










Images of Men and Women in the Mirror of Gender Metaphors

Gulzhan T. Shokym^a , Kamshat B. Zhumasheva^{b*} , Gabit K. Khassanov^c ,
Marat K. Azhgaliyev^d , Rita B. Sultangaliyeva^e , Aigul A. Ramanova^f ,
Astra E. Gabdesheva^g 

^a*K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University/Aktobe /Kazakhstan. Email: shokum@mail.ru*

^b*K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University/Aktobe/Kazakhstan. Email: kama0186@mail.ru*

^c*M.Utemisov West Kazakhstan University/Ural'sk/Kazakhstan. Email: hasan.gabit@mail.ru*

^d*University of Innovation and Technology of Western Kazakhstan / Ural'sk/Kazakhstan.*

Email: marat_ajigaliyev@mail.ru

^e*M.Utemisov West Kazakhstan University/Ural'sk/Kazakhstan. Email: r.sultangaliyeva@mail.ru*

^f*University of Innovation and Technology of Western Kazakhstan / Ural'sk/Kazakhstan.*

Email: ramanova2008@mail.ru

^g*M.Utemisov West Kazakhstan University/Ural'sk/Kazakhstan. Email: Astragab@mail.ru*

Received 10 September 2022 | Received in revised form 13 November 2022 | Accepted 15 December 2022

APA Citation:

Shokym, T., G., Zhumasheva, K., B., Khassanov, G., K., Azhgaliyev, M., K., Sultangaliyeva, R., B., Ramanova, A., A., Gabdesheva, A., E. (2022). Images of Men and Women in the Mirror of Gender Metaphors. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 272-282.

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911560>

Abstract

This investigation reveals gender specificity in the vocabulary segment of the Kazakh language picture of the world. The study draws the material from the Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language and the Kazakh Dictionary and is based on the theory of conceptual metaphor and analysis of gender-marked metaphors. The results show that the images of men and women are represented by metaphorical models "Human Being Is an Animal", "Human Being Is a Bird", "Human Being Is an Object", "Human Being Is a Mythical Creature". In addition to the common models, a model was revealed that is characteristic only for women – "Woman Is a Disease". The study highlights the differences between these gender metaphorical models in terms of quantitative representation and content. Thus, in the Kazakh language, men are most often described through the metaphors of animals and birds, while women are described through the metaphors of mythical creatures and animals. In the depiction of men, metaphors denoted their courage, strength and predominate social role, whereas in the depiction of women, metaphors characterize their predominate external beauty. Accordingly, in the metaphorical fragment of the dictionary of the Kazakh language picture of the world, a binary attitude to gender identity defined man as a hero, a support, and a woman as beautiful and slim. The results of the study allow us to conclude that dictionary metaphors, being linguistic material, are able to provide comprehensive information about the conceptual system and gender picture of a particular linguistic culture.

© 2022 EJAL & the Authors. Published by Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics (EJAL). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND)

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, gender metaphor, language picture, linguistic culture, gender linguistics

* Corresponding Author.

Email: kama0186@mail.ru

<http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911560>

Introduction

Aristotle defines metaphor as “the application of a word belonging to something else” (Cooper, 1935). This view of metaphor has led to the conceptualization of metaphors in modern times (Cameron & Maslen, 2010; Deignan, 2010; Kövecses, 2010, 2020; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and brought a dramatic shift in the field of metaphor studies. Several scholars contributed to postulation of the “Conceptual metaphor theory” or “Cognitive Metaphor Theory” which enriched the cognitive sciences (Kövecses, 2020; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and made a significant impact on cognitive linguistics with cross-cultural implications. In fact, the work of these scholars elaborated the conceptual metaphor theory into cognitive science, pointing out how the human thought process is metaphorically constructed; and how metaphor aligns both thought and language.

Metaphors take an active part in the formation of the language picture of the world of various languages. Metaphor is a language category that can provide complete information about the specifics of any language, culture, social environment. According to Black (1993), we use figurative language, primarily metaphor, because of its cognitive, interpersonal, and communicative impact. The uniqueness of metaphors lies in the fact that they express literally inexpressible concepts, provide a more vivid and suggestive environment for expressing complex ideas, allowing the predication of many properties in a condensed statement. In this regard, conceptual metaphors based on cognitive units are of great importance. Leung (2008) argues that conceptual metaphors are often articulated in language, which is a key component of culture, and language, in turn, acts as the main indicator of conceptual metaphors. By studying the conceptual metaphors of a language, one can gain insight into the culture of that particular language (Aliakbari & Faraji, 2013; Siqu, 2018). Moreover, conceptual metaphors can have fundamental similarities and differences both within the same culture and across cultures (Hayrutdinova, Wang, & Zhang, 2021; Kövecses, 2010).

Metaphors are uniquely associated with portraying men and women, symbolically representing the human biological body (Garcia-Fernandez, 2017). This symbolic representation plays a crucial role in the formation of gender inequality, often termed as gender metaphors and are used to identify and analyze the gender in media discourse. Ahmed (2018) comes to the conclusion that the perception and description of the “gendered self” in relation to others largely depends on the dominant gender ideology in society. From a pragmatic point of view, the use of gender-related metaphors is culturally specific (Pérez-Hernández, 2016). For example, as a result of studying images of a man and a woman on the material of the Collins COBUILD English Dictionary, Tenorio (2000) concludes that lexical units are used to refer to men and women in completely different ways. Based on the data of the Russian language dictionaries, Rezanova and Komissarova (2012) states that the gender fragment of the Russian language picture of the world is formed through the actualization of metaphors that represent different aspects and types of features when characterizing men and women. By identifying metaphors and adjectives used to describe a person. Borelli and Cacciari (2019) argue that gender stereotype and metaphors are closely related. As a result of the analysis of the conceptual metaphor, for example, “Woman Is a Car” in online discourse, Bratić and Stamatović (2017) noted that social relations are manifested based on metaphors of this kind: wherein, users consider a woman as an object that men use.

Gender studies has recently gained much attention in Turkic languages (Mammadova, 2015). The linguistic features of gender stereotypes are analyzed on the material of the Kazakh and Uzbek languages as well (Ismailov, 2017), and in the Tatar language too (Khuzina, 2011). In all the Kazakh, Tatar, Bashkir and Uzbek languages, cultural features, symbolic meanings and mental stereotypes are considered, which are realized through the concept of *kız* (girl) (Shokym et al., 2022). Having studied gender features in the Kazakh language, Shokym (2012) argues that by formulating the images “batyr, dzhigit, husband, father, grandfather, brother”, arising from the mental image “man”, in folk cognition, the gender model of a man “is formulated in accordance with masculine, fraternal (batyrylyk, zhigittik, aralyk) qualities” (p. 112), and the female image “is expressed through the qualities of beauty, good breeding, respect, kindness” (p. 117).

There is a dearth of studies on conceptual metaphors with human as a subject in the Kazakh language nor has there been any serious gender study. This investigation, therefore, aimed at determining the manifestation of gender conceptual metaphors in the lexicography of the Kazakh language. The purpose of the study was to determine the cultural, social, cognitive model underlying the conceptual metaphors depicting a man and a woman in the Kazakh understanding of the worldview. The study considered the metaphorical names that were constructed for men and women, analyzing how they portray the differences in the metaphorical characteristics of men and women. The attempt was also made to characterize the composition of gender metaphors in the Kazakh language and how these metaphors could represent the gender fragment of the Kazakh language to the world.

Literature Review

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) postulated the conceptual theory of metaphors, wherein it was stated that a conceptual metaphor comprises much of everyday language and its forms including the most abstract concepts. According to this theory, a metaphor consists of three elements: an initial domain (source sphere), a target domain (target sphere), and a mapping (a description resulting from the similarity of the two). In

other words, every metaphor has two mental representations, and the essence of a metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another kind of thing (p. 5). Understanding the goal (A) as the source (B) means that the constituent conceptual elements of B correspond to the constituent elements of A. These conceptual correspondences are called mapping. Thus, conceptual metaphor is “a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff, 1993). While the conceptual metaphors used across cultures may be universal, their expression in terms of reference domains used may vary across cultures (Kövecses, 2005).

The study of certain conceptual spheres through the prism of the interpretative orientation of the metaphor allows us to identify and characterize different aspects of the language picture of the world. One of the aspects of a person’s characteristics that receives metaphorical conceptualization is gender, which in modern gender studies is understood as a social construct based on a binary opposition (male – female) and includes what it means to be a man and a woman in a certain society (Khoshsaligheh, Eriss, & Ameri, 2019). Conceptual metaphors in gender linguistics mean “the transfer of not only physical, but also the entire set of spiritual qualities and properties, united by the words femininity and masculinity, to objects that are not related to gender” (Denisova, 2002). According to Khlebnikova (2017), the problem of metaphorical reflection of the opposition of male and female in the language picture of the world was formed at the intersection of gender issues, the theory of metaphor and the theory of language world modeling.

In a number of lexical representations of gender differences, the gender metaphor plays a key role. A gender metaphor is a metaphorical nomination, limited in relation, that does not refer to a person as a whole, but to a man or a woman (Rezanova, Nekrasova, & Temnikova, 2015), and contributes to the transmission of the dominant concepts of femininity and masculinity in society (Maestre, 2020). Gender metaphor can be of two main types: gender-marked metaphor and gender-unmarked metaphor. A gender-marked metaphor is subdivided into rigidly gender-marked and non-rigidly gender-marked metaphors. Gender-unmarked metaphors include metaphors in which the target sphere is a person in general, without differentiation into men and women; gendered metaphors include metaphors in which the target domain is a person of a certain gender, male or female. In rigidly gendered metaphors of the target sphere, “male” and “female” are assigned to certain initial domains; in non-rigidly gender-marked metaphors, the source can be combined with different targets (male, female, human), while the basis of assimilation-identification can change (Rezanova, 2011).

This study examines rigidly gender-marked metaphors presented in the explanatory dictionaries of the Kazakh language. Explanatory dictionaries are an important source of information about gender asymmetry in the representation of any trait as typically male or female, since the presence of markers in the dictionary interpretation indicates that the limitation of the scope of reference of a metaphorical nomination by gender is stable and reproducible (Rezanova, 2011). Based on the material of the above explanatory dictionaries, the purpose of this study was to highlight the composition of rigidly gender-marked metaphorical oppositions and determine the meaningful types of metaphorical models that reflect the specifics of the gender fragment of the Kazakh linguistic worldview.

Methodology

- *Research design*

The study adopted a qualitative approach, based on the theory of conceptual metaphor and analysis of gender-marked metaphors. Since its focus was on gender specificity in the vocabulary segment of the Kazakh language, the content analysis techniques to extract the constructs enabled to draw all its material from the Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language and the Kazakh Dictionary. This design also enabled the researchers to highlight the differences between gender metaphorical models in terms of quantitative representation and content.

- *Sampling and research procedure*

The study sampled 44 gender-marked metaphors extracted by continuous sampling from the 15-volume dictionary of the Kazakh literary language (Zhanuzak, Omarbekov, & Zhunisbek, 2011) and the Kazakh dictionary (Uali, Kurmanbayevich, Malbakov, & Shoibekov, 2013). The material of the dictionaries was supplemented with examples of the use of selected metaphors in the National Corpus of the Kazakh Language (<http://qzcorpus.kz/>). The research procedure comprised examining the Great Chain metaphor, based on the Great Chain of Being (Lakoff & Turner, 1989), and marching to ontological metaphors as models in which different kinds of entities are located, e.g., “human being > animal > plant > complex object > natural physical thing”, where a person represents the highest order, and a natural physical thing is the lowest.

- *Data Collection*

This study took into account not only the source spheres from the Great Chain metaphor model, but also the source spheres identified by researchers using material from different languages: a bird in Bulgarian and Croatian (Vasung, 2020), a mythical creature in Afrikaans, Arabic, Armenian, Persian, Russian (Maalej, 2001). Although these source areas were explored as a means of conceptualizing women, in this paper they were also considered in relation to men.

- *Data analysis*

The starting point of the analysis was the Great Chain metaphor (Lakoff & Turner, 1989), which was related to ontological metaphors in the hierarchy “human being > animal > plant > complex object > natural physical thing”, where a person represents the highest order, and a natural physical thing is the lowest. The analysis was based on the entity of Great Chain of Being defining a relationship between the various elements of the model. Each level of the model was characterized by the presence of properties that define the lower levels, but also included an additional distinguishing feature. For example, in the Kazakh language, the lexical unit *қыралai* /*quralay*/ ‘sweet, beautiful, too beautiful girl’ is the realization of the conceptual metaphor “Human Being Is an Animal” (metaphorical sub model “Woman Is an Animal”). Here, a culturally-attributed wild *saiga*/antelope trait, such as outward beauty, is used to describe the woman. Thus, the conceptual metaphor reflects the influence of social and cultural factors on the understanding of a person’s personal qualities in terms of the characteristics of the lower element of the model (in this case, the animal).

Results

As a result of the analysis of lexicographic sources, it was possible to identify metaphorical models that characterize a person from the point of view of gender. Animals, birds, objects, mythical creatures and diseases are used as source domains in Kazakh culture. Interestingly, the source domain *disease* has not been previously considered in other studies. Animals and birds are divided into wild and domestic categories. The pet category includes both farm animals and pets. The source domain *object* is represented by several categories: weapons, clothes, household tools, precious stones. Table 1 presents metaphorical models of gender-marked names of a person, where the images of a man and a woman in the Kazakh language picture of the world act as target areas for metaphorical modeling.

Table 1. Types of Metaphorical Models of Rigidly Gender-marked Metaphorical Names of a Person

Source domain	Target domain – man	Target domain – woman
Animal		
Wild	lion cub (<i>abdan</i>), lion (<i>arystan</i>), wolf (<i>arlan</i>), panther (<i>barys</i>), leopard (<i>qabilan</i>), tiger (<i>jolbaris</i>)	ide (<i>aqtorta</i>), roe deer (<i>elik</i>), saiga calf (<i>quralay</i>)
Domestic	donkey (<i>ānġi</i>), bull (<i>buqa</i>), thoroughbred camel (<i>jampoz</i>), breeding ram (<i>qoşqar</i>), two-year-old goat (<i>serke</i>), one-year-old goat (<i>tekeşik</i>), dog/male (<i>töbet</i>), ox (<i>ögiz</i>)	female humped camel (<i>aruana</i>), dog bitch (<i>qanşıq</i>)
Bird		
Wild	old eagle (<i>beşeñgel</i>), hawk (<i>kökjendet</i>), eagle (<i>qıran</i>), falcon (<i>suñqar</i>), white falcon (<i>aqsuñqar</i>), saker falcon (<i>itelgi</i>)	titmouse (<i>şımşıq</i>), parrot (<i>totıqus</i>)
Domestic	rooster (<i>qoraz</i>)	
Object		
Weapon	old steel gun or dagger (<i>beren</i>)	
Clothing	collar of a garment (<i>jağa</i>)	
Household tool	supporting frame wheel cart (<i>kegei</i>)	lasso for tying horses (<i>kündebaw</i>)
Precious stone		diamond (<i>gawhar</i>), sapphire (<i>jaqut</i>)
Mythical creature		
	mythical bird (<i>samruk</i>), mythical character (<i>Koja Nasreddin</i>)	patroness of women (<i>bibatpa</i>), maiden (<i>peri</i>), fairy (<i>perizat</i>), guardian angel (<i>perişte</i>), witch (<i>mıstan</i>), baba yaga (<i>jalmawız kempir</i>), devil (<i>saytan</i>)
Disease		animal nipple swelling disease (<i>qarajelin</i>)

1. Metaphorical Modeling of Male Images in the System of Rigidly Gender-marked Metaphors

1.1 Metaphorical model “Man Is an Animal”

The metaphorical model “Man Is an Animal” is the most quantitatively represented corpus under consideration (53.8% of the corpus of metaphors with the target domain “man” and 31.8% of the total corpus of rigidly gendered metaphors). It includes two main sub models: “Man Is a Wild Animal”, “Man Is a Domestic Animal”. The “Man Is a Wild Animal” sub model includes six source domains: *lion cub* (*abdan*), *lion* (*arystan*), *wolf* (*arlan*), *panther* (*barys*), *leopard* (*qabilan*), *tiger* (*jolbaris*). Interestingly, all these animals are predators, and most of them are from the cat family.

Through the metaphor “Man Is a Predatory Animal”, such qualities of a man as strength and power, courage and courage, bravery and courage, and fearlessness are conceptualized. So, in the studied lexicographic sources, the figurative meaning of the word *lion* (*arystan*) is “brave, brave, courageous”; *wolf* (*arlan*) is “unbridled, majestic”; *leopard* (*barys*) is “a man who knows no fear, a real hero”; *leopard* (*kabylan*) is “brave, brave man”; *tiger* (*jolbaris*) is “risky, fearless, courageous”: “*The cruelest discipline inherent in the army of Tamirlane, the lame lion of Asia with steel fangs, collapsed on the day when he was gone*” (Abilev. “Dream”, dictionary); “*Ruslan Abdrakov, who reached the final and was awarded the title of Kazakhstan Leopard, is a very strong wrestler*” (Baikonys. “Praise be to Allah that in the holy month of Ramadan, who made me the happiest of people”, corpus); “*Only recently did he exalt Zhanibek, calling him a powerful warrior*” (Moldagaliev. “Saryarka”, dictionary); “*Is there a bitterer share than impersonating a powerful tiger, when only a corsac lurked inside, how can he more resist the unstoppable crowd, calm and control it?*” (Kekilbaev. “Pleiades”, corpus); “*Khan also understood that the Kara-Kipchak tiger felt insulted*” (Yesenberlin. “The Conspired Sword”, dictionary).

The leadership qualities of a man as a commander are conceptualized using the metaphor “Man Is a Wild Animal”, in which *lion cub* (*abdan*) acts as a source domain, having a strong person who can lead others: “*There was a single lion cub among them. May that day be cursed when I saw his death*” (Magauin. “Time of Troubles”, dictionary).

The metaphorical sub model “Man Is A Domestic Animal” includes eight source domains: *bull* (*buqa*), *ox* (*ögiz*), *breeding ram* (*qoşqar*), *two-year-old goat* (*serke*), *one-year-old goat* (*tekeşik*), *donkey* (*ängi*), *thoroughbred camel* (*jampoz*), *dog/male* (*töbet*). Five of them are called artiodactyls, representatives of the classes of large and small cattle. The names of animals from the class of cattle are often used to metaphorically denote the social status of a man, as well as characteristics such as endurance. So, the source domain *bull* (*buqa*) is used for a metaphorical name of a person who is able to lead a family, clan, tribe, etc.: “*From the most noble families, wicked people gathered from all around, with eyes red from greed, with bellies bursting from prosperity, craving bragging in their honor*” (Zhansugirov. “Kulager”, dictionary); “*Those who create conditions for them to do this are bulls who have lost their conscience and forgotten about decency*” (KVN joke, corpus). Endurance and unpretentiousness of a man are conceptualized through the metaphor “Man Is an Ox”: “*Despite a lame leg, he is a real ox and a hard worker*” (Sarsenbaev. “Lonely shack”, dictionary); “*I do not intend to live like an ox and plow selflessly*” (Makataev. “Donation and Debt”, corpus).

The names of animals from the class of small cattle (ram, goat) are often used to denote a worthless, inconspicuous man, an ignoramus, for example: “*Without him, you will again quarrel like two sheep’s heads in one cauldron*” (Kekilbaev. Pleiades, corpus); “*We ridiculed her frail husband and called her a ‘goat’*” (Erdembekov. “Literary environment of Abai”, corpus); “*The people of liberty do not accept, they do not know what to do with it, and every ignoramus will not put you in anything*” (Mustafin. “After the Storm”, dictionary). On the other hand, the source domain *two-year-old goat* (*serke*) is used to express a certain status, the authority of a man, and the metaphor “Man Is A Two-Year-Old Goat” is already acquiring a positive connotation, meaning a leader, a respected person among the people, an honorary citizen: “*After the death of Isatay, the people lost their leader, having experienced great sorrow*” (Utemisov. “Brave Mynken”, corpus); “*There was one guy in our village, the most enviable of suitors, courage, prowess – everything was with him*” (Imanasov. “Life and Death”, corpus).

Other animals are also used as source domains to describe certain mental-psychic and behavioral characteristics. For example, the metaphor “Man Is a Dog” is used in relation to a bad man (scoundrel, stupid, vile person): “*You are not a master, but a dog who sowed discord between people, an insidious ignoramus and mediocrity*” (Abitzhanova. “Pub. style”, corpus); “*He saw the son of Kunanbai, who said to Zheksen: ‘How pathetic and insignificant you are, old dog?!’*” (Auezov. Selected Works, corpus). The metaphor “Man Is a Donkey” is used in relation to a half-witted, silly man: “*A simpleton, as always, will not notice, a stupid one, like a donkey, will not listen*” (proverb, dictionary); “*Remember my words forever, who was born a donkey will not appreciate a horse*” (Myrzaliev. “Let’s joke”, corpus). At the same time, through the metaphor “Man Is a Thoroughbred Camel”, a positive assessment of a man as the best of horsemen, a precious, real man is expressed: “*One spoke for everyone and often repeated ‘my only one, my brother, my precious’*” (Togysbaev, dictionary); “*He turned out to be not a commoner and behaved like a free steppe, harnessing one-humped camels and riding horses with solemn grandeur*” (Yesenzhanov. “Yaik is a bright river”, dictionary).

1.2. Metaphorical model “Man Is a Bird”

Within the framework of the “Man Is a Bird” model, 7 source domains were identified that are used in relation to male referents: *old eagle* (*beişeñgel*), *hawk* (*kökjendet*), *eagle* (*qıran*), *falcon* (*suñqar*), *white falcon* (*aqsuñqar*), *saker falcon* (*itelgi*). Of these, six are wild birds of prey and one is poultry. Rigidly gender-marked metaphors based on comparison of a man with wild predatory birds (first of all, an eagle, an old eagle, a saker falcon) emphasize, first of all, physical strength, grasping, tenacity, dexterity, assertiveness, power of a man: “*Tekpil batyr, old eagle, the storm of all his enemies, has he entered the battlefield?*” (Auezov. “Favorites”, dictionary); “*Like all our Kazakh guys, he is a real eagle*” (Raushanov, “Tbilisi”, Corps); “*Many eagles laid*

down their heads on the way to freedom" (Turganbaykyzy. "Zheksenbaev is worthy of all honors and praises", corpus); "Due to the haste, our saker guys on horseback had only whips in their hands, not one of them had clubs" (Bukei. "Kamshyger", corpus).

A courageous, fearless, courageous, strong-willed, warlike fighter in the Kazakh language is called with the help of metaphors, the source domains for which are a falcon ("a fearless, tireless person"), a hawk ("a person who does not save before the enemy"), a white falcon ("respected citizen, warrior"): "Saken is the first Kazakh revolutionary of the Zhanaarka region, a real falcon of the steppe, a faithful, devoted son of his people" (Sataev. "Poet", dictionary); "Yerkezhan, how would you try to hide your feelings, but I know that you are in love with Saylaubek, he is the right guy, a real falcon" (Alishev. "Batyr", dictionary); "Bright road to you, hawks!" (Auezov. "Karash", dictionary); "Am I not a white falcon, free of all birds, sir, do not make me leave" ("The Word of Makhambet to Sultan Baimaganbet", corpus); "You are a shy peregrine falcon, I am a white eagle, do not be afraid of me, who fell in love with you at first sight" (Zhabaev, "Girl's Spit", corpus).

Through the metaphor "Man Is a Rooster", a "pugnacious, warlike person" is described: "No matter how each of us roosters, we cannot finish the job" (Seydakhmetov. "There is no one higher than the people", corpus). Thus, the metaphorical model "Man Is a Bird" characterizes courage and prowess to a greater extent.

1.3. Metaphorical model "Man Is an Object"

Rigidly gender-marked metaphors of the model "Man Is an Object" are represented by three sub-models: "Man Is a Weapon" ("Man Is a Gun/Blade"), "Man Is a Household Tool" ("Man Is a Chariot Frame") and "Man Is A Garment" ("Man Is A Collar"). Through the metaphors "Man Is a Gun/Blade" and "Man Is a Chariot Frame", the image of a brave hero, a brave man, a warrior is realized: "Turekhan was a glorious gun, my only brave hero" (Heroic epic, dictionary); "All of them are the most courageous guns to a single one"; "The chosen guns, all as if they were brave men, fully armed and in all their majesty, proudly drive their horses" (Seifullin. Poems, dictionary). Through the metaphor "Man Is a Collar", care is conceptualized, the property of a man to be a support: "Altai and Yernazar for the rest and older brothers and ill defenders" (Dosanov. "Falcon", dictionary); "Whoever has an older brother has a support, whoever has a younger brother has help" (proverb, dictionary).

1.4. Metaphorical model "Man Is a Mythical Creature"

Within the framework of the "Man Is a Mythical Creature" model, two metaphors (*samruk*, *Koja Nasreddin*) conceptualize certain physical and mental-psychic qualities of a man. On the one hand, through the use of the metaphor "Man Is a Mythical Bird", strength and power, self-sufficiency, self-improvement are described: "He is no longer a youth, as he was yesterday, a self-sufficient person, he sets high goals for himself" (Kekilbaev. "Heavenly song", corpus); "If a magpie is lucky enough to fly up the stairs, it will have *samruk* as its servants" (Azerbai. "Selected Works", dictionary). On the other hand, with the help of a comparison with the mythical character *Koja Nasreddin*, a benevolent, surprisingly naive person is described, with sincere, pure thoughts, but getting into trouble because of his gullibility: "He, of course, will go, but he is so naive man," said Mohammedi, "won't he do something, spoil something?" (Gabdullin. "Severe time", dictionary); "Isn't this the same person with incomprehensible antics, always crying after playing the *dombra*?" (Nazhimedenov. "White Sands", dictionary).

2. Metaphorical Modeling of Female Images in the System of Rigidly Gender-marked Metaphors

2.1. Metaphorical model "Woman Is an Animal"

The metaphorical model "Woman Is an Animal" is represented by five source domains that are used in relation to female referents: *ide* (*aqhorta*), *roe deer* (*elik*), *saiga calf* (*quralay*, the word is applied to young girls), *female humped camel* (*aruana*, a symbol of motherhood among Kazakhs), *dog bitch* (*qanşıq*, mostly used in a disparaging sense). This model includes two main sub-models: "Woman Is a Wild Animal", "Woman Is a Domestic Animal". The sub model "Woman Is a Wild Animal" includes three source domains: *ide* (*aqhorta*), *roe deer* (*elik*), *saiga calf* (*quralay*).

In this conceptual area, the metaphorical nominations of a woman with the actualization of appearance are most widely represented. For example, by means of the metaphor "Woman Is a Fish", a bright woman with a beautiful appearance is described: "Sometimes, in a cart racing nearby, the shadow of a woman will flash like a white *ide*" (Kaiyrbekov. "Treasury Chest", dictionary). Through the metaphor "Woman Is an Artiodactyl Animal", a graceful, slender, stately woman (a roe deer) or a charming, pretty, immaculate girl (a saiga cub) is described: "We also once fell in love with girls as beautiful as roe deer" (Esdauletov. "We fell in love too", corpus); "Since you saw a roe deer in me, you stopped considering your wife beautiful" (Ongarsynova. "I read sadness in your eyes", corpus); "How many girls with saiga eyes have loosened their braids for me" (Imanasov. "My presumptuous youth", dictionary).

Separately, we can single out the source domain *dog bitch* (*qanşıq*), through which behavior that discredits the honor of a woman is conceptualized: “How could you, shameless bitch, raise your eyes to someone else’s husband? Don’t you dare contradict me, shameless! Get out of my house, immediately!” (Aimauytov. “Works”, dictionary); “Well, admit it, immediately, you unfortunate bitch, to whom did you give yourself and what dog needed you while I was gone?” (Kekilbaev. “Pleiades”, corpus).

The camel plays an important role in the life of the Kazakhs, so it is not surprising that this animal serves as a metaphorical name not only for a man, but also for a woman. As the analysis of lexicographic sources shows, the female one-humped camel (*aruana*), being a symbol of motherhood, serves as a source domain for conveying the metaphorical image of a mother who loves her children immensely and will stand to the death, protecting them: “An Aruana grandmother with a wrinkled face sits nearby and lulls the child” (Musrepov. “Gulzhazira”, dictionary); “Oh, our mothers, what is it like for them now, it’s a thousand times more difficult for them there than for us in the war, because their hearts burn not from fire, but from longing for children” (Bektemisov. “Front-line soldier”, dictionary).

2.2. Metaphorical model “Woman Is a Bird”

In this model, physical and mental-psychic meanings are metaphorically marked by two source domains, used only in relation to female referents: *titmouse* (*şımşıq*) and *parrot* (*totıqus*). When a woman is metaphorically associated with images of birds, a set of features representing behavior (titmouse) and appearance (parrot) is actualized. Thus, by identifying the titmouse, such feminine qualities as suppleness, compliance, unpretentiousness are actualized: “You dream of a swan in the sky, you stretch out your hands, but you can’t get it, but the titmouse, here it is, but you can scare it off” (Omirebekov. “Stone node”, dictionary). Through a comparison with a parrot, a beautiful, luminous, bewitching appearance of a woman is conceptualized: “Beken was disappointed in the depths of his soul with the transformation of his wife, who turned from a parrot into a vulture” (Sergaliev, “Contemporaries”, dictionary).

2.3. Metaphorical model “Woman Is an Object”

The metaphorical model “Woman Is an Object” is made up of three metaphors that are used only in relation to female referents: *lasso for tying horses* (*kündebaw*), *diamond* (*gawhar*), and *sapphire* (*jaqut*). The source domains *diamond* and *sapphire* are combined into a sub-model “Woman Is a Precious Stone”; through this model, the significance and value of a woman as the guardian of the family hearth are metaphorically actualized: “If our Salim aga was pure gold, then Aunt Lyailya is a real diamond” (Akhmetova. Neighbors, corpus); “Our daughter-in-law Zhakyp is really wonderful, her eyes are like a diamond and a sapphire” (Shal. “Poems”, dictionary). The opposite meaning of a woman as an object devoid of value is expressed using the metaphorical model “Woman Is a Rope for Tying A Horse”. So in the Kazakh tradition they usually called a girl who was given to the side of the enemy without kalym and other conventions as a sign of reconciliation in order to avoid major losses: “Kaldan gave Abylai a kündebaw from among his own daughters” (Regional Dictionary of the Kazakh Language, dictionary).

2.4. Metaphorical model “Woman Is a Mythical Creature”

The metaphorical model “Woman Is a Mythical Creature” is the most quantitatively represented among the rigidly gender-marked metaphors that are used only in relation to female referents (38.9% of the body of metaphors with the target domain “woman” and 15.9% of the total corpus of rigidly gendered metaphors). This model consists of seven lexemes that name women: *patroness of women* (*bibatpa*), *maiden* (*peri*), *fairy* (*perizat*), *guardian angel* (*perişte*), *witch* (*mıstan*), *baba yaga* (*jalmawız kempir*), and *devil* (*saytan*). Three source spheres (maiden, fairy and angel) are used in the Kazakh language to describe a beautiful, charming, attractive woman: “Like the breath of a fairy on my cheek, you clung and my heart disappeared, how beautiful you are!” (Raushanov. “Poems of my father”, corpus); “The fairy, exuding a sweet smell with every step, approaches me and says: ‘Only I will understand you’” (Raushanov. “Twilight”, corpus); “Among hundreds of faces, your face is the prettiest of all, my fairy” (Akan Seri. “The Secret of the Soul”, corpus); “The daughter-in-law of this house is like a fairy, a written beauty” (Aimauytov. “Works”, dictionary); “Yes, even if you are an angel in heaven, I will not kneel before you!” (Tazhibayev. “Lovers”, dictionary); “Hey, my beautiful angel! Give me your love, connect your dream with mine” (Orazalin. “No, I don’t envy someone else’s happiness”, corpus).

With the help of three source domains (witch, baba yaga and shaitan), the behavioral characteristics of a woman are metaphorically marked. Thus, the lexeme *witch* (*mıstan*) is used to metaphorically describe a sly, vile, dexterous, dodgy dishonest woman: “Cunning women from the mistress’s retinue, who know how to wishful thinking, did not bypass with their insidious attention the baloney holy old man” (Kekilbaev. “The end of the legend”, frame); “Oh, my witch aunt still closed the door with a hook, and while I tried to open it in vain, the rolling pin of this evil woman went over my back more than once” (“Snowdrop”, dictionary). On the basis of a comparison with *Baba Yaga* (*jalmawız kempir*) (“a woman with overgrown nails, a crow’s beak, in

some Kazakh fairy tales, a seven-headed woman sucking human blood – one of the most hated and unpleasant characters in Kazakh folk tales”), such characteristics as gluttony, greed, the ability to commit atrocities: “*Seeing how a woman is trying to feed the last piece of meat to her daughter Raushan, Kemelbay’s wife attacked her with the words ‘Oh, insatiable woman yaga, where did you come from, do you really want to leave me hungry?’ - and took the meat away from Raushan*” (Mailin. “Works”, dictionary). On the basis of identification with *shaitan* (*saitan*), such properties of a woman as frivolity and waywardness are conceptualized: “*Yes, this girl is not a gift, she is wayward like a shaitan*” (Aimauytov. “Works”, dictionary); “*Oh, you, shaitan, what kind of tricks are you having with Bazarbay, is he really better than your husband, oh you are insatiable*” (Aymaulytov. “Works”, dictionary).

Unlike the previous negatively charged metaphors, in the model “Woman Is a Bibatpa” such positive qualities of a woman as nobility, politeness, and decency are actualized: “*My mother-in-law was a woman with the character of a bibatpa, but her ungrateful numerous relatives survived*” (Alishev. “Next horse”, dictionary). The positive connotation is due to the fact that, according to old religious beliefs, *bibatpa* is the patroness of women.

2.5. Metaphorical model “Woman Is a Disease”

As a result of the analysis of lexicographic sources, the model “Woman Is a Disease” was discovered, in which the moral meaning is metaphorically marked, used only in relation to female referents. Thus, the name of the disease “cattle udder edema, or animal nipple swelling disease” (*qarajelin*) is used to figuratively describe a cruel, heartless, ruthless, indifferent woman: “*I have seen a lot of people in my life, but I did not receive kindness from my daughter-in-law. Expect a seed of discord from such a daughter-in-law, if she does not have a worthy family*” (Uske Torkauly. “XIX century. Kazakh poetry”, dictionary).

Discussion

As a result of the analysis, it is shown that the following main metaphorical models are used for the figurative naming of men and women in the Kazakh language: “Human Beings Are Animals”, “Human Beings Are Birds”, “Human Beings Are Objects”, “Human Beings Are Mythical Creatures”. Moreover, these models are presented for men and women in different ways, both in terms of quantitative representation and in terms of content. Thus, the most commonly used model for the metaphorical naming of men is “Man Is an Animal”, while the model “Woman Is an Animal” is in second place after the model “Woman Is A Mythical Creature”. Moreover, for the metaphorical description of women, the model “Woman Is a Disease” was singled out, which had not previously been identified in other languages.

The study showed that most of the strongly gendered metaphors are based on comparison with animals, and the conceptual metaphor “Human Being Is an Animal” is very productive, that is, it has many linguistic implementations or examples. Kövecses (2002) explains this by saying that much of human behavior can be understood metaphorically in terms of animal behavior. According to Rodriguez (2009), “metaphor is one of the main mechanisms for the spread and perpetuation of folk beliefs” (p. 78). Folk traditions and folk beliefs, as well as the geographic location in which members of a particular culture live, largely determine their experience with animals and, therefore, their attitude towards them. Culture plays a significant role in determining the meanings given to animal metaphors, and therefore different languages can assign different meanings to the same animal in different languages.

Many authors who study animal metaphors divide the metaphor “Human Being Is an Animal” (mainly in the description of women) into three categories: pets, farm(yard)/domestic animals, wild animals (HM Helmy, 2018; Maalej, 2001; Rashid, Hajimaming, & Muhammad, 2012; Rodriguez, 2009). Animal metaphors reflect the expected social roles of women and men depending on the animal in question and society's attitude towards it. Thus, in the metaphor “Woman Is A Pet” (for example, *kitten/gatita* in English and Spanish), a woman is depicted as keeping a man company and entertaining him. The metaphor “Woman Is a Farm Animal” (for example, *chicken/pollita*) describes the role of a woman who gives birth to children, prepares food and serves a man. According to Rodriguez (2009), the pets and farm animals’ metaphors have a positive connotation as they represent women as domesticated and domesticated. However, not all pets and farm animals have a positive connotation: for example, bitch and cow carry negative connotations to the point of being used as insults (HM Helmy, 2018). It is interesting that in the Kazakh language the categories pets and farm animals are represented by only two metaphors, and the dog female (*kanshyk*), as well as the exception from the pets’ category indicated above, is negatively charged, while the female one-humped camel (*aruana*), like most animals from the category farm animals in other languages has a positive connotation.

It is equally interesting to compare the metaphors of the category farm animals, which in different languages describe men. Most often, researchers consider the use of metaphorical names for men with goat and donkey source spheres. Thus, goats are often associated with negativity, referring to a coward or lazy person in Malay, or a gullible or deceitful person in Arabic (Rashid et al., 2012). In Persian, goats are usually associated with sullenness, impudence, poverty, gluttony (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020). Donkeys are used

negatively to connote deceit and weakness in Persian (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020) and stupidity and ignorance in Malay, while in Arabic expressions they have positive associations with patience and physical endurance (Rashid et al., 2012). This study shows that in the Kazakh language goats are used both negatively (for the name of a worthless man, ignoramus) and positively (for the name of a respected, authoritative man), whereas donkeys are used only negatively to connote a crazy, silly man.

Camels play an important role in the life of Eastern peoples, so it is not surprising that there are only positive associations with this animal. Thus, in Persian, camels are often associated with obedience, good character, humility, politeness, and generosity (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020). In the Kazakh language, a precious, real man is described through a comparison with a thoroughbred camel. In addition to the camel, positive connotations in the Kazakh language have been identified in the bull and ox, which are mainly associated with the endurance and high social status of a man.

No less interesting is the implementation of the metaphorical model “Human Being Is A Wild Animal” in different languages. Wild animal names are used primarily for human physical and behavioral characteristics (Aliakbari & Faraji, 2013). According to Rodriguez (2009), the metaphor “Woman Is a Wild Animal” (for example, *vixen/zorra* in English and Spanish) reflects the negative characteristics of a woman, since, according to the researcher, wild animals are free, dangerous, do not need male protection and not subject to his control. However, gazelle in Tunisian Arabic (Maalej, 2001) and deer in Egyptian Arabic (HM Helmy, 2018) have positive associations with female beauty and slimmess. In the Kazakh language, positive associations with the beauty and slenderness of a woman are characteristic of roe deer and saigas. It is also interesting that in the Kazakh language for the metaphorical naming of men, mainly wild animals – predators (lions, tigers, leopards, leopards, wolves) are used as source spheres, while wild animals – artiodactyls (roe deer and saiga antelope) are used to name women, which are the main prey of predators. In other words, women are metaphorically the prey hunted by men (Maestre, 2020). This coincides with the results of a study on the use of the original hunting area to express love and sexual desire in metaphorical linguistic terms with male hunters and female prey (Maestre, 2020).

It is interesting to compare the metaphorical model “Man Is a Wild Animal” and “Man Is a Wild Bird” in the Kazakh and Persian languages. In Persian, predatory animals have both positive and negative characteristics. For example, a lion is associated with bloodthirstiness and aggressiveness, but at the same time strength, courage, dignity; the leopard is associated with voracity; wolf - with ignorance, naivety, gluttony, but at the same time strength, courage, confidence, speed (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020). But as this study has shown, in the Kazakh language, these predatory animals have positive connotations and are associated with courage, courage, bravery, bravery, and leadership qualities. The attitude towards birds of prey (eagle, hawk, falcon) in the Persian and Kazakh languages is positive, the metaphorical name of a man is based on grasp, tenacity, vigilance, courage and fearlessness.

However, there is a significant difference between different languages in the metaphor “Human Being Is a Poultry”. Thus, in the Persian language, the rooster is associated with deceit, fear, imprudence (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020), while in the Kazakh language, the rooster is characterized by pugnacity and a militant look. In Bulgarian and Croatian, the names of both domestic and wild birds are widely used to convey female images, while domestic birds are semantically and metaphorically more productive (Vasung, 2020). In the Kazakh language, the category of birds that serve as the initial domain for describing women is represented by only two metaphors (*titmouse* and *parrot*). The sub metaphor “Woman Is A Parrot” deserves special mention. In English and Thai, the name of the bird parrot is used for a repeating, imitating person (Saralamba, 2021), in Persian, the parrot is associated with dispatch (Aliakbari & Karami, 2020). In the Kazakh language, through this metaphor, the external beauty of a woman is actualized.

The metaphor “Human Being Is a Mythical Creature” is currently not given sufficient research attention. Considering this metaphor for women as a target domain, Maalej (2001) concludes that this line of inquiry is important in re-categorizing women. Using this model as an example, it is shown that metaphorization does not have to be a concretization process when cognitive modeling is based on explaining the abstract through the concrete. On the contrary, in this model, the concrete is explained through the less concrete, that is, the mapping becomes backwards. It is also worth adding that in addition to positive associations with beautiful mythical creatures in different languages (*angel, nymph, goddess, fairy*), in the Kazakh language, *bibatpa* (patron of women) is added, which is associated with nobility and decency. Negative associations in the Kazakh language are associated with such mythical creatures as the *witch, Baba Yaga* and *shaitan* (cunning, greed, willfulness). Moreover, in the Kazakh language there are several metaphorical names of men as mythical creatures.

Conclusion

Metaphors in the dictionary are a valuable material that contains comprehensive information about the gender picture of the linguistic culture of each nation. This study, based on the theory of conceptual metaphor, showed that the conceptual sphere of metaphorical models representing the images of a man and a woman in the Kazakh worldview is different. Firstly, in addition to general metaphorical models, where the source

spheres are animals, birds, objects, mythical creatures, a model “Woman Is a Disease” was revealed for women. Also, when comparing the data obtained, the absence of metaphors describing the appearance, including the beauty of the image of a man, was found. On the contrary, it was found that in the Kazakh language picture of the world, through metaphors, a man is characterized by a certain social status, courage, courage, physical strength. It is important to note that in the metaphorical depiction of the image of a man, the transmission of the image through animals and birds prevails. In our opinion, this is due to the great similarity of the predatory qualities of animals and birds with the strength and heroism of men.

In the metaphorical gender fragment of the dictionary, which reflects the female image, metaphors in the model “Woman Is A Mythical Creature” predominate. In general, according to all metaphorical models, such qualities as beauty, stateliness and harmony of a woman prevail; several metaphors reflect the authority and value of women. In addition, an important feature that is inherent only to a woman is shown, her main quality as a mother is childbearing, which is described by the metaphor of aruana (an intra-pedigree type of one-humped camels). As a result, a meaningful originality of gender oppositions was revealed in a figurative fragment of the Kazakh language picture of the world, in which a man is brave, courageous, courageous and is a support, and a woman is distinguished by feminine beauty, stateliness.

References

- Ahmed, U. (2018). Metaphor in the construction of gender in media discourse: analysis of metaphors used to describe women in Nigerian newspapers. *International Journal of Gender and Women's Studies*, 6(1), 88-99. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijgws.v6n1p8>
- Aliakbari, M., & Faraji, E. (2013). Conceptualization of man's behavioral and physical characteristics as animal metaphors in the spoken discourse of Khezel people. *Linguistik online*, 59(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.59.1141>
- Aliakbari, M., & Karami, Y. (2020). A Corpus Analysis of Animal-Term Conceptual Metaphors in the Persian Book of Marzbannameh. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 12(1), 35-64. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2020.5713>
- Black, M. (1993). More about metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 19-41). Cambridge University Press.
- Borelli, E., & Cacciari, C. (2019). The comprehension of metaphorical descriptions conveying gender stereotypes. An exploratory study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2615. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02615>
- Bratić, V., & Stamatović, M. V. (2017). Commodification of women through conceptual metaphors: the metaphor woman as a car in the western Balkans. *Gender & Language*, 11(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.22009>
- Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (2010). Metaphor analysis. *London: Equinox*, 97-115. Retrieved from <https://www.equinoxpub.com/home/metaphor-analysis/>
- Cooper, L. (1935). The rhetoric of Aristotle. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 21(1), 10-19. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335633509380070>
- Deignan, A. (2010). The cognitive view of metaphor: Conceptual metaphor theory. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis* (pp. 44-56). London: Equinox.
- Denisova, A. A. (2002). *The dictionary of gender terms*. Information XXI Century.
- Garcia-Fernandez, M. (2017). Gender Metaphors in Representations of the Biological Body: An Analysis of Popular Medical Literature Published in Franco's Spain. *Cultural History*, 6(2), 209-226. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3366/cult.2017.0150>
- Hayrutdinova, G. A., Wang, X., & Zhang, X. (2021). The conceptual metaphors formed by culture in the functioning of the autumn word in the works of Russian poetry. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 9(3), 91-100. Retrieved from http://www.ijsc.net/article_245411.html
- HM Helmy, N. (2018). A Socio-Cognitive Analysis of Animal Metaphors in Egyptian Arabic. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 86(4), 923-941. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21608/fjhj.2018.174630>
- Ismailov, G. M. (2017). Linguocultural Study of Gender Stereotypes in Turkic Phraseology (on the Material of Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak Languages). *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 14(1), 85-92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8011-2017-14-1-85-92>
- Khlebnikova, A. L. (2017). Person viewed through the lens of gender marked metaphors and gender unmarked metaphors in English. *Sibirskii Filologicheskii Zhurnal*(2), 279-291. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17223/18137083/59/19>
- Khoshsaligheh, M., Eriss, A., & Ameri, S. (2019). The portrayal of women in English films localized into Persian. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(2), 40-51. Retrieved from http://www.ijsc.net/article_36685_92e97e521190112d03aa8007d401ffa8.pdf
- Khuzina, E. S. (2011). Gender stereotypes in the Tatar linguistic consciousness. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University*, 13, 147-149.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/metaphor-9780195374940>
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture*. Cambridge University Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408>
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://philpapers.org/rec/KOVMAP-2>

- Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202-251). Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://philpapers.org/rec/LAKTCM>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html>
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3774967.html>
- Leung, W. Y. Y. (2008). A contrastive study of Chinese and English metaphors of marriage. *LCOM papers*, 1, 21-35. Retrieved from <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.553.7774&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Maalej, Z. (2001). Of animals, foods, objects, plants, and others, or how women are conceptualized across languages and cultures. In *4th International Conference on Researching and Applying Metaphor (RAAM 4): Metaphor, Cognition, and Culture*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36169.36967>
- Maestre, M. D. L. (2020). Gender, ideology and conceptual Metaphors: Women and the Source Domain of the Hunt. *Complutense Journal of English Studies*, 28, 203-218. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5209/cjes.68355>
- Mammadova, K. (2015). Gender Linguistics and Literarыеlements in Turkic Languages: A Perspective. *International Journal of Philosophy*, 16(2), 1-1. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=4959>
- Pérez-Hernández, L. (2016). A cross-cultural gender analysis of the pragmatic functions of conceptual metaphor in Spanish and English newspapers. *Text & Talk*, 36(5), 541-563. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2016-0023>
- Rashid, S. M., Hajimaming, P., & Muhammad, N. N. (2012). 'Farm'Animal Metaphors in Malay and Arabic Figurative Expressions: Implications for Language Learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(7), 33-39. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.33>
- Rezanova, Z. I. (2011). Gender metaphor: typology, lexicographical interpretation, contextual representation. *Tomsk State University Journal. Series: Philology*, 2(14), 47-57. Retrieved from http://journals.tsu.ru/philology/en/&journal_page=archive&id=116&article_id=5223
- Rezanova, Z. I., & Komissarova, O. V. (2012). Metaphor in Modeling Gender Oppositions: A Fragment of the Russian Linguistic Picture of the World. *Siberian Philological Journal*(3), 184-192. Retrieved from <http://vital.lib.tsu.ru/vital/access/manager/Repository/vtls:000447679>
- Rezanova, Z. I., Nekrasova, E. D., & Temnikova, I. G. (2015). Gender-marked metaphors: influence of grammatical gender and frequency on referential choice of metaphorical name of the person in the Russian language. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 200, 135-141. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.033>
- Rodriguez, I. L. (2009). Of women, bitches, chickens and vixens: Animal metaphors for women in English and Spanish. *Cultura, lenguaje y representación: revista de estudios culturales de la Universitat Jaume I*, 1(7), 77-100. doi: <https://raco.cat/index.php/CLR/article/view/226358>
- Saralamba, C. (2021). A Comparison of HUMANS ARE ANIMALS Conceptual Metaphor between English and Thai. *Language and Linguistics*, 39(1), 128-150. Retrieved from <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/ijoling/article/view/249413>
- Shokym, G., Burankulova, E., Yessenova, K., Sarbassova, A., Bauyrzhan Kyzy, B., & Yerzhanova, G. (2022). Representation of the “kyz” Gender Concept in the Turkic Linguistics. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(1), 125-134. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22034/ij scl.2022.543085.2467>
- Shokym, G. T. (2012). *Basics of gender linguistics*. Economics.
- Siqi, Y. (2018). Conceptual metaphor “Human Beings Are Animals”: A case study of nicknames in Chinese literature of “Water Margin”. *Journal of Letters*, 46(2), 1-43 Retrieved from <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jletters/article/view/110547>
- Tenorio, E. H. (2000). Gender, sex and stereotyping in the Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 20(2), 211-230. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268600020006076>
- Uali, N., Kurmanbayevich, S., Malbakov, M., & Shoibekov, R. (2013). *Kazakh dictionary (one-volume large explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language)*. Daur Publishing House. Retrieved from <https://sozdikqor.kz/sozdik/?id=14>
- Vasung, A. (2020). Gender-marked Conceptual Metaphor'woman is a Bird'. *Philological studies*, 18(2), 212-235. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17072/1857-6060-2020-18-2-212-235>
- Zhanuzak, T., Omarbekov, S., & Zhunisbek, A. (2011). Dictionary of the Kazakh literary language. *Institute of Linguistics*. Retrieved from <https://sozdikqor.kz/sozdik/?id=35>