Olga Iakovleva, Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Poland
Mojca Kumin Horvat, Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Slovenia

Phraseological Units with a Zoonym Component Motivated by Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

The article discusses Russian, Polish and Slovenian phraseological units containing the names of animals (zoonyms). The aim of the study is to determine to what extent the stereotyped image of animals, fixed in phraseological units, corresponds to contemporary knowledge about the behaviour of animals. An analysis of phraseological units concerning a cow, bull, calf, ox, goat, sheep and ram is conducted. A comparison of these phraseologies with contemporary data on animal behaviour reveals a certain discrepancy between the actual intellectual and psychological capacities of animals and their image fixed in phraseological units.

Keywords: phraseological units, zoonym, animals, lexicography, semantics, stereotypes

1. Introduction: defining phraseological units and specifying the aim of the study

Words denoting animals belong to one of the most ancient layers of vocabulary in many languages of the world. The animalistic vocabulary and phraseology reflect centuries of human observation of animals, their external features, and behaviour. Through comparison with animals, people comprehend themselves. A manifestation of anthropomorphism as a form of mastering reality is the transfer of human properties to inanimate objects and the nature, including animals. Indeed, certain distinctive features of animals and characteristics of their behaviour man has transferred to his notion of self. Animals, in turn, have been endowed with human qualities.

It is animalistic phraseological units which reflect human observations of the behaviour, habits, and external features of animals. They are the perception of the animal world that has been formed over a long period of time. Phraseological units with a zoonym component are traditionally the focus of the scientific interest of many researchers. Especially relevant are the studies of the relationship

Olga Iakovleva, Katedra Lingwistyki Stosowanej, Wydział Filologiczny, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, ul. Sowińskiego 17, 20-040 Lublin, Phone: 0048815372664, olga.iakovleva@mail.umcs.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5124-6412
Mojca Kumin Horvat, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Novi trg 2, 1000 Ljubljana, mhorvat@zrc-sazu.si, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3235-4909

between language and culture, national and cultural specificity on the material of phraseological nominations (Babaeva, 2020; Dashieva, 2018; Filimonova, 2003; Koletnik, 2022; Lavrishheva et al., 2019; Nowakowska, 1991; Piasecka, 2018; Shustova et al., 2020; Skitina, 2007; Spajić, 2015; Vovk, 2007; Wtorkowska, 2014; Yakovleva, 2017), and the determination of universal and specific features in the linguistic picture of the world. It is worth noting that zoomorphic phraseonominations constitute a significant part of the phraseological composition of the Russian, Polish and Slovenian languages. For the purpose of our study, we adhere to a broad understanding of phraseological unit which was defined by Teliya in the encyclopedia *Russian Language*, edited by Karaulov:

> Phraseological unit is a common name for semantically unfree word combinations that are not produced in speech (as syntactic structures similar in form – word combinations or sentences), but are reproduced in it in a usually fixed steady relation of semantic content and certain lexico-grammatical composition. (Karaulov, 1997, p. 605)

In this paper, we attempt to consider some chosen phraseological units with the zoonym component in the aspect of cognitive ethology. The aim of the article is twofold: (i) to analyse a few carefully selected examples of Russian, Polish and Slovenian phraseological units containing the names of animals in terms of their lexical composition, and (ii) to determine how the ideas about animals recorded in phraseological units correspond to the empirical data about the behaviour as well as mental and cognitive abilities of these animals. Our purpose is to focus, primarily, on the intellectual abilities of animals, by which we mean such cognitive properties as memory, thinking, attention, perception, imagination and the ability to solve various kinds of problems.

The paper consists of four main parts. Having specified the aim of the research as well as the definition of phraseological units (Section 1), we proceed to introduce the details concerning the database and methodology of the research (Section 2). In the following part of the article (Sections 3), the results of the study are revealed and discussed. The paper closes with concluding remarks and a brief summary (Section 4).

2. Database and methodology of the study

The database of the research chosen for our investigation comprises of the phraseological units and expressions connected with the zoonym component of a cow, a bull, calf, ox, a goat, a sheep and a ram. The reason behind selecting the lexical units denoting these particular animals is that they are among the most popular types of livestock. Sheep and cattle are among the oldest domestic animals, having been kept since the early Stone Age (Keber, 1996, p. 265). The choice of these animals is also motivated by the fact that they have been part of the human world for millennia, thanks to which a lot of experience in observing their features, behaviour and habits has been gained.

The phraseological units have been extracted from numerous monolingual dictionaries. First, *Большой фразеологический словарь русского языка* [Bol`shoj frazeologicheskij slovar` russkogo yazy`ka] edited by Teliya (henceforth: *BFSRY*), which contains over 1500 thousand fixed expressions and phraseological units, presented in figurative and semantic networks and provided with stylistic labels. Second, *Словарь русской фразеологии* [Slovar` russkoj frazeologii] by Birikh, Mokiyenko and Stepanova (henceforth: *SRF*), which includes over 2500 thousand fixed expressions, each with their historical and etymological interpretation accompanied by a bibliographical reference. In addition, the modern meaning of phraseology is explained in here and its stylistic colouring is described. Third, *Большой словарь русских поговорок* [Bol`shoj slovar` russkix pogovorok] by Mokiyenko and Nikitina (henceforth: *BSRP*), comprising over 40,000 Russian proverbs, reflecting the literary and folk speech of the 19th-21st centuries. The material is collected from various sources, in particular, Russian folklore, works of classical and modern literature, mass media, records of modern speech. Fourth, Kuznetsov's *Большой толковый словарь русского языка* [Bol`shoj tolkovy`j slovar` russkogo yazy`ka] (henceforth: *BTSRY*) was also used in this work. A total of 169 phraseological units were analysed.

Fifth, the Polish dictionary in four volumes, edited by Stanisław Dubisz (2006), is entitled *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* [Dictionary of Polish language] (henceforth: *USJP*). Sixth, the Polish *Słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Polish Language], in two volumes, is edited by Stanisław Skorupka (2002) (henceforth: *SFJP*). Seventh, the Polish *Wielki słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego* [The Great Phraseological Dictionary of the Polish Language] is edited by Piotr Müldner-Nieckowski (2003) (henceforth: *WSFJP*). A total of 207 phraseological units were analysed.

Eight, the Slovenian Dictionary *Slovar slovenskih frazemov* (Keber, 2011) (henceforth: *SSF*), is edited by Janez Keber. Ninth, Slovenian book *Živali v prispodobah 1* (henceforth: *ŽP1*), is edited by Janez Keber (1996). Tenth, the dictionary *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika 2* [Dictionary of the Slovenian standard language 2 in two volumes] (henceforth: *SSKJ2/1* and *SSKJ2/2*), published in 1994, second updated edition in 2014 (retrieved www.fran.si), is a general monolingual dictionary of the Slovenian language. A total of 182 phraseological units were analysed.

Our study consists of three main stages, namely (i) selection of the material; (ii) lexical analysis of the phraseological units; and (iii) semantic analysis of the phrasemes under scrutiny. The selection of the material has been carried out by the method of continuous sampling of phraseological units, which include a zoonym component. Besides, the descriptive method, the method of component analysis, and the method of semantic analysis of the given dictionary definitions is used in the work, in order to investigate to what extent the ideas about animals encoded in

the phraseological units reflect the empirical data about the behaviour as well as mental and cognitive abilities of these animals.

3. Results and discussion

The semantics of animalistic phraseological expressions is mostly revealed in the stereotypical ideas about animals, which are often based on a subjective assessment of their qualities and properties. A stereotype is a simplified judgment about some fragment of the surrounding reality. Stereotyping the image of animals, and attributing certain properties and qualities to them is associated with the human desire to generalize, and simplify the process of cognition of the surrounding reality (Piętkowa, 2007, p. 104)). In this connection, zoo-phraseological phrases are reflected not only in the objective judgments based on human experience in joint living and communicating with animals, but also in features, and characteristics that are subjectively attributed to animals.

At the same time, the image of animals in phraseological expressions is often endowed with negative features, which has been pointed out by many researchers (De`ngi, 2002; Piasecka, 2018; Rak, 2007; Zimnowoda, 2003; among many others). The formation of a predominantly negative image of animals could be influenced by the idea of human superiority over animals, as well as a purely objective attitude to domesticated animals used by man in economic activity. In the phraseology, we find numerous examples confirming the cruel treatment of animals, e.g. the example from Russian *нагруженный (навьюченный) как осел* [about a very heavily loaded person] (*BSRP*, p. 469), *драть (лупить, бить, пороть) как сидорову козу* [to flog, trash something cruelly, unmercifully] (*SRF*, p. 270), as well as the examples from the Polish language: *kto chce psa uderzyć, (ten) zawsze kij się znajdzie* [if you want to hit a dog, a stick will be found] (*WSFJP*, p. 527) or *spiąć konia (ostrogą)* [pin the horse down (with a spur)] (p. 319), and the Slovenian language: *delati (garati) kot vol/ črna živina* [work very hard] (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 1141; *SSF,* p. 1143, *ŽP1*, p. 59) or *neumen kakor konj* [stupid as a horse] (*SSF*, p. 362) and *tepsti koga kot vola* [to treat heavily on someone] (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 917). Such an attitude toward animals, as a rule, is accompanied by attributing negative qualities to them, denying their ability to think and feel.

What is more, human perception of the psyche and intelligence of animals has evolved along with their knowledge of the surrounding reality. For a long time, it was believed that the behaviour of animals was limited to instincts and reaction to external stimuli, and true thinking was purely a human attribute. This perspective has its roots in the philosophy of Aristotle. (Vičar, 2013) Scientific views on the intellectual capacities of animals have, however, undergone significant changes over the centuries. In the last century, there was a transition from the absolute denial of the rudiments of reason in animals, to the recognition of the existence of the elements of thinking, manifested in different forms. The animal-oriented

studies involve various ethical aspects related to determining the dependence of empathy for animals or their consciousness, their level of intelligence, the use of animals for various research purposes, the treatment and conditions of farming, the need to revise the methods of studying animals in laboratories, etc. (Bekoff, 2010; Gómez-Leal et al., 2021; Sandøe et al., 2015; Singer, 2018; Young et al., 2018). Along with these impressive studies, the number of applied research aimed at studying the cognitive and behavioural features of animals in the context of their impact on the productivity of the livestock industry is constantly increasing (Blokhuis et al., 1998; De la Lama et al., 2019; Foster et al., 1997; Nawroth, 2017; Nowicki et al., 2015; Rørvang et al., 2018). At the same time, researchers are increasingly talking about the need to study the cognitive abilities of animals without regard to humans as the main reference point, with whose higher mental functions the properties of animals are historically compared. For example, the famous biologist and ethologist Marc Bekoff (2010) speaks of the necessity to change the scientific paradigm by revising the stereotypes related to the perception of the emotional lives of animals. A change in approach, according to Bekoff (2010), can remove such oppositions as 'us – them', 'laboratory – home', 'higher beings – lower beings'. In fact, over the last decades, the fields of ethology, zoo-psychology and comparative psychology have gathered a wealth of information about the cognitive abilities, learning, cognition, emotions and social complexity of animals; while new approaches are being developed, experimental studies of animal behaviour are actively conducted, and new data are constantly being accumulated. Nevertheless, in the field of animal cognitive abilities research, the main attention of scientists is still focused on the species characterized by relatively large brains (Reader et al., 2002; Tomasello & Call, 1997). The cognitive abilities of domestic farm animals are studied to a lesser extent and require further research.

As far as our first investigated animal study case is concerned, *cows*, often referred to as cattle or bullocks, are the most common species of domestic, cloven-hoofed ruminants of the *Bos taurus* species. Humans have been using cattle for centuries in various economic activities as draft labour, for milk, meat and hides. Under its appearance, the bull traditionally symbolizes strength, power and health, which is reflected in the following phraseological units: in Russian *здоров, как бык* (*BTSRY*, p. 107), in Polish *tosту, tęgi, wielki jak byk* (*SFJP1*, p. 125; *USJP1*, p. 360) and in Slovenian *močan kot bik* (*SSF*, p. 73), *močen ko bik* (*SSKJ2/1*, p. 129), *bosti se z bikom* (*SSF*, p. 73) – all refer to a person, usually a man, being in very good health, completely (healthy); hence, as healthy as a horse, bull (an ox), a man of sound health. The bull also symbolizes hard physical labour, as illustrated in the Russian phraseme: *работать как вол* [to work excessively, indefatigably, to work very hard, with zeal and obedience, to work like an ox (a horse, a mule, a dog] (*SRF*, p. 94). The equivalent (already

mentioned) Polish expression is: *pracować (harować, tyrać, orać) jak wół*, or
wół roboczy [to work very hard, especially physically] (*SFJP2*, pp. 606–607;
USJP4, p. 497), and the equivalent Slovenian phraseme is: *delati (garati) kot
vol* (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 917) or *zgrabiti bika za roge* [to take on difficult, demanding
work] (*SSKJ2/1*, p. 129). At the same time, the cognitive and emotional capacity
of the cow was denied; whereas low intellectual capacities were attributed to the
animal. Later on, such negative characteristics were transferred to mankind. In
the Russian language, there are phraseological units with the zoonym component,
which mean a stupid, limited person: *комольный бык* [komol – bull], to describe
a stubborn person or a stupid, unintelligent person (*BSRP*, p. 68). It should be
noted that both in Polish and Slovenian an ox can be used to describe a slow,
stupid, dull, unintelligent man who is hard to figure something out (*ti si vol*;
s takim volom se ne da pogovarjati (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 917); *zabit kot vol* (*SSF*, p.
1049); *kot tele se je rodil, kot vol umrl* (*ŽP1*, p. 99). This is also evidenced by
phraseological units occurring in both languages: *gapić się (patrzeć) (na kogoś,
na coś) jak wół na malowane wrota* (*SFJP2*, p. 607; *USJP4*, pp. 510–511), and
gledati kot / kakor zaboden vol / bik (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 917) or *zijati kot bik v nova
vrata* (*SSF*, p. 74) which mean 'to look like a slaughtered ox / bull, and look
at someone or something thoughtlessly, dully, stupidly or with surprise'. The
component *теленок*, *телячий* [calf], *телячьи нежности, телячий восторг*
[calf tenderness, calf delight] in Russian phraseological units symbolize naivety
and childishness, and sloppy (mushy) sentimentality.

Furthermore, the misconception about the behavioural characteristics of
the bull is reflected in the well-known, frequently used speech phraseology,
which in Russian sounds: *действовать /подействовать на кого как на
быка красная тряпка* (*SRF*, p. 63), in Polish *działać (podziałać) na kogoś jak
(niczym) (czerwona) płachta na byka* (*SFJP1*, p. 125; *USJP3*, p. 177), and in
Slovenian *to ga draži kot rdeča ruta bika* (*SSKJ2/2*, p. 129), all of which may
be translated as 'acting like a red rag to a bull' to refer to something annoying,
and bringing someone out of temper. In fact, the meaning of this phrases does
not correspond to reality, as the eyes of bulls do not perceive red colour per
se. Bulls react, first of all, to sharp movements, and the colour of the object
does not play a determining role (Adamczyk et al., 2015). Also, as noticed, the
collective noun *быдло* [ox] or Slovenian *govedo*, originally denoting 'cattle', in
all the investigated languages, has negative connotations and is used to pertain
to people, spiritually undeveloped, stupid, submissive to the will of others and
spending their lives in hard, exhausting work for someone (*BTSRY*, p. 107;
SSKJ2/1, p. 408). The zoonym *bully* is a component part of Polish phraseological
units used to refer to stupid, spiritually undeveloped people: (*bezmyślne, głupie,
nierozumne, skończone) bydlę* (*WSFJP*, p. 99) [fool, scoundrel], *żyć jak bydlę*
(p. 99) [immoral, debauched].

In contradistinction to the meaning denoted in the already mentioned phraseological units, the results of studies concerning cattle ethology show that cows, in particular, have a good memory, including long-term memory (Kovalčik & Kovalčik, 1986) and spatial memory (Hirata et al., 2016). In addition, they can learn and remember, perform complex analyses and synthesize environmental stimuli and form higher-order reflexes, and hold the ability to perceive spatial sensations and apply previous experience in a new situation (Skopichev, 2016). In addition, cows can distinguish between individual individuals in the herd, real objects and pictures that show only cattle heads (Coulon et al., 2009, 2011; Hagen & Broom, 2011). Moreover, they need intercommunication, display emotions, empathy and an individual character (Young, 2003). Cattle (bulls) are capable and aware of much more than has long been assumed.

The second animal under scrutiny, namely, a goat (*Capra hircus*) is a domestic ruminant of the semipedal family. The animal produces milk, meat, wool, fur and skin. As in the previous case, among the phraseological phrases with the zoonym goat, we find the evidence of how a person, being in a close contact with animals for a long time, has recognised the primarily useful, valuable qualities of the animal. In turn, lack of such qualities has been evaluated by a person negatively. For example, the phraseme in Russian such as *как от козла молока (ни шерсти ни молока)* [from goat's milk] [neither wool nor milk] means that someone or something is of absolutely no use, or help etc. This phraseme reflects the ancient assessment of the goat, which in popular opinion, is useless, in comparison with other animals. Subsequently, this negative assessment of a goat has been transferred to humankind, as reflected in the phraseme *как от козла молока* which refers to someone, something useless, not bringing the slightest benefit in some respect (*SRF*, p. 275) or similar Slovenian *s konja se je usedel na kozo* [to perish, to become poor] (*ŽP1*, p. 175). Generally speaking, phraseological units with the zoonym goat component have a pejorative connotative colouring. The lexeme *козел* and *kozel* [goat] is also used in Russian and Slovenian as a metaphorical characteristic of a man who is irritating by his persistent stupidity (*BTSRY*, p. 437; *SSKJ2/*1, p. 655). Indeed, the goat serves as a symbol of stupidity and stubbornness, as evidenced by such phraseological units as *упрямый козел* [as obstinate as a goat], which is used to talk about a stubborn, intractable person (*BSRP*, p. 296). Likewise, the Polish phraseme *uparty jak kozioł* underlies one's obstinate character. Yet, it is worth adding that one's stubbornness is much more frequently associated with a donkey or an ox; hence, the Polish phrase *uparty jak osioł / wół / muł*, with its Slovenian equivalent *trmast kot / kakor (istrski) osel / mula*, (*SSF*, pp. 564, 648), describes a very stubborn, persistent, and tenacious person who sticks to his/her opinion and plans (though he/she is not necessarily right) and does not give up, in Slovenian also describes a person or a thing, which has a very unpleasant smell – *smrdi kot kozel* (*SSKJ2/1*, p. 655).

Furthermore, the image of a goat in Russian, Polish and Slovenian phraseological units is motivated not only by long experience in observing the animal's behaviour, but also by the ancient stereotype of a goat as an unclean animal having some demonic power. In addition, mention of the goat can be found as early as in biblical texts, particularly in connection with the devil and as an offering in the Old Testament. So, for example, the Hebrew rite of laying the sins of all the people on a live goat is reflected in the phraseology *козел отпущения* (*BFSRY*, p. 331) a person or group blamed for the faults or misdeeds of others, which refers to a scapegoat, and a whipping boy, or a responder for another's guilt, for the mistakes of others. In Polish the expression *kozioł ofiarny* (*WSFJP*, p. 325), with its Slovenian equivalent phraseme *grešni / žrtveni kozel* (*SSF*, p. 386), is used with the same meaning.

Interestingly, the Slovenian language associates a goat also with blundering, as in the phraseme *ustreliti kozla*, *streljati kozle* (*SSF*, p. 387; *SSKJ2/1*, p. 655). The Slovenian expression may be occasionally used in Polish as *ustrzelić kozła* or *strzelać kozły*. Nonetheless, in Polish, the more frequent phrase reflecting this sense sounds *palnąć (strzelić) byka* (*SFJP1,* p. 125; *USJP3*, p. 20), rooted in original variety *bąka ustrzelić*, which pertains to one's foolishness, blunder, saying or writing something preposterous or acting imprudently, imprudently, and recklessly.

Having compared the meaning and concept of goat retrieved on the ground of the so-discussed phraseological units with the studies in the field of goat ethology and cognitive abilities, we can conclude that, in contrast to the image of being stubborn and unclean (as fixed in the expressions), goats have good long-term memory (Langbein et al., 2004, 2008). These animals have developed spatial orientation, can recognise people and establish complex social groups and dominance hierarchies (Aldezabal & Garin, 2000; O'Brien, 1988; Zobel & Nawroth, 2020). They can use basic forms of social learning (Briefer et al., 2014), distinguish colours and shapes of objects, have high taste, tactile and temperature sensitivity (Skopichev, 2016).

The last of the examined animals, i.e. sheep, (*Ovis ammon aries*) belongs to domesticated ruminants of the ram family of the semipedal family. Like goats, sheep (rams) are bred for meat, milk and wool. The phraseology of the Russian, Slovenian and Polish languages reflects the popular idea of sheep as animals with low intellectual abilities. The zoonym *баран* in Russian, *baran* in Polish [ram] is a standard for stupidity and a stupid, stubborn man (*BTSRY*, p. 59), but in Slovenian is a female form *ovca* (*SSKJ2/1*, p. 1122). The phraseological unit *глуп как баран* in Russian, with its equivalents in Polish *głupi jak baran* and in Slovenian, *neumen kot ovca*, is literally translated as 'as stupid as a ram / sheep and is commonly used to characterise a stupid, limited person (*SRF*, p. 42, *ŽP1*, p. 269).

Interestingly, in the Russian phrase *как баран на новые ворота (смотреть)* [to look, stare in utter confusion, understanding nothing] (*BFSRY*, p. 289), the

zoonym ram is used. However, the same meaning is generated in Slovenian while referring to a bull, as in the expression *gledati kakor bik v nova vrata* (*SSKJ2/1*, p. 129), i.e. to look like a slaughtered bull, to look like a bull at a new door, with the meaning 'to look stupidly or with surprise'. In the same sense, we will use in Polish the connection with the component calf, as in the phrase *patrzeć jak cielę* lub *patrzeć jak cielę na malowane wrota* [to look like a calf] or [to look like a calf at a painted door] (*USJP4*, pp. 510–511), which also occurs in Slovenian *gledati kot tele v nova vrata* (*SSF*, p. 74; *SSKJ2/2,* p. 727), and, as Janez Keber (2011, p. 74) claims, it is even more popular.

Moreover, a sheep (ram) is also associated with 'unquestioning obedience'. It is known that sheep succumb to the influence of the leader in the flock, they are attentive to imitate other individuals. This feature of sheep is reflected in the phrase *стадо баранов* in Russian, *stado baranów* in Polish, and *čreda ovac* in Slovenian, which means a 'herd of rams / sheep' and describes a disorderly crowd, and people who madly and blindly follow someone's deeds and actions; in Slovenian also in phraseme *iti za kom kot ovca za ovnom* (*BTSRY*, p. 59; *SSKJ2/1*, p. 1122).

Remarkably, if a sheep is separated from the flock for some reason, it will try to return to it as quickly as possible (Kluczek, 1994). In this respect, the well-known sheep-related phrase, i.e. *заблудшая овца* (*овечка*) in Russian, *zagubiona owca (owieczka)* in Polish, and *izgubljena / zablodela ovca* in Slovenian (*SSF*, p. 654), refers to a person who has strayed from a righteous way of life, is 'a lost sheep' and designates a person who has separated from his/her circle and family. The image of the lost sheep is found in the Gospel parable, which tells of Jesus Christ as The Good Shepherd who lost one sheep from His flock. The Shepherd found the lost and carried it back on His shoulders (*SRF*, p. 414). Originally, this expression had only a religious meaning of a lost sheep, pertaining to someone who had strayed from God, strayed from the flock, whose Shepherd is Jesus Christ. Such a person can get back if they come to the true faith again (*BFSRY*, p. 214).

These already elaborated phrases with the sheep zoonym seem not to correlate with the results of the studies of the cognitive abilities of sheep. To be precise, the results obtained reveal that sheep can distinguish the colour and shape of objects, use specific facial signals to distinguish species and breeds, as well as males and females (Kendrick et al., 1995). These animals have a developed ability to learn (Marino & Merskin, 2019), display self-identification and reveal orientation memory, and, as a species, are distinguished by the average development of mental abilities (Skopichev, 2016). Sheep have a highly socialized herd instinct, and group life is the most important innate characteristic of these animals (Bazewicz et al., 2018).

4. Conclusions

To sum up, the purely utilitarian approach of man to domesticated farm animals has contributed to his distancing from them. In the process of exploiting animals,

the man paid attention first of all to those qualities that he considered important, and valuable (for example, physical strength, endurance, fecundity, etc.). Of great importance is the goal that man pursued in the process of domestication of animals. In our opinion, the possible influence of domestication on the cognitive abilities of farm animals (in comparison with their wild relatives) deserves a detailed study.

The names of animals in phraseological units serve as symbols, etalons of certain human qualities, creating a figurative, emotionally expressive characteristic of man. The phraseological units reflect both the experience of observing the behaviour and habits of animals, which reveals objective reality, and the subjective perceptions of the collective linguistic consciousness. Among the analysed phraseological units with the zoonym components of a cow, a goat and a sheep, phraseological units with negative connotations prevail. While farm animals are presented as creatures with low intellectual abilities. Scientific research data on these species of domesticated animals, in contrast, indicate that they have developed advanced cognitive, emotional and social abilities.

References

Adamczyk, K., Górecka-Bruzda, A., Nowicki, J., Gumułka, M., Molik, E., Schwarz, T., & Klocek, C. (2015). Perception of environment in farm animals. A review. *Annals of Animal Science*, *15*, 565–589. https://doi.org/10.1515/aoas-2015-0031

Aldezabal, A., & Garin, I. (2000). Browsing preference of feral goats (Capra hircus L.) in a Mediterranean mountain scrubland. *Journal of Arid Environments*, *44*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.1006/jare.1999.0573

Babaeva, R. (2020). Zoolexemes and Zoo-Phraseological Units in the German and Russian Political Discourses. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 53–62. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.08.7

Bazewicz, K., Garbarz, W., Janicka, K., & Bojar, W. (2018). Czy jagnięta podczas zabawy uczą się zachowań przydatnych w przyszłości? In W. Chabuz, & B. Nowakowicz-Dębek (Eds.), *Aktualne problemy w produkcji zwierzęcej* (pp. 19–26). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczego w Lublinie.

Bekoff, M. (2010). *O zakochanych psach i zazdrosnych małpach. Emocjaonalne życie zwierząt.* Znak.

Birix, A., Mokienko, V., & Stepanova, L. (1998). *Slovar` russkoj frazeologii. Istoriko-e`timologicheskij spravochnik.* Folio-Press.

Blokhuis, H., Hopster, H., Geverink, N. A., Korte, S. M., & van Reenen C. G. (1998). Studies of Stress in Farm Animals. *Comparative Haematology International*, *8*, 94–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02642498

Briefer, E., Haque, S., Baciadonna, L., & McElligott, G.A. (2014). Goats excel at learning and remembering a highly novel cognitive task. *Frontiers in Zoology*, *11*, 11–20. https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-9994-11-20

Coulon, M., Deputte, B., Heyman, Y., & Baudoin, C. (2009). Individual recognition in domestic cattle (Bos taurus): evidence from 2D-images of heads from different breeds. *PLoS ONE*, *4*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0004441

Coulon, M., Heyman, Y., & Deputte, B. (2011). Cattle discriminate between familiar and conspecifics by using only head visual cues. *Animal Cognition*, *14*(2), 279–290. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-010-0361-6

Dashieva, S. (2018). Animalisticheskie frazeologizmy` russkogo, buryatskogo i kitajskogo yazy`kov v kontekste kul`tury`. *Filologiya: nauchny`e issledovaniya, 1*, 59–65. https://doi.org/10.7256/2454-0749.2018.1.25342

De la Lama, G. C. M., Pascual-Alonso, M., Angélica Aguayo-Ulloa, L., Sepúlveda, W., Villarroel, M., & Levrino, G. A. M. (2019). Social personality in sheep: can social strategies predict individual differences in cognitive abilities, morphology features, and reproductive success? *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, *31*, 82–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2019.03.005

De`ngi, A. (2002). *Frazeologizmy` s animalisticheskim komponentom v russkom yazy`ke: s pozicii nositelya vengerskogo yazy`ka:* avtoreferat dissertacii kandidata filologicheskix nauk, Moskva.

Dubisz, S., (Ed.). (2006). *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* (Vols. 1–4). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Ermakova, E., & Fajzullina, G. (2019). Russkie i tatarskie frazeologizmy` s komponentom-zoonimom kak istochnik lingvokul`turnoj informacii. *Nauchny`j vestnik Kry`ma*, *1*(19), 1–8.

Filimonova, T. (2003). Primerjalna analiza slovenskih in ruskih frazemov z živalskimi poimenovanji. In E. Kržišnik (Ed.), *Slovenski knjižni jezik – aktualna vprašanja in zgodovinske izkušnje*; *Obdobja, 20* (pp. 447–453). Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik pri Oddelku za slovenistiko Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana.

Foster, T. M.. & Temple, W. (1997). Behavior Analysis and Farm Animal Welfare. *The Behavior Analyst*, *20*, 87–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03392766

Gómez-Leal, R., Costa, A., Megías-Robles, A., Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Faria, L. (2021). Relationship between emotional intelligence and empathy towards humans and animals. *PeerJ, 9*(4),1–19. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11274

Hagen, K., & Broom, D. (2011). Cattle discriminate between individual familiar herd members in a learning experiment. *Applied Animal Behavior Science*, *82*(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(03)00053-4

Hirata, M., Tomita, C., & Yamada, K. (2016). Use of a maze test to assess spatial learning and memory in cattle: Can cattle traverse a complex maze? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *180*, 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2016.04.004.

Karaulov, Y. (1997). *Russkij yazy`k. E`nciklopediya.* Drofa.

Keber, J. (1996). *Živali v prispodobah 1*. Mohorjeva družba.

Keber, J. (2011). *Slovar slovenskih frazemov*. Založba ZRC.

Kendrick, K., Atkins, K., Hinton, M., Broad, K., Fabre-Nys, C., & Keverne, B. (1995). Facial and vocal discrimination in sheep. *Animal behaviour*, *49*, 1665–1676. https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(95)90088-8.

Kluczek, J. (1994). *Behawior owiec.* Bydgoskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Koletnik, M. (2022). Primerjalni narečni živalski frazemi na stičišču kultur. *Slovenščina kot drugi in tuji jezik v izobraževanju* (pp. 139–155). Univerzitetna založba Univerze v Mariboru. https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.12.2022.10

Kovalčik, K., & Kovalčik M. (1986). Learning ability and memory testing in cattle of different ages. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *15*, 27–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(86)90019-5

Kuzneczov, S. (2002). *Bol`shoj tolkovy`j slovar` russkogo yazy`ka.* Norint.

Langbein, J., Nürnberg, G., & Manteuffel, G. (2004). Visual discrimination learning in dwarf goats and associated changes in heart rate and heart rate variability. *Physiology & Behavior*, *82*, 601–609. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.05.007

Langbein, J., Siebert, K., & Nuernberg, G. (2008). Concurrent recall of serially learned visual discrimination problems in dwarf goats (Capra hircus). *Behavioural Processes*, *79*, 156–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2008.07.004

Lavrishcheva, E., Abros`kina, N., & Ostrouxova, A. (2019). Nacional`naya specifika frazeologizmov s komponentom-zoonimom v nemeczkoj i anglijskoj yazy`kovoj kartine mira. *Vestnik Volzhskogo universiteta imeni V.N. Tatishheva*, *2* (pp. 40–47). Volzhskij universitet imeni V.N. Tatishheva.

Marino, L., & Merskin, D. (2019). Intelligence, complexity, and individuality in sheep. *Animal Sentience*, *25*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1374

Mokienko, V., & Nikitina, T. (2007). *Bol`shoj slovar` russkix pogovorok*. OLMA Media Grupp.

Nawroth, C. (2017). Invited review: Socio-cognitive capacities of goats and their impact on human–animal interactions. *Small Ruminant Research, 150*, 70–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2017.03.005

Nowakowska, A. (1991). Obraz świata zwierząt we frazeologii polskiej i francuskiej. *Poradnik językowy*, *9-10*, 361–368.

Nowicki, J., Schwarz, T., Olczak, K., Świerkosz, S., & Tuz, R. (2015). Environmental enrichment in pig farming and tail-biting behaviour according to council directive 2008/120/EC. *Wiadomości Zootechniczne*, *53*(2), 103–111.

O'Brien, P. (1988). Feral goat social organization: a review and comparative analysis. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 21*, 209–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(88)90110-4

Piasecka, A. (2018). *Językowe portrety zwierząt hodowlanych w przestrzeni semantyczno-kulturowej polszczyzny i ruszczyzny (na materiale frazeologii)*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Piętkowa, R. (2007). Językowy obraz świata i stereotypy a nauczanie języka obcego. In A. Achtelik, & J. Tambor (Eds.), *Sztuka czy rzemiosło? Nauczyć Polski i polskiego* (pp. 85–104). Wydawnictwo Gnome.

Rak, M. (2007). *Językowo-kulturowy obraz zwierząt utrwalony w animalistycznej frazeologii gwar Gór Świętokrzyskich i Podtatrza (na tle porównawczym)*. Scriptum.

Reader, S., Kevin, M., & Laland, N. (2002). Social intelligence, innovation, and enhanced brain size in primates. *PNAS*, *99*(7), 4436–4441. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.062041299

Rørvang, M., Herskin, V. M., & Bak Jensen, M. (2018). The motivation-based calving facility: Social and cognitive factors influence isolation seeking behaviour of Holstein dairy cows at calving. *PLoS ONE, 13*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191128

Sandøe, P., Corr, S., & Palmer, C. (2015). *Companion Animal Ethics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Shustova, S., & Tyapugina, A. (2020). Animalizmy` v russkoj i anglijskoj lingvokul`turax. *Evrazijskij gumanitarny`j zhurnal*, *3*, 45–53.

Singer, P. (2018). *Wyzwolenie zwierząt*. Marginesy.

Skitina, N. (2007). *Lingvo-kognitivny`j analiz frazeologicheskix edinicz s zoonimny`m komponentom: na materiale russkogo, anglijskogo i nemeczkogo yazy`kov*: avtoreferat dissertacii kandidata filologicheskix nauk, Moskva.

Skopichev, V. (2016). *Povedenie zhivotny`x*. Lan'.

Skorupka, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika 2, *druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja*. Založba ZRC.

Spajić, I. (2015). *Idioms with animals in English and Croatian*. Završni rad.

Teliya, V. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya: semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij i lingvokul`turologicheskij aspekty`*. Yazy`ki russkoj kul`tury`.

Teliya, V. (2009). *Bol`shoj frazeologicheskij slovar` russkogo yazy`ka*. AST-press.

Tomasello, M., & Call, J. (1997). *Primate Cognition*. Oxford Univiversity Press.

Vičar, B. (2013). Primerjava zagovora živali v Plutarhovi razpravi Uživanju mesa in v Sheleyevem Zagovoru naravne prehrane. *Keria: studia Latina et Graeca*, *1*(15), 133–147.

Vovk, N. (2007). Semantika i funkcii frazeologicheskix edinicz s komponentom "koshka" v russkom yazy`ke (v sopostavlenii s ukrainskim yazy`kom). *Ucheny`e zapiski Tavricheskogo universiteta*, Nauchny`j zhurnal, Seriya Filologiya, *20*(59), 49–56.

Wtorkowska, M. (2014). Porównanie polskich i słoweńskich frazeologizmów z komponentem wybranych zwierząt domowych (byka, wołu, krowy i cielęcia). *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Kształcenie polonistyczne cudzoziemców*, *21*, 403–412.

Yakovleva, G. (2017). Zoonimy` kak markery` vokativov v raznostrukturny`x yazy`kax. *Mir lingvistiki i kommunikacii: e`lektronny`j nauchny`j zhurnal. World of Linguistics and Communication,* 40–52. www.tverlingua.ru

Young, A., Khalil, K. A., & Wharton, J. (2018). Empathy for Animals: A Review of the Existing Literature. *Curator the museum journal*, *61*(2), 327–343. https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12257

Young, R. (2003). *The Secret Life of Cows.* Gardners Books.

Zimnowoda, J. (2003). Opozycja homo – animal w ekspresywnych zwrotach językowych. In A. Dąbrowska (Ed.), *Język a Kultura. Opozycja homo — animal w języku i kulturze*, *15* (pp. 103–115). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Zobel, G., & Nawroth, C. (2020). Current state of knowledge on the cognitive capacities of goats and its potential to inform species-specific enrichment. *Small Ruminant Research*, *192*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2020.106208