the Bible, sacred animals, mythological animals, mammals and fish etc), could be distinguished, each one revealing points of interest if analysed either according to the method used above or according to other, perhaps better methods. The major weakness in Leach's and Whaley and Antonelli's theories, is that they cannot be applied universally - not even within one culture, and they do not cater for the exceptions, of which, it appears, there are as many, if not more than non-exceptions. The inherent associations between various animals and people are not symmetrical from one situation to another. It is very difficult to define the status of a rabbit, as it can be somebody's pet, it can be a farm animal and bred for food, it can be a wild animal and hunted, it can also be a pest to farmers when it destroys his crop. Associations of animals with people are also not symmetrical across cultural barriers e.g. whereas in English a young girl is readily referred to as a "chic", in German young girls are often referred to as "Käfer" or "Biene" but not as "Hühnchen" and neither beetles nor bees can be regarded as pets, whereas some people may keep chickens as pets. Another class which cannot be accommodated successfully in the theory are the variations of one animal within a species, depending on whether it is young or old, castrated or sexually intact, male or female. For example:
- dog, bitch, puppy
- sheep, ewe, ram, lamb
- cattle, ox, bull, steer, heifer, cow, calf
- horse, stallion, mare, gelding, filly, foal, colt
- antelope, stag, doe, faun
- fox, vixen, cub

Owing to these variations, it is very presumptuous to state that because a dog is a pet, therefore subservient and a friend of man, people referred to as a dog or bitch or puppy are being positively talked about. This is incorrect. Whaley and Antonelli class horses as farm animals, but horses could be pets, beasts of burden or even wild animals. It cannot be said with regard to any one category, that because horses are farm animals they are often used to express abuse because there is nothing abusive about calling someone a mare, gelding, filly or foal. If horses are classed as pets the only two terms which express affection are "filly" and "foal". If horses are classed as wild animals the category could not accommodate the term "gelding" because wild horses are never gelded. The inconsistency of the theory thus leaves a non-native speaker feeling very insecure as to which terms he can safely use to describe people without having to worry about insulting them. At the same time it would be unfair to lay all the blame on the theories, because no theory would be able to deal satisfactorily with the vast diversity of terminology in this field.
Metaphors and idioms based on animals in German and English

To a large extent native German and English speaking people share similar sentiments regarding pets, farm animals, wild animals and pests, primarily because they share a Western cultural background although not necessarily the same traditions. But, there are very obvious differences which become particularly evident when having to translate terms of affection and abuse based on animals. For instance, there may or may not be a clear, but inconsistent divergence in assigning adjectives (modifiers) from German to English. The "Du ... blöde, dumme, alte, dusselige, verdammt, ... Kuh" can be translated as "stupid, dumb, old, clumsy, damned cow". "Hundemüde" may be translated as "dog tired" but "Lammesfromm" cannot be translated as "lamb pious". It may however, quite safely be regarded as a rule of thumb that the common adjectives such as "dumm, alt, blöd, verdammt, schön, hässlich, widerlich, klein, gross, schnell, langsam etc. remain the same in English. The less common adjectives usually change.

One of the major differences lies in the German speaking people using different animals to describe people than the English speaking do e.g. "Du blöde Gans". In English a stupid person is not described as a goose, but as a donkey or ass, which is however, also common in German. In German it is common to speak of "ein scheues Reh" but not of "eine
scheu Maus", whereas in English "as timid as a deer" and "as timid as a mouse" are interchangeable. (Also "Dreckschwalbe" = "pig").

Another difference between the two languages is the joint noun/adjective construction such as "hundsgemein, hundsmies, katzenfreundlich, saudreckig" which cannot be rendered in the same form in English, as there are no direct equivalents for them in English. They have to be translated in the form of similies e.g. "as dirty as a pig". In other instances similies are translated as similies, but they have to be recoded e.g. "sich fuhlen wie Schwein auf Sofa" and "as happy as a pig in shit". Sometimes the German and English expressions cannot be translated so that both include animals although their pragmatic meanings will be the same e.g. "ein Esel der den anderen Langohr nennt" can be translated as "hypocrite" or "Geier!" as "idiot!" or "alter Ochse!" as "fool!" or "Teigaffe" as "baker". The compound noun construction which is occasionally used in German e.g. Hundeweib, Rindvieh, Hundesau, Charactersistwein etc. is also not found in English ("fishwife" is an exception), and would be best translated by means of the construction making use of the third person: That... of a ... or by the construction "You ...!". The third person construction facilitates (in most cases) the use of two nouns as is the case in German. The [preposition + indefinite article] construction is the only
way of using the two nouns together. In English it is very rare that nouns can be strung together for this purpose. One exception is "grease monkey".

There is one other alternative which may occasionally be used to overcome this translation problem, and that is by means of using the possessive e.g. "she is a fishmonger's wife" or "she could be a polecat's mother". This construction is however not commonly used in English for the purpose of expressing abuse.

Although a translator is often faced with translating non-standard metaphors, this is not as serious a problem as it may sound. Through the use of metaphors we are able to understand one emotion or experience in terms of another, and we can conceptualise one thing by means of its relation to something else. Understanding thus, does not occur in terms of numerous different concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:117). Conventional metaphors structure the ordinary conceptual system of our culture and facilitate understanding of it, but original, imaginative non-conventional metaphors give us a new way of conceptualising a familiar or unfamiliar experience. Metaphors cannot be deemed undesirable on the grounds that they are unconventional. It is therefore quite acceptable for the translator to translate unconventional metaphors literally, whereas a conventional German metaphor should be translated.
by a corresponding conventional English one. A translator must also take into consideration the person who is using the metaphor and what the speaker's social or political attitudes are, for this may have an important bearing on the actual, semantic meaning of the metaphor, which is not always evident at first glance and could be misinterpreted (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:12).

Some of the most fundamental roots and values of a culture are sometimes embedded in a metaphor. "Symbolic metonymies are critical links between everyday experiences and the coherent metaphorical systems that characterise religions and cultures" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:40). They have evolved through time and have, in most cases, carried history along with them, on the basis of which we have been able to reconstruct some of the ancient customs and beliefs. (This is obviously only possible with the conventional culture-based metaphors). Some metaphors and similes have also developed due to the simple reality of a situation e.g. "aussehen wie ein gerupftes Huhn" ("to look like a plucked chicken"). The metaphor is self explanatory. In general both metaphors and similes lend themselves well to translation.
c) Grammatical similarities and differences

i) Epithets

Epithets are terms or words which express a very strong emotional attitude, be it positive or negative. In English epithets can be used on their own e.g. "Bitch!" or "Cow!" but in German, whereas they can be used on their own, they become more acceptable when employed in conjunction with an adjective e.g. "blöde Ziege, dumme Gans, netter Käfer", where the adjective carries the actual semantic content. Women of all ages could be referred to as "Ziege", but in the hypothetical situation of one person reporting an event to another who was not present when the event occurred, the adjective helps to qualify the noun (in this case one designating a woman) thus clarifying the situation for the listener. The use of "dumme Ziege" gives some information on the stupidity of the woman's actions, but "alte Ziege" says that she was not a girl. "widerliche Ziege" says that the person telling of the event found the woman detestable. Epithets in the form: [personal pronoun + common noun] e.g. "You bitch!" exist in both German and English e.g. "Du Miststück!, Du Hexe!, Du Hündin!". Similarly epithets in the form: [personal pronoun + adjective + common noun] exist in both languages: "Sie gottverdammter Hund!" which is readily translatable as "You goddamn bastard!" But in some cases the grammatical compositions of the two languages are not symmetrical. For example in English the con-
structions: "That bitch of a woman" or "That angel of a mother of yours" are quite commonly used, whereas their usage in German would not be conventional. At best, an expression similar to the two mentioned above may be used, but they would not relate to animals. "Dieser Idiot von Mensch!" or "Was eine Perle von Mensch!". One exception would be "Dieses Mistvieh / Schwein von Kerl den sie geheiratet hat...". It would however be completely unacceptable to say "Du Hund von Bruder..."

ii) The use of the common noun as a term of address

With reference to pet names, common nouns are seldom if ever used on their own as proper nouns in German i.e. it is unusual to say to someone "Kälbchen, komm mal mit", as if "Kälbchen" were the person's name. It is however possible to say "Komm mal her mein Kälbchen", where the noun is qualified by a possessive. ("Come here my pet"). Sometimes a continual reference to a person by any noun or adjective, no matter how ridiculous it sounds, can cause that noun or adjective to become a proper noun or a pet name. In German proper nouns can really only be made out of adjectives e.g. a chubby little girl is called "Dicke" ("Fatty"). A stupid little boy could be "Dummerle" or "Pöy" but none of these adjectives used as terms of address can be associated with animals. In English however, this is possible and a few
examples come to mind, some of which are names given to radio, television or comic strip characters Piggy, Porky (in Golding 1970), Bull (in the TV programme "Night Court"), Bully, Ducky, Puppy, Pet, Woolfy, Twit (referring to a bird - originating from bird-brain which means idiot), Dodo, Tit, Kiddo, Kid, Foxy (red haired person), Kitten (see also sex kitten). A few examples from a specifically South African context are: Gogga, Nunu, Dikbek, (one who sulks), Haasbek (toothless person), (Branford 1980). Only a few examples come to mind in German: "Mäuschen", "Spatz", "Haserl" (Austrian dialect).

There are five simple methods of testing whether a term, when applied, is a term of address or a proper noun.

1) "Come here please..." (proper noun)
2) "Come here please my..." (term of address)
3) "You...!" (term of address)
4) "Have you seen..." (proper noun)
5) "Have you seen that...(of a)..." (term of address)

It sounds wrong to say "Kommst du mit Ferkelchen?", therefore the expression is not a proper noun but simply a term of address when it is correctly used: "Kommst du mit mein Ferkelchen?".

iii) Plays on sound and rhyme

There are a few common examples of alliteration and rhyme in English which bear reference to animals e.g. silly
billy, fat cat, legal eagle, rich bitch, love dove, bird brain, busy lizzy, (variation of busy body). This type of alliteration does not exist in German, especially not with reference to animals.

d) The use of diminutives

In German the use of diminutives appears to occur far more frequently than in English, but the reasons for this are unclear. In both English and German the young animal of many animal species is used to express genuine affection towards innocent and harmless beings, usually children e.g. "Kälbchen", "Mäuschen" "Kätzchen" and "lamb", "kid", "kitten", "filly", but from a grammatical point of view the German "Kälbchen" is a diminutive of "Kalb" etc., whereas in English "kitten" is not the diminutive of "kit", and hence the terms "kitten", "lamb" and "filly" are not diminutives. Examples of diminutives are "doggie", "birdie", "mousie" and "duckie", but there are very few diminutives in English, especially with regard to terms of affection and abuse.

In both German and English the use of diminutives or young animals in expressions of affection and abuse can and often does imply sarcasm. The translator should therefore always bear in mind that diminutives have two or three possible meanings, which can only be ascertained in the light of the context in which they are used. Firstly there is the
literal meaning which refers to the actual size of the animal and thus the size of the person (in a term of affection and abuse). Secondly there is the intended meaning which is the emotional meaning, but this can be either affectionate/abusive or sarcastic. In other words people who are compared to small, young animals could in fact find themselves being described as immature, silly, stupid, weak minded, inexperienced, "green", dumb and naive.

e) Affective versus literal meaning

In most cases the affective meaning of an expression of affection or abuse, obliterates the literal meaning of the expression e.g. when calling someone a "cow", in German or in English, the addressee is not really visualising a cow in the field, or a person with horns chewing grass. The reference is often purely emotional, and used because it has become linguistically acceptable within the frame of reference of one particular culture to compare human beings displaying certain characteristics to a cow. In other words the expression has connotations but no denotations. Most expletives and terms of affection are words of no content, and their use either successfully or unsuccessfully imparts a message depending on their degree of conventionality. The German expression "sie ist ein netter Käfer" is an affectionate mode of reference to a young girl, but in
English the expression "she is a cute beetle" has only a literal meaning and puts no message across to the addressee because he does not know what the addressee was trying to say by calling the girl a beetle.

Some expressions do however have a literal meaning, e.g. if one person refers to another as a "pig", then the addressee may have a vision in his mind of a real pig, and thus makes the association complete when he sees a dirty person, with dirty habits and morals. The same would go for calling someone a snail because a snail is slow.

f) Animals not used commonly to describe people or their habits

It would be interesting to make a more in-depth study of why certain animals are or are not constantly referred to when describing humans. One large category which is not used is that of fish and animals which live in water. The shark, codfish and eel are exceptions. Other categories would be insects (butterflies, beetles, stinging insects), reptiles, dinosaurs and mythological animals such as the unicorn, griffin and the centaur. The dragon is an exception. There are some expressions to be found using these animals, but they are not common and this may be because man simply has not been able to study and observe them as well as his pets, farm animals etc. Mythological animals never existed. Most prehistoric animals have become
extinct, and fish live in an environment in which man can only survive for a limited period of time, thus hindering him from getting too familiar with the underwater inhabitants. It must also be remembered that many of the animal expressions still used today, have their origins many centuries ago, when man had no oxygen tanks, binoculars, underwater cameras, microscopes etc, and this is sure to have influenced the occurrence of some animals over others, in expressions and metaphors.
C. Annotated Glossary

The annotated glossary below is comprised of a collection of German terms of affection and abuse with English equivalents. Unfortunately the prescribed length of this project has only permitted the annotation of the most commonly used German expressions and their variations. The expressions discussed are either epithets or idioms. Epithets can express affection or abuse and emotions rather than literal meanings e.g. "Philistine" or "chatterbox!". As becomes evident in the glossary, variation in usage occurs in the epithets and not in the idioms. The usage of idioms is far more standardised than that of epithets. The variation in epithets manifests itself primarily in the liberal use of adjectives (referred to as modifiers), which express the speaker's attitude and intention. Almost any modifier may be used to qualify the noun which forms the basis of the epithet, and only the common ones are discussed. Some animal metaphors are only used in the form of idioms or epithets, not both and most terms may be applied in the first person singular in the familiar and in the polite forms and in the third person singular. Where this is not the case, it will be discussed. Terms which are never used in the polite form are terms of endearment to little children, wives, girlfriends, and lovers.
Each of the five animal categories, as well as each individual animal forming part of one particular category is discussed separately in the glossary. If the gender, age or status of an animal is significant with regard to the meaning of the expression e.g. cow, bull, ox, calf etc. these are also discussed individually. Where possible, each animal is discussed in the light of its cultural and mythological background, to attempt to trace the origin of the good or bad reputations some animals have acquired today. In each case the German noun is translated literally and followed by a "suitable equivalent" in English. Each animal is discussed with respect to its use in epithets e.g. when and to whom it is applied, whether it is applied to males or females, to which age group of person it is usually applied, (age stipulations are approximate), the type of relationship existing between two people who use the expression (formal, informal, intimate, friendly, casual etc.), whether the expression is old fashioned but still in use, idiosyncratic or conventional, whether it is vulgar, sarcastic, affectionate or pejorative and whether it is acceptable or unacceptable, in low, middle or upper class circles. Finally regional variations are listed, followed by a list of the terms and their English equivalents. Idioms are translated and discussed individually. It may be assumed that the same holds true for idioms and epithets (e.g. to whom applied etc.) unless otherwise
specified. The terms are applicable by males and females unless specified.

a. Pets

i) **Hase** = "rabbit".

**EPITHETS**

Figuratively the term is translatable as "kitten", "lamb", "sweetie", "honey" etc. and may be used on its own or in conjunction with a modifier. "Hase" is usually directly applied by parents to their children (boys or girls) up to the age of 10. The use of the expression presupposes a close, harmonious family relationship. It is purely affectionate and conventional and prevalent in middle to upper class circles. Regional and idiosyncratic variations of the term are: Hässchen, Hässlein, Hasele, Hassle, Hassle (southern Germany), Häsli, Hassli (Switzerland).

-süßer/kleiner Hase = sweet little darling/lamb/angel

**IDIOMS**

- ein verrückter Hase = a madcap, crack-brained, as mad as a March Hare, as mad as a hatter

(applicable to a male for up to the age of 15 to express affectionate criticism. The term is used of someone doing something out of the ordinary).
- ein Has / Hasenfuss = coward
(applicable to males over the age of 10. Applicable in a casual relationship, the term is old fashioned but still in use and conventional. It is used critically to express cowardice).

- ein alter Hase = an old fox
(applicable to fathers, uncles etc., business men, male friends, in fact any mature men. Applicable in a formal or informal but friendly relationship. The term is old fashioned but still used occasionally. It is affectionate and laudatory and used in middle to upper class circles.)

- ein Angsthaser = coward
(Appplied to boys and girls up to the age of 15 in an informal situation. The term is old fashioned but still commonly used. It is affectionately critical and used in middle to upper class circles).

- ein Hässchen = bunny girl
(Appplied to loose girls and women up to the age of 30 in an informal, hostile situation. The term is conventional and pejorative and is used in low to middle class circles).

Hund = "dog". In mythology the dog appears as messenger, hunting companion and guardian and was the symbol of many a Roman and Greek god. It was awarded magical healing and protective powers, with powers over life and death. Although the Greeks, Romans and Hebrews praised the dog's