A Corpus Analysis of Animal-Term Conceptual Metaphors in the Persian Book of Marzbannameh

Mohammad Aliakbari[1], Yousef Karami[2]

[1] Professor, English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran, Email:maliakbari@hotmail.com

[2] Corresponding author, M.A., English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran, Email:yousefkarami1370@gmail.com

Abstract

The current study investigated the distribution of animal terms in the Persian book of Marzbannameh and their metaphoric repetition in the users' opinions, thoughts, and worthiness. By investigating the Persian book of Marzbannameh as one of the famous literary books which is rich of animal conceptual metaphors, a corpus of 376 animal terms in content has been chosen and analyzed. Four raters who were the Persian Literature teachers analyzed accurately the pertinent book for evaluating the available animal metaphors. And, two other raters who were the Persian Literature professors were asked to study the decisions and present the final propositions if they had different ideas about a concept. Moreover, as a supporting research method, focus groups were engaged by the Persian Literature teachers and professors to give their ideas and thoughts about the positive and negative qualities of the contained animals in the selected book. The results offered that animals are not distributed alike in this book, are used with diverse conceptualizations and stood for both positive and negative connotations. Also, it was found that the domestic animals generally have positive characteristics; however, some of them violate this rule, connoting just negative characteristics. After all, the wild animals, except for hawk, generally have negative characteristics.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, animal terms, culture, users' ideas

1. Introduction

Gibbs (2008) has considered metaphors as a way of making new categories or concepts. Cognitive linguistics considers language as a proper guide to uncovering the content and structure of our conceptual system (see, e.g., Langacker, 1987; Lakoff, 1987, as cited in Koveceses, 2015). According to Grady (2007), if cognitive linguistics is the investigation of ways in which features of language reflect other aspects of human cognition, metaphors provide one of the most obvious illustrations of this relationship. According to Koveceses (2002) metaphor is defined as comprehending one conceptual domain based on another conceptual domain. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have argued that metaphorical expressions in language, so-called linguistic metaphors, have been derived from and justified by underlying conceptual metaphors that map aspects of one source domain to the target domain. A conceptual metaphor is suggested as a unidirectional mapping across cognitive domains (Lakoff, 1993). Likewise, "the direction of mapping from the source to the target domain in metaphors derives from the conceptual relations between its members" (Porat & Shen, 2017). The conceptual metaphors could be considered to be shared by language users who have got linguistic metaphor types relating to a target. Experimental studies show that this is really the case (see, e.g., Gibbs, 1994, 2006; Gibbs & Colston, 2012, as cited in Kövecses, 2015). Many scholars examined animal metaphors willingly as one of the subject matters in the field of cognitive semantics. For instance, Aliakbari and Faraji (2014) considered the perception of humans' behavioral and physical attributes as animal metaphors in the spoken discourse of Khezel people and they discovered that the conceptual metaphors of wild/domestic and praising/degrading animals were applied in depicting one's physical and behavioral specifications.

Most of the studies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1998; Liu, 2002; Fontecha & Jimenez Catalan, 2003; Wang & Dowker, 2008; Rodriguez, 2009; Rouhi & Rasekh Mahand, 2011; Jafari, 2014, etc.) made on the conceptual metaphor of animals have investigated different standpoints, with emphasis on the source domain, especially on the manifestation of the concept *ANIMAL* in the linguistic metaphors and those on various animals in spoken and written discourse. The available literature on animal metaphors has helped us to understand that culture plays an essential role in determining the meanings attached to the animal metaphors and that in different languages different meanings are ascribed to the same animal. Although many studies have been written on the conceptual metaphors of animals, little attention has been paid to focus on the use, frequency, and distribution of conceptual metaphor of animals across languages in general and Persian in particular. Therefore, the present study has investigated the extent of using the conceptual metaphor of animals in one of the famous Persian literary books to recognize the most frequent animals and the commonest conceptualizations those animals associate with.

2. Literature Review

The application of the metaphorical concept demonstrated that the metaphor cognition has been worldwide across cultures; however, due to its different social and cultural backgrounds, it has had some discrepancies in its application (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). These differences are typically reflected in linguistic discrepancies. Investigations have presented that in certain cases a given concept seems to be realized differently among people who handle them. Deignan (2005) has pointed out that in English *cat* is used negatively to connote greed. She further has reported that in English, *cat metaphors* have generally connoted greed and selfishness. This somewhat contradicts the proposition that

has been made by Lakoff and Turner (1989), i.e. *cat* is fickle and independent. Such discrepancies are partly clear concerning animals. These inconformities in different cultures could direct to a kind of confusion, particularly in working with more needed matters. To justify the likely misunderstanding, this study made an effort to show a clear picture of the conceptual metaphor of animals in the Persian book of Marzbannameh to seek the development of the Persian texts for the readers. The justifications of choosing this book were its publicity, popularity, authenticity in the society, is a great sample of Persian prose, and its accessibility and counseling provided by some Persian Literature professors in Ilam and Yasuj Universities. Although many studies (Kövecses, 2017; Benczes & Ságvári, 2018; Aliakbari & Karami, 2019; and Pan, 2019) have been done on conceptual metaphors; however, no attention has been paid to investigate the animal terms in the Persian book of Marzbannameh. Therefore, as a heuristic study of the conceptual metaphor of animals in the Persian book of Marzbannameh, this study needed to analyze the animal term conceptual metaphors, to examine the distribution of animals in the Persian book of Marzbannameh, to investigate Iranian's conceptualizations associated with animals, to observe the extent to which their attitudes toward animals are positive/negative, to detect whether domestic animals connote positive/negative characteristics, and to find out the extent to which wild animals connote positive/ negative characteristics. By considering what has formerly been clarified and on the basis of the objectives of the study, the research questions that guided the study are as follows:

1) How balanced is the use of animal terms in the Persian book of Marzbannameh?
2) To what extent are animal metaphors reflected in the Persian book of Marzbannameh?

3) To what extent do the animal terms in the Persian book of Marzbannameh express positive or negative connotations?

4) To what extent do domestic animals in the Persian book of Marzbannameh connote positive characteristics?

5) To what extent do wild animals in the Persian book of Marzbannameh connote negative characteristics?

3. Method

This study aimed to analyze the animal term conceptual metaphors, to examine the distribution of animals, to investigate Iranian's conceptions associated with animals, to observe the extent to which their tendency toward animals are positive/negative, to figure out whether domestic animals connote positive/negative specifications, and to discover the extent to which wild animals connote positive/ negative characteristics. It took three months to conduct the study and to analyze the data specifically. For collecting the corpus of the study, among the available books on animals, the Persian book of "Marzbannameh" by Veravini (1220-1225) was selected. In order to figure out the accuracy of the conceptualizations of animals in this book, four Persian Literature teachers were asked to judge what the metaphors realized. If they had different thoughts about a concept, two other raters who were Persian Literature professors were asked to investigate the propositions and represent the final decision making on the possible connotation.

Moreover, as a supporting research method, focus groups were engaged by the Persian Literature teachers and professors to give their ideas and thoughts about the positive and negative qualities of the contained animals in the selected book. In so doing, two focus groups, involving four sessions, were administered. One group contained five people and the other seven. Each session lasted about

ninety minutes and was organized by the researchers, who presented the animal term conceptual metaphors on the monitor, about 94 metaphors for each session, and asked the subjects to comment on the ready connotations of the raters. The subjects in focus groups were allowed to interact with minimum interruption.

4. Results

For the number of animals in content and for the balance of the diverse animal terms repetition, the materials were analyzed quantitatively in Table A.1. The frequency of animal terms, their frequent conceptualizations, and the page number of animal terms for each conceptualization are demonstrated in Table A.2 (Appendix A.1). After all, the categorization and attitudes of the domestic and wild animals are presented in Table 3 (Appendix A.2).

To consider the first question of the study and to investigate the proportion of animal terms contained in the Persian book of Marzbannameh, all the stories in the aforementioned book were counted. From all the stories in the book, only 376 animal terms were found and then brought to further inquiry. As for the balance of the repetition of different animal terms in the corpus, Table A.1 shows the proportion of each animal in the corpus.

Table A.1

Frequency and Percentage of Animals in the Persian Book of Marzbannameh

Animal	Frequency	Percentage
Dog	48	12.76%
Lion	28	7.44%
Camel	26	6.91%
Bear	26	6.91%
Crow	22	5.85%
Mouse	22	5.85%
Eagle	20	5.31%
Jackal	20	5.31%
Elephant	15	3.98%
Partridge	14	3.72%
Wolf	14	3.72%
Cat	12	3.19%
Fox	12	3.19%
Goat	10	2.65%
Snake	10	2.65%
Hoopoe	7	1.86%
Rooster	7	1.86%
Rabbit	6	1.59%
Pelican	5	1.32%
Hawk	5	1.32%
Deer	4	1.06%
Owl	4	1.06%
Duck	4	1.06%
Eve	4	1.06%
Ferret	3	0.79%
Panther	3	0.79%
Scorpion	3	0.79%
Fish	2	0.53%
Hedgehog	2	0.53%
Leopard	2	0.53%
Nightingale	2	0.53%
Pig	2	0.53%
Donkey	2	0.53%
Francolin	1	0.26%
Pigeon	1	0.26%
Parrot	1	0.26%
Peacock	1	0.26%
Skylark	1	0.26%
Sparrow	1	0.26%
Spider	1	0.26%
Turtledove	1	0.26%
Vulture	1	0.26%
Total	**376**	100%

The number of animals mentioned in the Persian book of Marzbannameh was 42. As showed in Table A.1, dog with a repetition of 48 was the most repeated animal in the studied book. The next frequent animal was lion with 28 times of repetition. Camel and bear with the frequency of 26 and 26 were the following animals. Crow, mouse, eagle, jackal, elephant, partridge, and wolf with the repetition of 22, 22, 20, 20, 15, 14, and 14 were the following animals in sequence. Cat, fox, goat, snake, hoopoe, rooster, and rabbit were the next frequent animals with 12, 12, 10, 10, 7, 7, and 6 times occurrence. Pelican hawk, deer, owl, duck, eve, ferret, panther, scorpion, fish, hedgehog, leopard, nightingale, pig, donkey, francolin, pigeon, parrot, peacock, skylark, sparrow, spider, turtledove, and vulture with the repetition of 5, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1 and 1 were the following animals orderly.

Considering the second and third questions (based on Table A.2), *dog* was essentially related to protection as could be seen on pages 46, 60, and 333. Acuteness, freedom, contentment, guard, poverty, brassiness, erudite, insight, command, voracity, doggery, sarcophagy, bloodthirstiness, inoffensive, beneficence, loyalty, and uncleanness were other tacit meanings linked to this animal as were detected in the following pages correspondingly 46, 60, 251, 253-254, 254, 255, 266, 274, 304, 307, 308, 312, 316, 333 and 377. Page numbers 266, 304, 312, and 316 were evidence for other connotations of dog that were mysteriousness, madness, courage, continence, dignity, self-mindedness, magnanimity, and intelligence respectively. Gratitude, kindness, artistry, virtue, greed, guile, running, and saltation were the other conceptualizations of dog that were found on pages 307, 312, 315, 332, and 377. On the basis of all these affiliations, it can be asserted that dog was mostly considered as a positive animal, yet it signified ten negative features of brassiness, voracity, doggery,

sarcophagy, bloodthirstiness, uncleanness, madness, mysteriousness, greed, and guile.

Lion, as the second repeated animal in the corpus, was typically demonstrated voracity, oppression, power, gentility, courage, fear, dignity, prey, high-mindedness, and virtue on pages 193, 319, 322, 340, 341, 345, 346, 356, 358, 380, 403, 415 and 451. Patience, inoffensiveness, gratitude, and politeness were other implied meanings connected to this animal as were discovered in the following pages 193, 415, and 458. Page numbers 193, 358, and 360 were evidence for other connotations of lion that were magnanimity, pride, bloodthirstiness, and offensiveness. On the basis of all these associations, it can be claimed that lion was mostly considered as a positive animal but it signified seven negative features of voracity, oppression, power, prey, pride, bloodthirstiness, and offensiveness.

Camel, as the third frequent animal in the corpus, was showed Porterage, infirmity, frailty, unhappiness, obedience, naivety, and kindness on pages 379, 448, 482, 383-384, 386, 426, and 457. Fear, thought, vegetarianism, Good-characteredness, humility, and politeness were other tacit meanings linked to this animal as were detected in the pursuing pages correspondingly 448, 449, and 457. Magnanimity, sorrow, innocence, advice, and faith were the other conceptualizations of camel that were found on pages 457, 465, and 476. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that camel was considered a positive animal.

Bear, as the fourth frequent animal was represented jealousy, guile, implacability, dissimulation, and greed on pages 195, 216, 216-217, 237, 360, 422, 423, 454, 465, and 483. It also symbolized oppression, abusive, injustice, contamination, guiltiness, cowardiness, seduction, and brassiness on page

numbers 195, 423, 454, 460, 465, 476, 481, and 483. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that bear was considered as a negative animal.

Crow, as the fifth frequent animal in the corpus, was typically displayed foresight, high-mindedness, kindness, comfort, greed, sarcophagy, and espionage on pages 281, 282, 289, 283, 449, and 450. Incaution, courage, ambition, and help were other tacit meanings linked to this animal as were detected in the following pages 505 and 507. Page numbers 290, 332, 507, and 527 were evidence for other connotations of crow that were villainy, uncleanness, brassiness, guile, clownery, naivety, guess, wisdom, theft, and flight. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that crow was mostly considered as a positive animal, however, it signified nine negative attributes of comfort, greed, sarcophagy, espionage, villainy, uncleanness, brassiness, guile, and theft.

Mouse, as the sixth repeated animal in the corpus, was typically exhibited indecency, brassiness, guile, greed, infirmity, and ignorance on pages 86-87, 167, 168, 196-170, 268, 275, 397, and 398. Page numbers 267, 268, 275, and 481 were evidence for other connotations of mouse that were incaution, peacemaking, help, inelegance, villainy, honesty, and satisfaction. Artistry, cleanness, witness, theft, dissimulation, lying, and courage were the other conceptualizations of mouse that were found on pages 396-397, 481, and 483. On the basis of all these associations, it can be claimed that mouse was mostly considered as a negative animal, though it signified eight positive attributes of peacemaking, help, honesty, satisfaction, artistry, cleanness, witness, and courage.

Eagle, as the seventh repeated animal in the corpus, was typically demonstrated Savagery, guard, voracity, prey, rush, inexperience, and uncleanness on pages 87, 301, 332, 486, 503, 504, 510, and 522. Page numbers 491, 497, 499, 522, 530, and 540 were evidence for other connotations of eagle that were kindness, honesty, grace, justice, erudite, glory, bloodthirstiness,

unkindness, and power. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that eagle was mostly considered as a positive animal, yet it signified seven negative attributes of savagery, voracity, prey, uncleanness, bloodthirstiness, unkindness, and power.

Jackal, as the eighth frequent animal in the corpus, was typically showed incaution, ignorance, confidence, honesty, pertinence, and serving on pages 55, 59, 195, and 215. Cowardiness, guiltiness, magnanimity, foresight, acuteness, amiability, handsomeness were other implied meanings connected to this animal as were discovered in the following pages 194, 215, 217, 229. Awareness, ridicule, pride, reproach, advice, and jealousy were the other conceptualizations of jackal that were found on pages 194, 196, 198, and 228. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that jackal was mostly considered as a positive animal, nonetheless it signified six negative attributes of ignorance, cowardiness, guiltiness, ridicule, pride, and reproach.

Elephant, as the ninth repeated animal in the corpus, was typically illustrated oppression, impatience, scare, giantism, experience, advice, and honesty on pages 339, 341, 342, 343, 395, and 409. Bloodthirstiness, seduction, warfare, guile, fear, and naivety were the other conceptualizations of elephant that were found on pages 342, 361, 362, 380, and 411. On the basis of all these associations, it can be claimed that elephant was mostly considered as a negative animal, however, it signified five positive attributes of giantism, experience, advice, honesty, and warfare.

Partridge, as the tenth repeated animal in the corpus, was represented disaster, experience, solitary, infirmity, and incaution on pages 479, 486, 494, 495, 499, 504, 511, and 531. Page numbers 516 and 529 were evidence for other connotations of partridge that were erudite, sanity, speech, wisdom, beauty, and

sing. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that partridge was considered as a positive animal.

Wolf, as the eleventh frequent animal in the corpus, was exhibited power, ignorance, naivety, and voracity on pages 30, 47, 56, 57, 319, and 419. Courage, confidence, dispatch, and fear were the other conceptualizations of wolf that were detected on pages 366, 377, 388, 391, 407, and 444. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that wolf was mostly considered as a negative animal, even though it signified three positive attributes of courage, confidence, and dispatch.

Cat, as the twelfth frequented animal in the corpus, was showed bloodthirstiness, laziness, infirmity, sponging, and acuteness on pages 267, 279, and 378. Page numbers 275, 276, and 378 were evidence for other connotations of cat that were fear, disloyalty, indecency, offensiveness, villainy, disgrace, and naivety. On the basis of all these associations, it can be claimed that cat was mostly considered as a negative animal but it signified one positive feature of acuteness.

Fox, as the thirteenth repeated animal in the corpus, was displayed guile, betrayal, greed, and naivety on pages 105, 331, 332, 333, 360, 394, and 403. Consultation, experience, guard, and confidence were other tacit meanings linked to this animal as were found in the pursuing pages 394, 465, and 477. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that fox was considered equally as both a positive and a negative animal. *Goat*, as the fourteenth frequented animal in the corpus, was showed fugleman, morosity, prank, acuteness, and endeavor on pages 47 and 248. Brassiness, poverty, voracity, and menial were the other conceptualizations of goat that were found on pages 247, 248, 253-254. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that goat was mostly considered

as a positive animal, however, it signified three negative features of morosity, brassiness, and voracity.

Snake, as the fifteenth repeated animal in the corpus, was displayed oppression, dissimulation, villainy, and power on pages 70, 164-165, and 167. Sting, consultation, and guile were the other conceptualizations of snake that were found on pages 310, 408, 430, 441, and 442. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that snake was mostly considered as a negative animal but it signified one positive attribute of consultation.

Hoopoe, as the sixteenth frequented animal in the corpus, was demonstrated pride, acuteness, perspicuity, and flight on pages 207 and 208. Page numbers 207, 208, and 527 were evidence for other connotations of hoopoe that were inexperience, predicament, and dispatch. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that hoopoe was mostly considered as a positive animal, yet it signified one negative feature of pride.

Rooster, as the seventeenth frequented animal in the corpus, was exhibited guile, fear, and acuteness on pages 275, 330, 331, and 333. Experience, incaution, and early rising were the other conceptualizations of rooster that were found on pages 330, 333, and 527. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that rooster was mostly considered as a positive animal, yet it signified two negative features of guile and fear.

Rabbit, as the eighteenth frequented animal in the corpus, was illustrated acuteness, anticipation, leadership, fear, and guile on pages 231, 283, 307, and 377 and. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that rabbit was mostly considered as a positive animal but it signified two negative attributes of fear, and guile.

Pelican, as the nineteenth repeated animal in the corpus, was typically illustrated color, beauty, guile, age, and prey on pages 500, 502, 503, and 527.

Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that pelican was mostly considered as a negative animal but it signified two positive attributes of color and beauty.

Hawk, as the twentieth frequented animal in the corpus, was demonstrated glory, precision, and artistry on page 517. Erudite, sing, and dignity were the other conceptualizations of hawk that were detected on pages 517 and 527. Based on all these associations, it can be claimed that hawk was considered as a positive animal.

Deer, as the twenty-first frequented animal in the corpus, was exhibited predicament, beauty, nomadism, and scrutiny on pages 85, 87, 310, and 313. On the basis of these associations, it can be claimed that deer was considered as a positive animal. *Owl*, as the twenty-second repeated animal in the corpus, was demonstrated obedience and pertinence on page 282. Acknowledgment and innocence were other implied meanings connected to this animal as were discovered on page 282. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that owl was considered a positive animal.

Duck, as the twenty-third frequented animal in the corpus, was illustrated by ignorance, incaution, acting, and obedience on pages 107 and 223. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that duck was mostly considered as a positive animal and it signified one negative attribute of ignorance.

Eve, as the twenty-fourth repeated animal in the corpus, was showed scare, deduction, kindness, and sympathy on page 472. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that eve was mostly considered as a positive animal, though it signified one negative attribute of scare.

Ferret, as the twenty-fifth frequented animal in the corpus, was typically displayed caution, acuteness, and sanity on pages 507 and 508. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that ferret was considered a positive animal.

Panther, as the twenty-sixth frequented animal in the corpus, was showed voracity on pages 319, 332, and 360. On the basis of these associations, it can be claimed that Panther was considered as a negative animal.

Scorpion, as the twenty-seventh repeated animal in the corpus, was represented revenge, wickedness, and murder on page 400. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that scorpion was considered as a negative animal.

Fish, as the twenty-eighth frequented animal in the corpus, was displayed acuteness and naivety on pages 257 and 502-503. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that fish was equally considered as both a positive and a negative animal.

Hedgehog, as the twenty-ninth frequented animal in the corpus, was represented neglect and dispatch on page 460. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that hedgehog was equally considered as a both positive and a negative animal.

Leopard, as the thirtieth frequented animal in the corpus, was demonstrated voracity on pages 319 and 360. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that leopard was considered a negative animal.

Nightingale, as the thirty-one repeated animal in the corpus, was demonstrated sing on page 527. On the basis of these associations, it can be claimed that nightingale was considered as a positive animal.

Pig, as the thirty-two repeated animal in the corpus, was illustrated fear and anticipation on pages 360 and 377. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that pig was equally considered as a both positive and a negative animal.

Donkey, as the thirty-three frequented animal in the corpus, was exhibited guile and infirmity on pages 59 and 321. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that donkey was considered a negative animal.

Francolin, *pigeon*, *parrot*, *peacock*, *Skylark*, *sparrow*, *spider*, *turtledove*, and *vulture* as the next frequented animals in the corpus, were demonstrated hospitalization, dispatch, narration, ostentation, sing, predicament, prey, music, and greed on pages 299, 332, 377, 382 and 527. Based on these associations, it can be claimed that these animals were considered as positive, positive, positive, negative, positive, negative, positive, positive, and negative animals orderly.

As for answering the fourth research question (based on Table 3), findings indicate that the domestic animals generally have positive characteristics; however, some of them such as mouse, elephant, cat, pelican, donkey, peacock, and sparrow violate this rule and connote just negative characteristics. Concerning the fifth research question (based on Table 3), the wild animals generally have negative characteristics, yet hawk stood as an exception since it connotes glory, precision, artistry, erudite, sing, and dignity which are positive attributes.

5. Discussion

Very few studies have been previously conducted on the issues addressed in this study; therefore, comparing and contrasting results with other studies are rather impossible. Nevertheless, the findings are compared with the findings of two earlier studies. The findings of this study are in line with the results of the study performed by Marveh Miri and Afshin Soori (2015). In their study, fox, rabbit, and lion represented craft, smartness, and brevity respectively that are compatible with the findings of the current study. But, the findings of the present study are contrary to the results of their study that donkey demonstrated stupidity. In the present study, the donkey exhibited guile that is incompatible with the characteristic of stupidity. The results of the present study are in line with the findings of the study conducted by Esmail Faghih (2001). In his study,

fox, rabbit, lion, and bear demonstrated craft, smartness, brevity, and voracity respectively that are compatible with the results of the present study. Also, the cat represented spitefulness and unfaithfulness that which are in line with the findings of the present study. In addition, snake exhibited treachery, malice, and mischief that they are compatible with the results of the current study. However, the results of the current study are contrary to the findings of his study that donkey, owl, and peacock showed stupidity, ominousness, and beauty respectively. In the present study, donkey, owl, and peacock demonstrated guile, pertinence, and ostentation respectively that they are incompatible with the characteristics of stupidity, ominousness, and beauty. Then, in his study, mouse demonstrated weakness, insidiousness, and timidity that the first two are in line with the findings of the present study; however, the last one is incompatible with the characteristic of courage. Next, the dog demonstrated faithfulness, dirt, worthlessness, inferiority, and fidget that the first two are compatible with the results of the current study; however, worthlessness and inferiority are incompatible with the characteristic of beneficence, so the last one does not have any overlap with the obtained findings of this animal in the present study. After that, the parrot demonstrated mimicry that does not have any overlap with the obtained characteristics of this animal in the current study. After all, in his study, the wolf represented rapaciousness and cruelty that the first one is in line with the results of the current study, but the second one does not have any overlap with the obtained findings of this animal in the current study.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, the findings of the study supported that the distribution of animal terms in the Persian book of Marzbannameh is different. As illustrated in Table A.1, 12.76 percent of the total animal term conceptual metaphors in

Persian book of Marzbannameh belongs to dog, 7.44 percent to lion, 6.91percent to camel, 6.91 percent to bear, 5.85 percent to crow, 5.85 percent to mouse, 5.31 percent to eagle, 5.31 percent to jackal, 3.98 percent to elephant, 3.72 percent to partridge, 3.72 percent to wolf, 3.19 percent to cat, 3.19 percent to fox, 2.65 percent to goat, 2.65 percent to snake, 1.86 percent to hoopoe, 1.86 percent to rooster, 1.59 percent to rabbit, 1.32 percent to pelican, 1.32 percent to hawk, 1.06 percent to deer, 1.06 percent to owl, 1.06 percent to duck, 1.06 percent to eve, 0.79 percent to ferret, 0.79 percent to panther, 0.79 percent to scorpion, 0.53 percent to fish, 0.53 percent to hedgehog, 0.53 percent to leopard, 0.53 percent to nightingale, 0.53 percent to pig, 0.53 percent to donkey, 0.26 percent to francolin, 0.26 percent to pigeon, 0.26 percent to parrot, 0.26 percent to peacock, 0.26 percent to skylark, 0.26 percent to sparrow, 0.26 percent to spider, 02.6 percent to turtledove, and 0.26 percent to vulture. Besides, people's views, ideas, and values are exactly reflected in their use of animal metaphors.

Therefore, dog, lion, crow, eagle, goat, hoopoe, rooster, rabbit, duck, and eve are often considered as positive; mouse, elephant, wolf, cat, snake, and pelican are often discussed as negative; camel, partridge, hawk, deer, owl, ferret, skylark, francolin, parrot, pigeon, and turtledove as positive; bear, scorpion, panther, nightingale, donkey, peacock, spider, vulture, and sparrow as negative; jackal, fox, hedgehog, pig, and fish as both positive and negative in metaphoric use. Having all these in mind, it aspires that the acquired findings in the current study would function exactly as a tool for impressively hindering the likely misinterpretation while reading different types of texts in Persian. But, the main limitations that should be addressed alluding to the study are the limited number of the corpus and the centralization of merely the Persian language. Considering these limitations, it is proposed that the study be repeated with a larger corpus

from two or more linguistic and cultural grounds to investigate if the same results will be obtained for the conceptual metaphor theory.

Since the cultural conceptualization of metaphors may undergo changes in course of time, it is recommended that the study be replicated on recent Persian books for animal metaphors for a comparative investigation and if animal metaphor conceptualizations have witnessed any change over centuries or decades.

References

Aliakbari, M., & Faraji, E. (2014). Conceptualization of man's behavioral and physical characteristics as animal metaphors in the spoken discourse of Khezel people. *Linguistik online*, *59*(2), 57-59.

Aliakbari, M., & Karami, Y. (2019). A corpus analysis of 'death'and 'life' metaphorical expressions based on Forough Farrokhzad's Persian poetry book. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *7*(4), 178-181.

Benczes, R., & Ságvári, B. (2018). Where metaphors really come from: Social factors as contextual influence in Hungarian teenagers' metaphorical conceptualizations of life. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *29*(1), 121-154.

Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics* (Vol. 6). John Benjamins Publishing.

Faghih, E. (2001). A contrastive analysis of the interpretations of animal metaphors in Persian and English. *The international journal of Humanities of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 8*(2), 1-16.

Fontecha, A. F., & Catalan, R. M. J. (2003). Semantic derogation in animal metaphor: a contrastive-cognitive analysis of two male/female examples in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(5), 771-797.

Gibbs, R. W. (2006). Metaphor interpretation as embodied simulation. *Mind & Language*, *21*(3), 434-458.

Gibbs, R. W., & Gibbs Jr, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding.* Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs Jr, R. W. (Ed.). (2008). *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought.* Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs Jr, R. W., & Colston, H. L. (2012). *Interpreting figurative meaning.* Cambridge University Press.

Grady, E. J. (2007). *Metaphor in Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Jafari, Z. (2014). Metaphorized animals: an investigation of animal metaphors in King Lear. *Journal of International Social Research*, *32*(7), 354-367.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). Cognitive-linguistic comments on metaphor identification. *Language and Literature*, *11*(1), 74-78.

Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2017). Levels of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *28*(2), 321-347.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. University of Chicago press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The journal of Philosophy*, *77*(8), 453-486.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 202-251). Cambridge University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites* (Vol. 1). Stanford university press.

Liu, D. (2002). *Metaphor, culture, and worldview: The case of American English and the Chinese language*. University Press of Amer.

Miri, M., & Soori, A. (2015). A contrastive analysis of animal metaphor in English and Persian. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *6*(2), 160-162.

Pan, M. X. (2019). The effectiveness of the conceptual metaphor approach to English idiom acquisition by young Chinese learners. *Metaphor and the Social World*, *9*(1), 59-82.

Porat, R., & Shen, Y. (2017). Metaphor: The journey from bidirectionality to unidirectionality. *Poetics Today*, *38*(1), 123-140.

Rodriguez, I. L. (2009). Of women, bitches, chickens and vixens: Animal metaphors for women in English and Spanish. *Cultura, lenguaje y representación: revista de estudios culturales de la Universitat Jaume I*, *7*, 77-100.

Rashid, S. M., Hajimaming, P., & Muhammad, N. N. (2012). 'Farm' animal metaphors in Malay and Arabic figurative expressions: Implications for language learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *1*(7), 33-39.

Rouhi, M., & Mahand, M. R. (2011). Animal metaphor in cognitive linguistics. *Online Submission*, *1*(4), 251-254.

Veravini, S. (1220-1225). *Marzbannameh*. Publication of Iranian culture foundation.

Wang, C. & Dowker, A. (2007). *Interpretation of animal metaphors: Evidence from Chinese and English children and adults* [Paper presentation]. Child Language Seminar, University of Reading.

Appendix A.1

Table 2. *The Frequent Conceptualizations of Animals*

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
Dog	48	Protection	46, 60,333
		Acuteness	251,312
		Freedom	251
		Contentment	251,304
		Guard	251
		Poverty	253-254
		Brassiness	253-254,274,308
		Erudite	254
		Insight	254
		Command	254
		Voracity	254,266,316,377
		Doggery	254
		Sarcophagy	254
		Bloodthirstiness	254
		Inoffensive	255
		Beneficence	255
		Loyalty	251,307
		Uncleanness	251,266,274
		Mysteriousness	266
		Madness	266
		Courage	304
		Continence	304
		Dignity	304
		Single-mindedness	304
		Magnanimity	304
		Intelligence	304,312,316
		Gratitude	307
		Kindness	307
		Artistry	312
		Virtue	312
		Greed	315
		Guile	332
		Running	377
		Saltation	377
Lion	28	Voracity	193,319,322,403
		Oppression	346,358
		Power	341,451

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Gentility	345
		Courage	356
		Fear	380
		Dignity	193,340,415
		Prey	340,358
		High-mindedness	415
		Virtue	193,415
		Patience	415
		Inoffensiveness	193,415
		Gratitude	458
		Politeness	458
		Magnanimity	193
		Pride	360
		Bloodthirstiness	358
		Offensiveness	358
Camel	26	Porterage	379
		Infirmity	379,448,482
		Frailty	379,448
		Unhappiness	386
		Obedience	383-384,426,457
		Naivety	383-384,426
		Kindness	422,482
		Fear	448,457
		Thought	448
		Vegetarianism	449
		Good-characteredness	457
		Humility	457
		Politeness	457
		Magnanimity	457
		Sorrow	457
		Innocence	465
		Advice	476
		Faith	482
Bear	26	Jealousy	195,216,237,422
		Guile	216-217,360,465,483
		Implacability	216,237
		Dissimulation	237,454
		Greed	423
		Oppression	460,483
		Abusive	460
		Injustice	460

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Contamination	460
		Guiltiness	460,465,481
		Cowardiness	454
		Seduction	195,423,476
		Brassiness	483
Crow	22	Foresight	283
		High-mindedness	283
		Kindness	281
		Comfort	282
		Greed	382
		Sarcophagy	449
		Espionage	289,450
		Incaution	507
		Courage	505
		Ambition	505
		Help	505
		Villainy	507
		Uncleanness	507
		Brassiness	507
		Guile	507
		Clownery	527
		Naivety	257
		Guess	290
		Wisdom	290
		Theft	332
		Flight	332
Mouse	22	Indecency	86-87
		Brassiness	86-87
		Guile	169-170,397
		Greed	168,398
		Infirmity	167
		Ignorance	268,275
		Incaution	268
		Peacemaking	267
		Help	267
		Inelegance	275
		Villainy	275
		Honesty	481
		Satisfaction	481
		Artistry	481
		Cleanness	481

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Witness	483
		Theft	396-397
		Dissimulation	396-397
		Lying	396-397
		Courage	396-397
Eagle	20	Savagery	87
		Guard	301
		Voracity	332,510
		Prey	486,503,504
		Rush	504
		Inexperience	522
		Uncleanness	522
		Kindness	522
		Honesty	522
		Grace	522
		Justice	530
		Erudite	540
		Glory	540
		Bloodthirstiness	499
		Unkindness	491
		Power	497
Jackal	20	Incaution	55
		Ignorance	59
		Confidence	195,215
		Honesty	215
		Pertinence	215
		Serving	215
		Cowardiness	215
		Guiltiness	217
		Magnanimity	229
		Foresight	194
		Acuteness	194
		Amiability	194
		Handsomeness	194
		Awareness	194
		Ridicule	196
		Pride	198
		Reproach	198
		Advice	196
		Jealousy	228
Elephant	15	Oppression	343,409

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Impatience	341
		Scare	339
		Giantism	339,395
		Experience	342
		Advice	342
		Honesty	342
		Bloodthirstiness	342
		Seduction	342
		Warfare	361
		Guile	362
		Fear	380
		Naivety	411
Partridge	14	Disaster	486
		Experience	494
		Solitary	495
		Infirmity	479,531
		Incaution	499,504,511
		Erudite	516
		Sanity	516
		Speech	516
		Wisdom	516
		Beauty	529
		Sing	529
Wolf	14	Power	30
		Ignorance	47, 56
		Naivety	47, 57
		Voracity	319,419
		Courage	366,391
		Confidence	388
		Dispatch	391,407
		Fear	377,444
Cat	12	Bloodthirstiness	279
		Laziness	267
		Infirmity	267
		Sponging	267
		Acuteness	378
		Fear	378
		Disloyalty	275
		Indecency	275
		Offensiveness	275
		Villainy	275

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Disgrace	275
		Naivety	276
Fox	12	Guile	105,332,360,394,403
		Betrayal	105
		Greed	331
		Naivety	333
		Consultation	394
		Experience	394
		Guard	465
		Confidence	477
Goat	10	Fugleman	248
		Morosity	248
		Prank	248
		Acuteness	47,248
		Endeavor	248
		Brassiness	253-254
		Poverty	253-254
		Voracity	247
		Menial	248
Snake	10	Oppression	70,164-165
		Dissimulation	70
		Villainy	70
		Power	167
		Sting	310,408,442
		Consultation	430
		Guile	441
Hoopoe	7	Pride	207
		Acuteness	208
		Perspicuity	208
		Flight	208
		Inexperience	208
		Predicament	207
		Dispatch	527
Rooster	7	Guile	275,333
		Fear	331
		Acuteness	330
		Acuteness	330
		Acuteness	330
		Experience	330
		Incaution	333
		Early rising	527

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
Rabbit	6	Acuteness	231,307
		Anticipation	231
		Anticipation	231
		Anticipation	231
		Anticipation	231
		Leadership	231
		Fear	377
		Guile	283
Pelican	5	Color	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Beauty	527
		Guile	502
		Age	500
		Prey	503
Hawk	6	Glory	517
		Precision	517
		Artistry	517
		Artistry	517
		Erudite	517
		Sing	517
		Dignity	527
Deer	4	Predicament	85
		Beauty	87
		Nomadism	310
		Scrutiny	313
Owl	4	Obedience	282
		Pertinence	282
		Pertinence	282
		Acknowledgement	282
		Innocence	282
Duck	4	Ignorance	107
		Incaution	107
		Incaution	107

Animal	Freq.	Possible Conceptualization	Page Number
		Acting	223
		Obedience	223
Eve	4	Scare	472
		Deduction	472
		Kindness	472
		Sympathy	472
Ferret	3	Caution	507
		Acuteness	507
		Sanity	508
Panther	3	Voracity	319,332,360
Scorpion	3	Revenge	400
		Wickedness	400
		Murder	400
Fish	2	Acuteness	257
		Naivety	502-503
Hedgehog	2	Neglect	460
		Dispatch	460
Leopard	2	Voracity	319,360
Nightingale	2	Sing	527,527
Pig	2	Fear	377
		Anticipation	360
Donkey	2	Guile	59
		Infirmity	321
Francolin	1	Hospitalization	527
Pigeon	1	Dispatch	299
Parrot	1	Narration	527
Peacock	1	Ostentation	527
Skylark	1	Sing	527
Sparrow	1	Predicament	377
Spider	1	Prey	332
Turtledove	1	Music	527
Vulture	1	Greed	382
		Total	376

Appendix A.2

Table 3. The Categorization of the Domestic and Wild Animals

Domestic Animals / attitudes (P= Positive / N= Negative)	Wild Animals/ attitudes (P= Positive / N= Negative)
Camel	P/N
Dog	P
Crow	P/N
Lion	P/N
Mouse	N/P
Bear	N
Elephant	N/P
Eagle	P/N
Partridge	P
Jackal	P/N
Cat	N/P
Wolf	N/P
Fox	P/N
Snake	N/P
Goat	P/N
Hawk	P
Hoopoe	P/N
Panther	N
Rooster	P/N
Scorpion	N
Rabbit	P/N
Hedgehog	P/N
Pelican	N/P
Leopard	N
Deer	P
Pig	P/N
Owl	P
Vulture	N
Duck	P/N
Eve	P/N
Ferret	P
Fish	P/N
Nightingale	P
Donkey	N
Francolin	P
Pigeon	P
Parrot	P
Peacock	N
Skylark	P
Sparrow	N
Spider	P
Turtledove	P

* Note: P/N= When priority is given to positive attributes;

N/P= When priority is given to negative attributes