The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers' Daily Interactions

Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.

Department of English Language and Literature
College of Languages and Humanities
Qassim University, KSA
m.aslam@qu.edu.sa

==

Abstract

The creation and comprehension of animal metaphors seem to be automatic cognitive processes that most likely developed with language creation and comprehension. The aims of this study were threefold: (first) was to examine the topic of "PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS" in the context of everyday talks among Indian Urdu speakers from Moradabad city; (second) was to highlight the animal metaphorical expressions used in their conversations; and (third) was to explain how these animal metaphorical expressions take shape into meaningful expressions. Drawing on Semino's (2008) definition of metaphor and the concepts of Conceptual Metaphor Theory proposed by Lakoff & Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002), this study used a descriptive qualitative analysis of animal metaphors used in daily Urdu conversations. The findings of the study revealed that the people in Moradabad use a wide range of animal names for human. In this study, 48 different animal metaphors of four categories (mammal-animals, birds, reptiles and arachnids/ insects) were identified. Of these 48 animal names, the names of 28 mammal-animals—the most in number—as well as seven birds, five reptiles, and eight arachnids/ insects were identified. Most of these animal names were used for the people with negative characteristics while very few of them were used for the people with positive ones. The majority of these animal metaphors were used for males rather than females. Finally, the study concluded that the animal metaphors can be utilized to manipulate or convey quickly since they are digested

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   177

naturally and without conscious thought. Furthermore, these metaphors are culturally loaded and can vary from culture-to-culture.

Keywords: animal names for human, communication, cultural expressions, metaphorical expressions, socio-cultural concept, everyday communication

Introduction

Cambridge English Dictionary defines the term metaphor as "an expression, often found in literature, that describes a person or object by referring to something that is considered to have similar characteristics to that person or object". According to Simpson (2004, p. 41), it is "a process of mapping between two different conceptual domains." People can perceive and comprehend one type of entity in terms of another through the use of metaphorical language. Target categories can be understood in new and frequently illuminating ways by conceptually mapping and selectively transferring features from a certain source domain onto a target domain Haslam et al., (2011). Fadaee (2011) defines metaphor as the Greek word "metaphoria," which means "to carry," is where the word metaphor originates. Metaphor is the comparison of two distinct occurrences that have certain things in common. According to Fatihi (2015), metaphors are used to explain complicated and challenging concepts in terms of simpler and easier ones. According to Dubovičienė and Skorupa (2014), metaphor enhances the message's aesthetics and emphasizes the key concept by comparing one thing to another. As Shariq (2020) mentioned that the metaphors are used in expressions in order to create a poetic effect that makes listeners enjoy the expression. Metaphors provide insight into how social identities are formed. Many metaphors are biased in favor of specific social groupings that are viewed as the normal, harming others who do not fit into this group since they are conduits of folk ideas (Rodríguez, 2009).

The ability to convey oneself verbally, in writing, or in discussion (including gossiping and chit-chatting) with others is what most of us think of as communication. Additionally, it represents the sharing of ideas with friends, family, coworkers, superiors, subordinates, and even complete strangers (Shariq, 2013). The use of animal metaphorical expressions for humans is a very common aspect of our daily conversations. These metaphorical expressions define a person's appearance, thinking, activities and behavior. According to Haslam et al., (2011) animal

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions 178

metaphors can convey various meanings, including insults and demonstrations of affection. These animal metaphors occur because of the co-existence of people and animal since the beginning of the earth. As mentioned in Lund et al., (2024) and Hamdan et al., (2023), humans and animals have lived together on the same planet, Earth, for thousands of years or since the beginning of the universe. As a result, humans interacted with animals and used them as (1) pets, like dogs and cats; (2) guards, like German Shepherds; (3) circus performers, like monkeys, dolphins, and bears; (4) subjects for laboratory experiments, like mice and rabbits; and (5) food, among other uses. Because of their coexistence, people began referring to and addressing one another in communications by utilizing animal names and/or characteristics for a variety of purposes, whether they were complimentary or not. Humans frame their location in an evolutionary continuum and their ongoing relationship with the environment using animal analogies. Because they are automatically processed, concentrate on things that we prefer to pay attention to, and draw on the multitude of literary and thematic universals that inform stories, animal metaphors are incredibly effective communication tools (Hart & Long Jr (2011). Fatihi (2015) argued that the animal's negative or positive characteristics can be mapped on to people. He cited the example of 'dog' for the negative characteristics as given in Iqbal's poetry and 'hawk' for the positive characteristics. According to Iori (2023), it is very likely that metaphors that conceptualize people or human activity in terms of lower levels of the chain contain a negative connotation. It is possible to determine which species are most likely to be used as metaphors for human personality and which parts of personality are most likely to be included in animal metaphors by looking into animal metaphors for human personality. At least in folk speech, the lack of zoomorphs can aid in defining those characteristics that are thought to set humans apart from other species (Sommer & Sommer, 2011). This study intends to overcome the lack of comprehensive research that focuses on metaphor used in Urdu daily conversations. By examining animal metaphors used to frame humans in Urdu conversations, this study more precisely examines the use of animal metaphors in Urdu discourses and aims to answer the following questions:

- What animal names are used as metaphorical expressions for humans?
- How these animal metaphorical expressions take shape into meaningful expressions?

==

Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   179

- What characteristics of animals are mapped on to the human characteristics?

Literature Review

Since one's entire life experiences go into constructing and comprehending metaphors, conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) has quickly emerged as a crucial tool for organizing and comprehending the real world. The source, the target, and the ground—what the source and the target have in common—are the three factors to take into account when working with a conceptual metaphor. Metaphors are created and understood by drawing on one's entire life experience. According to Solopova et al., (2023), what the metaphor source and the metaphor target share in common is known as the metaphor ground. In order to determine the nature of the grounding—that is, the similarities between the source and the target—people must first consider the object being referred to (the target) in light of the comparison's foundation (the source). While typical metaphor targets are abstract, complicated, and novel, metaphor sources are typically common, every day, old, prototype, simple, and concrete components of life. By using references to the known, metaphors allow us to discuss the unknown. Furthermore, conceptual metaphor theory asserts that metaphors are a conceptual tool that people use to organize, reorganize, and build realities in addition to being decorative stylistic techniques used by authors and speakers to provide an artistic effect.

The universal and culturally unique nature of conceptual metaphors in language, society, and discourse have been the subject of several research over the past few decades (Kövecses, 2009; Silaški, 2011; Fatihi, 2015; Kozlova, 2020; Tran, 2022; Solopova et al., 2023; Rumman et al., 2023; Gong, 2024). Scholars agree that universal metaphors are panchronic in nature, originating from the collective unconscious, reflecting all that humanity has experienced throughout history, and reflecting comparable thought patterns and universal linguistic qualities. However, a wide range of circumstances influence and change the meanings of metaphors in various languages, discourses, and civilizations, influencing their application in the real language.

In his discussion of anthropological topics, Leach (1964) proposed that humans utilize figurative animals to convey the social difference that exists within a group and offered inedible animals and near animals as means of verbal abuse. Many scholars studied animal metaphors to describe

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   180

and illustrate their extent and to learn how they aid in the comprehension of human personalities (Brandes, 1984; Ana, 1999; Kiełtyka and Kleparski, 2005; Goatly, 2006; Hart and Long Jr, 2011, Sommer and Sommer, 2011; Miller, 2012; Lori, 2023). Three studies on the usage of nonhuman animals as zoomorphs (metaphors) for human personality traits were carried out by Sommer and Sommer (2011). In their study, University students evaluated 36 mammal names based on their gender, age, and favorability when used figuratively to describe a person. Furthermore, the majority of animal metaphors used to describe human personalities are negative and serve to further emphasize how different nonhuman animal species are seen to be from humans. Moreover, zoomorphs are mostly masculine and describe healthy adults; they are rarely used to describe infirmity or impairment. They concluded that zoomorphy of mammal names is higher than that of bird, insect, or fish names.

Talebinejad and Dastjerdi (2005) examined the nature of metaphor by comparing metaphors in two typologically distinct languages—Persian and English—across cultural boundaries. The findings demonstrated that while there are some similarities between Persian and English animal metaphors, many of their features are culturally distinct. By concentrating particularly on animal metaphors used to frame China during the COVID-19 epidemic in two corpora of American and Australian newspapers, Lori (2023) made a further contribution to the study of Sino-phobic discourses. The findings demonstrated how, in the newspapers examined, Chinese institutions are frequently linked to dangerous and predatory animals; these negative metaphorical representations are contrasted with those of Australian institutions, which are presented as innocuous pets. The evolving character of wild animal metaphors used to model the representation of Russia in American media discourse between the 19th and 20th centuries was studied by Solopova (2023). According to the study's findings, the metaphors "Russia is a bear" and "Russia is a beast" were widely employed in media discourse in the United States during the twentieth century to realize the "othering" strategy. However, their definitions permitted change and adaptation during the times of friendship and collaboration between the two nations. Bhattacherji and Sinha (2024) presented cognitive analysis of animal imagery in Bengali digital discourse and provided empirical evidence that one of the main causes of Bengali speakers' speciesist views is their usage of animalized language. Additionally, they made people more

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   181

aware of the hateful content of the animalized tweets. (Fatihi, 2015) examined the metaphor of dog in Faiz's poem that conceptualizes the common man as dog in order to show the socio-cultural component of animal metaphors. He maintained that in order to comprehend why common people use dog metaphors, it was essential to look at our social and cultural roots.

Methods

A qualitative investigation of animal metaphors utilized in everyday Urdu talks is employed in this work. There are 15 participants in all, including both males and females. These participants are from the Indian state of Uttar Pradesh, specifically the city of Moradabad. Urdu is the native tongue of these participants. In order to examine the negotiation of meaning of animal metaphors, the researcher in this study employed a descriptive qualitative method. According to Creswell and Poth (2023), human social problems that arise spontaneously are analyzed and explored using the qualitative research approach. This approach involves word analysis and a detailed explanation of the data collected; the descriptive qualitative design is used in this study. Descriptive qualitative research is a popular approach for studying environmental situations, claims Sugiyono (2013). As a crucial tool, the researchers present a scenario honestly or in light of obvious facts. This study uses the definition of metaphor given by Semino (2008, p. 1), who defines it as the process "whereby we talk and, potentially think about something in terms of something else." The study addresses the PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS idea within the theoretical framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Kövecses 2002). Inter-domain mappings of concepts across two distinct domains are well known, and the collection of correspondences between them is referred to as "conceptual metaphors" (Fatihi, 2015).

Data collection

The data in this study was collected through the discussion, observation, and interview method from the people of Moradabad city in India while having usual conversations with them. The researcher observed and noted the names of animals referred to a person's quality, behavior, appearance and activity etc. The researcher then identified and categorized the types of animals in four categories namely; mammals, arachnids or insects, birds and reptiles. The grammatical category (masculine and feminine) for these names was also identified.

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   182

Results

It can be seen from the four tables below that the Urdu speakers in Moradabad use a wide range of animal metaphors to represent or talk about people in their conversations. The total number of animal metaphors collected in this study is 48 including 28 mammals (Table 1), 7 birds (Table 2), 5 reptiles (Table 3), and 8 arachnids /insects (Table 4). The most of the animal metaphors are used for males representing the negative character while very few of them represent the positive characters and used for females.

Table 1

Human described as Mammals

No	Metaphor used	Gloss	Grammatical category in the source domain	Grammatical category in the target domain	Characteristic (positive/negative)
1	*/kutta/*	Dog	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
2	*/kutiya/*	Bitch	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
3	*/lomRi/*	Fox	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Negative
4	*/gadha/*	Donkey	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
5	*/gadhi/ or /gadhayya/ (impolite form)*	Female donkey	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
6	*/bhens/*	Buffalo	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
7	*/sand/*	Bull	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
8	*/bail/*	Ox	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
9	*/bakri/*	Goat	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
10	*/bhediya/*	Wolf	Masculine	Masculine	Negative

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   183

11	/suwar/	Hog	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
12	/jaanwar/	Animal	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
13	/jangli/	Wild	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
14	/billi/	Cat	Feminine	Feminine	Positive
15	/u:t/	Camel	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
16	/girgit/	Chameleon	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
17	/haathi/	Elephant	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
18	/sher/	Lion	Masculine	Masculine	Positive
19	/chiita/	Tiger	Masculine	Masculine	Positive
20	/hiran/	Deer	Feminine	Feminine	Positive
21	/genda/	Rhinoceros	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
22	/bandar/	Monkey	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
23	/ghora/	Horse	Masculine	Masculine	Positive
24	/ghori/	Mare	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
25	/gaaye/	Cow	Feminine	Feminine	Positive
26	/chuhiya/	Mouse	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
27	/chuha/	Rat	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
28	/chamgadaR/	Bat	Feminine	Feminine	Negative

Table-1 shows that the people are represented as mammal-animals. Here the source is mammal-animal and the target is human. The first two examples in the table-1 above are /kutta/ 'the dog' and /kutiya/ 'bitch' used for males and females with negative or bad characteristics. The Urdu speakers use the animal metaphor dog, for people especially, when they are very unhappy or angry with them. The sentence spoken by one the participants is /us kutte ne mere pese nahi diye/ 'That dog did not give me my money'. In this example, the source 'dog' and his characteristic of not returning a piece of flesh when grabbed is mapped to the person who doesn't return someone's money. Another example, /kutte ki dum/ 'the tail of dog', is also frequently represented in Urdu speakers' talk. Here, the source idea is that the dog's tail 'doesn't remain straight' which is mapped to the person's unchanged negative behavior. The female counterpart

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   184

of dog */kutiya/* 'bitch' is also negatively mapped to a female's bad characteristic and its use is considered as more impolite than the use of the word 'dog'. The other negative qualities such as the wild nature, dirty appearance, carnivorous nature, eating and drinking behavior, mating, barking are also mapped on to the target domain.

The third animal */lomRi/* 'fox' as metaphorical expression is also used by the Urdu speakers. It is because of the use of the animal in children's stories as sharp minded animal. Hence, the source idea that fox is a sharp minded animal is referred to the target as a sharp minded person. The sharp mindedness represents the positive character of a person. However, in the target domain, it is used negatively for the person who deceives with tricks or talks tricky. The word 'foxy' is also found in google translate dictionary when searched for the word 'clever' and it translates it as 'cunning', 'clever', 'like fox' etc.

The fourth example */gadha/* 'donkey' for males and fifth */gadhi/* 'female donkey' for females is mapped to the people representing the foolishness. In Urdu/ Hindi, donkeys are the symbols of foolishness and used in most of the jokes. When a person does some foolish activity, then he becomes the target. */gadhayya/* female donkey is very impolite form used for females' foolishness. Hence, the sixth animal metaphor like */bhens/* 'buffalo' is mapped for the female target who is overweight and someone who doesn't respond as said in the proverb */bhens ke aage biin bajana/* that can be translated as 'cast pearls before a swine, talk wisely before a fool'. The seventh example */sand/* 'bull' is used for a male who is also overweight. The participants used the name of 'bull' in the expression like */wo sand ki tarah khata hai/* 'He eats like a bull' that means 'He is bull'. In the same way */bail/* 'ox' also mapped on to a person who eats more, overweight, of fighting nature, and doesn't understand. Similarly, */bakri/* 'goat' is also represented in the same sense 'who eats more' but never gets weight. The expression used in this situation is */khaye bakri ki tarah aur sukhe lakRi ki tarah/* 'eats like a goat and gets dried like a wood'. The tenth animal metaphor */bheDiya/* 'wolf' is mapped for a person 'who is wild in nature', 'keeps on fighting with other people' 'hairy' 'someone who has long canine teeth' etc. The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth animal metaphors */suwar/* 'hog', */jaanwar/* 'animal', */jangli/* 'wild' is for someone who is wild in behavior, having bad behavior, or anyone who does something bad. The fourteenth animal metaphor */billi/* 'cat' is used for females but with good

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   185

characteristics like beauty, cuteness, innocence etc. The famous Bollywood star Shahrukh Khan also calls the actress Priyanka Chopra as /jangli billi/ 'wild cat'. The other animals /u:t/ 'camel' for someone who is tall, foolish or doesn't understand, /girgit/ 'chameleon' for someone who is dynamic and changes his behavior, ideas, thoughts, breaks promise etc., /hathi/ 'elephant' for someone who is giant, huge, tall etc., /sher/ 'lion' for brave, powerful, dominant, /chita/ 'chitah or leopard' for 'active', 'fast', 'speedy', 'powerful', 'brave' etc., /hiran/ 'deer' for 'beautiful woman', 'woman with beautiful eyes, neck etc., /genda/ 'rhinoceros' for 'overweight', /Bandar/ 'monkey' for 'ugly faced', 'hairy' 'who jumps a lot' etc., /ghoRa/ 'horse' masculine and /ghoRi/ 'mare' feminine for 'who runs fast', 'eats more chickpeas' and foolish for female only, /gaye/ 'cow' for 'an innocent lady who follows commands easily', /chuhiya/ 'mouse' for female who is 'slim' and /chuha/ 'rat' for male who is slim. Finally, the mammal that is a flying animal /chamgadaR/ 'bat' is mapped to a female who is 'slim', 'not beautiful', and 'doesn't sleep at night'.

Table 2

Human described as Birds

No	Metaphor used	Gloss	Grammatical category in the source domain	Grammatical category in the target domain	Characteristic (positive/negative)
1	/ullu/	Owl	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
2	/Kawwa/	Crow	Masculine	Masculine	Positive & Negative
3	/Chiil/	Eagle	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Positive
4	/giddh/	Vulture	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
5	/morni/	Peahen	Feminine	Feminine	Positive
6	/murghi/	Hen	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Positive

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   186

7	/murgha/	Cock	Masculine	Masculine	Negative

Table 2 shows the animal metaphors as birds used for human. These commonly used birds are seven in total and out of these are four that have negative characteristics and three have the positive characteristics. The first bird is */ullu/* 'owl' that is negatively mapped to a person who is 'fool' or 'block head' and 'doesn't sleep at night'. The most common phrase used with the owl is */ullu ka paTTha/* literally translated as 'the son of owl' and */ullu ki paTThi/* as 'the daughter of owl'. However, the feminine phrase is considered as the impolite form. The second */kawwa/* 'crow' for someone who is 'clever', 'black skin' and 'speaks more' etc., The third */chiil/* 'eagle' is used for someone who has 'sharp eyesight', */gidh/* 'vulture' for who remains 'dirty with scattered hair', the feminine */morni/* 'peahen' for 'beautiful lady', */murghi/* 'hen' positively used for someone who is rich as in the phrase */moTi murghi/* 'fat hen' and finally */murgha/* 'cock' for someone who is easily 'fooled' by the others.

Table 3

Human described as Reptiles

No	Metaphor used	Gloss	Grammatical category in the source domain	Grammatical category in the target domain	Characteristic (positive/negative)
1	/saanp/	Snake	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
2	/sapola/	Snakelet	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
3	/magarmach/	Crocodile	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
4	/chipkali/	Lizard	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Negative
5	/kachua/	Tortoise	Masculine	Masculine	Negative

Table 3 shows the animal metaphors as reptiles used for human. These commonly used reptiles are five in total and all of these have negative characteristics with one used for females and four

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   187

for males. The first reptile is */sanp/* 'snake' that is used for someone who is 'poisonous in the sense that he speaks harsh to someone or responds suddenly in a way that hurts'. The most common used proverb */astin ka sanp/* literally translated as 'the snake in the sleeve' that is used for 'the enemy in the guise of a friend'. The second example */sapola/* 'baby snake or snakelet' is used for enemy's son. The third animal */magarmach/* 'crocodile' is also used for someone who acts as an enemy. The proverb used with this animal */magarmach ke aansu/* 'crocodile tears' is referred to a person who 'begs something, shows something or mourns for something with artificial tears. The fourth */chipkali/* 'lizard' for 'slim women or girl' and finally */kachua/* 'tortoise' is mapped to a person who is slow in doing his work.

Table 4

Human described as Arachnids /Insects

No	Metaphor used	Gloss	Grammatical category in the source domain	Grammatical category in the target domain	Characteristic (positive/negative)
1	*/bicchu/*	Scorpion	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
2	*/macchar/*	Mosquito	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
3	*/dimak/*	Termite	feminine	Masculine & feminine	Negative
4	*/jonk/*	Leech	Feminine	Feminine	Negative
5	*/keeRa/*	Insect	Masculine	Masculine	Positive & Negative
6	*/makkhi/*	Fly	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Negative
7	*/TiDDa/*	Grasshopper	Masculine	Masculine	Negative
8	*/chiTi/*	Ant (wing)	Feminine	Masculine & Feminine	Negative

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   188

Table 4 shows the animal metaphors as arachnids/ insects used for human. These commonly used arachnids/ insects are eight in total and all of these have negative characteristics. In this category, the first metaphor for human is */bicchoo/* 'scorpion' that mapped with the same characteristics of snake as mentioned above. The second in this category is */macchar/* 'mosquito' used for someone who is 'slim'. The phrase */macchar pehelwan/* 'mosquito wrestler' and */macchar ki aulaad/* impolite form 'son of mosquito' are used frequently in this sense. The third metaphor termite used for a person who 'finishes things like money or property slowly' and who 'hurts' time to time and it is used for both males and females. The fourth */jonk/* 'leech' is used for a person who 'stays at one place for long', 'talks a lot' or 'takes longer'. The fifth is */ki:Ra/* 'insect' which is mapped on to several things that a person does in abundance. For example, the expression such as */kitabi kiRa/* 'book worm' describes a person who reads books a lot. It is also used for someone who 'deeply thinks and does things with perfection'. However, the verbal expression used negatively as */kiRe ka kaatna/* 'insect bite' and used for someone who 'does things in a hurry and doesn't seek for advice'. The sixth is */makkhi/* 'house fly' that is used for a person who 'whispers' or 'talks slowly'. The seventh */TiDDa/* 'grasshopper' refers to a person who is slim. And finally, the last metaphor */chiTi/* 'ant' is used in the expression such as */pardaar chiTi/* 'winged ant' that refers to a person who 'does things or appears occasionally'.

Discussion and conclusion

The study's conclusions showed that the majority of animal analogies are negative, indicating that most people are characterized by the negative traits of animals. This result is consistent with Sommer and Sommer (2015). Metaphors involving more despised animals may be more insulting because they equate someone to an animal that is despised or repulsed, which is equivalent to attributing the animal's undesirable traits to them. Moreover, the most dehumanizing metaphors could also be the most offensive. Some animal analogies may be particularly offensive to human dignity (Haslam et al., 2011). It suggests that people place themselves in a better position than the animal. However, when it comes to define some other persons' nature, they disguise them. These could include the user of the metaphor, its target, and the character of their relationship. In summary, a metaphor's offensiveness may vary depending

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   189

on the speaker's intention while expressing it in a specific social setting in addition to its propositional meaning.

As mentioned earlier in this study that the human and animals have lived together since the beginning of the life. This co-existence is largely with mammals because of the similarities with humans. And scientifically, human is also characterized as mammal. These mammal animals are kept by human for several benefits like; guards, entertainers, pets, laboratory experiment subjects, for source of food; dairy products and meat (Hamdan et al., 2023). "Much of human behavior seems to be metaphorically understood in terms of animal behavior," according to Kövecses (2002, p. 124). The conceptual analogies "HUMANS ARE ANIMALS" and "HUMAN BEHAVIOR IS ANIMAL BEHAVIOR" eventually emerged as a result of this. Our surroundings have a significant impact on how we perceive the world, how we perceive animals, and how we use them symbolically in our discourse. Moreover, it is believed that these animal metaphors might have different dimensions of meanings in different cultures, contexts and situations.

The present study focused on the conversations of Urdu speakers in Moradabad. According to the study's findings, individuals in Moradabad refer to humans by a variety of animal names. This study identifies 48 distinct animal metaphors from four categories: birds, reptiles, arachnids/insects, and mammals/animals. Few of these animal names are used for their positive traits, whereas the majority are used for their negative traits. Males are the subject of most of these animal metaphors, not females. Moreover, the source and target concepts in this kind of metaphor are socioculturally determined, and the resemblance between the source and target concepts as viewed by society serves as the driving force behind their mapping (Fatihi, 2015). Identifying the animal metaphors used by the people of the context, which conceptualizes human as an animal, has demonstrated this. It should be noted that in order to comprehend why people use animal metaphors, it is important to look at our social and cultural roots. According to Littlemore (2003), metaphors are usually culturally loaded statements whose meaning must be deduced by drawing on common cultural knowledge. Furthermore, the study suggests that the future research should focus on the use of these animal metaphors in different regions and

==
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   190

languages in order to see the cultural differences and aspects of these animal metaphors used for humans.

References

Ana, O. S. (1999). "Like an Animal I was Treated": Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society, 10*(2), 191-224. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002004

Bhattacherji, M., Sinha, S. (2024). A cognitive analysis of animal imagery in digital discourse: a case study of Bengali tweets. *Journal of World Languages, 10*(2), 401–429. https://doi.org/10.1515/jwl-2022-0055

Brandes, S. (1984). Animal Metaphors and Social Control in Tzintzuntzan. *Ethnology, 23*(3), 207-215. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3773747

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design.* California: SAGE Publications. https://books.google.com.sa/books?id=pwjMEAAAQBAJ&source=gbs_navlinks_s

Cambridge English Dictionary. n.d. Metaphor. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/metaphor (accessed 28 November 2024).

Fatihi, A. R. (2015). Animal metaphors in Faiz Ahmad Faiz's poem "Kutte." *Language in India, 15*(4), 104-115. http://www.languageinindia.com/april2015/fatihimetaphors.pdf

Fadaee, E. (2011). Symbols, metaphors and similes in literature: A case study of "Animal Farm". *Journal of English and Literature, 2*(2), 19-27. https://academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text-pdf/39296CD965

Goatly, A. (2006). Humans, animals, and metaphors. *Society & Animals, 14*(1), 15–37. https://www.animalsandsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/goatly.pdf

Gong, Z. (2024). A brief analysis of animal metaphor in Emily Dickinson's poetry. *Lecture Notes on Language and Literature, 7*(2), 12-18. http://doi.org/10.23977/langl.2024.070203

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   191

Hart, K. R., & Long Jr, J. H. (2011). Animal metaphors and metaphorizing animals: An integrated literary, cognitive, and evolutionary analysis of making and partaking of stories. *Evolution: Education and Outreach, 4*(1), 52-63. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12052-010-0301-6

Hamdan, H. J., Al-Madanat, H., & Hamdan, W. J. (2023). Connotations of Animal Metaphors in the Jordanian Context. *Psycholinguistics, 33*(1), 132–166. https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2022-33-1-132-166

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., & Sun, P. (2011). Beastly: What makes animal metaphors offensive? *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 30*(3), 311–325. http://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X11407168

Kiełtyka, R., & Grzegorz A. K. (2005). The scope of English zoosemy: The case of domesticated animals. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia, 3,* 76–87. https://publikationen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/opus4/frontdoor/index/index/docId/25706

Kövecses, Z. (2009). *Metaphor and Discourse.* London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594647

Kozlova, L. A. (2020). Metaphor as the refection of culture determined cognition. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 24*(4), 899–925. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-4-899-925

Lakoff, G., & Mark, J. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lori, I. (2023). Hawks, beasts, and canaries: A comparative analysis of animal metaphors used to frame China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Language Studies, 17*(3), 103-128. https://iris.unimore.it/bitstream/11380/1309846/1/07-Iori-2.pdf

Lund, T. B., Forkman, B., Meyer, I., & Sandøe, P. (2024). How is human socioeconomic position linked with dog ownership practices? A study from Denmark. *Anthrozoös: A multidisciplinary journal of the interactions of people and animals, 37*(6), 1171–1193. https://doi.org/10.1080/08927936.2024.2384211

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   192

Miller, J. (2012). Rebellious Tigers, a Patriotic Elephant and an Urdu- Speaking Cockatoo: Animals in 'Mutiny' Fiction. *Journal of Victorian Culture, 17*(4), 480-491. http://doi.org/10.1080/13555502.2012.733066

Rodríguez, I. L. (2009). Of women, bitches, chickens and vixens: Animal metaphors for women in English and Spanish. *Cultura, Lenguaje Y Representación / Culture, Language and Representation*, *7*, 77-100. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/39085608.pdf

Rumman, R. A., Haider, A. S., Yagi, S., & Al-Adwan, A. (2023). A corpus-assisted cognitive analysis of metaphors in the Arabic subtitling of English TV series, *Cogent Social Sciences, 9*(1), 1-21. http://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2231622

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shariq, M. (2013). Borrowing, code mixing and hybridization of English words in communication among the workers of Moradabad brass industry. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics*, *6*, 223-232. https://linguistics.uok.edu.in/Files/f6ec3740-422d-4ac1-9f52-ddfe2cffcb28/Journal/1b6a6b95-7dc2-462d-9db8-4925ac5f183d.pdf

Shariq, M. (2020). Tools and techniques used in the language of advertisements: The linguistic perspective. *Media Watch, 11*(3), 565-580. http://doi.org/10.15655/mw/2020/11092020

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students.* London: Rutledge.

Skorupa, P., & Dubovičienė, T. (2015). Linguistic characteristics of commercial and social advertising slogans. *Santalka: Filologija, Edukologija / Coactivity: Philology, Educology. 23*(2), 108-118. http://doi.org/10.3846/cpe.2015.275

Solopova, O. A., Nilsen, D., & Nilsen, A. (2023). The image of Russia through animal metaphors: A diachronic case study of American media discourse. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 27*(3), 521–542. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-35048

===
Language in India www.languageinindia.com**ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 25:8 August 2025**
Mohammad Shariq, Ph.D.
The Use of Animal Metaphors for Humans: A Discourse Analysis of Indian Urdu Speakers'
Daily Interactions   193

Silaški, N. R. (2011). Animal metaphors in some business-related terms in English. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Istočnom Sarajevu, 13*(1), 565-576. https://studylib.net/doc/8094690/animal-metaphors-in-some-business

Sommer, R., & Sommer, B. A. (2011). Zoomorphy: Animal metaphors for human personality. *Anthrozoös: A multidisciplinary journal of the interactions of people and animals,* 24(3), 237-248. http://doi.org/10.2752/175303711X13045914865024

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D (Educational Research Methods Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Approaches).* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Talebinejad, M. R., & and Dastjerdi, H. V. (2005). A cross-cultural study of animal metaphors: When owls are not wise! *Metaphor and Symbol, 20*(2): 133–150. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2002_3

Tran, B. (2022). Universality vs. cultural specificity of anger metaphors and metonymies in English and Vietnamese idioms. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 26*(1): 74–94. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-24951