Original Research

English dog expressions: Categorisation, structure, attitude, semantic molecules, and translatability into Arabic

by Mohammed Farghal and Ahmad S. Haider

Mohammed Farghal Applied Science Private University & MEU Research Unit, Middle East University, Jordan m_farghal@hotmail.com
Ahmad S. Haider Applied Science Private University & MEU Research Unit, Middle East University, Jordan ah_haider86@yahoo.com

The present study aims to examine dog expressions in English in terms of categorisation, structure, attitude, semantic molecules, and translatability. This paper shows that the richness of English dog expressions qualifies the conceptual metaphor HUMANS are DOGS at a status comparable to that of the universal conceptual metaphor HUMANS are ANIMALS. The data in this study consists of 110 English dog expressions, a large sample that may not exhaust the entire corpus. This data is mainly collected from internet sources, dictionaries, linguistic textbooks, and native speakers of English. Based on the analysis of these expressions, the results show that 91.25% map negative dog attributes and habits onto people despite the highly-esteemed position the dog now occupies in Anglo-American cultures. Idiomatic expressions are found to be dominant in the data (72.72%), followed equally by idiomatic comparisons (13.64%) and proverbs (13.64%). While idiomatic comparisons and proverbs are structurally realised uniformly in similes and sentences respectively, idiomatic expressions are varied in structure, which is mostly realised in noun phrases (50%) and verb phrases (43.75%). In terms of semantic molecules, dog expressions are shown to reflect a rich spectrum of source domains. Regarding translatability, only some dog expressions translate formally, while most call for either functional equivalence or paraphrase. To conclude, this paper fills in a gap by systematically investigating English dog expressions from several perspectives. Besides, it is particularly valuable for both non-native English speakers who may not be familiar with many of the dog expressions in the corpus and native English speakers whose lexical competence may fall short of accounting for all the expressions in the data.

KEYWORDS: *dog expressions, attitude, semantic molecule, translation, conceptual metaphor, idiom*

1. INTRODUCTION

Making meaning in human language ranges between the literal and the figurative. While the literal mainly implements the open principle by preserving the dictionary meaning of lexical items in a proposition, the figurative mainly follows the idiom principle where lexical items lose their dictionary meaning to varying degrees in favour of a unitary meaning (Sinclair, 1991). Idiomatic expressions, in which English abounds, are a typical category where there is a huge loss of dictionary meaning in favour of figurative meaning. Thus, one entity (e.g., dog) is interpreted in terms of another entity (e.g., human). Such expressions must have started out as creative metaphors but have become fossilised expressions that have largely lost their creative aspect over time. Figurative meaning usually exploits comparisons drawn between two entities or concepts in an unusual

way to attract the reader's attention and conceptualise ideas vividly. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) view figures of speech in human language as conceptual metaphors that underlie the entire human conceptual system. In this vein, Schäffner (2004) considers conceptual metaphors as basic resources for thought processes in human society rather than only decorative elements.

The general conceptual metaphor HUMANS are ANIMALS seems to be a universal molecule in the human conceptual system (see Fraser, 1981; Newmark, 1988; Davies & Bentahila, 1989; Nadim, 2000; Faghih, 2001; Hsieh, 2006; Estaji & Nakhavali, 2011a, 2011b; Miri & Soori, 2015; Anjomshoa & Sadighi, 2015; Pourhossein, 2016; Farghal, 2019, 2021). This encompassing conceptual metaphor which maps a plethora of animal attributes as source domains onto human nature and behaviour as target domains overwhelmingly takes the negative

rather than the positive side. For example, Newmark (1988) states that animal metaphors are usually employed to portray inferior or undesirable human habits and attributes. Therefore, negative attributes like deception, laziness, stupidity, stubbornness, worthlessness, dirtiness, incompetence, aggressiveness, etc. find a haven in the animal kingdom for analogues that reflect the way human beings behave and think.

The present study aims to examine dog expressions in English in terms of categorisation, structure, attitude, semantic molecules, and translatability. To start with, one is amazed by the large number of English dog expressions which draw analogues practically pertaining to all walks of life. This amazement is heightened when it comes to English non-native speakers who need to comprehend and sometimes produce dog expressions in their day-to-day communication. Some dog expressions may even astound them on first encounter, e.g. *It's raining cats and dogs* (raining very heavily) or *My dogs are barking* (my feet are aching due to much standing). The large number of English dog expressions may even lead one to assume that the conceptual metaphor HUMANS are DOGS is comparable in its salience to the universal conceptual metaphor HUMANS are ANIMALS.

Despite the existence of several dictionaries and internet resources that list and explain English dog expressions, there are no systematic research studies that examine the linguistic nature of such expressions. This quantitative and qualitative study is intended to fill in this gap. There will be an attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. What categories are featured in dog expressions and their frequency?

2. What structural features are found in dog expressions and their frequency?

3. What attitudes (positive/negative) are expressed in dog expressions and their frequency?

4. What are the most salient semantic molecules in dog expressions?

5. How translatable are dog expressions into Arabic?

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Figurative language is used frequently in everyday speech and writing and includes idiomatic phrases, proverbs, and conceptual metaphors. They can be utilised to explain complicated ideas succinctly and memorably (Colston & Gibbs, 2021). Idiomatic expressions are words or phrases with a metaphorical meaning that is not immediately apparent from their literal meaning (Glucksberg & McGlone, 2001). For instance, *It's raining cats and dogs* does not refer to actual cats and dogs really dropping from the sky. It indicates heavy rain instead. Proverbs are short, pithy sayings that impart knowledge or wisdom. Proverbs can be used to instruct or inspire people because they frequently have a moral or lesson in them (Farghal, 2019). To grasp one notion in terms of another, one can employ conceptual metaphors (Abu Rumman et al., 2023). Using the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY as an illustration, we might consider time to be a valuable resource that can be used, conserved, or

wasted. Proverbs, idioms, and conceptual metaphors are all closely related to one another. Proverbs are frequently found in idiomatic language, and they can be thought of as more explicit mental analogies or conceptual metaphors (Farghal & Saeed, 2022).

Idiomatic expressions and proverbs are not just random word combinations. They instead have a structured underpinning that is founded on conceptual metaphors. English has many different and rich terms for dogs. They can be used to characterise dogs, their actions, and their interactions with people. Dog expressions can convey a variety of attitudes, from affection to rage. There are many different ways that dog expressions can be put together and structured. 'Dog' and 'bark' are two examples of phrases that are merely nouns or verbs. Other dog phrases are more sophisticated and may include metaphorical language. For instance, the expression *Dog eat dog world* alludes to a hostile and competitive workplace. Using metaphor effectively might help people create vivid and unforgettable visuals. As an illustration, the expression *He's a real dog* might be used to characterise someone who is unreliable or violent.

The context in which a dog expression is used, the tone of the speaker's voice, and the relationship between the speaker and the listener are just a few of the variables that might affect the attitude that it conveys. For instance, when praising a dog for good behaviour, the phrase *Good boy* may be used in a humorous or friendly manner or in a more serious manner. Semantic molecules are small units of meaning that can be combined to form new phrases. For instance, the expression *Dog eat dog world* can be made using the semantic molecules 'dog', 'eat', and 'world'. Dog utterances often contain semantic molecules. They enable speakers to produce new expressions quickly and effortlessly, and they can be employed to convey a variety of meanings. Concerning translatability, it can be challenging to translate dog expressions into Arabic. While some dog idioms are straightforward to translate, some are more difficult (Farghal & Al-Hamly, 2015). The meaning of the expression, its structure, and the cultural context in which it is used can all affect how difficult it is to translate.

Animal expressions are sometimes used to describe human behaviours and feelings. Additionally, they can be employed to convey metaphors, make comparisons, and convey attitudes. In recent years, there has been a growing amount of studies of animal expressions. Belkhir (2019) examines the use of animal-related concepts in English, French, Arabic, and Kabyle proverbs, making the case that these proverbs provide interesting instances of how culture can affect conceptual metaphor and how it manifests in language. The researcher made an effort to demonstrate that different notions within the same animal species can be ranked. The results showed the impact of cultural contexts and cultural models on the primary meaning foci defining the concepts of DOG, LION, ASS, HORSE, CAMEL, and OX, leading to not only a classification of these animals in a hierarchical manner but also a classification of animals within one animal species as a result of the influences of cultural contexts and cul-

tural models. According to the study's findings, sociocultural circumstances influence the primary meaning foci defining the animal source domain concepts used in the HUMAN IS ANIMAL metaphor, resulting in animal-animal ranks within the same species and across species.

Al-Harahsheh (2020) examines the metaphorical and vocative uses of animal names in Jordanian Spoken Arabic (JSA) to address people, either abusively or warmly, in order to convey the attitudes and feelings of the speakers toward their addressees. The study's findings are based on a survey that was given to 100 undergraduate students at Yarmouk University in Jordan (50 men and 50 women) and comprised 44 animal names. The study comes to the conclusion that human invectives frequently use animal vocative patterns. The findings show that Jordanians refer to people as animals based on their appearance, behaviour, intelligence, and character, and recommends that while performing pragmatic studies about speech exchanges in JSA, linguists should take these factors into account.

According to Yakub (2020), metaphors, in general, have been observed to be crucial to the interpretation and comprehension of human language. Animal metaphors, particularly in proverbs, have frequently been employed to describe specific human behavioural patterns. By examining how specific animals are used in Nzema (a Kwa language of Ghana) proverbs to depict various human experiences, behaviours, and attributions based on the socio-traditional values, beliefs, and overall worldview of the people of Nzema, the researcher conducted a cognitive-conceptual metaphorical analysis of animal proverbs in Nzema. Adopting the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), the researcher argued that the animals serve as the source domain and other human experiences serve as the target domain. The findings showed that both domestic and nondomestic animals are used in Nzema proverbs to caution people against undesirable attitudes like recalcitrance, procrastination, greed, and all kinds of social vices. Nondomestic animals include birds, flies, insects, and reptiles. Proverbs also make use of these creatures to guide humans toward virtues like kindness, patience, cooperation, obedience, tolerance, forgiveness, faithfulness, and hard work, among others.

Altarbaq (2020) examines some popular animal idioms in English and their Arabic equivalents in two different idiom dictionaries, namely, *Al-Mawrid: A Dictionary of Idiomatic Expressions* and *A Dictionary of Common English Proverbs*. He attempts to provide a clearer understanding of the literal and free translation methods utilised in idiom dictionaries. The study adopts Nida's (1964) theories of idiom translation as well as Baker's (2018) strategies. This study's methodology is a qualitative approach based on corpus linguistics and critical analysis. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs, McGraw-Hill's American Idioms Dictionary,* and an online English dictionary called *The Free Dictionary* were all utilised to clarify each idiom's meaning in English. To make the analysis process easier, the data were then split into three idiom categories: identical idioms, semi-identical idioms, and culturally distinctive idioms. The findings show that

the chosen dictionaries contain certain English and Arabic animal idioms that are similar to one another and that are different from each other. Some idioms utilise animals in exactly the same way in both English and Arabic, while others use animals differently yet have a comparable meaning. Others might convey the same concept using different imagery, and the author might explain how idioms function in translation in a way that makes sense in the target language.

Al-Qahtani and Qahtani (2021) examine the issues translators encountered when translating animal idioms from English into Arabic. Based on Nida's (1964) methodologies for translating idioms, the study addresses the challenges and solutions of interpreting animal idioms. To acquire a thorough grasp of the translational issues and procedures used by Saudi translators in the transference of animal idioms from English into Arabic, the researchers designed an empirical study using a blended method of qualitative and quantitative approaches. According to the study's findings, even when an equivalent idiom can be found in Arabic, the majority of translator respondents chose to translate an idiom into a non-idiom. Both Arabic and English have many idioms referring to animals. Animal idioms, however, have the potential to widen the cultural divide that prevents mutual understanding between Arab and Western civilisations because of the historical, cultural, geographical, and philosophical disparities between them.

Khelf (2021) emphasises the semantic meaning and pragmatic function of animal names in Arabic and English proverbs and highlights the significance of the differences and similarities between Arabic and English proverbs. Although there are many different animal proverbs in Arabic and English, certain animals have universal cognition, while others have different cognition in the two languages. Animal proverbs in Arabic and English both use the same conceptual metaphor. The researcher comes to the conclusion that the semantic nature of proverbial expressions presents a significant challenge for linguists who are interested in analysing the functions of proverbs across languages, keeping in mind the cultural differences that exist between them and the role that these differences play in the semantic interpretation of these expressions.

Bachrun (2023) investigates the metaphors of dogs in English and Indonesian proverbial expressions and examines the shared target domains that are present in both languages. The findings showed that there are twenty concepts that were found to be the target domains of the lexicon 'dog' inside the proverbs being analysed in this research. These include a terrible person; a fortunate talent; a spiteful person; a hungry soul; significant problems; a cornered person; an offender; a close friend; a fool; a threat; a lucky talent; an unappreciative person; a powerful person; insincerity; courageous nature; humble upbringing; decisions significance; perceived aspects; grateful someone; and a coward. The study concludes that the way that the English and Indonesian speech communities perceive the term dog symbolically differs. However, both speech groups' preserved the lexicon 'dogs' and still used common ideas as their target domains.

'Idiomatic expressions and proverbs are not just random word combinations. They instead have a structured underpinning that is founded on conceptual metaphors. English has many different and rich terms for dogs. They can be used to characterise dogs, their actions, and their interactions with people. Dog expressions can convey a variety of attitudes, from affection to rage. There are many different ways that dog expressions can be put together and structured. 'Dog' and 'bark' are two examples of phrases that are merely nouns or verbs. Other dog phrases are more sophisticated and may include metaphorical language'

Madani et al. (2023) examine the connotative implications of animal-related proverbs used to describe male and female conduct in Algerian and Jordanian communities. To do this, 30 native Arabic speakers enrolled at the University of Jordan received questionnaires, including 46 Algerian and 45 Jordanian proverbs about animals. The findings revealed that animal-related proverbs from Algeria and Jordan had various connotative interpretations. In both cultures, women were primarily connected with negative connotations that portrayed traits like frailty, stupidity, inferiority, cunningness, and deception. Men were described with similar traits, though women in Arab societies were continuously portrayed as inferior and despised. Men, on the other hand, were portrayed as having power, dominance, superiority, and authority over women. Additionally, to emphasise the attractiveness of women, positive representations included animals like gazelles, peacocks, partridges, cats, and horses. Horses, camels, and lions were associated with men's superior qualities, such as strength, bravery, and dominance. The study emphasised how often men and women in Algerian and Jordanian communities are referred to as animals in proverbs.

Hamdan et al. (2023) explored how Jordanian Arabic speakers understood the meanings of the ten animal metaphors that were most frequently used in Jordanian contexts. The findings suggest that the ten most prevalent animal metaphors in the Jordanian context are (1) X IS A MONKEY, (2) X IS A DONKEY, (3) X IS A COW, (4) X IS A SNAKE, (5) X IS A DOG, (6) X IS A PIG, (7) X IS A BEAR, (8) X IS A DUCK, (9) X IS AN OWL, and (10) X IS A DEER. They have 39 distinct implications altogether. There are five meanings associated with the phrase X IS A MONKEY, with hyperactivity being the most prevalent. Regarding X IS A DONKEY, it has four meanings, with ignorance being the most prevalent one. X IS A COW has six meanings and is frequently used to refer to obesity, particularly in females. X IS A SNAKE implies that one is poisonous and dishonest. When it comes to X IS A DOG, bad manners are primarily associated with it. There are three meanings associated with the phrase X IS A PIG, and lying is one of them. Regarding X IS A BEAR, it has four meanings, with overweight being the most common. There are three meanings to the phrase X IS a DUCK, but the main one is being attractive and having a good

figure. There are three meanings associated with X IS AN OWL, with pessimism being the main one. Finally, X IS A DEER has three meanings, with beauty being the most prevalent. The study's findings suggest that animal metaphors are culturally loaded and that our environment has an impact on how we perceive and use animals metaphorically.

Al-Hamzi et al. (2023) investigate the socio-pragmatics of English translations of Yemeni Arabic (YA) names for animals and other mythical creatures. By sending a questionnaire to 43 native English speakers (NESs), focusing on target language metaphors and similes (TL), the study seeks to find out the most effective English translations of these metaphors. The results show that YA dialects prefer to employ precise similes that combine feature and element, whereas NESs preferred to utilise the names of animals and mystical entities to convey meanings, feelings, and intent. The majority of NESs rejected the metaphor because it lacks simile, in contrast to YA, which accepts all three types of metaphor and simile to refer to humans by the names of animals and fantastical creatures. These results point to probable cultural translation disparities between the two languages and cultures for names of animals and supernatural creatures. In general, this research advances our knowledge of the socio-pragmatics of language use in many cultures and how it affects intercultural communication. The results point to the need for additional study into how the names of animals and supernatural beings translate across languages and cultures.

The current study will look more closely at English dog expressions. It will concentrate on classifying, structuring, attitude, semantic molecules, and the capacity to translate these expressions into Arabic. Our comprehension of animal expressions, in general, and dog expressions, in particular, will be improved by the study's findings. They will also expose the difficulties involved in translating these idioms from English into Arabic. It closes a gap by providing a methodical analysis of English dog expressions from several angles. Additionally, it is extremely helpful for both non-native English speakers who might not be familiar with many of the dog idioms in the corpus and native English speakers whose lexical proficiency may fall short of accounting for all the expressions in the data.

3. MATERIAL AND METHODS
3.1. Data collection
The data in this study consists of 110 English dog expressions, a large sample which may not exhaust the entire corpus. This data is mainly collected from dictionaries, linguistic textbooks, native speakers of English, and online dictionaries.

A two-fold strategy was used to guarantee a thorough and reliable dataset as well as diverse coverage of dog expressions. The first step was to conduct a thorough search in academic databases, particularly linguistics and language-related archives. Furthermore, to extract dog-related terms, relevant corpus studies, authoritative dictionaries, recognised language textbooks and corpus studies were reviewed. In order to reduce selection bias and provide a solid dataset, this multi-source strategy was used.

'The first step was to conduct a thorough search in academic databases, particularly linguistics and language-related archives. Furthermore, to extract dog-related terms, relevant corpus studies, authoritative dictionaries, recognised language textbooks and corpus studies were reviewed'

3.2. Data pre-processing

To guarantee accuracy and consistency, the collected expressions underwent stringent and rigorous preprocessing procedures. This involved ensuring accuracy, getting rid of duplication, fixing typos, and uniformly normalising expressions. A clean dataset for analysis was produced as a result. One hundred and ten dog idioms were included in the dataset, which was compiled from a variety of language sources. To guarantee tracability, replicability and reproducibility, each expression was documented, along with its source.

3.3. Annotation

A thorough annotation strategy was developed to attain neutrality when assessing attitudes in dog expressions. The process of attitude annotation was carried out by a group of expert linguists who are knowledgeable about the intricacies of the English language. In order to foster a comprehensive knowledge of the attitude expressed, annotators were given access to the expression and its context. The annotation guidelines were used to classify each expression as either good, negative, or neutral. A subset of phrases was arbitrarily chosen, and each annotator worked independently to produce their own annotations in order to ensure reliability.

3.4. Quantitative analysis

Quantitative analysis was performed on the annotated dataset. The frequency of each attitude category (positive, negative, and neutral) within the dog expressions was calculated. These frequencies were crucial in identifying dominant attitudes and their distribution in the dataset.

4. STUDY RESULTS

4.1. Categorisation of dog expressions

Based on the study's corpus and the analysis of 110 examples, we hypothesise that English dog expressions fall into three main categories: idiomatic expressions, idiomatic comparisons, and proverbs. Idiomatic expressions are the most common category, accounting for 72.72% (80/110) in the data (see Appendix 1). An idiomatic expression is generally viewed as an expression whose meaning cannot be worked out based on the dictionary meaning of the words composing it (Wood, 2019). That is, it communicates a unitary meaning that drastically sails away from what it literally means. For example, the idiomatic expressions *puppy love* (young adolescent love) and *a dog in the manger* (a person who prevents or hinders others from having something that may benefit them, even though they do not want or need it) do not communicate messages about dogs but about humans. As

can be noticed, the degree of opaqueness in idiomatic expressions is so high to the point that it may hinder communication if either the addressor or the addressee is not aware of its figurative import.

Idiomatic comparisons are similes which are formally marked by '(as) adj as', e.g., *as sick as a dog* (very sick) or 'like NP', e.g., *like a whipped dog* (a person having an unhappy or embarrassed expression). Despite their being idiomatic, they usually show a lesser degree of opaqueness. For example, it is easier to figure out what the idiomatic comparisons *as mean as a junkyard dog* and *work like a dog* mean than the idiomatic expressions *barking up the wrong tree* (following an incorrect course of action or making the wrong choice) and *doggy bag* (a bag for taking home the remains of your meal at a restaurant). Some dog comparisons, however, can be as challenging as dog idiomatic expressions in terms of interpretation, e.g., *like a dog with a bone* (a person fixating on a topic) or *as crooked as a dog's hind leg* (a deceptive person). Idiomatic comparisons account for 13.64% (15/110) in the data (see Appendix 2).

Like other idiomatic expressions in English, dog idiomatic expressions and dog idiomatic comparisons are employed to communicate a high degree of emotiveness which is missing in their literal counterparts. For example, describing someone as *a dirty dog* and *an attack dog* is much more negatively emotive than describing them as *a deceptive person* and *a person used to hurt others on behalf of someone*, respectively. That is why idiomatic expressions are frequently used in expressive and argumentative discourse in order to both impress and persuade.

Finally, we have the category of dog proverbs in the data (see Appendix 3), which ties in with idiomatic comparisons in percentage – 13.64% (15/110). In addition to emotiveness, which is the main function of idiomatic expressions in discourse, proverbs transmit collective human wisdom and experience. For example, the idiomatic expressions *dog days* (bad days) and *in a dog's age* (in a very long period of time) merely refer to two things emotively by using figurative language. By contrast, the proverbs *a living dog is better than a dead lion* and *love me, love my dog*, besides expressing two propositions both metaphorically and emotively, communicate human wisdom and experience. The former advises us to gauge entities according to existing conditions rather than an absolute value, hence a living coward is better than a dead hero, despite the fact that, other things being equal, being a hero is better than being a coward. The latter expression, *love me, love my dog,* advises us to accept people as they are rather than as what we want them to be, in order to make friends and maintain friendships. Therefore, the virtual dividing line between an idiomatic expression/comparison and a proverb has to do with the function it performs in the course of human communication.

Table 1 below displays the distribution of dog expressions categories in the data. The frequency column indicates how frequently each value appears in the dataset. The percentage each value reflects is indicated in the percentage column. The data in this study consists of 110 English dog expressions.

Table 1

Distribution of dog expressions across categories

NAME OF CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Dog idiomatic expressions	80	72.72
Dog idiomatic comparisons	15	13.64
Dog proverbs	15	13.64
Total	110	100

4.2. Structure of dog expressions

Dog idiomatic comparisons uniformly take the simile form 'be (as) adj as' or 'V like NP', which functionally appear as subject complements, e.g., *(as) lazy as a dog, sleep like a dog* and *be like a dog with a bone*. Dog proverbs also behave uniformly by being realised in complete sentences/utterances, e.g., *a barking dog never bites* and *a scalded dog dreads cold water*. By contrast, dog idiomatic expressions display a rich variety of structures, including noun phrases, being part (noun or verb) of verb phrases, adjective phrases, adverb phrases, complete sentences, and exclamatory phrases. The occurrence of the word 'dog' idiomatically in noun phrases accounts for half the data – 50% (40/80). The majority of them has the word 'dog' as part of modifying the head noun in the noun phrase – 62.5% (25/40). As can be observed in Table 2, the word 'dog' in (1)-(4) is part of a pre-modifying phrase that describes a head noun, i.e., 'story', 'chance', 'whistle', and 'leg', respectively. In the rest of noun phrases – 37.5% (15/4) – the word 'dog' is used as a head noun (Table 3). As can be seen in Table 3, in (5)-(8) the head noun 'dog' is pre-modified, while it is post-modified in (9). The second frequent

occurrence of the word 'dog' appears in verb phrases – 43.75% (35/80). The majority of these cases feature the word 'dog' as an object (of a preposition) in a verb phrase – 68.59% (24/35) – which is headed idiomatically by a lexical verb (Table 4).

In the rest of cases – 31.41% (11/35) – the word 'dog' is employed as a verb, either separately or as part of a compound verb (Table 5). In the remaining five cases (6.25%) of dog idiomatic expressions in the data, the word 'dog' appears in a mixed bag: once in an adjective phrase, once in a complete sentence and once as an exclamatory utterance; and twice in an adverbial phrase (Table 6).

For their turn, idiomatic comparisons occur uniformly in two simile forms: '(as) adj as' (33.33%) or 'like NP' (66.66%) (Table 7). Similarly, proverbs take the sentence/utterance which expresses an independent proposition as a uniform structure (100%). Thus, dog proverbs represent complete propositions unlike most idiomatic expressions and idiomatic comparisons which occur as parts of propositions (Table 8). The frequency and percentages of types of structures across categories are presented in Tables 9 and 10 below.

Table 2

The occurrence of the word 'dog' idiomatically in noun phrases

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
1	a shaggy-dog story	a story that ends ridiculously
2	a dog's chance	a very slim chance
3	a dog whistle	an indirect signal to some party
4	a dogleg	a sharp curve in a road

Table 3

The occurrence of the word 'dog' idiomatically in noun phrases

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
5	the top dog	the privileged
6	a sea dog	an experienced sailor
7	something that shouldn't happen to a dog	something terrible

8	the tail wagging the dog	a small part controlling the whole
9	a dog in the manger	a person who prevents or hinders others from having something that may benefit them, even though they do not want or need it

Table 4
The occurrence of the word 'dog' as an object (of a preposition) in a verb phrase

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
10	to beat a dead dog	to do something useless/to no avail
11	to call off one's dogs	to stop criticising someone
12	to look for a dog to kick	to seek out someone to blame
13	to put on the dog	to behave lavishly/self-importantly

Table 5
The occurrence of the word 'dog' as a verb

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
14	to dog it	to idle/loaf
15	to dog out	to mistreat
16	to dog food	(in business) to use one's own products
17	to bird-dog	to pay unwelcome attention to someone/to steal one's girlfriend

Table 6
The occurrence of the word 'dog' as a mixed bag

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
18	dog-tired	very tired
19	my dogs are barking	my feet are aching due to much standing
20	Hot dog!	expression of excitement on observing or receiving a pleasant thing
21	between dog and wolf	between dusk and daylight
22	until the last dog is hung	until the very end

Table 7
The occurrence of the word 'dog' in two simile forms '(as) adj as' and 'like NP'

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
23	(as) lazy as a dog	very lazy
24	(as) sick as a dog	very sick
25	like a dog's breakfast/dinner	messy, disorganised
26	like a dog in heat	sexually aroused

Table 8
The occurrence of the word 'dog' as an independent proposition

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
27	It's the hit dog that howls	If someone complains about something they were probably affected by it
28	Let sleeping dogs lie	Ignore the problem, otherwise it might be worse
29	You can't teach an old dog new tricks	You cannot replace people's set habits with new ones

Table 9
Type of structure across categories

NAME OF CATEGORY	TYPE OF STRUCTURE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Idiomatic expressions	Phrases (see Table 3)	80	72.72
Idiomatic Comparisons	Similes (as) adj as like NP	15 (33.33%) (66.66%)	13.64
Proverbs	Sentences	15	13.64
Total		110	100

Table 10
Distribution of type of structure in dog idiomatic expressions

TYPE OF STRUCTURE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
NOUN PHRASE 'dog' as modifier 'dog' as head noun	40 (25) (15)	50 (62.5) (37.5)
VERB PHRASE 'dog' as object 'dog' as verb	35 (24) (11)	43.75 (68.59) (31.41)
MIXED BAG	5	6.25
Total	80	100

4.3. Attitude in dog expressions

Despite the important emotional and social role that pet dogs play in the Anglo-American cultures, only 9/110 (8.18%) out of the 110 English dog expressions in this study show positive attitudes towards dogs, which means 101/110 (91.82%) of them express negative attitudes towards dogs. This finding is surprising given the fact that pet dogs enjoy a high degree of care and love by their owners in these cultures. In fact, you can hardly find an English or American family who do not keep a pet dog at home. One may even go as far as saying that pet dogs in such cultures are receiving better care and providence than millions of people in developing countries.

Some people would argue that there is a contrast between the affectionate treatment of pets in Anglo-American societies and the largely unfavourable opinions shown by English dog expressions. This difference is probably caused by the fact that idiomatic expressions and proverbs frequently come from historical contexts, where the characteristics and social functions of dogs may have been very different from what they are today. It is crucial to make an explicit distinction between dogs as domesticated pets and the broader idea of 'dogs' as a species or archetypal representation. Such a distinction is crucial, and it is probable that some of the unfavourable attitudes implied by English dog representations stem from historical views of dogs as strays or wild creatures.

Within dog idiomatic expressions, negative attitudes towards dogs show in 73 (91.25%) cases covering a wide range of topics (see section 6 for more details). Table 11 shows some illustrative examples, where one can readily see the negative attitudes expressed towards dogs in (30)-(33). To explain, in (30)

and (31), dogs are portrayed as representing problems/trouble. In (32) and (33), they stand for small, unimportant entities. Similarly, in (34) and (35), dogs stand for negative acts, i.e., deteriorating and spying, respectively. Only in 7 (8.75%) instances of the idiomatic expressions in the data are dogs viewed positively. The examples in Table 12 are illustrative. As for idiomatic comparisons, 13 out of 15 instances (86.66%) show negative atti-

tudes towards dogs, as can be witnessed in the examples in Table 13. Only in two idiomatic comparisons in the data (13.34%) are dogs viewed positively, as can be observed in Table 14. Finally, we have the category of proverbs in which all of them (15 proverbs) depict dogs negatively (Table 15). Table 16 displays the frequency and percentage of negative attitudes towards dogs in idiomatic expressions, idiomatic comparisons, and proverbs.

Table 11
Distribution of type of structure in dog idiomatic expressions

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
30	not my dog	not my problem
31	be/get in the doghouse	to be in trouble or not in favour
32	dogsbody	one who does all the work for a powerful or important person
33	a yellow dog	a despicable person/thing
34	go to the dogs	to deteriorate
35	dog around	to follow or pursue someone closely

Table 12
Positive attitudes towards 'dogs' in idiomatic expressions

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
36	a hair of the dog	an alcoholic drink that helps one get rid of a hangover
37	eat (one's) dog food	(in business) to use one's own products
38	my dog	my close friend
39	top dog	a person, group, or a nation that has acquired a position of highest authority
40	Hot dog!	an expression of positive excitement

Table 13
Negative attitudes towards 'dogs' in idiomatic expressions

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
41	as sick as a dog	very ill
42	as mean as a junkyard dog	very mean
43	like a dog in heat	aroused sexually
44	like a blind dog in a meat market	reckless; out of control
45	die like a dog	to die in an unpleasant and demeaning manner

Table 14
Positive attitudes towards 'dogs'

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
46	like a dog with two tails	very happy
47	(as) fit as a butcher's dog	in excellent physical health

Table 15
Negative attitudes towards 'dogs' in proverbs

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
48	A barking dog never bites	people who make angry/threatening statements rarely act upon them
49	If you lie with dogs, you (will) get up with fleas	one is influenced by bad people's company
50	Love me, love my dog	one should accept friends along with their faults
51	Let sleeping dogs lie	one should not start trouble
52	Every dog will have its/his day	even the least fortunate person will have success at some point

Table 16
Positive and negative across categories

CATEGORY	ATTITUDE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Idiomatic expressions	Negative	73/80	91.25
	Positive	7	8.75
Idiomatic comparisons	Negative	13/15	86.66
	Positive	2	13.34
Proverbs	Negative	15	100
Total	Negative	101/110	91.82
	Positive	9	8.18

4.4. Semantic molecules

The universal, general conceptual metaphor HUMANS are ANIMALS is narrowed down in dog expressions to HUMANS are DOGS. The pervasiveness of this English conceptual metaphor, especially in its negative parameter, wins it a status comparable to that of its mother metaphor. This is evident in the wide range of semantic molecules the dog metaphor subsumes. The aim of this section is not to list all the semantic molecules featured in dog expressions and the English conceptual metaphors they generate. Rather, it aims to present an adequate sample of these molecules as source domains and the way they are mapped onto people as target domains in the varied structural realisations of dog expressions.

4.4.1. Semantic molecules in noun phrases

Semantic molecules that are realised in modifying the head noun 'dog' by an adjective in a semantically transparent or opaque way are metaphorically mapped onto people in a straightforward manner. Thus, many semantic molecules that constitute source domains such as LAZY are DOGS, SICK are DOGS, CUNNING are DOGS, DECEPTIVE are DOGS, and DISPICABLE are DOGS are generated. These semantic molecules are subsequently mapped onto people, and sometimes onto things, to produce conceptual metaphors, as can be observed in the following examples, respectively (Table 17). As can be seen, (53)-(55) are semantically transparent, while (56) and (57) are semantically opaque. In this way, the adjectives in the former maintain their dictionary meaning, whereas they do not in the latter. For example, the literal and the metaphorical meaning converge in (53) when mapped onto people, but they do not in (57), in which the receiver may wonder what 'yellow' metaphorically refers to. Alternatively, the head noun 'dog' may be modified by a noun rather than an adjective, in which case the molecule is usually semantically opaque rather than trans-

parent such as DOGS have AUTHORITY, MERCENARIES are DOGS, PUPPETS are DOGS, EXPERIENCED are DOGS, as can be witnessed in the following examples respectively (Table 18). In several cases, dog noun phrases feature the word 'dog' as a modifier of a head noun, which usually involves opaque rather than transparent semantic molecules such as MISERABLE is A DOG'S LIFE, SLIM is A DOG'S CHANCE, LONG is A DOG'S AGE, BENDING is A DOG'S LEG, DISORDERLY are DOGS, VALUELESS is DOG'S FOOD, as can be witnessed respectively in the conceptual metaphors (Table 19).

Table 17
Semantic molecules realised in modifying the head noun 'dog' by an adjective

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
53	a lazy dog	a very lazy person
54	a lucky dog	a lucky person
55	a sly dog	a cunning person
56	a dirty dog	a deceptive/dishonest person
57	a yellow dog	a cowardly person

Table 18
Semantic molecules realised in modifying the head noun 'dog' by a noun

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
58	top dog	a party viewed as having high authority
59	attack dog	a person who physically attacks others on behalf of someone
60	lap dog	a puppet person who submissively does work for someone
61	sea dog	an experienced sailor

Table 19
The word 'dog' as a modifier of a head noun

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
62	dog days	bad days/times
63	a dog's chance	a slim chance
64	a dog's age	a long period of time
65	a dogleg	a curve in a road
66	a dog-eat-dog world	an inpleasantly competitive situation
67	dog meat	(a threat) food for dogs

4.4.2. Semantic molecules in verb phrases

Verb phrases that are headed by lexical verbs and that often feature the word 'dog' as an object (of preposition) involve semantic molecules such as AGGRESSIVE are DOGS, LAVISH are DOGS, SECRETIVE are DOGS, ANNOYING are DOGS, VICTIMS are DOGS, SLAVES are DOGS. Note that these semantic molecules drive from actions acted upon dogs and produce semantically opaque conceptual metaphors whose use pre-

supposes the receiver's familiarity with their communicative import. Table 20 lists metaphorical dog expressions representing the semantic molecules above. Even more challenging and metaphorical are verb phrases whose headword is 'dog' employed as a lexical verb, either separately or in a compound verb.

From this verbalisation of the word 'dog', several semantic molecules that underlie some conceptual metaphors may be derived, such as DETECTIVES are DOGS, IDLE are DOGS, THIEVES are DOGS, INSULTING are DOGS, and DEFENSIVE are DOGS, as can be illustrated in the following dog expressions in Table 21.

Table 20
Metaphorical dog expressions representing semantic molecules

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
68	to call off the dogs	to stop criticising others
69	to put on the dog	to behave lavishly
70	to go see a man about a dog	to not tell someone where you are going or what you are going to do
71	to let the dog see the rabbit	to let someone finish their work uninterrupted
72	to look for a dog to kick	to seek out someone to blame
73	to not keep a dog and bark oneself	not to do something one hired another person to do

Table 21
Metaphorical dog expressions representing semantic molecules underling conceptual metaphors

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
74	to dog someone	to follow or pursue someone wherever they go
75	to dog it	to loaf
76	to bird-dog someone	to steal someone's girlfriend
77	to dog someone out	to mistreat them
78	to hit-dog	to react defensively

4.4.3. Semantic molecules in idiomatic comparisons

Idiomatic comparisons express both transparent and opaque conceptual similes in which literal and metaphorical semantic molecules may be found. Similes in the form '(as) ADJ as' usually include literal molecules that map metaphorically on people such as SICK are DOGS, MEAN are JUNKYARD DOGS, and FIT are BUTCHER'S DOGS, while those in the form 'like NP' usually feature metaphorically-interpreted molecules mapped onto people such as EMBARRASSED are DOGS, HORNEY are DOGS, and MESSY is DOG FOOD. As can be observed in Table 22, the conceptual similes in (79)-(81) are interpreted straightforwardly in terms of their semantic molecules, whereas the ones in (82)-(84) are opaque and require metaphorical unpacking before comprehension can take place.

Table 22
Transparent and opaque conceptual similes with the word 'dog'

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
79	(as) sick as a dog	very ill
80	(as) mean as a junkyard dog	very aggressive or nasty
81	(as) fit as a butcher's dog	very healthy

82	like a whipped dog	feeling ashamed or embarrassed
83	like a dog in heat	very excited or enthusiastic, sexually aroused
84	like a dog's dinner	very messy or disorganised

4.4.4. Semantic molecules in proverbs

Semantic molecules in dog proverbs range between relatively transparent and highly opaque. In both cases, they offer advice and wisdom in a propositionally multi-layered conceptual metaphors unlike dog idiomatic and comparative expressions which usually include only one metaphorical layer. To explain, let us consider the following examples in Table 23.

While the idiomatic expression and the idiomatic comparison in (85) and (86) include one-layer metaphorical mappings which respectively refer to chaos and physical fitness, the proverb in (87) involves more metaphorical complexity. To get the metaphorical piece of wisdom, the receiver must first retrieve the semantic molecule LIVING LION better than LIVING DOG. Second, this semantic molecule must be mapped onto human circumstances by extracting another semantic molecule GOODNESS depends on CIRCUMSTANCE. Finally, the target semantic molecule LIVING COWARD better than DEAD HERO is reached. This metaphorical complexity is found even in proverbs that may otherwise look straightforward. Observe the two proverbs in Table 24 below. One may mistakenly get the wrong message from (88) that people should keep off dogs because they are dirty. However, the target message is more metaphorically interwoven to communicate the import that people should avoid involving themselves in dangerous things. In this way, the receiver must first derive the semantic molecule DOGS collect FLEAS. Second, they must extract the semantic molecule DANGEROUS are FLEAS. Finally, the target semantic molecule PEOPLE should avoid DANGEROUS THINGS must be unravelled. A similar complex process needs to be followed in (85) in order to get to the metaphorical import represented by the target semantic molecule ACCEPT FRIENDS along with THEIR FAULTS.

Table 23
Semantic molecules in dog proverbs

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
85	a dog-eat-dog meeting	a meeting where people are very competitive and aggressive towards each other
86	as fit as a butcher's dog	very healthy and strong
87	a living dog is better than a dead lion	it is better to be alive and humble than to be dead and powerful

Table 24
Metaphorical complexity in 'dog' proverbs

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
88	If you lie down with dogs, you (will) get up with fleas	if you associate with bad people, you will eventually become like them
89	Love me, love my dog	if you love someone, you should also love their pets

4.5. Translatability of dog expressions into Arabic

Idiomatic expressions have been a familiar subject in translation studies since the contrastive publication between French and English by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), in which equivalence (finding a functional equivalent apart from literalness) was best suggested as a translation procedure for them. Although this procedure may suffer a deficit in the transfer of source language (SL) cultural features, it gains tremendously in terms of fluency and acceptability in the target language (TL). More recently, translation theorists (see Newmark, 1988; Baker, 2018) suggest many procedures ranging between literal translation and omission for translating idiomatic expressions. Looking more closely at various classifications, one can generally talk about three main procedures: formal equivalence (literal translation), paraphrase (ideational equivalence), and functional equivalence (see Nida, 1964; Catford, 1965; Newmark, 1988; Farghal, 1994, 2012 for general literature on types of equivalence). These procedures may vary in their implementation according to the type of text and purpose of translation. Dog expressions, like other idiomatic expressions, are subject to similar translation procedures. How-

ever, given the large number of idiomatic dog expressions in English compared to no more than a dozen or so of such expressions in Arabic opens the door wide open for renderings that embrace functional equivalence and paraphrase. Such renderings avoid literalness in which the referent 'dog' is employed in favour of calling up an idiomatic equivalent that performs the same function or just capturing the communicative import of the dog expression. Let us first consider some examples in an area, probably the only one, where we find correspondence in dog expressions between English and Arabic (Table 25).

Table 25
Correspondence in dog expressions between English and Arabic

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING	ARABIC IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
90	to die like a dog	to die in a painful or humiliating way	يموت ميتّة الكلاب.	to die like a dog
91	to lead a dog's life	to live a life of hardship and misery	يعيش عيشة الكلاب.	to lead a dog's life
92	to treat someone like a dog	to treat someone cruelly or with contempt	يعامل شخصا معاملة الكلاب	to treat someone like a dog
93	to throw it to the dogs	to abandon or discard something as worthless	يرمى شخصا للكلاب.	to throw to the dogs

In all these expressions as can be seen, the dog is viewed negatively in terms of the kind of life it leads and the kind of treatment it receives. These negative things are mapped onto humans in both English and Arabic. However, there are some English dog expressions that look like Arabic dog expressions, but they differ in their communicative import, a fact that deserves utmost attention from translators. Table 26 shows some illustrative examples.

Table 26
English and Arabic dog expressions that differ in their communicative import

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING	ARABIC IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
94	Call off the dogs	stop being aggressive or threatening	كف كلابك عني.	call off the dogs
95	A living dog is better than a dead lion	it is better to be alive and humble than to be dead and powerful	كلب حايم ولا سبع نايم.	a living dog is better than a dead lion
96	Like a dog with a bone	very possessive or determined about something	مثل كلب ماسك عظمة	like a dog with a bone

At first sight, one may think that these dog expressions in English and Arabic communicate the same import but, in fact, they do not. In (94), the addressor in English calls upon the addressee to stop criticising him/her, while the addressor in Arabic calls upon the addressee to stop people acting on their behalf from annoying him/her. To capture the meaning of the English expression, the translator needs to call up a functional equivalent (lit. 'stop your tongue from criticising me'). Similarly, the English proverb in (95) communicates the message that a living coward is better than a dead hero, while the Arabic dog proverb has to do with being practical by getting benefit from something, e.g., 'an awake dog is more beneficial than a sleeping lion'. That is why the translator should look for an Arabic proverb here that performs the same function (lit. 'a hundred times coward rather than saying 'May God take mercy on him', i.e. 'better call someone a coward a hundred times than have him die'). For its turn, the English expression in (96) describes someone who is fixated on a certain point/topic, while the Arabic expression – lit. 'like a

dog holding a bone' – refers to someone acting very aggressively. The majority of English dog expressions calls for Arabic idiomatic expressions which do not feature the word 'dog', but they perform the same function. Below are some illustrative examples (Table27). As can be witnessed in this small sample, it is impossible for the translator to maintain the reference to 'dogs' in their translation. Therefore, the best option is to call up an Arabic idiomatic expression that performs the same function but by lexicalising the expression differently as is done in (97)-(102). The Arabic expressions above respectively translate literally into 'not to have a she-camel nor a he-camel in something', 'flying with happiness', 'look for a scapegoat', 'to blow into a vessel with a hole in it', 'like a beggar's food', and 'a flying signal'.

Finally, there are some English dog expressions whose meaning must be unpacked in Arabic for lack of such use. We have already observed in this paper how the word 'dog' is verbalised in several English expressions, something which is large-

ly alien to Arabic. The only way to verbalise the word 'dog' in Arabic is in the vernacular verb 'to turn into a dog in terms of bad behaviour'. Below are some English dog verbs that must be communicatively unpacked in Arabic translation (Table 28). As

can be observed, the productive verbalisation of the word 'dog' in English is missing in Arabic; hence, the communicative import of the English dog expressions in (103)-(107) has been unpacked in Arabic translation.

Table 27
English dog expressions with Arabic equivalents that do not include the word 'dog'

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING	ARABIC IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
97	I don't have a dog in this fight	I am not taking sides in this argument or conflict	لا ناقة لي ولا جمل في هذا الأمر.	I have neither a camel nor a hump in this matter
98	John is like a dog with two tails	John is very excited or enthusiastic	جون طاير من الفرح.	John is flying from joy
99	The manager is looking for a dog to kick	The manager is looking for someone to blame or punish	يبحث المدير عن كبش فداء لتلقي اللوم.	The manager is looking for a scapegoat to blame
100	Mary is beating a dead dog in this matter	Mary is wasting her time trying to resolve an issue that is already over	تنفخ ماري في قربة مخزوقة في هذه المسألة.	Mary is blowing into a punctured waterskin in this matter
101	Peter's research paper is like a dog's breakfast/dinner	Peter's research paper is messy, disorganised, or poorly written	يبدو بحث بيتر كطبيخ الشحادين.	Peter's research looks like a beggar's stew
102	John gave me a dog whistle during the meeting, but I didn't get it	John made a subtle or indirect remark that was intended to be offensive or inflammatory, but I didn't understand it	أعطاني جون إشارة على الطاير ولكني لم أفهمها.	John gave me a signal on the fly, but I didn't understand it

Table 28
English dog verbs that must be communicatively unpacked in Arabic translation

NO.	IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING	ARABIC IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	MEANING
103	Sarah has been dogging it for three hours	Sarah has been slacking off or not working hard for three hours	لا تزال سارة تتسكع منذ ثلاث ساعات.	Sarah has been hanging out for three hours
104	One should dog-ear the page in a book to remember where they have reached	One should fold the corner of a page in a book to mark the place where they have stopped reading	نبغي على المرء طيّ رأس الصفحة في الكتاب كي يتذكر أين وصل.	One should fold the corner of the page in the book to remember where they left off
105	A woman dogged me around for no obvious reason yesterday	A woman followed me around yesterday for no obvious reason	تابعتني امرأة لسبب غير واضح أمس.	A woman followed me for no apparent reason yesterday
106	I didn't imagine John would ever think of bird-dogging me	I didn't think John would ever try to sabotage me	لم أتصور أن يفكر جون بسرقة صديقتي قطُّ.	I never thought John would think about stealing my friend's cat
107	Everyone knows that the new teacher dogs out her pupils	Everyone knows that the new teacher is very critical of her students	الكل يعرف أن المعلمة الجديدة تسيء معاملة تلاميذها.	Everyone knows that the new teacher is mistreating her students

5. CONCLUSION

The richness of English dog expressions renders the conceptual metaphor HUMANS are DOGS comparable in its scope to the universal HUMANS are ANIMALS. Expressions in this study, which fall into three categories – idiomatic expressions (72%), idiomatic comparisons (13%), and proverbs (13%) – cover a plethora of source domains that are mapped onto humans as target domains. The bulk of conceptual dog metaphors

(91%) include negative attributes such as DECEPTIVE are DOGS, VICTIMS are DOGS and SECRETIVE are DOGS. The few positive attributes (9%) feature semantic molecules such as DOGS have AUTHORITY and EXPERIENCED are DOGS. While English idiomatic expressions and comparisons mostly express single sematic molecules that are either transparently or opaquely mapped onto humans, dog proverbs usually include a series of semantic molecules culminating in a target molecule.

In terms of structure, idiomatic dog expressions are so varied and are mainly split between noun phrases (50%), in which the word 'dog' functions as modifier (62.50% or a head noun (37.50%), and verb phrases (43.75%), in which the word 'dog' mainly occurs as object (68.59) or as verb (31.41%). The remaining mixed bag (6.25%) includes an adjective phrase, an exclamatory phrase, a sentence, and two adverbial phrases. Idiomatic comparisons, by contrast, are more uniform taking the simile forms '(as) adj as' (33.33%) or 'like NP' (66.66%). As for dog proverbs, they uniformly take the sentence/utterance as their host structure.

In terms of translatability, the bulk of English dog expressions subscribes to the search for functional equivalents that lack the employment of the word 'dog' in them, given their large number in English compared to that in Arabic. In this regard,

translators need to pay their utmost attention to the dofference between dog expressions in English and Arabic that may only have an apparent formal similarity, but deliver different semantic molecules, i.e., they perform different functions. In addition, special care needs to be taken when encountering English idiomatic 'dog verbs' because they are alien to Arabic, thus calling for the procedure of paraphrase when rendering them.

To conclude, this paper fills in a gap by offering a systematic investigation of English dog expressions from several perspectives: categorisation, structure, attitude, semantic molecules, and translatability into Arabic. Besides, it is particularly valuable for both non-native English speakers who may not be familiar with many of the dog expressions in the corpus and native English speakers whose lexical competence may fall short of accounting for all the expressions in the data.

Appendix 1: Dog idiomatic expressions

1. (one's) dogs are barking
2. a dog and pony show
3. a dog in the manger
4. a dog-eat-dog world
5. a doggone shame
6. a dog's age
7. a dog's breakfast/dinner
8. a dog's chance
9. a dog's life
10. a hair of the dog
11. a shaggy-dog story
12. a sly dog
13. attack dog
14. be going to the dogs
15. beat a dead dog
16. between dog and wolf
17. bird-dog (verb)
18. bite the dog that bit you
19. blow this hot dog stand
20. bring a dog to heel
21. call off one's dogs
22. cat-and-dog life
23. cats and dogs
24. couldn't be elected dogcatcher
25. dirty dog
26. dog (one's) footsteps/dog around
27. dog ate my homework
28. dog collar
29. dog day afternoon
30. dog days
31. dog fashion
32. dog it (verb)
33. dog meat
34. dog out (verb)
35. dog style

36. dog tired
37. dog whistle
38. dog-ear (verb)
39. dogfood (verb)
40. dogleg
41. dog's mother
42. dogsbody
43. don't keep a dog and bark yourself
44. eat (one's) own dog food
45. everybody and their dog
46. get in the doghouse
47. give a dog a bad name (and hang him)
48. go see a man about a dog
49. hangdog expression/look
50. have a dog in the fight/hunt
51. have a dog's chance
52. hit dog (verb)
53. Hong Kong dog
54. Hot dog!
55. It's not my dog
56. It's raining cats and dogs
57. lap dog
58. lazy dog
59. let the dog see the rabbit
60. look for a dog to kick
61. lucky dog
62. make puppy dog eyes
63. my dog
64. play hide the hot dog
65. put (one) off the scent
66. put on the dog
67. run with the big dogs
68. sea/salty dog
69. shaggy-dog story
70. shouldn't happen to a dog

71. tail wagging the dog
72. the black dog
73. the dog that caught the car
74. the top dog
75. the underdog

76. three-dog night
77. throw to the dogs
78. until the last dog is hung
79. wag the dog
80. yellow dog

Appendix 2: Dog idiomatic comparisons

1. (as) black as a dog's guts
2. (as) crooked as a dog's hind leg
3. (as) fit as a butcher's dog
4. (as) lazy as a dog
5. (as) mean as a junkyard dog
6. (as) sick as a dog
7. die like a dog
8. like a blind dog in a meat market

9. like a dog in heat
10. like a dog with a bone
11. like a dog with two tails
12. like a dog's breakfast/dinner
13. like a whipped dog
14. like showing a card trick to a dog
15. sleep like a dog

Appendix 3: Dog proverbs

1. a barking dog never/seldom bites
2. a dog that'll bring a bone will carry a bone
3. a hit dog will holler
4. a live/living dog is better than a dead lion
5. a scalded dog dreads cold water
6. as a dog returns to his vomit, so a fool repeats his folly
7. better be the head of a dog than the tail of a lion
8. dog does not eat dog

9. every dog will have his/its day
10. if you lie down with dogs, you (will) get up with fleas
11. it's the hit dog that howls
12. let sleeping dogs lie
13. love me, love my dog
14. while two dogs are fighting for a bone, a third one runs away with it
15. you can't teach an old dog new tricks

References

Abu Rumman, R., Haider, A. S., Yagi, S., & Al-Adwan, A. (2023). A corpus-assisted cognitive analysis of metaphors in the Arabic subtitling of English TV series. *Cogent Social Sciences, 9*(1), Article 2231622. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2231622

Al-Hamzi, A. M. S., Nababan, M., Santosa, R., & Anis, M. Y. (2023). The simile and metaphor in translation of Yemeni spoken Arabic common names of animals and supernatural creatures into English: A socio-pragmatic approach. *Cogent Arts and Humanities, 10*(1), Article 2223816. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2223816

Al-Harahsheh, A. (2020). Animal names used to address people in Jordanian spoken Arabic. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences, 47*(1), 328-336. https://dx.doi.org/10.35516/0103-047-001-045

Al-Qahtani, F., & Qahtani, O. A. (2021). Translating animal idioms from English into Arabic: An application of Nida's strategies for translating idioms. *AWEJ for Translation and Literary Studies, 5*(3), 82-100.

Altarbaq, H. A. (2020). *A critical analysis of some common animal idioms in two English-Arabic idiom dictionaries.* American University of Beirut Lebanon.

Anjomshoa, L., & Sadighi, F. (2015). The comparison of connotative meaning in animal words Between English and Persian expressions and their translation. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 3*(2), 65-77.

Bachrun, N. A. (2023). *Metaphors of animal lexeme 'dog' in English and Indonesian]roverbs: A comparative study.* Universitas Gadjah Mada Press.

Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation.* Routledge. https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187

Belkhir, S. (2019). Animal-related concepts across languages and cultures from a cognitive linguistic perspective. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies, 6*(2), 295-324. https://doi.org/10.1075/cogls.00042.bel

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics* (Vol. 31). Oxford University Press.

Colston, H. L., & Gibbs, R. W. (2021). Figurative language communicates directly because it precisely demonstrates what we mean. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology, 75*(2), 228-233. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cep0000254

Davies, E. E., & Bentahila, A. (1989). Familiar and less familiar metaphors: An analysis of interpretations in two languages. *Language & Communication, 9*(1), 49-68. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(89)90006-2

Estaji, A., & Nakhavali, F. (2011a). Contrastive analysis of 'dog' expressions in English and Persian. *US-China Foreign Language, 9*(4), 213-219.

Estaji, A., & Nakhavali, F. (2011b). Semantic derogation in Persian animal proverbs. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(9), 1213-1217. https://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.9.1213-1217

Faghih, E. (2001). A contrastive analysis of the interpretations of animal metaphors in Persian and English. *The Journal of Humanities, 8*(1), 1-16.

Farghal, M. (1994). Ideational equivalence in translation. In R. de Beaugrande, A. Shunnaq, & M. Heliel (Eds.), *Language, discourse and translation in the West and Middle East* (pp. 55-63). John Benjamins. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/btl.7.10far

Farghal, M. (2012). *Advanced issues in Arabic-English translation studies*. Kuwait University Publication Council.

Farghal, M. (2019). *Jordan's proverbs as a window into Arab popular culture: The fox in the blackberries.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Farghal, M. (2021). Animal proverbs in Jordanian popular culture: A thematic and translational analysis. *Journal of English Literature and Language, 2*(1), 1-8. https://dx.doi.org/10.31829/2767-2964/jell2021-2(1)-109

Farghal, M., & Al-Hamly, M. (2015). Arabic proverbs in fiction translation: Girls of Riyadh as an example. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures, 7*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.12816/0027236

Farghal, M., & Saeed, A. T. (2022). Proverbial use of fauna in Arabia: A theoretical, thematic and translational account. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University, 57*(6), 454-456. https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.42

Fraser, B. (1981). Insulting problem in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(4), 435-441. https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586484

Glucksberg, S., & McGlone, M. S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language: From metaphor to idioms*. Oxford University Press.

Hamdan, H. J., Al-Madanat, H., & Hamdan, W. (2023). Connotations of animal metaphors in the Jordanian context. *Psycholinguistics, 33*(1), 132-166. https://dx.doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2023-33-1-132-166

Hsieh, S. (2006). A corpus-based study on animal expressions in Mandarin Chinese and German. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(12), 2206-2222. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.08.007

Khelf, Y. (2021). The semantic meaning and the pragmatic function of animal proverbs: A contrastive study between Arabic and English proverbs. *Language Art, 6*(3), 57-68.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* University of Chicago Press.

Madani, Z., Abusalim, N., & Rayyan, M. (2023). Gender representation in animal-related proverbs: Algerian vs. Jordanian Arabic. *Frontiers in Sociology, 8,* Article 1145200. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1145200

Miri, M., & Soori, A. (2015). A contrastive analysis of animal metaphor in English and Persian. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(2), 160-162. https://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.6n.2p.160

Nadim, M. (2000). *The role of animals in Shirazi proverbs with sociolinguistic approach.* Daneshgah Publication.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation.* Prentice Hall.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating.* Brill.

Pourhossein, S. (2016). *Animal metaphors in Persian and Turkish proverbs: A cognitive linguistic study* Doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University. Hacettepe University Archive. https://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18987.03361

Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics, 36*(7), 1253-1269. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.012

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.

Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (Vol. 11). John Benjamins Publishing. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/btl.11

Wood, D. (2019). Classifying and identifying formulaic language. In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (pp. 30-45). Routledge. https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780429291586-3

Yakub, M. (2020). The wisdom of our forefathers: Animal metaphors and imagery in Nzema proverbs. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 2*(1), 175-195. https://dx.doi.org/10.29162/pv.40.1.54