

<https://doi.org/10.29162/pv.43.1.1131>
UDC 811.124'373.7:811.111'373.7:81'27=111
Original scientific paper
Received on 13 June 2025
Accepted for publication on 16 April 2026

MARTA PETRYSHYN
HALYNA ZAHAIKA
OKSANA LIUBIMOVA

NATIONAL AND CULTURAL PECULIARITIES OF THE ZOONYM *DOG* IN LATIN AND ENGLISH PAROEMIAS

Abstract: The article presents a comparative analysis of the connotative meanings and national-cultural specifics of the zoonym dog in the linguocultures of the ancient Romans and the British. This allows tracing the conceptualization of the animal, as well as universal and distinct stereotypes shaped by the national-cultural worldview of different ethnic groups. The metaphorical interpretation of the lexeme is grounded both in the behavioral traits of the animal and the societal attitudes towards it. The zoomorphic cultural code conceptualizes human character traits, interpersonal relations, moral essence, intellect, appearance, environmental realities, etc. In the paroemiological space of Latin and English, the image of the dog carries ambivalent evaluative connotations. On one hand, the dog is portrayed as a loyal and experienced companion endowed with intelligence and devotion; on the other, the zoonym embodies the worst human qualities: aggression, cruelty, insatiability, indifference, ingratitude, insincerity, stubbornness, shortsightedness, laziness, etc. The analysis of the zoonym *dog* in paroemiological traditions enables the reconstruction of different peoples' perceptions of the animal, tracing its metaphorical reinterpretation, and identifying universal and culture-specific features of folk symbolism.

Keywords: zoonym, dog, linguistic worldview, symbol, linguoculture, proverbs and sayings

1. Introduction

The representation of nature, particularly the zoosphere, in paroemiological heritage dates back to the pre-Christian era when humans identified themselves with nature, attributing anthropomorphic traits – habits, behavioral patterns, emotional, and moral-ethical characteristics – to fauna. Over centuries, stable perceptions of animals as bearers of symbolic meanings formed in the ethnocultural consciousness of various peoples, fueling interest in the study of animal imagery in language as representations of cultural stereotypes, mental concepts, and evaluations. Thus, the study of paroemias with zoonyms serves as a valuable source for exploring the cognitive and pragmatic features of the linguistic worldview. Their analysis enables the tracing of the metaphorical reinterpretation of animal images in the linguistic consciousness of different peoples.

2. Literature review

One of the priority directions in modern linguistic research is the study of animal-world concepts in terms of their role in revealing the figurative-nominative nature of language. A number of contemporary linguists have explored zoonymic lexicon, particularly its symbolic potential in linguoculture, using classical and modern languages. Babič S.'s academic research examines the symbolism and cultural stereotypes associated with wild animals (the wolf, bear, and lynx) as reflected in Slovenian proverbs and idioms (Babič 2024). The peculiarities of zoomorphic metaphor through Latin paroemias are examined in the work of Petryshyn M. (Petryshyn 2015), while the structural and semantic features of Ancient Greek zoomorphic metaphors are analyzed in Lazer-Pankiv O.'s research (Lazer-Pankiv 2012). In Ukrainian linguistics, the study of zoonyms has been addressed in scholarly works by Golubovska I. (Golubovska 2003), Salata I. (Salata 2010), Uzhchenko D. (Uzhchenko 2000) and others. Within our research, the dissertation by Novikova O., which examined the figurative and axiological potential of the concepts *CAT* and *DOG* in the English phraseological worldview and literary discourse, is noteworthy (Novikova 2021). Recent years have seen growing interest in comparative studies of the nation-

al distinctiveness of linguistic worldviews. The analysis of the metaphorical objectification of the *DOG* concept in phraseological units and slang expressions enabled Suima I. and others to identify its key figurative features and most productive models in English (Suima et al. 2021). The study by Farghal M. and Haider A. focuses on the conceptual metaphor *human–animal* through English proverbs, sayings, and idioms with the zoonym *dog* (Farghal and Haider 2023). The study of the *cobaka*/Hund concept in the linguistic worldviews of Ukrainians and Germans falls within the scholarly interests of Holodnova Ye. (Holodnova 2011). Asimopoulou the P.'s research compares phraseological units with the semantic component 'cobaka' in Bulgarian, Greek, Russian, and Serbian (Asimopoulou the 2018). Liu J.'s work explores the metaphorical use of animal images (dogs, cats, tigers, lions) in English and Chinese proverbs (Liu 2013). The study by Kochman-Haładyj B. examines the metaphorical usage of the 'dog' concept in Polish and English linguocultures through paroemiological heritage (Kochman-Haładyj 2024). The study by Błajet and Błajet (2017) focuses on analyzing the image of the dog as a metaphor for human traits in Polish and Iranian-language aphorisms, highlighting both universal and culturally specific connotations of the zoonym shaped by the traditions of each people, which provides a basis for identifying the distinctive features of the dog's image in Latin and English paroemias (Błajet and Błajet 2017). The application of methodological frameworks proposed by Waśniewska (2018), Belkhir (2014), and Rashidi and Ghaedi (2013) facilitates an in-depth comparative analysis of the zoonyms *canis* and *dog*, elucidating their significance for ethnolinguistics and cultural interpretation. Despite the extensive body of comparative research, the image of the dog in the paroemiological heritage of classical and modern languages has yet to be examined as a standalone subject. Thus, the aim of the article is a comparative analysis of the national-cultural peculiarities and connotative meanings of the zoonym *dog* in the linguistic worldviews of the ancient Roman and English peoples. Focusing on the comparative analysis of the emotional-evaluative potential of the zoonym *dog* in Latin and English reveals both shared universals and nationally specific perceptions. This approach complements existing comparative studies of the dog's

image, holding significant value for ethnolinguistics and comparative paroemiology, and opens new avenues for comprehending the role of zoomorphic metaphors in shaping the linguistic worldviews of different peoples and for understanding the evolution of cultural stereotypes over millennia.

3. Materials and methods of research

3.1 Material and Data Sources

The research material comprises a selection of proverbs and sayings from lexicographic sources in Latin and English, including: *Latin Phraseology* (Osipov 2009), *From the Treasury of Ancient Wisdom* by Korzh N. (1994), *Dicionário de Expressões e Frases Latinas* by Henerik Kocher,¹ *The Oxford Dictionary of Idioms* by Judith Siefring (Siefring 2004), *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs* by Speake, J. (Speake 2015), and *Animal Proverbs and Quotes Kingdom. Domestic Animals* by Lyazidi, R. (Lyazidi 2012). The total number of proverbs in the sample is 178, including both Latin and English proverbs. The Latin idioms with the zoonym *dog* comprise 68 proverbs, whereas the English sample consists of 110 proverbs. Units for analysis were selected based on the keywords *canis* (dog) in Latin and *dog* in English, as these lexemes constitute the primary semantically neutral designations for the concept of *dog*. Their high frequency in Latin and English paroemias, coupled with their representation of a wide range of connotations, underscores the relevance of this study to ethnolinguistics. Lexical units specifying gender, age, or breed were excluded from the analysis due to their low frequency and stylistic markedness. The corpus includes both traditional English proverbs, documented in authoritative lexicographic sources and characterized by a long history of usage, and modern paroemias. This dual approach enables tracing the evolution of the dog's image from classical folkloric expressions to contemporary interpretations.

Emphasis was placed on examples where the lexeme activates connotative meanings, reflecting perceptions of behavior,

¹ <https://www.scribd.com/document/629609914/Dicionario-de-Expressoes-e-Frases-Latinas>, retrieved on 31 May 2026.

emotional states, moral-ethical traits, or social roles through the prism of the animal world. This approach reveals nationally conditioned stereotypes, associations, and cultural concepts surrounding the image of the dog in linguistic worldviews. The choice of proverbs and sayings as primary research material is justified by their role, as noted by Holubovska I.,

in ‘mirroring universal human priorities while simultaneously capturing nationally conditioned value-based perceptions of the world and one’s existence within it. The study of proverbs and sayings allows delineating national logic (logical-conceptual categorisation of reality) and national evaluative frameworks (emotional-evaluative categorisation), as well as uncovering the hierarchy of values held by speakers of a particular language and culture’ (Holubovska 2004: 216).

3.2 *Research Methods*

The methodological framework integrates general scientific methods (analysis, synthesis, comparison) with specialized research methods. To isolate the research material, the method of continuous sampling was employed, which involved defining search keywords, excluding peripheral nominations, and compiling a corpus of paroemias containing the components *canis* and *dog* from lexicographic sources. An inductive approach enabled the systematization and description of the material, while a deductive method was applied for comparative analysis to identify common and distinct features in the interpretation of the dog in Latin and English paroemias. The cognitive-interpretative analysis revealed paroemias in which the zoonyms *canis* and *dog* actualize figurative meanings, as well as their positive and negative connotative nuances. This facilitated an examination of the dog’s role as a cultural symbol across different linguocultures. The comparative-contrastive method was used to determine shared and culture-specific connotations of the zoonym dog in the linguistic worldviews of ancient Romans and the English, revealing universal patterns and ethnically conditioned interpretations of the dog’s image in Latin and English proverbs. The descriptive method allowed for the classification and characterization of the analyzed paroemias and the summarization of research

findings. To validate the conclusions regarding the negative and positive connotations of the zoonym in different linguocultures, a quantitative analysis was conducted. This method traced the dominance of specific semantic features and outlined culturally specific interpretations of the dog's image in the linguistic consciousness of different peoples.

4. Theoretical background

Among the linguistic units that attract the attention of ethnolinguistics and linguocultural studies, proverbs and sayings most fully convey national and cultural semantics, as they directly reflect the surrounding reality. Paroemias (traditional wisdom sayings) emerge from the accumulation of folk experience, serve as manifestations of collective consciousness, and function as vehicles for expressing social worldviews. Following Paziak M., we contend that

“the term ‘paroemia’ is primarily used to designate the generic concept of the genre alongside the term ‘proverbs and sayings,’ while specific subcategories are denoted by terms such as ‘proverb,’ ‘saying,’ ‘wish,’ ‘greeting,’ ‘pun,’ ‘tall tale,’ ‘riddle,’ etc., though these terms are often conflated and used synonymously” (Paziak 1984: 3).

As Zaporozhets L. aptly observes, paroemias are

“stable, reproducible, culturally marked units that constitute an inseparable component of any linguistic worldview. They most vividly reflect the sociocultural experience amassed by generations of native speakers” (Zaporozhets 2002: 155–156).

Consequently, paroemic units offer fertile ground for uncovering the ethnocultural component of meaning, analyzing national peculiarities of culture, worldview, and mentality, and investigating the conceptualization and categorization of reality among representatives of diverse linguocultural communities.

The use of animal names in proverbs and sayings stems from ancient traditions when humans perceived themselves as integral to nature, personifying it and attributing human-like traits to fauna. The close bond between humans and nature, the significance

of animals in their lives, and observations of animal behavior fostered the active use of zoonyms for figurative descriptions of human physical and psychological traits, mentality, and lifestyle. At the core of understanding animal metaphors lies the Conceptual Metaphor Theory put forth by Lakoff G. and Johnson M. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 5). According to this theory, metaphors are not merely linguistic embellishments, but fundamental cognitive mechanisms rooted in embodied experiences, i.e. abstract concepts are often understood through more concrete and tangible domains. Animal metaphors exemplify the metaphorical mapping process, wherein attributes of animals serve as source domains that facilitate the understanding of abstract concepts in target domains. As noted by Lakoff G. and Turner M.

Animals act instinctively, and different kinds of animals have different kinds of instinctive behaviour. We comprehend their behaviour in terms of human behaviour, and we use the language of human character traits to describe such behaviour. Cleverness, loyalty, courage, rudeness, dependability, and fickleness are human character traits, and when we attribute such character traits to animals we are comprehending the behaviour of those animals metaphorically in human terms (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 193–194).

According to Fauconnier G. and Turner M., animal metaphors systematically integrate zoological attributes with human experiential frameworks, exemplifying the cognitive plasticity inherent in linguistic cognition. Following their theoretical paradigm, we construe metaphor as fundamentally constituting “conceptual blending”, a process generating “the creation of new meaning”, (Fauconnier and Turner 2003: 39) – this capacity representing both a defining feature of human cognition and an evolutionary correlate of linguistic development, enabling the conceptual mapping between ontological domains. As Kyryliuk M. and Stavchuk N. aptly note,

In the process of societal development, many animals acquired cultic significance, and the words denoting them became imbued with unique associations and connotations, shaping national folklore, phraseology, and paroemiological repositories—the most stable layers of the lexico-phraseological level, thus possessing “cognitive memory”(Kyryliuk and Stavchuk 2018: 57).

The process of symbolic metaphorisation, according to Myzyn T.,

“is facilitated by the prevalence of the animal denoted by the zoonym, the frequency of encounters with it, and the accumulation of information about its habits and behaviour” (Myzyn 2022: 143).

Thus, stereotyping animal traits and assigning them to a certain type of person, as A. Grebenyuk notes, is a double, reverse metaphor, wherein

primary metaphorical projections assigned human psychophysical traits to fauna (canine loyalty, leporine timidity, etc.). These fixed features, which were supported by folklore as symbols, were then assigned to particular types of animal. The signs of these animals were used to denote a person based on the established stereotypes (Grebenyuk 2011: 132).

Zoomorphic metaphors thus simultaneously encompass both universal anthropocentric value systems and culture-specific conceptual configurations. While cross-linguistic parallels in metaphorical mappings attest to shared cognitive architectures and analogous environmental engagements, each linguistic system develops unique metaphorical pathways reflecting idiosyncratic historico-cultural trajectories. Thus, animal images have served for millennia as sources of human self-perception, acting as codes of a people’s mentality and indicators of their value systems.

5. Results of the Study

The dog is one of the earliest domesticated animals, having accompanied humans for thousands of years. It has played an important role in various spheres of human life, serving not only as a loyal friend and guardian but also assisting people during hunting, protecting them from enemies, and warning of danger. Human observation of the animal’s behavior and habits contributed to the development of symbolic meanings associated with the zoonym dog, the identification of a system of ethnically determined associations and evaluations, and played a significant role in shaping the conceptual and linguistic worldviews of particular nations. In this context, the image of the animal has verbalized

virtually the entire cultural code of humanity from ancient times to the present. Conceptions of the dog were formed not only on the basis of empirical observations of the animal over millennia, but also through the prism of national cultures. The image of the dog in the linguocultures of both ancient and modern peoples is ambivalent. On the one hand, the zoonym served as a symbol of loyalty, devotion, intelligence, and life experience; on the other hand, it was attributed with aggression, laziness, and gluttony.

In our research, we focus on paroemias in which the image of the dog metaphorically represents aspects of objective reality related to the characterization of the social or psychological specificity of the human individual. The zoonym under analysis occupies a prominent place in the linguistic worldviews of the ancient Romans and the British, since this representative of the animal world was closely connected with humans, and its behavioral traits served as the basis for metaphorically denoting certain human features of appearance, inclinations, behavioral patterns, character, emotional disposition, and moral qualities. The image of the dog is examined through the lens of both negative and positive connotations, enabling the tracing of the multifaceted nature of its symbolism and cultural variability within the Latin and English paroemiological heritage.

5.1 Pejorative connotations of the zoonym dog

As a result of the analysis of the paroemiological heritage of the Roman and English peoples, it was established that anthropomorphic associations related to the analyzed zoonym predominantly possess a pejorative connotation.

Barking, growling, howling and whining of dogs have been interpreted differently across the ethnocultures of various peoples. As a result of the animal's basic instincts and based on socio-domestic experience, the image of the dog became the cause of its predominantly negative perception and served to characterize the human being – namely, their behavior, emotions, physical condition, or to describe the situations in which the person acts. Dog barking is not only a means of self-defense or protection, but also a manifestation of verbal behavior, as acoustic signals (barking, growling, howling, whining) serve as the basis for metaphorical reinterpretation. These signals reflect various aspects

of communication – aggression, warning, emotional state, and social interaction – and are transformed into linguistic models describing human actions. Thus, animal sounds acquire symbolic significance in cultural interpretations.

This very feature became the basis for the metaphorical re-interpretation of such behavior. Accordingly, in the linguistic worldview of the Romans, the sounds produced by dog barking evoked associations with slander, lies, gossip, and boastfulness. In a number of Latin proverbs, deceitful people are equated with useless barking dogs:

- (1) *Luna latrantem canem non curat* (The moon does not care about a barking dog).
- (2) *Pro quo canes latrant* (That about which dogs bark).

As a result of the human – dog metaphorisation, the zoonym becomes associated in the linguistic consciousness of the people with the image of a liar. This trait is also recorded in English proverbs. In the British linguoculture, the image of a liar or gossip is represented by the lexeme *dog* in paroemias such as:

- (3) *A dog that will fetch a bone will carry a bone.*
- (4) *A gossip carries talk both ways.*

In the analyzed linguocultures, the behavior of a dog became symbolic of insidious and insincere people, especially when referring to those who flatter but harbor malicious intentions:

- (5) *Canis vestigia lingit, dum venena gerit in pectore* (The dog licks the footprints but carries poison in its heart),
- (6) *Canis blandus mordet* (A fawning dog bites).
- (7) *A fawning dog is worse than a barking one.*

The image of the dog in the everyday consciousness of the Romans and the English is associated with discord, the absence of mutual understanding, and disharmony between people. This feature is vividly illustrated by the following paroemias:

- (8) *Duo canes, os unum* (Two dogs, one bone).

- (9) *Canes mordentes non facile concordant* (Biting dogs do not easily agree).
- (10) *Dog eat dog*.
- (11) *Two dogs and a bone never agree*.
- (12) *They fight like cats and dogs*.

In Roman linguoculture, dog barking evoked associations with misunderstanding, rejection of the new, or the narrow-mindedness of certain individuals, since people, like dogs, often react negatively or suspiciously to that which they do not understand or have not encountered before:

- (13) *Canes omnibus ignotis allatrant* (Dogs bark at all whom they do not know).

The Latin proverb symbolizes an uneducated person incapable of appreciating high and refined art.

- (14) *Canis non curat num sint magna atria* (The dog does not care about the grandeur of the palace)

Similar connotations of the dog's image are found in the paroemiological heritage of the English people. For instance, in the English proverb the old dog is compared to a person who either lacks the desire or the capacity to accept new knowledge,

- (15) *You can't teach an old dog new tricks*.

In the paroemiological heritage of the ancient Romans and the English, the image of the dog also came to symbolize not only an unintelligent person but also a stubborn and short-sighted one who either cannot or does not wish to learn. In Roman linguoculture, the attempt to teach someone who is incapable of understanding elementary things is likened to teaching a dog to cook:

- (16) *Canem coquere doces* (You teach a dog to cook),

and unintelligent people who fail to learn from their own mistakes and repeat them again are compared to a dog that returns to its own vomit:

- (17) *Canis reversus ad vomitum suum* (The dog returns to its vomit).

In the linguistic consciousness of the English, such human traits as foolishness, narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness are verbalized through the prism of the analyzed zoonym in paroemia such as:

- (18) *A foolish dog barks at a flying bird,*
 (19) *The dog returns to its vomit,*
 (20) *A barking dog never learns.*

Latin paroemias represent a correlation between the image of the dog and the concepts of latent threat, aggression, and danger. When displaying aggression, a dog may attack, bite, or maul its victim – this serves as the basis for characterizing human cruelty, insidiousness, and aggressiveness. The metaphorical link between these human traits and the dog's behavior is reflected in the following proverbs:

- (21) *Canis rabiosa* (Mad dog);
 (22) *Cave canem* (Beware of the dog);
 (23) *Cave tibi a cane muto et aqua silente* (Beware of the silent dog and the still water);
 (24) *Prospectandum vetulo cane latrante* (Beware when the old dog barks);
 (25) *Hac urget lupus, hac canis* (On one side the wolf snarls, on the other the dog);
 (26) *Canem sopitum ne excita* (Do not wake the sleeping dog).

The actualization of these meanings is also observed in the linguoculture of the English people:

- (27) *Beware of the dog that does not bark;*

(28) *Let sleeping dogs lie.*

Thus, the perception of the dog as an evil, cruel, and subordinate creature contributed to the formation in English linguoculture of associations with human malevolence, fury, meanness, and betrayal:

(29) *A mad dog bites his own master;*

(30) *In every country, dogs bite.*

The image of the dog in the linguistic consciousness of the Roman and English peoples carries negative connotations associated with insincerity and unreliability. For example, in Roman linguoculture, the zoonym activates the connotation of a flattering and insincere person whose actions and words do not reflect genuine intentions or feelings:

(31) *Canis lingit manus, dum mordet cor* (The dog licks the hand, but bites the heart).

Moreover, the behavior of a dog that flatters and feigns submission often formed the basis for metaphorical reinterpretation and was associated in Roman consciousness with a person who outwardly appears obedient and docile, yet inwardly harbors malice and betrayal:

(32) *Canis vestigia lingit, dum venena gerit in pectore* (The dog licks the footprints, but carries poison in the heart).

In the linguistic worldview of the British, the zoonym may serve as a symbol of a flattering and malicious person:

(33) *Sly dog;*

(34) *Three things are not to be trusted: a cow's horn, a dog's tooth and a horse's hoof.*

In the linguistic consciousness of the Romans, the old dog was a symbol of conservatism and rigidity – that is, of a person's ina-

bility to change their beliefs, habits, views, or way of life, even when circumstances required it:

- (35) *Canis antiquus cateni assues fieri non potest* (An old dog cannot get used to a collar),
- (36) *Canis vetulus non assuescit loro* (An old dog does not get used to a leash).

In English linguoculture, the lexeme *dog* is metaphorically used to describe people – mainly of older age – who find it difficult to accept innovations or to keep up with the times:

- (37) *A dog that will fetch a bone will carry a bone;*
- (38) *You can't teach an old dog new tricks.*

The image of the dog in the paroemiological heritage of both peoples is also a symbol of cowardice. In folk consciousness, a person who is fearful and tries to conceal their fear behind loud words is often compared to a dog that barks loudly and excessively:

- (39) *Canis timidus vehementius latrat, quam mordet* (A timid dog barks more loudly than it bites);
- (40) *A cowardly cur barks more than it bites;*
- (41) *A barking dog never bites.*

Furthermore, in the linguistic consciousness of the English, the dog symbolizes people who run away in fear, even when there is no real threat:

- (42) *Every dog has his tail between his legs sometimes;*
- (43) *A running dog is a cowardly dog.*

The dog also became a symbol of people who behave confidently and aggressively only in familiar surroundings or environments, while outside of them they are weak and cowardly:

- (44) *Canis in casa sua latrat fortius* (A dog barks louder in its own house);

- (45) *Omnis canis in porta sua magnus est latrator* (Every dog is a loud barker at its own gate);
- (46) *In foribus propriis canis est audacior omnis* (At its own door, the dog is bolder than others);
- (47) *Canis domi ferocissimus* (The fiercest dog is at home);
- (48) *Every dog is a lion in his own yard*;
- (49) *A barking dog at home is silent abroad*.

In the mentioned proverbs, the dog symbolizes people who display strength or aggression only where they feel safe. In many Latin and English proverbs, the dog carries negative connotations, which are associated with its innate behavioral traits. In Latin, the semantics of a deceitful person are verbalized through paroemias such as:

- (50) *Canibus agnos obicere* (Throw lambs to the dogs);
- (51) *Canis canistri malus est custos* (A dog is a bad guardian of the basket).

In British linguoculture, the pejorative image of a deceitful person is also conveyed through the zoonym *dog* in proverbs such as:

- (52) *A dog that licks your hand today may bite it tomorrow*;
- (53) *A silent dog is more dangerous than a noisy one*;
- (54) *Beware of a silent dog and still water*;
- (55) *Beware of the dog that does not bark*;
- (56) *Every dog has a bit of wolf in him*.

Moreover, the dog symbolizes a situation where a hidden enemy poses a greater threat than one who openly declares their intentions:

- (57) *Canis, dum latrat, non mordet* (The dog, while barking, does not bite);
- (58) *Barking dogs seldom bite*;
- (59) *Sly dog*.

In the linguistic consciousness of the Romans, the dog often evoked associations with a greedy, gluttonous, and insatiable person:

- (60) *Canis a corio nunquam absterrebitur uncto* (A dog will never be driven away from the greasy rind);
- (61) *Canes socium in culina nullum amant* (Dogs do not like companions in the kitchen);
- (62) *Canis in praesepe* (A dog in the manger).

In the linguistic image of the world of the British, the analyzed zoonym also became a symbol of an envious and greedy person:

- (63) *A dog in the manger*;
- (64) *Greedy as a dog*;
- (65) *Give a dog a bone and he will want a steak*;
- (66) *Like a dog with two bones*.

In the linguistic culture of the Romans, the dog symbolizes simplicity, the ability to survive even in unfavorable conditions. For example, some Latin proverbs emphasize not only the animal's simplicity but also the humble life of certain people who can be satisfied with minimal goods:

- (67) *Aqua et panis est vita canis* (Bread and water is a dog's life),
- (68) *Canis esuriens libenter panis somniat* (The hungry dog gladly dreams of bread),
- (69) *Canis esuriens etiam stercus deglutit* (A hungry dog even swallows dung),
- (70) *Canis vivit sine mensa* (A dog lives without a table).

Latin proverbs represent the ability of people to adapt to modest living conditions, highlighting a person's indifference to luxury:

- (71) *Canis famelicus etiam dura mandit* (A hungry dog eats even hard things);
- (72) *Canis non curat num sint magna atria* (A dog does not care about the grandeur of the palace).

In the English linguistic culture, the image of the dog is used to characterize people who are indifferent to their living conditions, symbolizing a person's ability to adapt to any living conditions:

- (73) *A hungry dog will eat anything;*
- (74) *A dog does not mind what he eats;*
- (75) *A hungry dog will eat dirty puddings;*
- (76) *A dog sleeps anywhere;*
- (77) *Dog's life.*

In these examples, as a result of metaphorical reinterpretation, the unsatisfactory living conditions of the animal are equated with the miserable existence of people, their social or material disorganization, or vulnerability.

The image of the dog in the analyzed proverbs correlates with the concepts of ingratitude and selfishness, and serves to characterize people who do not appreciate kindness, do not justify the efforts spent on them, and respond to good treatment with evil. In the Latin proverb, the dog's behavior becomes the basis for a metaphorical reinterpretation, serving as a prototype for an ungrateful person who responds with evil to good:

- (78) *Canis saginatus et latrat et mordet* (A well-fed dog both barks and bites).

In the linguistic consciousness of the English, a dog's biting is not only an act of animal aggression but also an association with a person who betrays or harms those who helped them:

- (79) *Bite the hand that feeds you*

or a symbol of a person who is grateful only as long as they personally benefit from it:

- (80) *A dog will bite when you stop feeding him.*

In English paroemias, the dog also embodies human selfishness. Particularly vivid expressions include:

(81) *Every dog for himself;*

(82) *While the dog gnaws bone, companions would be none*

as a hint towards the selfish approach where everyone only thinks about their own gain. In both Latin and English proverbs, the dog can symbolize people who are indifferent to the problems of others, show no interest in anything, and remain indifferent to the events around them. Thus, in the Latin paroemia

(83) *Canis mortuus non mordet* (A dead dog does not bite)
the dog symbolises indifference, the loss of interest in purposeful activity, and in the proverb

(84) *Canis famelicus non curat amicos* (A hungry dog does not think about friends)

the image of the dog embodies the idea of selfishness and indifference of people who, in difficult situations, defend only their own interests. In English, the image of the dog reflects human indifference to material goods:

(85) *A dog does not care whether he is rich or poor*

or to people who remain indifferent to problems until they are personally affected by them:

(86) *A sleeping dog dreams no nightmares.*

The dog in the conceptual sphere of the Romans and the English serves as a symbol of human laziness, inactivity, and unwillingness to work. For example, in the linguistic consciousness of the Romans, a lazy person was compared to a sleeping dog:

(87) *Canis qui dormit non capit leporem* (A dog that sleeps does not catch a hare),

and an old dog that sleeps all day was compared to people who do nothing and are constantly lazy:

- (88) *Canis vetulus dormit totum diem* (An old dog sleeps all day).

In the paroemia

- (89) *Cave ne cadas in somnum canis* (Beware of falling into the dog's sleep)

there is a call not to be lazy and never lose vigilance. In the linguistic consciousness of the English, people who avoid work and seek only personal gain are compared to a lazy dog basking in the sun:

- (90) *A lazy dog lies in the sun,*

and in the paroemia

- (91) *A lazy dog does not hunt rabbits,*

it is pointed out that without effort neither the dog will catch prey, nor the person will achieve anything if they are lazy.

The image of the dog also reflects the idea of a cunning, crafty, and cautious person who knows how to avoid danger and uses deceptive means to achieve their goals. In Latin, the metaphor “dog = cunning person” is represented by paroemias such as:

- (92) *Canina impudentia cum vulpina astutia coniuncta* (The impudence of the dog is combined with the cunning of the fox),
 (93) *Canis fidelis in die, callidus in nocte* (The dog is faithful by day, cunning by night).

In the proverbs of the English, the dog also represents a cunning person who will never take risks but will act carefully. For example, the dog is compared to people who act wisely and unobtrusively, not revealing their intentions:

- (94) *A cunning dog barks least,*

(95) *An old dog knows all the tricks,*

(96) *Every dog has his own way of barking.*

The image of the dog in the linguistic consciousness of the Roman and English peoples represents the idea of ungrateful people who do not know how to appreciate good, selfishly live at the expense of others, use and subjugate them, and take all the blessings of life for granted. In the image of the dog in the analyzed paroemias, there is a representation of people who do not value good deeds, perceive them as something deserved, and may repay their benefactors with harm:

(97) *Canis quem nutris, te mordet* (The dog you feed may bite you);

(98) *Canem cibando facis audacem* (Feeding a dog makes it bold);

(99) *Canis saginatus et latrat et mordet* (A well-fed dog both barks and bites);

(100) *Bite the hand that feeds you;*

(101) *You rear a dog and he will bite you;*

(102) *A curst dog must be tied short.*

As a result of the comparison between humans and animals, the zoonym *dog* evokes the image of a slovenly person who neglects their appearance and does not care about the state of their home:

(103) *Canis in stercore suo dormit* (The dog sleeps in its own dung).

In the paroemia

(104) *Canis sordidus non timet lutum* (A dirty dog is not afraid of the mud),

the dog is associated with a person who has become indifferent to cleanliness and neatness, and is not ashamed of their state. In English, the comparative expression

(105) *As dirty as a dog.*

In English proverbs the zoonym *dog* takes on a pejorative tone and represents people who despise personal cleanliness, lead an irresponsible lifestyle, and exist in an environment that reflects their internal negligence and disorder:

- (106) *Dirty dogs get dirty dens;*
 (107) *A muddy dog enjoys the rain.*

The image of the dog in the analyzed linguistic cultures may symbolize impudence, audacity, and shamelessness. In Latin proverbs, the lexeme *canis* is used to characterize impudent people who behave insolently and constantly demand more:

- (108) *Canis sine osse latrare non desinit* (A dog without a bone does not stop barking),
 (109) *Canis satiates famescit adhuc* (A satiated dog is still hungry).

In the linguistic worldview of the English, the zoonym *dog* serves to characterize impudent people who, after receiving help, demand even more, becoming shameless and ungrateful:

- (110) *Give a dog an inch and he will take a mile;*
 (111) *The more you feed a dog, the more he barks.*

The analyzed zoonym metaphorically verbalizes in proverbs the concept of poverty, demonstrating the social status of a person in society. In the Latin proverb the image and lifestyle of the dog become the basis for comparison with the impoverished condition of a person:

- (112) *Mendicus et canis de eadem scutella edunt* (A beggar and a dog eat from the same bowl).

In English linguistic culture, the images of the dog, the beggar, and the widow's cat embody the idea of poverty and the harsh life of a person:

- (113) *A beggar's dog and a widow's cat are always lean.*

Additionally, as a result of metaphorical transfer, the analyzed zoonym in the imagination of the Roman and English peoples serves not only to express a person's impoverished condition but also to assess the negative influence of their surroundings, highlighting the importance of choosing friends and environment:

(114) *Qui cum canibus concumbunt, cum pulicibus surgent*
(He who lies with dogs will rise with fleas);

(115) *If you lie down with dogs, you will get up with fleas.*

In the linguistic consciousness of the Romans, the dog was associated with uselessness, redundancy, or lack of value. In Latin proverbs, the animal symbolized things or people who had lost their usefulness and become unnecessary:

(116) *Canis inutilis abicitur* (An unnecessary dog is thrown out);

(117) *Canis sine dentibus nullius est usus* (A toothless dog is of no use);

(118) *Canem vetulum novi catulli depellunt* (Young puppies drive away the old dog).

In English, the dog also symbolizes something or someone who no longer has value, has become redundant, or does not bring any benefit:

(119) *An old dog is driven from the door;*

(120) *A dog without teeth is useless;*

(121) *A dog that has lost its master is a stray.*

Thus, in the studied linguistic cultures, the image of the dog reflects not only the idea of the futility of material wealth but also the harsh attitude of society towards people who have lost their usefulness.

In the linguistic traditions of the Roman and English peoples, proverbs with the analyzed zoonym, based on comparison with a chained dog, reflect the idea of captivity, restriction, and dependence:

(122) *Canis in vinculis latrat frustra* (A dog on a chain barks in vain);

(123) *A chained dog does not hunt.*

In certain English proverbs, the dog is portrayed as a conflict-prone creature, serving as the basis for the metaphorical use of the zoonym to denote social relations between people and symbolizing hostility and conflict:

(124) *Fight like cats and dogs;*

(125) *As mean as a junkyard dog;*

(126) *Two dogs and a bone never agree.*

The results of quantitative analysis (Table 1) demonstrate the dominance of negative connotations associated with the image of the dog in both linguocultures (approximately 78% in Latin and 70% in English). This prevalence arises because the animal was primarily perceived as a bearer of aggressive instincts, which served as a basis for metaphorical reinterpretation and the projection of negative human traits.

Table 1. Results of quantitative analysis

Connotation	Latin		English	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Deceit, gossip, insincerity	9	13%	12	11%
Conflict, lack of agreement	6	9%	6	5%
Ignorance, foolishness	7	10%	4	4%
Aggression, danger	9	13%	5	5%
Ingratitude, betrayal	8	12%	6	5%
Greed, gluttony	6	9%	4	4%
Poverty, destitution	7	10%	4	4%
Laziness, passivity	5	7%	2	2%
Dirt, untidiness, negligence	4	6%	3	3%
Impudence, shamelessness	3	4%	2	2%
Futility, uselessness	4	6%	2	2%
Dependence	2	3%	1	1%
Cowardice	4	6%	5	5%
Egoism, indifference	4	6%	4	%
Total	53	78%	77	70%

5.2 Positive connotations of the zoonym dog

Let us examine the positive connotations of the zoonym in the paroemiological heritage of the ancient Romans and the British. The image of the dog primarily embodies notions of loyalty, kindness, obedience, and selfless love. Dogs are always by one's side when support is needed, rejoice at their owner's return home, and daily bestow boundless love and joy upon humans. It is precisely kindness and loyalty, embodied in the image of the dog, that serve as universal shared values for humanity, regardless of historical epoch, nationality, religion, or culture. Most often, the image of the dog symbolizes loyalty and goodwill in English linguoculture. This is evidenced by a number of proverbs:

- (127) *A dog knows the hand that feeds it;*
- (128) *A dog never betrays his master;*
- (129) *A dog never forgets his home;*
- (130) *A dog never forgets who saved him;*
- (131) *A dog's loyalty lasts a lifetime;*
- (132) *A dog's loyalty is worth more than gold;*
- (133) *A dog's trust is the greatest treasure;*
- (134) *A dog's loyalty cannot be bought;*
- (135) *A faithful dog is worth a thousand friends;*
- (136) *A loyal dog never forgets his home;*
- (137) *Dogs never betray their friends;*
- (138) *A dog is a man's best friend.*

In English, the dog, owing to its loyalty, self-sacrifice, and selfless kindness, embodies the notion of an angelic essence – an invisible force that stands guard over goodness at every moment:

- (139) *A dog is proof that angels exist.*

In Roman linguoculture, the kindness and sincerity of the dog were also regarded as symbols of fidelity:

- (140) *Canis amici fidelissimi sunt* (Dogs are the most faithful friends);
- (141) *Fidelis canis numquam nocet* (A loyal dog never harms).

In certain proverbs, we observe the association between dog and friend, which represents the friendliness of dogs projected onto human qualities:

- (142) *Canis – amicus hominis* (A dog is a friend of man);
- (143) *The dog is man's best friend;*
- (145) *A dog's love heals a broken heart;*
- (146) *A dog's love is the greatest gift;*
- (147) *Dogs are love wrapped in fur;*
- (148) *Dogs bring warmth to the coldest hearts;*
- (149) *Dogs do not lie about love;*
- (150) *Dogs make bad day better;*
- (151) *No home is empty when you have a dog.*

The paroemia

- (152) *A dog's tongue heals many wounds*

reflects both the literal and figurative meanings of the lexeme. Primarily, the saying is linked to the folk belief that a dog's saliva has bactericidal properties and can heal wounds. Figuratively, the image of the dog embodies love, care, and devotion, which have a soothing and therapeutic effect on the human soul.

Among the positive connotations of the zoonym in the paroemiological heritage of the ancient Romans and the English, we distinguish not only loyalty and kindness but also wisdom and experience, rooted in such canine traits as attentiveness, vigilance, and caution. A striking example of the use of the zoonym *dog* to denote an experienced and knowledgeable person in Roman and English linguocultures are the proverbs:

- (153) *Canis sapiens non latrat in vanum* (A wise dog does not bark in vain);
- (154) *A smart dog knows when to bark and when to be silent;*
- (155) *Dogs speak with their eyes.*

Moreover, an important component of wisdom and experience is age, both in animals and humans. In the Latin proverbs the image of an old dog embodies the notion of an experienced person, for

with time come wisdom and understanding, allowing *homo sapiens* to avoid mistakes and not panic over trivialities:

(156) *Canis vetus negligit furem* (An old dog does not fear a thief);

(157) *Canis vetus os sapiat* (An old dog knows a good bone).

In the linguistic consciousness of the British, the image of an old dog is also associated with a wise and experienced person:

(158) *An old dog does not bark without reason;*

(159) *An old dog barks not in vain;*

(160) *The old dog for the hard road;*

(161) *When the old dog barks, take notice;*

(162) *An old dog knows the best bone.*

In certain paroemias, the linguistic unit is used figuratively to verbalize solidarity, mutual support, or the unlikelihood of betrayal among like-minded individuals:

(163) *Canis caninam non est* (A dog does not eat dog);

(164) *Canis caninam non est mordere pellem* (A dog does not chew another dog's hide);

(165) *Latrante uno latrat statim et alter canis* (When one dog barks, another immediately joins);

(166) *Qui amat me, amat et canem meum* (Who loves me, loves my dog too);

(167) *Dog does not eat dog;*

(168) *Love me, love my dog.*

The dog, as an animal that carefully selects its owner, food, or resting place, has become a symbol of discernment in various linguocultures, reflecting both positive (wise choice) and negative (excessive pickiness) human traits:

(169) *Canis satur ingrata esca est* (A sated dog finds food distasteful);

(170) *A full-fed dog does not hunt.*

Despite a number of shared features of the zoonym in Roman and English cultures, paroemiological heritage highlights the national-cultural peculiarities in how each nation perceives the image of the dog. It is known that dogs, due to their physiological ability to rotate their ears in any direction, possess exceptionally acute hearing and can detect sounds imperceptible to humans. This trait has undergone metaphorical transfer, becoming a symbol of vigilance – a person distinguished by attentiveness, observational skills, and the ability to notice subtle details while remaining alert:

(171) *A dog's ears hear everything.*

In English linguistic consciousness, the image of the dog embodies not only loyalty and devotion but also honesty:

(172) *A dog's eyes never lie;*

(173) *An honest dog does not steal from his master.*

The animal's natural instincts to sense danger and human emotions have formed the basis for the metaphorical use of the zoonym as a symbol of a person with developed intuition:

(174) *Even a lost dog knows his way home.*

The proverb

(175) *A dog's nose knows*

emphasizes not only the dog's ability but also the human capacity to intuitively avoid mistakes, act cautiously, react swiftly to changes, and make sound decisions in complex life situations. English proverbs not only describe the animal's innate ability to discern human intentions and intuitively sense kind people, but also serve as symbols of individuals with heightened intuition:

(176) *Dogs always recognize a good heart;*

(177) *Dogs know a friend from a foe.*

Among the positive connotations of the dog's image in British paroemiological heritage, we distinguish the trait of perseverance, which underlies the metaphorical use of the zoonym to denote people who persistently move forward, striving to transform obstacles into means for achieving goals and success:

(178) *The dog that trots about finds a bone.*

Although the dog was domesticated in ancient times and played a significant role in human life as a guardian against predators, a shepherd, or a hunter, the paroemiological corpus of the analyzed languages contains far fewer proverbs with the *dog* component that carry a positive connotation. In our opinion, this can be explained by the perception of the dog as a wicked, cruel, and subordinate being, rooted in the understanding of the dog as a guard for whom these traits are beneficial. Consequently, the symbolic meanings of 'loyalty', 'devotion', and 'wisdom' appear much less frequently. Quantitative characteristics of proverbs and sayings with positive connotations of the dog's image in Latin and English are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Quantitative characteristics of proverbs and sayings with positive connotations of the dog's image in Latin and English

Connotation	Latin		English	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Loyalty, friendship, love	5	7%	20	18%
Wisdom, experience	4	6%	6	5%
Solidarity, support	3	4%	2	2%
Vigilance, intuition	2	3%	4	4%
Persistence, endurance	1	2%	1	1%
Total	15	22%	33	30%

6. Conclusion

Human life, experience, and beliefs have long been closely intertwined with the animal world, where the dog holds a special place as one of the most devoted and benevolent domestic animals, and a faithful guardian of human dwellings. Proverbs containing the zoonym *dog* offer a unique reflection of centuries of human observation, capturing this animal's behavior, appear-

ance, and role in daily life. They attest to the emotional and value-driven attitude of humans towards 'our smaller brothers.' An in-depth analysis of proverbs with the lexeme *dog* allows for a better understanding of the nature of the of the human-animal bond, tracing the symbolism of the dog's image and identifying the spheres in which this symbolism operates. A comparison of paroemias featuring the *dog* component in Latin and English has revealed both universal traits of the canine image, shared across these linguocultures, and nationally specific connotations shaped by cultural-historical context and the native speakers' mentality. The figurative component of the zoonym *dog* in the linguistic cultures of the ancient Roman and English peoples has been examined through the analysis of a set of cognitive metaphors, defined here as stable conceptual models through which human experience is structured by means of animal imagery. Cognitive metaphors reflect the verbal behavior, emotional states, and social characteristics of human beings that are metaphorically projected onto the image of the dog. This approach affords a systematic account of how universal patterns of metaphorical thinking – such as “speech – animal sounds”, “outward submissiveness – concealed aggression and hostility”, “human traits – animal characteristics”, “resistance to novelty – human narrow-mindedness”, and “canine greed – human selfishness” – are realized within the paroemiological tradition while simultaneously acquiring culturally specific interpretations in Latin and English. The cognitive metaphors identified corroborate the foundational propositions of Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory, according to which metaphor functions not merely as a stylistic device but as a mechanism for the conceptualization of experience and an instrument for the description of human traits, behavior, and social relations. The dog serves as a marker of anthropocentric characteristics, reflecting the ambivalent human attitude towards the animal: from negative attributes – aggressiveness, cunning, and ingratitude — to positive ones, including loyalty, wisdom, and perseverance. Analysis of Latin and English paroemias establishes that in the linguistic consciousness of the ancient Romans and the English, negative connotations of the dog image are predominant – approximately 78% in Latin and 70% in English – having been formed on the basis of interpretations

of the animal's instincts and behavior. In both linguistic cultures, the zoonym functions as a symbol of aggressiveness, treachery, greed, insincerity, ingratitude, selfishness, sloth, stupidity, and moral and social degradation. At the same time, a tendency towards a positive psycho-emotional reappraisal of the dog image is discernible in British linguistic culture: approximately 30% of proverbs activate ameliorative connotations – friendship, devotion, and psychological comfort – attesting to an evolution in the perception of the dog as a human friend and companion, and reflecting a contemporary anthropocentric worldview. The divergences in the interpretation of the zoonym are conditioned by the distinctive mentality, worldview, cultural traditions, and historical heritage of the respective speech communities.

References

- Asimopoulou, The, Panagiotis. "Zoonym 'dog' in idiomatic expressions in the Bulgarian, Greek, Russian and Serbian languages". *Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie(scol)*, vol. XI, no. 1-2, 2018, pp. 130–147.
- Babič, Saša. "Animal predators as a characterising element in short folklore forms". *Proverbium - Yearbook*, vol. 41, no. 1, July 2024, pp. 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.29162/pv.41.1.472>, retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Belkhir, Sadia. "Cultural influence on the use of DOG concepts in English and Kabyle proverbs". *Metaphor and intercultural communication*, 2014, pp. 131–145. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472593610.ch-007>, retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Błajet, Zuzanna, and Błajet, Piotr. "Metafora z motywem psa, czyli o bliskości odległych kultur" [A dog-themed metaphor about the proximity of distant cultures]. *Edukacja międzykulturowa*, vol. 1, no.6, 2017, pp. 163–181. retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Farghal, Mohammed, and Haider, Ahmad S. "English dog expressions: Categorisation, structure, attitude, semantic molecules, and translatability into Arabic". *Training, Language and Culture*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2023, pp. 41–58. doi: 10.22363/2521-442X-2023-7-3-41-58, retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Fauconnier, Gilles, and Turner, Mark. *The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.
- Holodnova, Yevheniia Yu. "Desemantyzatsiia elementa «sobaka» / HUND yak komponenta stal'nykh narodnykh porivnian i frazeologizmiv ukrainskoi ta nimetskoi mov." [Desemanticisation of the element 'dog' / HUND

- as a component of the established folk comparisons and phraseology of the Ukrainian and German languages]. *Linhvistychni studii*, vol. 22, 2011, pp. 263–267.
- Holubovska, Iryna O. “Metaforyko-symvolichni ipostasi zoonimiv u ramkakh frahmenta movnoi kartyny svitu ‘tsarstvo tvaryn’ [Metaphorical and symbolic Implications of zoonyms within the fragment “animal kingdom” of the linguistic world picture]. *Movoznavstvo*, vol. 6, 2003, pp. 61–68.
- Holubovska, Iryna O. *Etnichni osoblyvosti movnykh kartyn svitu* [Ethnic specifics of linguistic worldviews]. Kyiv: Lohos, 2004.
- Hrebeniuk, Alla. “Typolohiia frazeolohizmiv z komponentom-faunonimom” [Typology of phraseological units with a faunonym component]. *Filolohichni studii: Naukovyi visnyk Kryvorizkoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu*, 2011, vol. 6, no 1, pp. 128–133.
- Kochman-Haładaj, Bożena. “A cognitive contrast of Polish and English proverbs with dog components”. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, vol. IX, no 1, 2024, pp. 35–66. ISSN 2453–8035 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.24.9.1.03>, retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Kyryliuk, Mariia, and Stavchuk Nataliia. “Strukturno-semantychni ta kohnityvni osoblyvosti frazeolohizmiv z nomenamy na poznachennia domashnikh ptakhiv u nimetskii, anhliiskii ta ukrainskii movakh” [Structural, semantic and cognitive features of phraseological units with nomens for poultry in German, English and Ukrainian]. *Filolohichni chasopysy*, vol. 1, no. 11, 2018, pp. 55–64.
- Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, George, and Turner, Mark. *More than a Cool Reason – A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lazer-Pankiv, Olesya V. “Osoblyvosti davnohretskoi zoomorfnoi metafory na poznachennia rys kharakteru liudyny” [Peculiarities of the Ancient Greek zoomorphic metaphor for human character traits]. *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu*. 2012, pp. 391–398.
- Liu, Jianwen. “A Comparative study of English and Chinese animal proverbs – From the perspective of metaphors”. *Theory and practice in language studies*, vol. 3, no 10, 2013, pp. 1844–1849. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.10.1844-1849>, retrieved on 1 June 2025.
- Myzyn, Tetiana O. “Tvaryny yak obiekt linhvokultury.” [Animals as an object of linguistic culture]. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*, vol.25, no. 1, 2022, pp. 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.25.1.26>

- Novikova, Olha V. *Verbalna obiektyvatsiia kontseptiv CAT i DOG u suchasni anhliskii linhvokulturi* [Verbal Objectification of CAT and DOG Concepts in Modern English Linguoculture]: Dys. na zdob. nauk. stupenia kand. filoloh. nauk: 10.02.04 'Hermanski movy'. Zaporizkyi natsionalnyi universytet, 2021.
- Paziak, Mykhailo M. *Ukrainski prysliv'ia ta prykazky: problemy paremiolohii ta paremiohrafii* [Ukrainian proverbs and sayings: problems of paremiology and paremiography]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1984.
- Petryshyn, Marta. "Zoomorfna metafora v latynskykh prysliviakh i prykazkakh." [Zoomorphic metaphor in Latin proverbs and sayings]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu 'Ostrozka akademiia'. Seriia : Filolohichna* 51, 2015, pp. 285–287.
- Rashidi, Naser, and Ghaedi, Hadis. "Contrastive discourse analysis of Persian and English animal proverbs". *Babel*, vol. 59, 2013, pp. 1–24. doi: 10.1075/babel.59.1.01ras
- Salata, Iryna A. "Osoblyvosti semantychnoho y prahmatychnoho aspektiv zoomorfnykh frazeolohizmiv v anhliskii ta ukrainskii movakh." [The peculiarities of semantic and pragmatic aspects of zoomorphic phraseology in English and Ukrainian]. *Filolohichni studii*, vol. 5, 2010, pp. 57–64.
- Suima, I., Shevchyk, K., Novikova, O. "Metaforychna obiektyvatsiia anhliskoho kontseptu Dog" [Metaphoric objectivation of the English concept DOG]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Ser.: Filolohiia*, vol. 52, 2021, pp. 183–186. <https://doi.org/10.32841/2409-1154.2021.52-1.44>
- Uzhchenko, Dmytro V. *Semantyka ukrainskykh zoofrazeolohizmiv v etnokulturnomu vysvitleni* [Semantics of Ukrainian zoological phraseology in the context of ethnocultural coverage]: dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.01 (Kharkiv), 2000.
- Waśniewska, Małgorzata A. "Dog or a Wolf – The Role of Connotations in Animalistic Metaphors and the Process of Dehumanisation." *New Horizons in English Studies*, vol. 3, no.3, 2018, pp. 3–17. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/nh.2018.3.3>
- Zaporozhets, Larysa P. The relationship between the subject and the symbolic in the structure of the paremic content, *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu: zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv : Instytut ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy*, vol. 6, 2002, pp. 154–157.

Primary Sources

Dicionário de Expressões e Frases Latinas. Compilando por Henerik Kocher.
https://hkocher.info/minha_pagina/adagia/adagia.htm, retrieved on 15 May 2025.

The Oxford Dictionary of Idioms, ed. by Judith Siefring. 2nd ed. (Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press), 2004.

Korzh, Nadiia. H. *Iz skarbnyci antychnoi mudrosti* [From the treasury of ancient wisdom]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola, 1994.

Latynska frazeolohiia: Slovnyk-dovidnyk [Latin phraseology : A reference dictionary] (2009), ed. by P. I. Osipov. Kyiv: Akademvydav, 2009.

Speake, Jennifer. *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Lyazidi, Rachid. *Animal Proverbs and Quotes Kingdom. Domestic Animals*. Parker, Colorado: Outskirts Press, 2012.

Marta Petryshyn
Department of General and Germanic Linguistics
Vasyl Stefanyk Carpathian National University
Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine
E-mail: marta.petryshyn@cnu.edu.ua

Halyna Zahaiska
Department of Romanian and Classical Philology
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
Chernivtsi, Ukraine
E-mail: g.zagaiska@chnu.edu.ua

Oksana Liubimova
Department of Romanian and Classical Philology
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
Chernivtsi, Ukraine
E-mail: o.liubimova@chnu.edu.ua

Copyright (c) 2026 Author(s)

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

