them on the inferior end with the animals. They are seen as less intelligent therefore free to use for menial labor and easily controlled.

The next compound that will be analyzed is *lovebirds*. This compound uses the common name of a group of parrots that are very affectionate, monogamous and spend long periods of time sitting together[3]. Here, it is important to make a distinction between intentional behavior and instinct. This type of behavior is probably instinctual to these animals and is not a result of intentional choice. Milić (2013: 200) points out that zoosemic metaphors often explain human behavior based on animal instincts. In this particular example, engaging in a romantic relationship is interpreted through the nature of the bird's instincts. This is where the Nature of Thing theory and quintessential property that were discussed in the theoretical framework come into play. The quintessential property in question is the romantic behavior people exhibit once they enter new relationships and are very affectionate with their partners. As was previously stated, for these metaphors to work there "must be something perceived as similar in the two domains" (Benczes 2004: 11), a domain shared by both inputs. The "generic space" (Benczes 2004: 11) here is behavior which is "the most common attribute selected in the animal frame in the process of […] zoosemy" (Egorova 2019: 48). This is another example of metaphor "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316).

Railbird is another compound that uses "metonymy-based modifier and metaphor-based profile determinant" (Benczes 2005: 184). Bird is again a zoosemic metaphor that refers to "human attributes and behavior through animal attributes and behavior" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). In order for the metaphor to work there "must be something perceived as similar in the two domains" (Benczes 2004: 11), a domain shared by both inputs. In this case the "generic space" (Benczes 2004: 11) is behavior which Milić (2013: 202) points out, is one of the most common sources of knowledge of the concept of the particular animal which is then mapped onto the person. The behavior that is referred to in the compound is perching on rails which is done by both birds and people intensely watching a race.

[3] Wikimedia Foundation. (2024, January 6). *Lovebird*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lovebird

The modifier is an example of the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy where rail is used to stand for the whole racetrack. Since metonymy is primarily a "referential device" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 36) and any part of the whole can be used, and it is usually "grounded in bodily experience but shaped by cultural understanding" (Gibbs 2008: 247) it is important to look at the cultural background in order to understand the choice of the word. Rails are used to keep people away from the track, so they don't disturb the racers, but spectators often end up leaning on the rail which is reminiscent of a bird perched on a rail.

The last compounds that will be analyzed in this section are *night owl* and *early bird*. In the case of *night owl* the choice of the profile determinant might seem obvious here as owls are famously nocturnal creatures. This is another example of "mappings from the source domain of instinctual attributes and behavior onto the target domain of human character traits" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25). Since "the correspondences between domains are not random or exceptional" (Kiełtyka and Kleparski 2005a: 25) it is clear that the "generic space" (Benczes 2004: 11) is staying awake at night. The modifier is, however, the one that drives home the meaning of the compound as "culture is a filter" (Gibbs 2008: 249) for metaphors and metonymies and in Western culture owls are often used as symbols of wisdom. Therefore, without the modifier, one might think of that aspect of owls first, instead of their nocturnal nature. This modifier can be viewed as a TIME FOR ACTION metonymy where the night represents the activities that one might do at the time.

The compound *early bird* is the direct opposite of *night owl*. For the profile determinant it likely uses the general term bird as most birds are early risers and because metaphors are "shaped by cultural understandings" (Gibbs 2008: 9) it is necessary to note that there is not one single bird that stands out as a morning bird in the Western culture as much as owls are known to be nocturnal. The modifier is again the opposite of the previous modifier. This compound is an example of metaphor "affecting the compound as a whole" (Nagano 2014: 316). It uses zoosemy to equate a person to a bird and the modifier specifies what aspect of the bird the compound refers to.

The question that arises in this analysis is if *early bird* is the opposite of *night owl*, why does it use early as a modifier and not morning which would be the direct opposite of the latter's modifier. The answer this study proposes is that morning would be too restricting. Each of these words comes with its own set of meanings and semantic networks it can access and early is a broader concept than morning. Morning is a specific part of the day whereas early can mean early in the day, which includes the meaning that morning covers, as well as early to any other appointment throughout the day as well as being metaphorically early to things that have no

real start time. If the compound was indeed coined as ‘morning bird’ it might mean someone who rises early and enjoys the morning hours whereas early bird can cover that idea as well as the notion of arriving first to something regardless of the time of day.

5. Conclusion

At the beginning of this study, we stated that the hypothesis is that exocentric compounds are based on metaphor and metonymy and that zoosemy in compounds is used predominantly with animals that are culturally closer to people, primarily pets. Although the first part of the hypothesis turned out to be correct, the second part was not. Through this study we found that there were many more examples of farm animals used to represent people than there were pets as was initially expected. Even without the marginalized members, the farm animals’ category contains more compounds than the pets category, having 16 members as opposed to 11 members in the pets category. This could be due to the fact that these animals have a lot more meaning and direct influence on people’s lives. Animals such as cows and chicken are used for food, so they are more important to human survival than cats and dogs which are mostly used for companionship in the Anglo-American culture. Animals such as bees, whilst still important, are culturally further from people than cows so there are less compounds inspired by them. It is clear that animals play a sociocultural role in people’s lives which translates into language. Those animals that have a more prominent sociocultural role will also have a more prominent role in language.

Although, it is also worth noting that there were more compounds, with more diverse meanings, that used the word *dog*, than there were any that used any word for a farm animal. The most used farm animal in this study was *horse* which occurred in five compounds, tying with cats, while *dog* was used in six compounds. This might be due to the fact that, whilst domestic animals might be more important for human survival, dogs are more pervasive in people’s everyday lives as they live everywhere where there are people while horses can only be kept at specific locations. Dogs are therefore culturally closer to people, which also gives us a better insight into their behavior, habits and personalities which can all be used as inspiration for the creation of zoosemic noun compounds.

When it comes to the analysis of the creation of compounds there are some patterns that have been observed and need to be pointed out. When the word for an animal is used as a profile determinant, it is most often used zoosemically since the profile determinant is the one that always refers to the person. On the other hand, when it is used as a modifier zoosemy does not affect the compound at all and the animal is mostly used in a metonymical way. Another

important finding is that, unlike metonymy which affects only some compounds, metaphor has been observed to affect all compounds on either their modifier, profile determinant or the semantic link between the constituents.

These conclusions can be tested by expanding the corpus to include another category that would deal with compounds containing words for wild animals, such as *ratbag* or *litterbug*. Another possible direction would be to test if these conclusions only apply to noun compounds or if the same patterns would arise when analyzing adjective and verb compounds as well. Due to the scope of the study, the analysis had to be limited only to noun compounds, but there are plenty of adjective and verb compounds that also use animals to refer to humans so it would be interesting to see if they also follow the patterns of noun compounds or if there are completely different rules for them.

6. References

Benczes, Réka (2004). On the analysability of English exocentric compounds. *Jezikoslovlje* 5.1-2: 1-21

Benczes, Réka (2005). Metaphor- and Metonymy-Based Compounds in English: a Cognitive Linguistics Approach. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 52: 173-198 http://www.jstor.org/stable/26190066

Bisetto, Antonietta and Scalise, Sergio (2005). Classification of compounds. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 4:2: 319-332, http://doi.org/10.1418/20728

Egorova, Alisa (2019). *Hunting Down Animal Verbs: An Investigation into the Mechanisms of Meaning Transfer Underlying English Verbal Zoosemy.* Master's Thesis. Universität Potsdam. https://doi.org/10.25932/publishup-55770

Gibbs, Jr., Raymond (Ed.) (2008). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511816802

Kiełtyka, Robert and Kleparski, Grzegorz A. (2005b). The scope of English zoosemy: The case of Domesticated Animals. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia 3*, 76-87.

Kiełtyka, Robert and Kleparski, Grzegorz A. (2005a). The ups and downs of the Great Chain of Being: The case of canine zoosemy in the history of English. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, *2*, 22-41.

Koch, Peter (1999). Frame and contiguity. In: *Metonymy in Language and Thought.* K.U. Panther and G. Radden (eds.). *John Benjamins Publishing Company*, 139-167.

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mikulić, Andrea (2022) *Analyzing the metaphor and metonymy behind exocentric compounds*. Lexicology and Lexicography. University of Zagreb

Milić, Goran (2013). Pristup zoosemiji u okviru teorije konceptualne metafore i metonimije. *Jezikoslovlje*, 14(1), 197-213.

Nagano, Akiko (2014). Creative Compounding in English: The Semantics of Metaphorical and Metonymical Noun-Noun Combinations [Review]. *English Linguistics* 31:1: 312-324, https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj.31.1_312

Plag, Ingo (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Špiranec, Ivana (2015) The Importance of Specialized Knowledge in the Meaning Construction of Noun-Noun Compounds

https://www.academia.edu/36027534/The_Importance_of_Specialized_Knowledge_in_the_Meaning_Construction_of_Noun_Noun_Compounds (last accessed: 18.02.2024.)

7. Sources

Corpus of Contemporary American English https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

Dictionary by Merriam-Webster https://www.merriam-webster.com/

The Free Dictionary https://www.thefreedictionary.com/

Wikipedia https://www.wikipedia.org/