A CROSS -LINGUISTIC STUDY OF ANIMAL METAPHORS: A CASE STUDY OF KAMBA AND MAASAI LANGUAGES

BY

MUANGE CATHERINE NDUNGE

C50/80597/2015

A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS, IN LINGUISTICS DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGES, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.

2018

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been submitted for examination in any other university.

Signature:…………………………………   Date………………………………
Muange Catherine Ndunge

This project has been submitted for examination with our approval of the university supervisors.

Signature:…………………………………   Date………………………………
Prof. Helga Schroeder
University of Nairobi

Signature:…………………………………   Date………………………………
Prof. Lilian Kaviti
University of Nairobi

DEDICATION

To my beloved husband Charles. Thank you for your heartfelt support towards achieving my Dream.

To my lovely children, Frank and Audrey, your patience and understanding is worthy this great achievement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ABSTRACT

This research study presents a comparative analysis of animal metaphors from the Kamba and Maasai languages. The research study endeavors to find out how cultural background contributes to shared and divergent views of the same animal metaphor in the two cultures. The research used Fillmore Frame Theory in the analysis of animal metaphors. Animal metaphors in the Maasai and Kamba cultures are commonly used to connote negative meaning although a few depicts positive qualities. The findings of this study indicated that both Kamba and Maasai cultures have animal metaphors that are similar for instance in both cultures there are metaphors drawn from lion, elephant, donkey, wasp and dogs among others. Among the shared metaphors there are those that have the same interpretation in both cultures for example metaphor on elephant which means huge and energetic and metaphor drawn from wasp which means aggressive and violent. Other metaphors are similar but are conceptualized differently for example metaphor drawn from a cow in Maasai means a respected person because a cow is the main source of food while in Kamba it means a stupid person since it is basically used to assist in tasks like farming, this therefore raises the question of intercultural miscommunication. The other category of animal metaphors discovered in this study is observed to be culture specific it is as a result of the distinct differences in the living environment of the two communities, among the Maasai there are more animal metaphors drawn from wild animals like giraffe, eland, wild dog and chameleon. On the other hand the Kamba have animal metaphor inspired by farming drawn from cock, caterpillar, raccoon, robin among others. Verbal metaphors are also found in the two cultures. Verbal metaphors in both communities are universal while others are culture specific. In both cultures these metaphors do not have similar interpretation due to the differences in cultural beliefs and attitude upheld by members of the two communities both have metaphors derived from the verb to roar, in the Maasai it means to boast for no reason while among Kamba it is to warn. The research has concluded that different interpretation of same animal metaphor leads to miscommunication among native speakers of the two speech communities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This research is meant to investigate animal metaphors in both Kamba and Maasai languages using Fillmore's Frame Theory. It deals with background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives and questions, rationale to the study, scope and limitation, literature review, theoretical framework, research methodology and conclusion.

1.2 Background to the Study

This study sets out to do a cross-linguistic study of animal metaphor in Kamba language and Maasai language using Fillmore approach. This study also intends to find out how cultural backgrounds contribute to divergent views and shared views for the same animal metaphor among Kamba and Maasai native speakers. Conceptual metaphor is a figure of speech whereby an idea is compared with another to bring out mental picture. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) are the pioneers of the idea of conceptual metaphors in Cognitive Linguistics. In their work entitled (metaphors we live by) they explain how metaphors are used in everyday language even without speakers being able to realize it. They also discuss how metaphors shape the way people think and the way they act. In their work the scholars give an example of a commonly used metaphor.

"Argument is war" They explain that this metaphor shapes the way people perceive argument as war or as a fight whereby victory is anticipated (Lakoff: 1987) further states that metaphors are not a way of naming but also a way of thinking. It is a figurative thought as well as a figure of speech .(Johnson 1987) further claims that metaphors is a process by which people understand and structure one domain in terms of another domain of a different kind.

The two scholars, Johnston and Lakoff explore two types of conceptual domains from which metaphorical expressions are draw, the source and target domains. The source domain is the domain that people use to try to understand the target domain. It can be illustrated by use of an example.

<u>Mary</u>	is	a	<u>pig</u>
Target domain			source domain

In this example Mary is given the attributes of a pig. In listeners' encyclopedic entries, the nature of a pig is known to be a dirty, greedy and a fat animal. This could mean that Mary is dirty, greedy or even fat.

Searle (1993) argues that metaphor is not a question of language but language use. He uses principles to explain how to get metaphorical meaning out of sentence meaning and shared background. According to Searle metaphorical meaning is not a sentence meaning but an utterance meaning, which is only shared in the context use. Searle (1979: 93) states that to understand utterance meaning is equivalent to "identifying speaker's intentions". He further points out that utterance meaning is also derived from what the speaker might actually mean. This might be different in different occasions due to the fact that the shared background assumptions may be different. Most of the research carried out on metaphors is based on an individual language but a comparative study is yet to be done to establish whether the differences in cultural background may lead to different interpretation of the same animal metaphor among native speakers of two different language families.

The following is an example of the same animal metaphor drawn from both Kamba and the Maasai language. The native speakers belong to different cultural backgrounds but are able to give the same encyclopedic entries. Mutua ni nzou (Mutua is an elephant)-Kamba. Epik Saitoti entuuroyie (Saitoti is an elephant)-Maasai. In both cases the meaning of lion which is the source domain is shared, the mentioned persons are said to be huge, strong and energetic.

Different approaches have been used by scholar to examine the nature of metaphors. Traditionally, philosophers treated metaphors as part of figurative language just like a simile because they basically looked at language in literal terms. Davidson (1975) argues that language users will have a better theory of meaning if they focus on the sentences truth condition. He claims that to know a sentence's meaning is to know the conditions under which that sentence would be true. Davidson (1978: 30) opposes metaphorical meaning

and is not in agreement with linguistic mechanism by which metaphorical significance is expressed. "Metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more."

The Naïve simile theory (NST) which is also a traditional approach to metaphor holds the view that metaphors simply abbreviate literal comparison that is, similes and metaphors, express comparison in one way or the other (Lycan: 2000). NST approach states that metaphor derives from a corresponding simile by comparison for example:

1. James is a star
2. James is bright like a star.

The first Sentence is simply an abbreviation of the second one.
Traditionally, metaphors are viewed as part of speech mainly used in poetry. Frost state that "poetry provides the one permissible way of saying one thing and meaning another" He further points out that although words do have literal meaning, they also have explicit or implied meaning. For instance when one says 'This boy is an angel, literally the sentence does not make sense but the idea of an angel can be figuratively applied to mean that the boy is holy or even God sent. The character of the boy is admirable.

Looking at Beardsley (1966) Metaphors are functional and are used in our everyday conversation. Metaphors are not only used in poetry and imaginative works but also in expository and persuasive works. The scholar further indicates that a metaphor has both denotation and connotation meaning.

Richard (1967) in his article he argues that metaphors involves comparison between at least two objects. He was the first scholar to discuss the complex interrelationship that might exist between tenor and vehicle in metaphors. He gave the following example to demonstrate his argument.

The man has a wooded leg.
The word leg in the above statement could have both literal and metaphorical meaning. After the publication of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) many scholars began to look at

metaphors as conceptual system of human beings (Croft & Cruse, 2004 Kovecses, 2002 Ungerer & Schmid, 1996).

Kovecses (2005) gives a brief account of traditional features of metaphors. Firstly, the scholar states metaphor is a characteristic of words. Secondly, metaphor is used for some artistic and rhetorical purpose. In addition, it entails similarities between the two entities that are compared and it is also a conscious and deliberate use of words and finally can be viewed as a figure of speech, which is not indispensable.

Searle (1979) examines metaphor as simply a species of indirect communication. According to Searle (1974: 92-93):

> The problem of explaining how metaphors work is a special case of the general problem of explaining how speaker meaning and sentence or word meaning come apart ,our task is constructing a theory of metaphor is to try to state the principle which relate literal sentence meaning to metaphorical (speaker's) utterance meaning.

Searle explains the process of interpretation by stating that the speaker first use Gricean reasoning to determine if the speaker is trying to express something other than the literal meaning, then the speaker uses speech-act theory to work out the intended meaning of the utterance. Searle idea of metaphor is rejected by Cooper (1986) and Moran (1997) who claim that metaphorical meaning is simply speakers meaning, and is determined and confined to speakers' intentions. Moran (1997: 264) state that "the interpretation of the light that a metaphor sheds on its subject may outrun anything the speaker is thought to have explicitly had in mind."

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) clearly state their understanding of metaphor as follows:

> Metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphors. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of

4

which we are brought, think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.

Guthrie (1948) describes the Akamba as a Bantu speaking community that can be located in Eastern Province of Kenya. According to Guthrie's classification of Bantu languages, Kikamba is categorized as Bantu language E 55- referring to Bantu language – zone E-Group 50 – No. 55. Heine and Mohlig (1970) recognize five major real groups of Bantu languages in Kenya. The two scholars categorize Kikamba into four major dialects as follows:-

(a) Masaku dialect
(b) Southern Kitui dialect
(c) Northern Kitui dialect
(d) Mumoni dialect

According to Ethnology there are approximately 3,960,000 Kamba speakers which is equivalent to 11 percent of Kenya population. The Akamba border with Maasai people and are separated by Kenya Uganda railway from Athi to Kibwezi. On the other hand Greenberg (1966: 85) classifies the Maa language as a member of Eastern Nilotic Sub-family, a sub-group of the Chari-Nile sub-family. According to Sim (1980: 5) there are three Maa speaking communities: Isampur (Samburu), IIchamu (Jemps) and IImaasai (Maasai). This classification corresponds to that of Spear and Wallace (1993) and Grimes (1996). The Maasai live in Southern Kenya and Northern Tanzania and the population both in Kenya and Tanzania is approximately 800,000 Bauer (2007).

The language of the Maasai is referred to as Ulmaa. "Maa" is the language and culture while "Maasai" refers to people who speak Maa. The spoken language is their way of contact and the only way that enhance their traditional way of life Nicholson (2005). The Maasai way of life is deeply rooted in their language.

In the 20th century the Maasai and Kamba communities were involved in persistent cattle-rustling and pasture conflicts mostly on Konza plains. Mutie (2003) has studied into details how the Kamba and Maasai communities have coexisted in spite of the distinction in

language, discursive cultural practices, different mode of subsistence, scarcity of resources, disparity in social transformation and conflicting political orientation. The Maasai are predominantly pastoral while Kamba are mixed farmers. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that people's everyday life is filled with metaphors even without them being able to notice. There is a possibility that Maasai speakers construct a lot of metaphors through inspiration of their way of life, that is, pastoralism and therefore one might gather a lot of metaphor that have to do with livestock and even wild animals. On the other hand, Kamba are well known for mixed farming therefore metaphors constructed by this language community will majorly be based on domestic animals and a few wild animals.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

All metaphors are culturally based because they rely on cultural encyclopedic entries. These metaphors are not shared among other speech communities. They are found in that one speech community and only understood by those particular native speakers.

This study is intended to investigate animal metaphors that are found in the Kamba language and the Maasai language. Different interpretation of the same animal metaphor may arise through the use of context as a result of difference in the cultural background. This may lead to miscommunication among the native speakers of both languages. This is what this study pursues, it is to find out how cultural background influences metaphor interpretation and by extension leads to misunderstanding of the same metaphor by users of different languages. Frame theory by Charles Fillmore will be used to analyze the interpretation of animal metaphors among the native speakers of the two different speech communities.

1.4 Research Questions
   a) What animal metaphors are found in the Kamba language?
   b) What animal metaphors prevail in the Maasai language?
   c) What meaning differences exist in the animal metaphors common in Kamba and Maasai languages?

1.5 Research Objectives

a) To identify some animal metaphors in the Kamba language
b) To identify some animal metaphors in the Maasai language.
c) Compare the meaning of same animal metaphors in Kamba and Maasai language.

1.6 Rationale of the Study

This research is invaluable to both Kamba and Maasai language speakers. These are two communities that have coexisted in harmony despite the great difference in cultural and other social aspects. The research will intensify the peaceful co-existence between the two speech Communities since the in depth discussion on animal metaphors more especially that are shared and might evoke different interpretation or meaning and therefore no room for misunderstanding of metaphorical meaning among the speakers of the two languages.

1.7 Scope and Limitation

This study focuses on animal metaphors collected in the Kamba dialect of Kimasaku in which the researcher is a native speaker and the Maasai language of the Kajiado County in Kenya. Metaphor is a widely researched topic but this study is concentrates on animal metaphors only and does not focus on other figures of speech. Metaphor can be analyzed using other linguistic models such as cognitive semantic and the correspondence model but frame semantics is the approach used to analyze data in this study.

1.8 Literature Review

This section of the study is divided into four sub-sections namely; literature on animal Metaphor, literature on Kamba language, literature on Maasai language and literature on metaphors in general.

1.8.1 Literature on Animal Metaphors

Animal metaphor is a subject that has been under research in African languages therefore need for upcoming researchers to take this direction. Most of the studies under taken are based on fictional work.

Biyela (2014) in his study; animal metaphors representing human images, explores ways in which social behavior of animals is used to represent king Shaka's image. The researcher point out that animals are the most popular characters used as metaphors in Zulu folklore because of Zulu's traditional closeness to wildlife. The scholar further indicates that the dynamism and legacy of animal metaphors is used to create new facet of meaning and to reflect the relationship of human beings with the animal world. This study is of immense importance because Maasai is a community that lives in the vicinity of wildlife and therefore there is a possibility that most of the metaphors that are found among the speakers are constructed from wildlife animal names.

Rouhi and Mohand (2011) explored animal metaphors on class-inclusion model in cognitive linguistics. In their work they noted that what accounts as animal metaphors (AM) is the use of animal names as source rather than the target, they gave an example in Persian to illustrate this "He is a fox " in this case the word fox is said to be the source. The scholars also claim that animals name is also an AM and can be used as a label for an object (referentially) or predicatively as a description that an object may satisfy to varying degree or not satisfy at all, I do concur with this argument that animal name is also metaphor because in both Kamba and Maasai languages you do not need to mention the target but the source for the metaphor to be complete. For instance a person can refer to you directly as the animal (Ngiti) (Kamba) to mean dog, and the listener is able to draw encyclopedic entries. In the framework of cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT), animals are among the most commonly used source domains (Kovecses 2010:19). According to this scholar there are different types of animals that have different characteristics and therefore can be used metaphorically to refer to human beings and human characteristics.

In Shakespearian poetic drama 'King Lear' animal images have been used to portray negative qualities in human that degrades their status to that of animals. The characters in the play are associated with certain types of animals for instance the character Goneri is compared to sea-monster, Fox, Wolf, Vulture and serpent because of the characters heartless ingratitude. The mentioned animals are known for ferociousness.

1.8.2 Literature on Metaphors in General

Lakoff (2008) and Gentner and Bowdle (2008) argue that metaphors can serve as analogies, mapping from a known source to the conceptually new target. Kovesce (2002) looked at metaphor as understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain. He defines conceptual domain as any coherent organization of experience.

Lakoff (1993) and the correspondence model state that there is a particular correspondence between certain kinds of source and certain kinds of target that already exists in our long term semantic memory due to the sensory motor experiences that human beings are exposed to as a consequences of neurobiological make up.

Searle (1979: 96) argues that the literal meaning of a sentence only determines a set of truth conditions relative to a set of the semantic content of the sentence. According to Searle metaphorical meaning is an utterance meaning which is assigned in the context use. The animal metaphors in this study are assigned meaning according to the cultural background of the two communities.

Some of the study done on metaphors by Kenyan scholar include but not limited to following:

Muniafu (2012) investigated Lubukusu metaphors in an attempt to determine the pragmatic meaning of some metaphors in Lubukusu with regard to transfer in meaning. This research seeks to find out how cultural background determines the interpretation of animal metaphors.

Adoyo (2013) focused on the semantic analysis of verbs in Dholuo metaphors using conceptual metaphor theory whereas this study briefly looks into how verbs of animal sounds can be used metaphorically.

Nyakundi (2013) sought to establish why metaphors are understood differently by different group of people despite its universal element. In this study I will do a cross-linguistic

investigation to find out the different and shared encyclopedic entries of animal metaphor by two different language groups

1.8.3 Literature on Kamba Language

A lot of studies have been undertaken by scholars on Kamba language .Different fields of linguistic study such as syntax, semantics, phonology and many others areas have been explored. Lindblom (1926) wrote notes in Kikamba grammar. This is one of the earliest studies to be done on Kamba language. In this study he looked at dialectal differences of Kikamba in comparison with other Bantu languages. He focused on peculiarities of Kithaisu in terms of differences of phonology, inflection and also vocabulary. The scholar observed that Kikamba is very close to Kikuyu, and Mumoni dialect may be considered a translation of Kikuyu.

Maundu (1980) looked at the main consonantal sound change in Kikamba within the natural generative framework. His motivation was to find out sounds that are regular enough to be the basis of reconstructing photo-sound form which the four varieties of Kikamba have developed .According to Maundu , sound variation in Kikamba are the product of historical sound development and the Kitui North dialect is the most conservative because it has retained most of the photo-sound.

 Kitavi (1992) did a comparative study of the Kitui North and Machakos dialect of Kikamba with the aim of identifying the phonological, morphological and lexical features that differentiate the two varieties.

Mutiga (2002) explored the tone system of Kikamba in her studies she looked at how tone functions, and pattern and bearing units are in a specific dialect. She also examined what rules relate tones to the tone bearing units and what phonological processes regulate these patterns.

Kaviti (2004) researched on minimalist perspective of the principles and parameters in Kikamba Morpho-syntax. In her work she looked into in depth of word-formation process, particularly inflection process in explaining a syntactic phenomenon in Kikamba. The

researcher demonstrated how morphological and syntactic processes apply to different domain of constituent representation.

These are some of the early researchers to venture in the field of linguistic many more scholars have recently taken this direction. The topic of animal metaphors has not yet been investigated.

1.8.4 Literature on Maasai Language

Maasai is a very rich language but it has been under- researched. Much of the work done on Maasai has been carried out by non-speakers of the languages. Most of the research carried out on Maasai languages is on Sociolinguistics. There is a lot that needs to be done on other fields of linguistics like semantics, phonology, morphology and syntax.

Lamoureaux (2004) looked at applicative construction of Maasai language. The scholar analyzed syntax and semantics of the 'dative' instrumental and 'directional' applicative in Maasai language. This study sought to find out what syntactic effects result from applicative construction and what semantic roles are promoted by applicative morphemes. In the findings it was noted that Applicative construction in Maa increases the valence of the verb in some cases while semantic functions of each applicative appear polysemous.

Karani (2001) examined semantics of the "perfective" grammatical construction in Arusa (Maasai) language of Tanzania using a two- dimensional dynamic model. The researcher illustrated various senses exhibited by perfective grammatical construction form, the context of their use and relationship to other meanings and forms found in Arusha language.

Payne (2008) explored a number of linguistic fields in Maasai language. These included historical linguistics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. In the semantic domain she focused on Maa color terms and discovered that Maasai has a wide set of about 30 colors, and about 20 color –plus- design terms, five of them are stative verbs while the rest are adjectives. The adjectival colors developed from words that stand for objects and others that have no nouns that relate to them.

Kimani (2005) researched on phonotactic adaptation of Maasai loanwords in the Gikuyu language. In her work she sought to find out how loanwords derived from Maasai language are nativized into Gikuyu.

Nganga (2009) examined morphonological modification of English and Kiswahili loanwords in Maasai by describing the adaptation process involved in the incorporation process.

1.9 Theoretical Framework

This section deals with a detailed discussion of the frame semantic theory that will be used in data analysis. Fillmore (1967) defines framing as perceiving, thinking and communicating to structured ways of interpreting. The term has also been used to mean concepts or categories formed through the process of matching sets of perceptual features with words. Fillmore uses frame concepts to explain communication and comprehension processes.

Fillmore (1967: 24) points out that the process of interpreting an utterance may depend more on the fact that people are used to thinking, on the perception of the context in which the utterance or its constituents is in it. In language understanding there is some kind of network of interlinked relationship that represents bits of knowledge and ways in which these bits of knowledge are integrated into a more or less coherent model of images of the world. In this conception, in an act of communication, one person affects the content of another person's world image. The model or image includes a record of individual's beliefs about the world, a filtered and partly integrated record of his past experiences a current register of information about his position in space, time and society, together with his vision of the world – models of the other relevant people in the environment.

The process of communication involves one person saying something that will induce another person to change his image of the world. Fillmore seems to agree with Bowding who states that the meaning of a message is the change which it produces in the images. The process involves an appeal to context, because current, imagined and remembered

context make up part of the model and also it involves frames, because frames, according to Fillmore, provide the building blocks for constructing pieces of the model.

Every memorable experience occurs in a meaningful context and is memorable because the experience has frames on cognitive schema for interpretation. This frame identifies the experience as a type and gives meaning to the points and relationships, the object and events, within the experience.

Individual words are learned within meaningful contexts, and each word serves to foreground some parts of the context. Fillmore(1967) goes ahead to give an example to explain this assumption by stating that there is a possibility that American children first learn the nouns" Orange" and "grapefruit" in the manner in which they are commonly eaten. Oranges are eaten by peeling them and breaking it into its natural segments while grape fruits by cutting them in half and eating them with a spoon. It is argued that it is possible that the first frames these children acquire for these fruits were scenario that included specific ways of eating them.

Many objects, persons, and experiences in the world are framed in terms of their potential role in supporting, harming, or enhancing people's lives or interests. It is not possible to interpret expressions that contain for instance the words "good" or "bad" because it is not easy to count on any scenario what can be invented as the one the speaker intends. The act of understanding the word "good" requires one to find an appropriate dimension of evaluation.

The process of understanding a language is a creative process and depends on the language user's ability to use language to indicate ways of framing experience.

Fillmore (1977) uses commercial transaction frame and case frame to explain the origin of frame semantics. He uses a large set of English verbs and explains how they are semantically related to each other by virtue of the different ways in which they evoke the same scene. Fillmore uses the term BREAKFAST as a category of word that has to be understood in terms of background of institutions and practice the word is associated with.

To understand the term it is important to understand the practice in our culture of having three meals in a day and at particular times of the day. Breakfast is eaten early in the morning and may consist of a unique menu which varies from community to community. The word breakfast can be used by native speakers without having to observe the typical conditions associated with it for example having a unique menu. A person can work overnight and have a heavy meal at sunrise and this will still be termed as breakfast.

The word VEGETARIAN means in most culture as someone who eats vegetable and it is applicable in a background of community where most people eat meat regularly. The term is used appropriately in situations where people avoid meat due to health reasons. In other communities it could be used to describe people whose diet does not include meat because they are unable to find any, or because they cannot afford to buy it.

Frame semantics is a terminology used to refer to a wide range of ways in which natural language meaning are systematically described Fillmore (1977) refers to frame semantics as meanings that are relativized to scenes. By this he meant that meanings have internal structure which is determined relative to a background frame or a scene. Hamm (2009:1) uses an example to explain Fillmore (1977) slogan. He gives an example of two identical twins Mark and Mike who are assumed to be both in a hospital sitting on the edge of their bed in exactly the same position. When a nurse walks by Mark's room, she says" Look at Mark, he is able to sit up now", and when she walks by Mikes room she remarks" Look at Mark he is able to sit down now". From experiences that people know about hospitals, frame listeners are likely to evoke two different encyclopedic entries or meanings of the sentences and therefore relativizing the meaning of her comment to the relevant scenes.

Fillmore (1977) further demonstrates how meanings are relativized to scenes by explaining the meaning of the following two sentences.
   a) I spend three hours on land this afternoon
   b) I spend three hours on the ground this afternoon.

The background scene for the first sentence is a sea voyage while the second refers to an interruption of air travel. This illustrates Fillmore's use of the term frame as an idealization of a coherent individuable memory, experience, action or object Fillmore (1977).

In conclusion it is necessary to observe that frame semantics is an approach on semantic meaning that allows for frames with single lexical representatives (Fillmore 1985: 225 – 230) whereas other theories of word meaning rely on existence and knowledge of other semantically related words. Frame semantics is a reliable model used in interpretation of metaphorical expressions. A frame based lexicon gives more comprehensive information than traditional lexicon. An example is the studies that look at vocabulary of body frame in Modern Hebrew (Pectruct: 1986). A frame net – system is a computational lexicography (Boas: 2002) A frame net is also a frame based lexicons. Frame semantics has a wide range of use in different subfields of linguistics theorizing from morphology to typology, discourse analysis to language acquisition.

1.10 Research Methodology
This section deals with data collection and data analysis.

1.10.1 Data Collection
The researcher will use random sampling method of data collection to represent speakers of larger population from both communities and purposive sampling method of data collection to suit the objectives of the study. The two methods will run concurrently. The corpus of data on animal metaphors in Kamba language will be collected through language intuition of the researcher as native speaker of the language and through interviews between the researcher and three native speakers, one an ardent listener of Kamba radio stations and who has lived in Ukambani for more than 20 years and the other a very competent speaker of the language and of about 59 years of age and has studied and lived all his life in Ukambani and lastly through interaction with semi- illiterate speaker 80 years of age. The first two native speakers will be invaluable to the study firstly because they have a good understanding of metaphors and secondly they are richly endowed in the language while the third speaker is deeply rooted in the Kamba culture, monolingual and has a vast knowledge of the language. The three informants will adequately furnish the

researcher with twenty animal metaphors and also assist the researcher to get the correct encyclopedic entries for various animals metaphors found in the speech community.

The data on Maasai animal metaphors will be gathered through the aid of an assistant researcher (AR).The AR is a secondary school teacher, a consultant on Maasai language and culture, and an upcoming author who has written books on proverbs in Maasai among others. The AR through linguistic competence and interaction with other native speakers of the language for example on social media like whatsapp, Facebook and more importantly through face to face conversation, will be able to collect accurate and reliable data in Maasai which will be pivotal to this study. The data will be generated among the Maasai speakers of Kajiado County and twenty animal metaphors will be collected. The data collected through the AR will be verified to ensure that it is an actual representation of the animal metaphors found among the Maasai in Kajiado County.

1.10.2 Data Analysis

Firstly, the researcher will list animal metaphors from the two speech communities separately and meaning through the encyclopedic entries of the metaphors and mapping from source through target will be analyzed using Fillmore's Frame Theory. The animal metaphors that are shared in both languages will be picked from the two lists and researcher seeks to find out if the encyclopedic entries are shared or not based on cultural understanding of the meaning of the metaphor. These metaphors will be categorized into two,that is, common animal metaphors with similar interpretation and common animal metaphors with different interpretation. The rest of the metaphors that are not shared will be analyzed under the category of metaphors that are culture specific.

The researcher will finally explain the reasons for difference in interpretation of shared animal metaphors.

1.11 Conclusion

This chapter has looked into background to the study, statement of the problem and research questions and objectives. It has further dealt with other areas that include rationale of the study, scope and limitation, literature review, theoretical framework, methodology and lastly conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO
COMMON WILD AND DOMESTIC ANIMAL METAPHORS

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a descriptive analysis of common wild and domestic animal metaphors in the Kamba and the Maasai languages. The metaphors are discussed systematically whereby a common metaphor in both languages is tackled concurrently. The wild animals in this study will include insects and birds. The chapter is divided as follows 2.1 Introduction 2.2 Metaphors 2.3 common wild animal metaphors and 2.4 Common domestic animal metaphors and 2.5 Conclusion.

2.2 Metaphors

Metaphorical expressions can be derived from animals. In this discussion, metaphors have been used to describe mainly people using animal attributes. The analysis and interpretation of animal metaphors will depend on the encyclopedic entries of the animal characteristics in the mind of the hearer. Lakoff and Johnston (1980:5) look at metaphor as cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system. This is to mean that a set of correspondences from a source (the realm of physical or more concrete reality to a target domain. Through conceptual metaphor, the source domain (mainly animal expressions in this study) is mapped systematically to the target domain (people). Metaphor shape and structure our perceptions and understanding leading to a framework within which our experiences are interpreted and assigned meaning. (Langacker 1987:147) asserts that domains are necessarily cognitive entities: mental experience, representational spaces and concepts. It provides background information against which lexical concepts can be understood and used in language.

Cognitive semanticist view encyclopedic knowledge as structured system of knowledge, organized as a network, and not all aspects of the knowledge, that is, in principle, accessible by a single word has equal standing. For example what people know about an orange includes its color, shape, smell, texture and taste; whether people like or hate orange or where they are grown and harvested and; how they are processed to make juice and so on.

2.3 Common Wild Animal Metaphors

The first example of animal metaphor in this section will be given in Kamba followed by Maasai for the same animal metaphor in that order throughout the chapter. The first example in Kamba is derived from a hyena:

> (1) *Mutinda Wendete nyama uu ko wi mbiti.*
>
> Mutinda why do you like meat so much? Are you a hyena?

In this metaphorical expression Mbiti 'hyena' is the source domain while the man Mutinda is the target domain. Mutinda is not literally referred to as hyena but certain characteristic of hyena found in the encyclopedic entries of the hearer in this cultural background are mapped on Mutinda. In Kamba community hyena is known to be greedy and likes meats very much.

The encyclopedic entries of hyena in the mind of the hearer will provide the following general information:

> -it has fur
>
> -It has black spots on its skin
>
> -It has hind legs that are shorter
>
> -It is greedy
>
> -It likes eating flesh

The listener is careful to select qualities that fit Mutinda who is a human being according to this culture. Based on the interpretation intended by the speaker, Mutinda is therefore a person who loves meat very much and will do whatever it takes to have it just like hyena that can feed on carcass.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10-3) posit that the choice of source domain highlights some aspects of the target domain and hide others. Entries like has fur, black spotted and has hind legs that are shorter are left out because they do not correspond to Mutinda as a person and are also not recognized in this cultural background when the metaphor is uttered.

The Maasai people also have a metaphor drawn from hyena the following is an example:

(2) *Orng'ojine taake Sintimon, tenidol enya endaa niaku ijo olopisho.*

Sintimon is hyena, if you see him eating food you can easily vomit.

Sintimon (a person) is metaphorically referred to as Orng'ojine 'hyena' Hyena is the source domain that is used to conceptualize Sintimon, the target domain. In this speech community, the hearer is able to conceptualize what it means to be a hyena by drawing appropriate encyclopedic entries and therefore transfer the interpretation to Sintimon. The hearer will access all the entries available in his/her mind and after picking the appropriate one will conclude that Sintimon is greedy and eats in a disorderly way.

The interpretation of the metaphor is the same in both the Kamba and Maasai culture, that is, it means someone greedy.

The next metaphor is derived from lion. The following is an example in Kamba language:

(3) *Mutumia usu ni munyambu.*

The old man is a lion.

The old man is literally referred to as a lion. The idea of being a lion is conceptualized in the mind of the hearer. Munyambu 'lion' is the source domain while mutumia 'old man' is the target domain. The attributes of the lion are transferred onto the target, in this case mutumia 'old man.' The listener of this utterance is expected to choose the correct interpretation. The general characteristic of a lion are as follows:

-Strong

-daring and brave

-Like eating fresh flesh

-Has a mane

-is a fast animal

-Fierce and so on

The listener in this cultural background will access all the encyclopedic entries available and conclude that Mutumia 'The Old man' is brave, strong and courageous.

The Maasai people also have the same metaphor as follows:

(4) *Ore Leina naa Olowuaru. Einosa eukop enye pooki.*

Leina is a lion he has disposed all his land.

Leina is the target domain while Olowuaru 'Lion' is the source domain. According to Lakoff (1987) the association that constitutes this metaphor maps our perception about 'lion' animal onto our target domain 'Leina,' a human being. The source domain helps in the understanding of the target domain. The hearer of this utterance will access his /her encyclopedic entries and interpret Leina to be savage / fierce. He misused and wasted his property leaving nothing behind for the children to inherit. The metaphor is directed to people who are extravagant or wasteful in nature.

Metaphor meaning is different in the two cultures, while in Kamba it is perceived positively, in Maasai it has a negative connotation.

The metaphor that comes next is drawn from a reptile, lizard. The following is an example in among the Kamba:

(5) *Mwieea ngewa Syomiti ee vakuvi? Kiveti kyu ni syomiluli.*

Was syomiti around when you were having a conversation? That woman is a lizard.

In this metaphorical expression Syomiti is the target domain. The attributes of the source domain syomiluli 'lizard' are transferred to the woman Syomiti. The concept lizard is defined as a reptile that is dangerous, poisonous, preys on insects, lives on rocky place; some lizards have eavesdropping characteristics. The encyclopedic knowledge enable the listener in this cultural background to interpret the metaphor in the sense that Syomiti eavesdrops on people's conversation mainly with malicious intention, so Syomiti is a malicious person and in a conversational situation speakers ought to be cautious. Lizards have this behavioral characteristic as protective measure against the enemy. They can easily detect the direction of the enemy.

The Maasai version of metaphor on lizard is as follows:

(6) *Entaa toi apa Saitoti Olmaima ana negila enkeju.*

Saitoti has become a big lizard. Since he broke his leg he cannot move fast.

20

The qualities of the target domain which is Olmaimo 'lizard' are mapped onto Saitoti who is the source domain. This helps the hearer to conceptualize the aspects of the target domain that can be transferred to fit the interpretation of the metaphor.

Evans and Green (2006:160) posit that principle of cognitive linguistic holds the view that semantic structure is encyclopedic in nature. This means that words serve as 'point of access' to vast repositories of knowledge relating to particular concept or conceptual domain. The hearer is this community therefore will look for the attributes of the reptile lizard and select the intended meaning of the utterance. The appropriate interpretation is that Saitoti is crippled or disabled. The metaphor refers to crippled in general with no consideration of what resulted to the condition. Saitoti is compared to a big lizard that moves with a lot of difficulty.

The meaning attached to the metaphor drawn from lizard is quite different in both cultures. In both cultures the meanings also have negative connotation, among the Kamba people it means someone malicious while in the Maasai culture it means a crippled person.

The metaphor that comes next is common in many languages. It is a metaphor that is derived from a squirrel. The following is an example in Kamba:

(7) *Mueni ni nduu, ndalilikana kila mwalimu unasomethisye iyoo.*

Mueni is a squirrel she cannot recall what the teacher taught yesterday.

The characteristics of the source domain nduu 'squirrel' are mapped onto the person that is the target domain Mueni. A squirrel is generally perceived as follows.

-An intelligent animal

-It has a bushy tail

-It is herbivorous

-It has a great memory

-It has soft and smooth fur

In Kamba if someone is referred to as nduu 'squirrel' the hearer of such an utterance will construe this to mean that the person is actually forgetful. This is quite interesting because according to research a squirrel has a great memory. In fact if someone is very forgetful

21

they might be asked 'kowaie nduu' which means did you eat a squirrel, this to emphasize on degree of forgetfulness.

In this cultural background squirrel are very troublesome to farmers. They destroy crops in the farms by digging out the seeds that have been planted and eating them, eating harvest before it is ready or when ready. No matter what measure the farmer puts to stop this nuisance, the squirrel is stubborn and always comes back and that is why in my own opinion it is perceived as forget just like Mueni in this situation.

The Maasai people also have a metaphor in which a squirrel is a source domain as illustrated below:

(8) *Enkarkabobo taake Saitoti te ng'eno, eitaka Nkutiti and Kaelo.*

Saitoti is a squirrel he was able to reconcile Nkutiti and Kaelo.

Enkarbobe 'squirrel' is the target domain, the characteristic of the squirrel are transferred to the person 'Saitoti' after the hearer conceptualize what it entails to be a squirrel. The speaker accesses the encyclopedic knowledge and comes to the understanding of the speaker's intention.

According to this culture a squirrel is perceived to be intelligent and has a great memory. The utterance is interpreted to mean that Saitoti is an intelligent person he is capable of giving solution to difficult problems and in the context mentioned above he was able to resolve the problem between Nkutiti and Kaelo, a husband and a wife.

The animal squirrel is known to be very intelligent, according to research when a squirrel observes that other squirrels have noticed where it has hidden its food in the ground, it confuses them and transfers the food to a different location. The interpretation of squirrel in both communities is different, among the Kamba it has a negative connotation while in the Maasai the meaning is positive.

Among the Kamba people characteristics of people are also comprehended in terms of buffalo attributes as indicated in the following example:

(9) *Mutwii ni mboo ndwiki.*

Mutwii is a loner buffalo.

Mboo ndwiki 'a loner buffalo' is the source domain in this metaphorical expression while Mutwii is the target domain. For the hearer in this cultural background to conceptualize the metaphor he/she has to access encyclopedic entries in the mind in order to arrive at the correct interpretation. Some of the general attributes of a buffalo are as follows.

-They are violent

-They are aggressive and dangerous

-Adult buffaloes are dark grey or black

-They have horns

-Largely look like bulls

The hearer in this speech community will pick the interpretation that Mutwii is aggressive and violent person. Mboo ndwiki a loner buffalo' is a dangerous and aggressive towards other buffalo in the herd. It cannot be accommodated and has to wonder in the wild alone. This means Mutwii cannot live peacefully with other men he is aggressive and easily gets into fights and therefore is a lonely person.

On the other hand Maasai   also have the same animal as a source domain, the following is an example:

(10) *Olarro aka Simanka le ngilon, neisul lenegora.*

Simanka is just a buffalo when he is annoyed.

Olarro 'buffalo' is the target domain and Simanka is the source domain. The characteristics of the Olarro 'buffalo' are conceptualized in the mind of the hearer and mapped onto Simanka. The interpretation of the metaphor will depend on the encyclopedic entries in the hearer's mind. The listener will draw upon appropriate entries and map on Simanka. In this cultural background Simanka will be understood to be violent and a quick-tempered. Metaphor on buffalo is interpreted and understood the same way in both the Kamba and the Maasai cultures .In both it means someone who is aggressive and violent. Animal metaphors on wasps are also common among the Maasai and the Kamba people. The following is an example in Kamba.

(11) *Mutumia usu ni mauwi.*

The old man is a wasp.

Mauwi 'wasp' is the source domain that is mapped onto Mutumia 'old man.' The common characteristics of wasps are:

-they are insects

-they have painful sting

-they are aggressive when disturbed

-they are dangerous.

A native listener in this situation is capable of accessing the frame elements evoked by the target domain and pick out the frames that fit the description of Mutumia 'old man' This would mean that the old man is aggressive and gets easily agitated. The metaphorical expression is directed towards such kind of people and it used as a precaution to people who would like to approach them.

The Maasai example is as follows:

(12) *Etaa duo Sinapei Oltimitimi, Meibung'ayu.*

Sinapei has become a wasp, she cannot calm down.

The characteristics of the target domain 'oltimitimi 'wasp' are mapped onto the person, 'Sinapei' the source domain. The hearer draws upon encyclopedic entries in his /her mind and selects the appropriate meaning that fit Sinapei. In this expression, it is therefore construed that Sinapei is aggressive and easily agitated. Just like it has been implied she cannot be easily calm down once provoked.

In his fictional book 'Blossoms of The Savannah,' Ole Kulet painted a character by the name Emakererei also referred to as 'wasp' in a setting of the Maasai community. Emakererei fights for women's right and more especially abolishment of F.G.M. She is a strong woman who has gone through a lot of struggle to stand for women's right. Despite going against tradition by fighting female circumcision, the community is portrayed of being afraid of confronting her. In the book when she is provoked by a character Oloisudori who is very wealthy man, she become agitated and sets his vehicles on fire and the man has to run for his dear life.

The conceptualization of metaphor derived from wasps is similar in both languages. In both cultures it is interpreted to mean an aggressive and a violent person.

The next metaphor is drawn from snakes. Snake metaphors are common and the following is an example in among Kamba people:

>   (13) *Kiveti kyu ni nzoka mbai.*
>
>   The woman is a deadly snake.

The woman is literally referred to as a deadly snake. The characteristics of nzoka mbai 'deadly snake' are transferred to kiveti 'woman.' This could generally mean that she is a reptile, capable of shedding skin, poisonous, venomous, she moves fast or even malicious. The listener draws upon encyclopedic knowledge relating to the source domain 'kiveti' woman based on the cultural background, to what it means to be a deadly snake. In this community such a person is understood to be malicious and capable of doing harm and thus should be avoided or approached with a lot of caution. Just like a deadly snake that is poisonous and when it bites it kills the victim.

Next is an example of the same animal metaphor in Maasai:

>   (14) *Tamala Loosuk amu entara ngussur, kesakut ninye ilalashora.*
>
>   Stay away from Loosuk because he is a puff adder.

The characteristics of the source domain entara ngussur 'puff adder' are found in the encyclopedic entries of the hearer's mind are activated and transferred to the target domain Tamala. The Maasai people believe that a puff adder is the most dangerous, malicious and poisonous snake. The hearer picks only those attributes that fit the cultural background knowledge of the utterance. The listener therefore, interprets and understands Tamala as a malicious person capable of committing evil like in this case bewitching his own brother. The evil nature of the person, in this community, more especially associated with witchcraft is compared to that of a snake.

The metaphor drawn from snake is understood in similar was in both cultures. It implies that the person is evil in nature.

The metaphor that comes next is derived from ants. An example among the Kamba is as follows:

>(15) *Kana kaa Kote Muthwa.*
>
>>This baby is ants.

The metaphorical expression is derived from the cultural background of Kamba people, the attributes found in the encyclopedic entries of Muthwa 'ants' in the mind of the listener are activated and mapped onto kana 'baby'. The encyclopedic entries for Muthwa 'ants' provide the following information:

>-Ants are social insects
>-Exist in large numbers
>-Work collectively
>-Of different color
>-Like to eat sugary things
>-Ever busy
>-eats a lot of food

All the listed entries refer to ants in general and are stored in the mind of the speaker and hearer. When the statement is uttered all the entries are available for the listener but only a few entries can be selected to refer to Kana 'baby.' The entries are screened to pick the ones that fit 'baby' as a human being based on this speech community, therefore, Muthwa, 'ant' is interpreted to mean the baby is greed and eats a lot of food.

Just like ants that are ever ferrying food from one point to the other. The metaphor is used to scorn the behavior of greed people, those who eat more than enough.
The Maasai metaphor drawn from ants is as follows:

>(16) *Eta duo Iltung'ana emuuyo le nikang e masho eltu alkata adol olerere oba neijia.*
>
>>People have becomes red ants at the home that is holding a party. I have never seen such a multitude.

The attributes of emuuyo 'red ants' that are conceptualized in the mind of the hearer of this cultural background are mapped onto Eta 'people'. (Cruse2000: 205) views metaphor as essential component of human recognition which is conceptual in nature and is a means whereby the abstract and intangible area of experience can be conceptualized in terms of familiar and concrete.

(Sweetser: 1999) on the other hand states that meaning constructions draws upon encyclopedic knowledge and involves inferencing strategies that relate to different aspects of conceptual structures, organization and packaging.

The encyclopedic entries are stored in the mind of the hearer. The characteristics of ants are as follows:

-they are red in color

-they like eating sugary food

-they are hard working

-they are ever busy and so on.

The hearer chooses those attributes which fit cultural background of the utterance, in this case, the Maasai culture. People referred to as emuyoo 'red ants' is interpreted to mean a multitude of people covered in red. The interpretation is appropriate because Maasai like to cover themselves in red shukas and therefore they are likened to a large number of red ants.

The meaning of the metaphor on bird in both cultures is totally different. In Kamba it is interpreted as a greedy person while in Maasai it is all about a multitude of people.

Birds are also used to characterize people. The following is an example of a metaphor formed bird in Kamba:

(17) *Susu Usu ni ndundulu.*

That grandmother is an owl.

This metaphor is derived from Kamba people cultural background. The attributes of ndundulu 'owl' are conceptualized to understand susu 'grandmother'. Such attributes are drawn from concrete and experiences that are well understood by listeners and hearers and

in this case the concrete is the bird 'owl.' The general encyclopedic entries provided for the owl include the following information:

-It is a bird

-It has wing and can fly

-It is a sign of bad omen

-It hoots

- It is a symbol of death and so on.

The hearer will draw upon encyclopedic entries in their mind and recognized the meaning of the utterance based on the cultural background. Therefore, the grandmother in this sense is a symbol of death. She represents death itself. In Kamba community, it is believed if an owl hoots nearby a homestead someone will die. It is a symbol of death. On the other hand the Kamba people are stereotyped as witches. It is believed that some witches are capable of casting evil spell on people by just looking at them. So, Just like an owl susu 'grandmother' can cause death if someone associate with her.

The following is an example of the same in Maasai:

(18) *Meshula enaisho niaku oltilo eng'orisho aka intae.*

Meshula is a woodpecker, just be careful.

Meshula is literally referred to as Oltilo 'a woodpecker.' The characteristics of a woodpecker are mapped onto Meshula. This could generally mean that Oltilo 'woodpecker' can climb trees, has feathers, capable of pecking, forages for insect prey, communicate by drumming their breaks and so on.

There are no particular characteristics of Oltilo 'woodpeck' peculiar to human beings that would evoke frame elements in the mind of the hearer leading to appropriate interpretation. It is conventionally understood in the Maasai cultural background that a Woodpecker is bad omen. The hearer will conceptualize that Meshula is a bad omen through association. Woodpeckers and owls are two different types of birds with a few different characteristics but interestingly, they are understood and interpreted in the same way. In both cultures they are symbol of death.

28

The last example of metaphor under this category is derived from elephant the following is an example in the Kamba language:

(19) *Mutiso ni Nzou.*

Mutiso is an elephant.

The attributes of Nzou 'elephant' which is the source domain is mapped on the target domain, Mutiso. The encyclopedic entries for nzou 'elephant' will provide the following information.

-It has a trunk

-It is huge and energetic

-It is destructive

-It has small eyes

-It is lives in wetlands and so on

The listener will activate his/her encyclopedic entries and conceptualize this metaphorical expression to mean that Mutiso is huge and energetic.

An example among the Maasai on elephant is as follows:

(20) *Olkachaoi ele tung'aai oji sinka entuuroyie Olchani openy.*

This man called Sinka is an elephant, he fell the tree alone.

Listener from this cultural background will conceptualize this metaphor by drawing upon correct entries in his /her mind which are the same entries as given in the Kamba examples and interpret the metaphor to mean Sinka is huge and energetic.

In both cultures the meaning is shared. If someone is said to be an elephant literally, it means that they are huge and energetic.

2.4 Domestic Animal Metaphors

Metaphors are also derived from domestic animals. Domestic animals are tamed and kept by humans for various purposes. This section is descriptive analysis of domestic animals. The first example is given   in Kamba:

(21) *Wingua ata? Ndi ing'oi yaku!*

Why do treat me like this? I am not you donkey!

The speaker remarks that he is not a donkey in literal terms. The utterance begins with a question and then the speaker emphatically declares that he is not literally speaking ing'oi 'donkey'. A donkey is generally perceived as a beast of burden; it can do a lot of work; it brays loudly, it is mistreated in most cases; defends itself by biting or kicking and so on. The listener in this cultural background selects appropriate encyclopedic entries from the mind to interpret the utterance and concludes that the speaker is to be understood that he is not a beast of burden and will not be mistreated. The metaphor is used to express anger when one is overworked.

The Maasai metaphor drawn from the same animal is as follows:

(22) *Etua taa toi ng'ole loomunyi nemayiolo ajo inyoo ranukaa amu asikiria taake.*
Loomunyi died yesterday and I am not sure who will bury him because he is just a donkey.

Loomunyi is literally referred to a donkey. The hearer is expected to draw upon the encyclopedic knowledge about a donkey in his mind and pick the one that fits Loomunyi as a person. The meaning of ng'ole 'donkey' will be interpreted to mean Loomunyi was a person who was mistreated and is looked down upon. There is a possibility that no one cared about him just like the way most people don't care about a donkey and do not care when they are overworked.

In the two cultures the animal metaphor is understood and interpreted in the same way. In both it means to overwork someone without caring.

The next metaphor is drawn from a dog. Example in Kamba is as follows:

(23) *Thie naku! ngiti ino!*
Go away you dog!

Ngiti 'dog' is the source domain and ino 'you' (2nd person pronoun), is the source domain. The attributes of the source domain Ngiti 'dog' are mapped onto the target domain you 'ino.' The mapping process helps in understanding the abstract target domain 'ino' when the statement is uttered.

(Roubi and Mohand 2011) pointed out that what accounts for animal metaphor is the use of animal names as source rather than target. In the cultural background, calling a person animals name qualifies to be a metaphor. A speaker will just utter the word ngiti 'dog' and the meaning is implied. The metaphorical expression in (23) will generally depict ngiti 'dog' to have the following characteristics.

-It is four legged

-It barks

-It is loyal and faithful

-It disgusts by eating back its vomits and so on.

The Kamba speaker will pick appropriate attributes of the dog from encyclopedic entries in his mind and map on the person. In this case the person is conceptualized to be disgusting and annoying. This metaphor is commonly used in this cultural background when a member of the community is upset or offended by others. The following is also a common metaphor derived from dogs used by the Kamba people.

(24) Witheka ata? Ko wi ngiti ya Mungethya?

Why do you laugh like that? Are you dog infected with rabies?

The person being addressed is literally called ngiti ya mungethya 'a dog infected with rabies'. The characteristics of a sick dog are conceptualized and transferred to a person. A dog that is infected by rabies generally exhibits the following characteristics: furious, overt aggressive and excessive excitability. This means the hearer can recognize these attributes in their encyclopedic entries and will pick the appropriate one to interpret that the person is excessively excited. The metaphorical expression is used to condemn such behavior. The community discourages overexcitement.

The Maasai version of the same animal metaphor is as follow:

(25) *Oldia ake Parsanka. Tenning inkirorot ni mbayu.*

Parsanka is just a dog if you listen to his talk you will just hate it.

Parsanka is the target domain while Odia 'dog' is the source. The characteristics of 'Odia' dog are mapped onto the target 'parsanka'.The interpretation of this metaphor will depend on the encylopedic entries of the dog in the mind of the hearer. Here the person is not

literally referred to as a dog but certain attributes that are conceptualized are transferred to the person. The following are characteristic of a dog according to the Maasai people:

-it is annoying

-it lives with human beings

-it is disgusting and so on.

In this community the speaker is careful to pick the correct interpretation according to the understanding, experience and background knowledge of the actual happenings in this society. This will mean that the person is annoying.

The meaning of the metaphor in both Kamba and Maasai is relatively the same. It is perceived to mean someone who is annoying and disgusting.

The next example of animal metaphors is derived from sheep, below is an example among the Kamba people:

(26) *Mwitu wakwa ni ilondu, ndakutethya*

My daughter is a sheep, she is of no help.

Mwiitu wakwa 'my daughter' is compared to ilondu 'sheep' in this metaphorical expression. Ilondu 'sheep' is the source domain which is mapped onto Mwiitu wakwa 'my daughter'. A sheep is generally perceived to be stupid, meek, follows blindly, not intelligent, has long fur and many other characteristics. The listener in this cultural background will select attributes that fit mwiitu wakwa 'my daughter' from the encyclopedic knowledge in his /her mind and therefore my daughter will be perceived to mean stupid in the context mentioned in the example.

An example in Maasai is as given below:

(27) *Entopal Lemoika amu enkerr meeta enaas.*

Just leave Lemoika alone, he is a sheep and cannot do anything.

The attributes of a sheep 'enkerr' are mapped onto Lemoika, the target domain. The encyclopedic entries of a sheep will provide the same enries as the ones found among the Kamba people and therefore, Leimoka being referred to as sheep is conceptualized to mean

that Lemoika follows blindly he is stupid and cannot make decision on his own. This metaphor is understood in this way according to Maasai cultural background.

The metaphor drawn from sheep among the Kamba and the Maasai people is perceived in the same way. In both cultures it means someone Stupid. The next metaphor is derived from goat. The following is an example in Kamba:

> (28) *Nthege ino! evete vaa!*
>
> He goat! Get away from here!

The features of nthenge 'he-goat' also known as a buck are used metaphorically to understand the abstract behavior of the person in question. Nthenge 'he-goat' has the following general characteristics

> -It has horns
>
> -It is herbivorous
>
> -It smells bad
>
> -It is aggressive

The hearer is expected to grasp the meaning of the metaphor as intended by the speaker by accessing his /her encyclopedic entries and pick the correct meaning. The hearer therefore will conclude that the person being addressed smells bad. If the person is young he /she will be referred to as 'Kathenge' young he- goat 'ka- for diminutive.'

The following is the Maasai example:

> (29) *Itaa duo alkuo le kine tiatua aji*
>
> Have you become a young one of a goat (kid)?

The properties of alkuo le kine 'young goat' are transferred to the target domain that is the addressee of the speaker. The encyclopedic entries of alkuo le kine 'young goat' will provide the following information:

> -It is playful
>
> -It is delicate
>
> -It loves jumping up and down

The listener will access the above encyclopedic knowledge in the mind and conclude that the speaker is addressing a playful person most likely a young person who loves to jump up and down just like a young goat.

The metaphors from the two communities are different in terms of the age of the animal and also the meaning. In Kamba the metaphor mean a person who produces foul smell while on other hand among the Maasai people it means a playful person.
The next metaphor is drawn from cow see the example below from Kamba:

(30) *Ekana na mutumia usu, ni ng'ombe.*

Don't mind about the old man, he is a cow.

Certain characteristics of the source domain, ng'ombe 'cow' are mapped onto mutumia 'old man.' Frames elements are evoked in speakers mind and the hearer select the ones that appropriately suits mutumia 'old man.' The encyclopedic entries activated in the mind of the speaker and hearer about ng'ombe 'cow' is as follows:

-A cow produces milk

-A cow moos

-A cow eats grass

-It is stupid

-Cows are social animal and so on.

The listener will draw upon entries that suits mutumia 'old man' as a person. In this cultural background, stupidity is a conventional feature associated with cows, so mutumia is simply understood as a stupid person.

The Maasai also have an example of a metaphor drawn from their favorite animal. The following is an example:

(31) *Ol Enkiteng ai supat, aning eji iyie Olsula te nkuetata kintishipa oleng enkerai ai.*

Oh my good cow, "I heard you emerged the best in athletics you made me proud my son."

The attributes of supat 'cow' are conceptualized and mapped onto enkerei's son. In Maasai cultural background generally cattle are endeared animals.

A person who is productive and highly respected can be literally referred to as a cow. From the example given, the speaker, a father is addressing the hearer 'my son' and calls him his cow instead of the usual 'my son'. This is because enkerei 'son' emerged a winner in athletics. Men are also commonly addressed literally as cows because they are highly respected in this community. Among the Maasai, apart from the cow there is also a metaphorical expression derived from bulls. An example is given below:

(32) *Oloing'oni taa toi melompuki, menyanyuk O lalashera lenyena.*

Melompuki is a bull you cannot compare him with his brother.

The attributes of oloing'oni 'bull' are conceptualized by the listener and mapped onto Melompuki. A bull is perceived to be hardworking, energetic, can be fierce sometimes and it is used to plough in the shamba and so on. In this community Melompuki is understood to be a hardworking man.

The metaphor drawn from cow has positive meaning among the Maasai while among the Kamba community is perceived negatively.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has examined common animal metaphors in both the Kamba and Maasai cultures. A systematic discussion on animal metaphor derived from the same source domain in both languages has been carried out to ascertain whether the meaning is shared or not. The chapter begins with a brief introduction on metaphors followed by a detailed description of metaphors in context in both Kamba and Maasai languages and then lastly a summary of the chapter. The interpretation of the animal metaphors is strictly based on the cultural background knowledge of the native speakers in question.

CHAPTER THREE
ANIMAL METAPHORS NOT COMMON IN KAMBA AND MAASAI AND VERB METAPHORS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the analysis of animal metaphors that are not shared in the Kamba and the Maasai cultures and also verbal metaphors in both languages. The chapter is divided into seven sections as follows: 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Kamba animal metaphors 3.3 Maasai animal metaphors 3.4 verb metaphors 3.4.1 Kamba verb metaphors 3.4.2 Maasai verb metaphors and 3.5 Conclusion

Metaphors are culture- specific and sometimes you might find a metaphor in one cultural background that is not found in other cultures. (Lakoff: 1980) argues that metaphorical mapping vary in university, some seem to be universal, others are wide spread, and some seem to be culture-specific.

The animal metaphors that are going to be discussed in this chapter are found in one of the two cultures while missing in the other. Animals, whether wild or domestic are part of the physical environment. A great number of human beings attributes are therefore comprehended in terms of properties of animals.

(Lakoff and Johnson 1980:10-12) point out that the choice of source domain highlights some aspects of target domain and hides other, this bias in the processes of conceptualization is what, from this theoretical perspective, constitutes the "framing" power of metaphors. (Clauster andCroft: 1999) claim that Lakoff and Johnson notion of conceptual domain owe much to Fillmore's concept of 'frames' in semantics which was a major influence in Cognitive linguistics generally.

3.2 Animal Metaphors in Kamba

There are animal metaphors in Kamba that are culture –specific and not shared in other cultures. The following are some examples. The first example is derived from a cock

> (1) *Mwana Mutuku ni Nzamba.*
>
> Mutuku's son is a cock.

Mwanaa Mutuku 'Mutuku's son' is nzamba' a cock' in literal sense. The listener is expected to activate his encyclopedic entries in order to conceptualize what it means to be nzamba 'a cock.' The properties of nzamba 'a cock' have been transferred to the target domain Mwana Mutuku 'Mutuku's son'.

(Grady 2010: 193) posits that abstract domain are expressed and understood through concrete domain. In this example the abstract domain which is our target domain mwana Mutuku 'Mutuku's son' will be interpreted and understood through the concrete domain which is nzamba 'cock.' A cock is generally known to have the following characteristics:

-It is a bird

-It likes fighting other cocks

-It can mate with several hens

-It has a large comb

-It is aggressive and so on.

In this cultural background, the attributes of nzamba 'cock' that are shared are picked by the hearer from his encyclopedic knowledge and mapped onto Mwana Mutuku 'Mutuku's son'. In this situation therefore the metaphor will be interpreted to mean Mutuku's son sleeps around with ladies, in other words he is a womanizer. Just like a cock that mates with several hens so long as they show signs that they are ready for mating, Mutuku's son sleeps around with any female that is available.

The next metaphor is formed from mosquitoes

    (2) *Ngusu sy Muthonuwa Syiuluka Umuu.*

      Inside my in-laws pockets are flying mosquitoes

(Grady 2010:193) argues that metaphors are based on perceptual features shared by source and target domain and others are based on qualities which are not shared. In this regard the characteristics that are shared by ngusu sya Muthonuw 'my in laws pockets' and Umuu 'mosquitoes' are highlighted in this cultural knowledge. Mosquitoes are commonly known to have the following characteristics.

-They can fly

-They are light and weightless

-They suck people's blood

-Some cause malaria

-They breed around wet places and so on.

The hearer will activate his mind and select the appropriate interpretation based on the culture of the Kamba people and conclude that my in-laws pockets are light or weightless just like mosquitoes. The metaphor is used to ridicule people who are financially poor in this community.

The animal metaphor that is discussed next is drawn from caterpillar.

(3) *Muthukumi wakwa ni Kiinyu*

My servant is a caterpillar

Kiinyu 'caterpillar' is the source domain. The characteristics of Kiinyu 'caterpillar' are conceptualized and transferred to the target domain. The encyclopedic entries of caterpillar will provide the following information.

-It is a crawling insect

-It produces silk.

-It has many eyes

-It is slow in movement

-It spends most of the time eating and so many other characteristics.

Among the Kamba people the utterance will be interpreted to mean that the servant is very slow at work. The listener is expected to pick the characteristics of Kiinyu 'caterpillar' as far as its movement is concerned to interpret and understand the speaker's intention. This metaphorical expression is commonly used with lazy people.

The metaphor that is commonly used to refer to people as animals also exists among the Kamba people. The following is an example:

(4) *Muume wa Kameme ni nyamu.*

Kamene's husband is an animal.

The attributes of animals generally are conceptualized and transferred to Muume Wa Kamene 'Kamene's husband'. Animals have the following general characteristics.

38

-They do not reason

-They have unrestricted instincts

-They are emotionally detached

-They are savage

-They are wild and so on.

The above mentioned frame elements will be activated in the listener's mind and he/she will highlight only those elements that are understood according to the intention of the speaker. In this culture, then it will imply that Muume wa Kamene 'Kamene's husband' does not reason and he is a savage. Just like an animal. The metaphor is commonly used in situations where physical violence is rampant among Kamba people. In the month of July 2013, a video of a man by the name Nzomo beating his wife senselessly in Makueni went viral on social media in Kenya. This metaphor was widely used in the community. Members of the Kamba community were enraged because of the brutal act and could be heard saying 'Nzomo ni nyamu ekunaa kiveti uu niki?' meaning Nzoma is an animal how could he beat the wife so ruthlessly?"

The metaphor that comes next is drawn from a small bird popularly known as a robin in western cultures.

(4) *Kalunde ni kavilivili.*

Kalunde is a robin

Kavilivili 'robin' is the source domain and Kalunde is the target domain. The characteristics of the source domain are mapped onto Kalunde. The common characteristics of robin is as follows.

-It is small in size

-It is colorful

-It can fly

-It eats worms and so on

The listener in this culture is expected to screen through all the entries and select the one that fits Kalunde as a human being. The metaphor is perceived to mean that Kaunde is

small body wise or tiny just like a robin. Metaphors formed from hare are widely used, especially in animal tales to depict certain human qualities. The following is an example in Kamba.

(6) *Muli ni Kavaluku.*

Muli is a hare

This attributes of Kavuluku 'hare' are transferred to the target domain, Muli. The metaphor has been used severally in political circles in Ukambani to refer to The Governor of Machakos County, Dr. Alfred Mutua. In the example given in sentence, the attributes of Kavaluku 'hare' are conceptualized by hearer to fit the intention of the speaker. The animal hare is generally known to have long ears, smooth and long fur, it is ever eating, it is herbivorous, has unpredictable behavior and is cunning. These frame elements are evoked in the listener's mind and the listener conceptualizes the meaning of the utterance and is expected to conclude that Muli is unpredictable and cunning. In the Kamba community when the Governor is literally referred to as Kavuku 'a hare.' It actually means that he is cunning.

A metaphor on fish is also found among the Kamba especially involving people who love water an example in context is as follows;

(7) *Mueni utindie mbavu niki? Ko wi ikuyu?*

Mueni why did you take too long in the bathroom? Are you fish?

The metaphorical expression is in form of a question. The attributes of the source domain ikuyu 'fish' are mapped onto the target, Mueni. Mueni is literally compared to ikuyu 'fish' which leads the hearer to draw upon his encyclopedic entries and pick out the one that fits Mueni as a person. The general characteristics of a fish are as given below.

-It lives in water

-It has fins

-It feeds on aquatic plants

-It loves water

-It can swim and so on

The metaphor will be interpreted to mean that Mueni loves water. The next metaphor is drawn from a troublesome animal known as a raccoon. The following is an example among Kamba people.

(8) *Ndikwenda Kukwona vaa! Mukololo uu!*

   I don't want to see you here! You raccoon!

The attributes of Mukololo 'raccoon' are transferred onto the person who is being addressed, the target domain. A raccoon is a small animal that bears the following characteristics:

   -It has a black masked face

   -It washes its food

   -It is intelligent

   -It is a conniving thief

   -It is extremely destructive and so on

When such a metaphor is uttered, the listeners among the Kamba will activate his encyclopedic entries in his mind and conclude that the person being addressed is as a conniving thief and so the speaker doesn't want the person close to him. The next section is a discussion on the Maasai animal metaphors.

3.3 Maasai Animal Metaphors

This section is a detailed analysis of animal metaphors that are not found in the Maasai culture. The first example is on a metaphor derived from a fox.

(9) *Ore Musa naa Olbarie ake, Mindim aisiliga to larrabal*

   Musa is just a fox you cannot rely on him during war.

The characteristics of the source domain Olbarie 'fox' are conceptualized and mapped onto Musa who is the target domain. The hearer is supposed to highlight attributes that fit Musa as a human being. The general characteristics of fox in the encyclopedic entries of the hearer's mind will provide the following information.

   -It is a wild animal that resembles a dog

   -It is cunning

-It is inconspicuous

-It lives in cozy environment and so on.

The listener will be expected to grasp the intended meaning by the speaker and interpret the metaphor to mean that Musa is cunning and as a result also untrustworthy.

The next metaphor is formed from a tortoise

(10) *Melejay toi Sironka amu Oloikuma*

You cannot deceive Sironka because he is a tortoise.

In this metaphor, Sironka is literally referred to as Oloikuma 'a tortoise.' The attributes of Oloikuma 'tortoise' are mapped onto Sironka. The general characteristics of a tortoise include the following:

-It has a hard shell

-It is slow in movement

-It lives long

-It is viewed as intelligent

-It smells with its throat and so on.

The hearer draws upon encyclopedic entries and chooses the correct interpretation to mean that Sironka is a very intelligent person. The metaphor is directed to people who are clever more so in decision making. A metaphor on wild dog is found among the Maasai, the following is an example

(11) *Etaa ilewa isuyien, aar alikae meeta olung'urr*.

Men have become wild dogs. Imagine beating someone mercilessly like that.

Etaa 'men' are compared to isuyien 'wild dogs' according to this metaphor. The qualities of isuyien 'wild dogs' are conferred to etaa 'men.' Wild dogs are generally known to have colorful coat , look very much like domestic dogs, are very aggressive, fond of attacking weak and sick animals and many others qualities. A listener in this cultural background will draw encyclopedic entries from his mind and understand Etaa 'men', violently attack women because women are weak physically. The same is reflected on isuyien 'wild dogs' that attack sick and weak animals. The Maasai community is patriarchal and as a result

42

men frequently use force to assert respective authority usually without protest from women. The metaphor that comes next is derived from an insect, Flea. The following is the example:

(12) *Mintoki akeohare ena pidilai riaji Lerionka amu nime enkerai toi.*

Do not compete with this flea called Lerionka because he is a child

Lerionka is literally referred to as Pidilai 'a flea.' The attributes of pidilai 'flea' are carried across to the target domain, Lerionka. The general characteristics of flea is as follows:

-It is very thin

-It is a blood sucker

-It is an insect that can fly

-It is found among animals and so on.

The Maasai listener is expected to conceptualize the metaphor and understand the intentions of the speaker. In this situation it would mean that Lerionka is very tiny and in fact looks like a child. In this culture people who are small body wise are looked down upon and perceived as weak and incapacitated.

The metaphor that comes next is derived from chameleon.

(13) *Iroro akae teng'eno amu kiata Lelyio tere naa ng'ote tanki*

Speak with wisdom because we have Lelyio here and he is a chameleon.

Lelyio is the target domain and tanki 'chameleon' is the source domain according to the utterance. The encyclopedic entries in the bearer's mind will provide the following information:

-It is a solitary animal

-It moves slowly

-It has a sticky tongue

-It hides by camouflaging to avoid detection

-It hisses and many other attributes

The hearer activates his encyclopedic entries and selects the entry that fits Lelyio based on Maasai belief. According to the utterance therefore it means that Lelyio is someone who

cannot be trusted, just like a chameleon he hides his personality to avoid detection and one cannot be certain about what he is capable of doing, he camouflages just like a chameleon. A metaphor formed from giraffe is among metaphors found in the Maasai culture. The following is an example.

(14) *Etaa enkayioni Olmeut*

The boy has become a giraffe

The characteristics of the source domain Olmeut 'giraffe' have been mapped onto the target domain, etaa 'the boy.' The hearer is expected to conceptualize the meaning and interpreted it as intended by the speaker. The giraffe is generally known to be a very tall animal, walks gracefully, it is herbivorous, it is slender and many other characteristics. The Maasai listener will draw upon encyclopedic entries and conclude that Olmeut is very tall just like a giraffe.

The next metaphor is derived from an antelope like animal called an eland. Below is an example in the Maasai culture.

(15) *Osiru taake Tobiko, eipido ng'ole neisul inkera pooki*

Tobiko is just an eland yesterday he jumped and won among the children.

The attributes of Osiru 'eland' are conceptualized and transferred onto Tobiko, the target domain. In the Maasai community an eland is a wild animal that is perceived to have the following characteristics.

-It has horns

-It can be domesticated for meat

-The bull barks to alert others in case of danger

-It eats in the morning and evening

-It can jump very high.

These frame elements are evoked in the listeners mind and the listener chooses the one that fits the utterance according to the Maasai culture and therefore, the metaphor is understood and interpreted to mean that Tobiko jumped very high during the competition. Among the

Maasai people Osiru 'an eland' is known to jump very high fences into the farms to eat maize.

The last metaphor in this category is formed from a small insect called a louse. An example is given as follows:

（16) *Emiure Lerionka amu elashei ake.*

Do not be afraid of Lerionka because he is just a louse.

Lerionka is termed elashei 'a louse' literally. The listener is supposed to conceptualize the attributes of elashei 'a louse' and map them onto Lerionka. The general characteristics of a louse will provide the following encyclopedic information.

-It is a parasite

-It is found in dirty places

-Its bite is irritating

-It has single food source and so on.

Among the entries provided there is no entry in the mind of the hearer that can be transferred to a person that is connected to a louse, it is conventionally understood in this culture that when you compare a person to elashei 'louse' it means that the person is stupid. From the example give we can therefore conclude that Lerionka is stupid.

3.4 Verbal Metaphors

This section presents the analysis of verbal metaphors. It begins with a general introduction to verb metaphors followed by verb metaphors in Kamba and lastly verb metaphors in Maasai.

Verbs can be used in metaphorical comprehension. Situations can be expressed metaphorically by verbs of animal sound and even animal behavioral characteristics. (Rhankilina 2010: 321) observes that verbs of animal sounds are cross-linguistically used for human subjects and their action. On the other hand (Chahine 2017) claims that verbs of animal sounds such as English verb 'bark' which expresses sound emitted by dogs, constitute a well define lexical domain and lend themselves easily for metaphorical uses. The scholar gives an example of the verb 'bark' which can be used with human subjects

such as 'to bark a command.' In a sentence or context one we can say the supervisor was barking commands at the employees.' In this metaphorical expression, the verb barking is the source domain that is mapped onto the target domain, 'the supervisor.' There are various reasons why a dog barks and they include the following:

-To induce play

-To warn of danger

-To threaten intruders

-To mark territory

-To announce that it is in charge and many other reasons.

In the encyclopedic entries of the listener of the given utterance, he will select the entry that is correct and it will be interpreted to mean that the supervisor was simply marking his territory and make the employees understand that he is in charge in a rather crude way. (Chahine: 2017) comments that verb of animal sound and prototypically animals emitting them are common and numerous in European languages.

(Merle 2017: 98) posits that metaphorical use of verbs of animal sounds for a human target suggests that they are sometimes unusual and outside the norm. To describe this strange thing, a figurative expression is needed. The scholar further adds that metaphorical expressions include evaluation made by the speakers, in that they choose to liken the subject with the animal prototypically emitting the sound. In the example in English where bark is used metaphorically, the supervisor is generally expected to issue orders but instead he does so in unusual way, lending himself to be understood as 'barking.'

(Chanine 2017:18) further points out that the basis for metaphors are on cultural ideas. He illustrates by giving an example of Finnish the verb Kukkua 'to cuckoo,' which in metaphorical means to stay up in the night. The scholar argues that the change is not just in the meaning between the source and the target domain, the verb also moves from the class of activity verbs to a class of state verbs. The repetitive action of the bird cries is lost instead the verb describes a state of being awake.

3.4.1 Kamba Animal Verbal Metaphors

Kamba people not only use noun animal metaphors but also verbal animal metaphors. The noun metaphors are more compared to verb metaphors. The following is the first example:

> (1) *Mutua Witunduma niki? Nuu ulawakuvitiisye?*
>
> Mutua why are you roaring? Who has offended you?

In this metaphor the verb kutunduma 'roaring' is used metaphorically to refer to Mutua's manner of speaking. Kutunduma 'roaring' is the source domain that is mapped onto Mutua. Among Kamba people if such an utterance is made, the hearer is expected to draw encyclopedic entries associated with the animal sound and select that which will fit the subject, Mutua. A lion roars because of the following reasons:

> -To tell other lions where it is
>
> -To send a warning to other lions
>
> -When it is fighting with other lions
>
> -To show who big it is
>
> -To protect its kill
>
> -To scare other animals within the territory and many other reasons.

In this circumstance, the hearer will understand Mutua is Kutunduma 'roaring' to warn people to stay away from him because he is angry. Kutunduma 'roaring' is an unusual quality of voice similar to that of a lion and anyone communicating with the speaker can easily detect that the speaker is agitated.

The next metaphor is derived from sound made by a cock.

> (2) *Mwana usu niwe ukumaa kwoo.*
>
> The young man is the one who barks in the homestead.

Ukumaa 'the one who barks' is the source domain which is transferred onto Mwana usu 'young man' The verb 'kukuma' 'to bark' is sound associated with dogs. The dog will bark if it is hungry, when it is playing, when it notices an intruder, to announce that it is the one in charge and so on.

According to the example give, if Mwana usu 'the young man' barks literally it means that he talks as if he is the one in charge just like a dog entrusted to guard a home. In this community this metaphor is used sarcastically. In the example given the young man has bestowed upon himself leadership position that he does not deserve.

There is also a metaphor formed from the verb to growl among Kamba. It is sound that is made by quite a number of animals. So someone might be asked in Kamba.

(3) *Wi Koomea uu?*

Who are you growling at?

This metaphorical expression is in form of a question. Koomea 'growling at' is the source domain. The target is the person to whom the question is intended 'Kooma' to growl' is a sound associated with animals. Animal growl because of various reasons as enumerated below:

-They are aggressive

-They are about to attack

-They are hungry or angry

-They are playing and so on

In Kamba cultural background the listener will understand that the person to whom the metaphor is intended is talking in a manner that indicates that he is angry and ready for a fight. The metaphor that is tackled next is associated with cobra's behavioral characteristics.

(4) *Wi ivuvia mana, nuwe wina makosa*

You are inflating yourself for no reason you are the one who is wrong.

Inflating of body is a characteristic behavior of a cobra. In this particular utterance Kwivuvia 'inflating yourself' is the source domain that is transferred unto 'you', the target domain. A cobra inflates itself because of the following reasons.

-When it is agitated

-To give warning of an attack

-For defense

-To scare away the enemy and many other reasons.

48

The listener in this cultural background will choose the entry that will fit 'you' as a person. The utterance will be understood and interpreted to mean that that you is agitated and is about to attack someone. The signs can tell through facial expressions. The metaphor that is given as an example next is formed from sound made by chicken.

(5) *Kalekye eka kutinda uiteta.*

　　Kalekye stop cackling.

Uiteta 'cackling' is the source domain that is mapped onto the subject, Kalekye. Kuteta 'to cackle' is a sound associated with hens. Hens cackle because of the following reasons:

-When it about to lay an egg

-When angry

-To show discontentment

-To attract its chicks

-To warn chicks of the impending danger

Among the Kamba native speakers, when someone is said to Kuteta 'cackle' it is a show of discontentment just like a hen whose chick has been snatched away by a hawk. Based on our example Kalekye is being told to stop portraying anger and discontentment.

There is also a verbal animal metaphor formed from noise made by houseflies as given in the following example

(6) *Syana Syinoona Kyathini kya Muisyo*

　　Children were buzzing at Muisyo's party.

Kunoona 'buzzing' is noise made by quite a number of insects. In this metaphor it is particularly associated with houseflies. Syinoona 'were buzzing' is the source domain that is transferred to Syana 'children'. The listener is expected to conceptualize the metaphor and grasp the meaning intended by the speaker. Houseflies are commonly known to buzz when competing for food or in a place where there is foul smell. A Kamba listener will draw encyclopedic entries of such behavioral characteristics of flies and pick that which fits Syana 'children'. This will then be interpreted to mean Syana 'children' were making noise as they were competing for food at Muisyo's party. In most cases, where there is a

party in Kamba community there is food and therefore, this scenario lends itself for the listener to understand the unusual behavior of children.

The metaphor that comes next is drawn from horned animals.

> (7) *Mutua na Nzioka manakimanie iyoo.*
>
> Mutua and Nzioka attacked each other like horned animals yesterday.

Kukimana 'attacked each other like horned animal' is a characteristic behavior of horned animal like goats and cows and it is the source domain that is mapped onto the target domain, Mutua and Nzioka. Under normal circumstance Kambas would talk about Kuukita 'to fight' but in this case the fight is usual the characters are getting at each other head on like animals. There are various reasons why animals lock horns with each other and they include the following:

> -To compete with each other
>
> -To compete for a female
>
> -For food
>
> -To threaten
>
> -To find out which animal is strong
>
> -To keep away a rivalry

The listener will activate his encyclopedic entries and pick an entry or entries that will fit the subject's actions. So, Mutua and Nzioka are rivals and were competing with each other on who is strong. Kukimana 'Locking horns' is a term that is used to talk about the way horn animals fight. Among Kamba it is not applicable to animals that do not have horns. The last metaphor on this area is drawn from mating behavior of animals.

> (8) *Eka Kunduliila! Mwanake!*
>
> Stop mounting on me! youngman!

Kunduliila 'Mount on me' is the source domain that is transferred to mwanake 'young man' Kutuliila 'mounting on' is a characteristic behavior of an animal during mating in the Kamba culture. The listener is expected to draw encyclopedic entries in his mind that are characterized by this animal behavior. Human beings normally have sex and do not mount

like animals and mostly after the individuals consent. Among the Kamba people kutuulila 'to mount on someone' would mean that the person is forcing himself on another like an animal that have a different way of detecting when their mates are on heat. Based on the example given, the speaker is warning the subject to keep off the annoying act.

3.4.2 Maasai Animal Verbal Metaphors

The following on the other hand are animal verbal metaphors found in the Maasai culture. The first example is drawn from sound made by a cow as follows:

(9) *Tapala Saitoti amu keorito aka kakeaka kake medume aikata erorouata.*

Leave Saitoti alone he is just roaring because but he cannot make a step.

Keorito 'moos' is the source domain that is mapped – onto Saitoti who is the subject or target domain Keorito 'moos' is the sound made by cattle. Cows moo because of reasons illustrated below.

-They want to be milked

-They have lost their calf

-They are hungry

-When they are distressed

-They want to make a baby and so on.

Among the Maasai when someone is said to keorite 'moo'. The listeners does not actually draw encyclopedic entries and relate the action of the subject for the reasons why a cattle moos but it is simply conventionally known that when someone moos it means the person is not serious about what he/she promises to do this person is likened to a cow that is not able to communicate but makes sounds to attract attention. To listeners the words of the subject are likened to the mooing of a cow. The subject is just talking to attract attention but does not actually mean what he/she says. The next metaphor is drawn from sound made by lions.

(10) *Tenining Sairiamu eipurr nijo iyie keeta toki, keomonisho ake tiatua ilewa.*

If you hear Sairiamu roaring you would think that he owns anything. He lives on borrowing from other men.

Sairiamu is literally said to be eipurr 'roaring'. The aspects of 'lion' are transferred to Sairiamu. The encyclopedic entries in the hearers mind on why a lion roars will provide the following information.

-When it is about to attack

-To protect its territory.

-When it is aggressive

-To show how big it is and so on.

As it was observed earlier, metaphor drawn from the lion has a negative connotation which is not common in other cultures. According to the example give when such an utterance is made, the listener will draw entries to interpret the metaphor to mean that Sairiamu is showing off on how famous he is yet he has nothing to be proud of. The manner in which Sairiamu talks, that is unusual is compared to the roaring of a lion. Lions are animals that Maasai people are not fond of that is why metaphors drawn from lions in this culture have negative meaning. The most probable reason is because lions attack Maasai's livestock during herding and lead to a great loss cause when they kill their cattle. Killing of lions in Maasai culture was viewed as a rite of passage, currently the habit is discouraged. The metaphor that is discussed next is derived from sound made by a dog as indicated below:

(11) *Ebwaleita ake sironko nemetii oltung'ani agira ainining.*

Sironko is just barking and nobody is listening to him.

In this metaphorical expression ebwaleita 'barking' is the source domain that is transferred to Sironko who is the subject and also target domain ebwaleita 'barking' is a sound made by a dog .Dogs barks because of the following reasons:

-To induce play

-Threaten intruder

-For curiosity

-Some dogs bark at object or noise that catches their attention.

-When they want something and so on.

Among the Maasai if such a metaphor is uttered, the listener will draw encyclopedic entries and interpret it to mean Sironko is just making noise to seek attention. His words are of no substance to the listener and that is why he is said to be ebwaleita 'barking'.

The next verb metaphor comes from sound commonly made by a snake.

(12) *Enaijo duo etaa ikutisho pee mikinyikakini kainyoo igira amit?*

Why are you hissing people away from you? What are you protecting?

Ikutisho 'hissing' is the source domain that is transferred onto the target domain etaa 'you'. The verb ikutisho 'hissing' is the sound made by a snake according to the Maasai people and the listener will draw the encyclopedic entries on why a snake hisses as follows:

- To evoke fear in humans and other animals
- To protect themselves
- To dissuade predators.

The listener will select the appropriate entry that will suit the utterance to mean that the unusual manner of speaking exhibited by etaa 'you' is to protect him/herself and evoke fear in other people just like a snake does.

The last verb metaphor in this category is drawn from the sound made by frogs.

(13) *Tung'aitie Simintei egira airrung'urung amu raposhe oleng.*

We have just left Simintei croaking because he has eaten a lot.

Airring'urung ' Croaking' is the source domain while Simintei is the target domain. Simintei is literally said to be airrung'urung 'croaking'. The encyclopedic entries for the reasons why frog croaks will provide the following entries.

- To attract female frogs for breeding.
- To warn other male frogs.
- When it croaks, it means it is going to rain and so on.

According to this cultural background there is no direct association between reasons for croaking of a frog and the croaking implied by the metaphor. It is conventionally known

that when a person is airrung'urung 'croaking' is actually belching as is conventionally understood by English speakers. A croak is produced by pushing air through the larynx in the throat and similarly belching is the act of expelling air from stomach through the mouth and that is why the human action of croaking is compared to croaking of a frog.

3.5 Conclusion

Chapter three is an elaborate discussion on animal metaphors that are not common in Maasai and Kamba cultures and a brief session on verbal animal metaphors. From the discussion it is clear that there are metaphors that are culture specific in both languages. These metaphors are not shared by the cultures and only understood based on the cultural background of the particular speech community. The last section of the chapter is a brief analysis of verbal metaphors specifically drawn from animals. It is an interesting account of how verb of animal sounds and actions can lend themselves easily for metaphorical uses.

CHAPTER FOUR
COMPARISON OF ANIMAL METAPHORS THAT ARE THE SAME AND DIFFERENT AND REASONS FOR THE DIFFERENCE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a critical analysis of the factors that lead to the same interpretation and different interpretation of common animal metaphors in Kamba and Maasai languages. The explanation is based on the findings of the data presented in Chapter 2 and 3.The chapter is divided into 4.1. Introduction 4.2.Comparison and discussion between Kamba and Maasai animal metaphors 4.2.1 similarity in interpretation 4.2.2 Difference in interpretation 4.3 Animal metaphors specific to the Kamba and Maasai cultures 4.4 Conclusion.

4.2 Comparison and Discussion between Kamba and Maasai Animal Metaphor

Metaphors cannot exist alone; they have to be combined with certain language situation and culture and hence cannot break away from social and cultural environment. Cultural views enable people to reach amount of background knowledge and cultural beliefs that they portray.

Lakoff and Turner (1987: 193) posit that different metaphorical schemas show how people conceive of animal, and how this folk knowledge is applied to construction of metaphorical schema.

Metaphors make people thoughst more vivid and also structure their understanding. Kovecses (2002: 36) claims that metaphors may be based on knowledge and image.

Chapter two and three of this research has provided a detailed account of similarities and differences between Kamba and Maasai animal metaphors that have been analyzed to show to what extend the metaphor share a common underlying conceptualization and to what extend they reflect different cultural belief.

Metaphors and culture have commonness because of the difference in living environment, cultural background, custom, habit, and psychology and observation angle. Culture

55

determines meaning attached to the animal metaphor. Different meaning may be ascribed to the same animal metaphor and on the other hand same animal metaphor may not be equally conceptualized in different language and culture.

Cultural context influences conceptualization of metaphor (Kovecses 2002:186) points out two factors that brings about cultural variation in metaphors and metonymy as broader cultural context and natural and physical environment. (Kovecses 2002:183) further adds that the cross cultural variation is in the range of conceptual metaphor for a given target.

4.2.1 Similarities in Interpretation

The same conceptualization of metaphors can occur in many unrelated languages. This might happen as a result of universal motivation for the metaphor to emerge in the cultures or one language may have borrowed the metaphor from another language.

The tables below provide information about animal metaphors and verbal metaphors that are particular to the two cultures that this study is based on.

Table 4.1: Common wild animal metaphors in Kamba and Maasai cultures with similar interpretation

Animal	Language	Interpretation	language	Interpretation
1).Buffalo	Kamba	Aggressive, Easily gets into fights	Maasai	Aggressive , violent
2.)Wasp	Kamba	Aggressive, Easily agitated	Maasai	Aggressive/Easily agitated
3).Snake	Kamba	Malicious/Evil	Maasai	Malicious/Evil
4.)Elephant	Kamba	Huge, Energetic	Maasai	Huge/Energetic
5).Donkey	Kamba	Mistreated	Maasai	Mistreated/Despised
6).Dog	Kamba	Disgusting/Annoying	Maasai	Annoying
7).Sheep	Kamba	Stupid	Maasai	Stupid

Table 4.1 gives similarity of interpretation of common animal metaphor in both Maasai and Kamba cultures. The Similarity is due to the same observation of the world about the animal in both cultures. Different communities have different views to different objective things, but all human beings have similar capabilities of thought, some laws of cognition are the same and the animals have the same attributes. The Kamba connotations of some animal words are similar to the Maasai cultural connotation of other Maasai words. The similarity in conceptualization of animal metaphors found in both Kamba and Maasai cultures as illustrated in table (1) is based on the same observation of the characteristics of the animal by the members of the speech communities. For example a buffalo has characteristic behavior of being aggressive and violent; an elephant is huge and energetic; a dog is annoying and wasps are aggressive. The interpretation of other animals discussed is based on conventional understanding by the members of the community. For instance, in both communities the conventional feature of feature of sheep is stupidity; a donkey is an animal that is mistreated.

4.2.2 Difference in Interpretation

Table 4.2: Common wild animal metaphors in Kamba and Maasai cultures with different interpretation

Animal	Language	Interpretation	Language	Interpretation
1).Lion	Kamba	Brave, strong, Courageous	Maasai	Extravagant or Wasteful
2).Lizard	Kamba	Malicious	Maasai	Cripple or disabled
3.)Squirrel	Kamba	Forgetful	Maasai	Highly intelligent
4).Ants	Kamba	Greedy, one who eats a lot	Maasai	Multitude of people
5).Cow	Kamba	Stupid	Maasai	Highly respected
6).He goat	Kamba	Smelly		
7).Young goat			Maasai	Playful

Table 4.3: Common Animal verbal metaphors in Maasai and Kamba Cultures with different interpretation

Verb	Language	Interpretation	Language	Interpretation
1).Bark	Kamba	To show anger by commanding or giving orders	Maasai	To seek attention through making noise
2).Roar	Kamba	Use of hoarse voice as a sign of one who is furious	Maasai	To be proud without anything to show

Kamba and Maasai are two languages that belong to totally different language families. The Maasai people are predominantly pastoralist while Kamba people are agriculturists who keep a few domestic animals. The formation of metaphor in the two cultures is influenced by their way of life or custom of the people. Most of the Maasai metaphors are drawn from the wildlife animals because of living in the vicinity of game parks. The Maasai living environment inspire them to come up with metaphor whose source domain is drawn from wild animals while the Kamba people have more metaphor that are drawn from domestic animals and other animals that can be found in their environment like snakes, birds and raccoons as illustrated in the previous chapters of this research. Table 4.1 shows there are similarities and differences between interpretations of animal metaphors in the two languages.

The major cause for the difference in meaning for the same animal metaphor provided in table 1 is the attitude of the members of the speech community towards the animal. For example in the Maasai culture, Lion has a negative connotation because of its destructive nature, since Maasai have to look for pasture in the wild and in open grassland their cattle are at risk of being attacked by lions. When lions get an opportunity to get close to the cattle, the lions kill the cattle in large numbers. On the other hand the Kamba rarely encounter lions and therefore their interpretation of metaphor drawn from lion is conventionally understood from the nature of the animal.

The verbal metaphor also drawn from lion in the Maasai language has negative connotation. It is perceived from the destructive nature of the lion among Maasai and therefore someone who barks is said to be a show off who has nothing to be proud off.

Among the Kamba people a squirrel is perceived in a negative way due to the behavioral characteristics of the animal despite it being proven to be one of the most intelligent animals. A squirrel is a destructive animal to farmers among Kamba people and therefore lends itself to be perceived in a negative way on the other hand Maasai are known to be pastoralists and encounter squirrels when herding their cattle. Among the Maasai a squirrel is a very intelligent animal because of its ability to confuse other animals by hiding its food underground.

The metaphor derived from ants in Maasai culture is inspired by their way of life which is very different from the Kamba one. Maasai people predominantly adorn themselves in 'Red Shukas' as a symbol of identification. The Kamba people on the other hand scorns a person who eats a lot by comparing him to an ant most probably because in Ukambani rains are inadequate and food production is low and so one is not expected to consume a lot of food.

In (Table 4.2 & 4.3) we can also conclude that most animal metaphors have negative figurative meaning because of the fact that animal metaphors in general have negative connotation which is a common belief among speakers of different languages, this is because they can be easily used to comment about negative behavior of human beings in the societies. Among the Maasai cows are animals that are endeared because they are the sole source of their livelihood. The metaphor formed from cow is inspired by their way of life. Among the Kamba people agriculture is the main source of food and that is why metaphor formed from a cow has negative connotation and a cow is not highly respected like among the Maasai. The Kamba people can survive comfortably without cows and those have who keep them have a few to supplement their main source of food. Among Kamba people a cow is believed to be stupid especially in circumstances when it is supposed to assist in accomplishing tasks such as pulling a cart or in ploughing. A cow can turn out to a nuisance when it has to be forced to do the task.

4.3 Animal Metaphor Specific to Kamba and Maasai Cultures

This section is a discussion of animal metaphors that are culture specific among both Kamba and Maasai speakers.

(Kovecses 2005: 11) pointed out that metaphors gain within a community of speakers. This means that the source – conceptual material is basically applied to a range of target domains within specific communities and not others.

The table below provides data on animal metaphors that are specific to the mentioned communities of discussion.

Table 4.4: Kamba animal metaphors

Animal	Interpretation
1). Cock	Womanizer
2). Flying Mosquitoes	Broke
3).Caterpillar	Lazy
4). Animal	Brutal or a savage
5). Robin	Tiny
6). Hare	Cunning
7). Fish	Loves water
8).Raccoon	Conniving thief

Table 4.5: Kamba verbal metaphors

Verb	Interpretation
1). Growl	Angry and ready for a fight
2). Inflate oneself	Agitated
3). Cackle	Show of discontentment
4). Buzz	To makes noise when competing for food
5). Lock horns	To fight
6). Mount	Force oneself on someone

Table 4.6: Maasai animal metaphors

Animal	Interpretation
1). Flea	Tiny
2). Chameleon	Untrustworthy
3). Giraffe	Tall
4). Eland	Can jump very high
5). Louse	Stupid
6). Tortoise	Very intelligent
7) Fox	Cunning/untrustworthy
8). Wild dog	Violent, brutal

Table 4.7: Maasai verbal metaphors

Verb	Interpretation
1). Moo	To attention seek
2). Hiss	Protect oneself by evoking fear

It is interesting to note that among the Maasai community most of the metaphors are drawn from wild animals because they are inspired by the environment in which they live in. This category contains metaphors that have both positive and negative connotation. A chameleon is conventionally depicted as untrustworthy while a tortoise is perceived to be intelligent. Both a fox and a chameleon are given similar interpretation, that is, untrustworthy and can be used interchangeably. Both the fox and chameleon have unpredictable characteristics, a chameleon has the ability to camouflage and a fox is cunning. The Maasai also have metaphors drawn from insects that are parasitic to their animals such as flea and louse. In addition, among the Maasai a flea is interpreted to mean a tiny person whereas among the Kamba a robin that has a similar interpretation and this might result to intercultural miscommunication. On the other hand, metaphors that are particular to the Kamba community are drawn from animals that are found in their neighborhood such as a cock which is conceptualized according to its behavioral characteristics. A flea is tiny insect that is troublesome to cattle and difficult to deal with among the Maasai while robins are tiny birds that are detested by farmer for ruining their

farm produce. The interpretation arrived at for most animals in this category are based on the world view about the animal. Apart from that, there are those that are conventionally understood by speakers for example, flying mosquito which is understood to mean broke and metaphor derived from hare which means cunning.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted on the similarities and differences of animal metaphors in the Kamba and Maasai cultures. It has also briefly looked into animal metaphors that are culture specific in both languages. It has been observed that the similarity in meaning is as a result of both cultures having the same world view about the animals while differences in meaning are related to the social and cultural beliefs and attitude upheld by community of that particular culture. The differences in meaning are also related to the social and cultural beliefs upheld by the community of that particular culture. The difference in the interpretation of same animal metaphor brings obstruction of intercultural information. If either member of the two cultural backgrounds understands the metaphor according to their cultural background, this can lead to deviation from information transmission and misunderstandings in intercultural communication leading to miscommunication or failure of communication.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Research Findings

This study set out to do a comparative study of animal metaphors. The research was conducted using Fillmore frame theory that influenced the encyclopedic model adopted within Cognitive linguistics. Conceptual metaphor which is grounded in Frame & semantics has played an important role in the conceptualization of the animal metaphors to bring out appropriate encyclopedic entries. The study looked into how cultural background contributes into divergent views and shared views of same animal metaphor. All metaphors are culturally based because they rely on cultural encyclopedic entries. The study has also sought out to find how different interpretation of the same animal metaphor may arise through the use of context as a result of differences in the cultural background and therefore lead to miscommunication among the native speakers of the different speech communities.

The research was undertaken with the guidance of the following objectives: To identify animal metaphors in both Kamba and Maasai cultures and compare the meaning differences of the same animal metaphor in the Kamba and the Maasai languages.

The findings of the study revealed the following firstly, it established that there are shared animal metaphors in Kamba and Maasai cultures. Among these common metaphors in the two languages, there are those that are conceptualized in the same way. For example, the metaphor derived from wasps, among other metaphor, is understood and interpreted in the same way, that is, a person who is aggressive and easily agitated when provoked.

Secondly, the research has established that there are common animal metaphors in both Kamba and Maasai culture but are conceptualized differently. For example the metaphor drawn from a lion is found in both cultures, in Kamba it has a connotative positive meaning while in the Maasai it has a negative connotation due to the attitude attached to the animal. Among the Kamba a lion is interpreted to mean someone who is strong, brave or courageous but in Maasai it is used to depict someone who is extravagant and wasteful because lions kill the Maasai livestock.

Thirdly, it has also been established that the other metaphors in the two cultures, that are not shared, are culture specific and while one is found in one of the two cultures, the animal metaphor is not found in the other because the two speech communities have totally different cultural practises and live in different environments.

Lastly, the study has established that apart from animal metaphors that are drawn from nouns, verbal animal metaphors are found in the two cultures. The verbal animal metaphors are less compared to those drawn from nouns. The common verbal animal metaphors discussed in this study are interpreted differently in the two communities.

5.2 Conclusion

The study has established that there are animal metaphors that are common in different cultures, and some of the metaphors meaning are different due to cultural influence. The discrepancies in the use of metaphor in communities with different cultural background can leads to failure in communication or misunderstanding in inter cultural communication.

5.3 Recommendation

This study focused on analyzing animal metaphors derived from nouns, a brief discussion on verbal animal metaphor has been undertaken. Verbal metaphor is an area that has not been explored in African languages. I would suggest for an intensive study to be carried out in this direction.

I would also recommend that a comparative study on animal metaphors to be carried out in other languages with a view to establish whether culture influence metaphorical interpretation of same animal metaphor since conceptualization of metaphors depend on cultural background and communities have different values.

This study has established that misunderstanding may arise as a result difference in interpretation of same animal metaphor. Little findings have been established in this research since the study was restricted to purposive and random sampling method of data collection. I would recommend further study to be done based on actual speech situation to find out the kind misunderstanding that may arise cross linguistically.

REFERENCES

Akins B.T.S (1995): *'The role of The example in a Frame Semantics Dictionary'*: In essays in Semantics and Pragmatic .ed .M. Shibatani and S. Thompston, 25-42 Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Bauer L, (2007). The Linguistics Student's Handbook, Edinburgh.

Beardsley, M.(1966). In W. L. Anderson and N. C. Stageberg (Eds.). *Introductory Readings on Language*. New York. Holt, Rinehart Winston.

Brandes, S. (1984). *Animal Metaphors and Social Control in Tzintzuntza. Ethnology*, 23,207-215

Clark, B. (2013). *Figurative Language: Metaphor. In Relevance Theory.* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, pp. 253-279). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. Doi.10.1017/CBO9781139034104.013.

Cooper, D. E. (1986). *Metaphor.* Oxford: Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Croft, W. & Cruse, D.A (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, D. (1978). What metaphors means. In S Sacks(Ed), On metaphor Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davidson, D. (1975) Semantics for natural languages. In D. Davidson & G. Harman (Ed) The logical of grammar. Encino, CA: Dickenson

Evans. V. & Green, M. (2006). Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. Edinburg: University Press.

Fillmore (1977a) *"The Case for Case Reopened"* In Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations, ed. P. . Cole, 59-81. New York : Academic Press

Fillmore (1977b) *'Scene-and-Frames Semantics'.* In Linguistics Structure Processing, ed .A. Zambolli, 55-82 Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company

Fillmore (1977c) *'Topic in Lexical Semantics '.*In Current Issues in Theory, ed. R.W. Cole,76-138 .Bloominton .Indiana University Press

Fillmore, C. (1979) *"Frame Semantics and the nature of Language"*. Annals of the New York Academics of Science 280, 20-32

Fillmore, (1982) *"Frame Semantics in Linguistics Society of Korea"* (ed) Linguistics in the Morning Calm (119-137). Soeoul Hanshin

Fillmore,C B (2000) Frame Net Web Site .http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/framenet.

Glucksberg. Sam (2008). *How Metaphors Work.* In: Ortony, Andrew (ed). Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge, 401-424.

Greenberg, J. (1963): The Languages of Africa. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Guthrie, M (1948) *The Classification of Bantu Languages Oxford*: Greggs Press .The Journal of International, a social Research Cite. 7 Sayl: 32 Volume: 7 issue: 32 www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

Kovecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphors in Culture.*New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kovecses, Z. (2002). Metaphor: *A Practical Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press

Kitavi, H.M (1992) *A Comparative Study of the The Kitui North and Machakos dialects of Kenya*; UON: MA Thesis

Kaviti, L. K (2004) A minimalist Perspective of the Principle and Parameters in Kikamba Morpho - Syntax; UON: PHD Thesis

Langacker, R. (1999). *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin- New York: Mounton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110800524.

Lakoff, G, & Johnson .M (1980) *Metaphor We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Lakoff, G (1980) *Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language*: The Journal of Philosophy

Lindblom, K. G(1926) *Notes on Kamba grammar with two appendices, Kamba names of persons, places, animals and plants – salutations;* Uppsala; Appelbergs Boktryckeri Aktiebolag Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary: International Student's Edition (7th Ed) (2005:1169)

Maundu, P (1980) *Reconstruction of Kikamba Consonantal Sounds*; MA Dissertation

Moran, R (1997). Metaphors. In C.Wright & R. Hale (Eds.) A comparison of philosophy of languages Oxford: Blackwell.

Miniafu .M. (2012) A Relevance - theoretic analysis of Lubukusu Metaphors. U.o.N Unpublished M.A Thesis

Mutie, P. M (2003) In spite of differences: Making sense of the coexistence between the Kamba and the Maasai people of Kenya. U .o. N. Unpublished M.A Thesis

Mutiga, J .M (2002) *The tone systems of Kikamba; a case study of Mwingi dialect;* UON: PHD Thesis

Nicholson, N (2005). Meeting the Maasai.14(3) 2005th ser: Journal of management Inquiry.

Richards, L. A. (1967).The command of metaphors. In W. L. Anderson & N. C. Stageberg (Eds.) *Introductory reading on language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston.

Rouchi, M. (2011). *Animal Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Ivan David Publishing House.

Schmitz-Berning, Cornelia (2000). Vokabular des Nationasozialismus. Berlin.

Simon, Gary F. and Charles D. Fennig.(Eds.). 2018. Ethnologue: Language of the world. 26th ed. Dallas, Texas: SIL International

Spear, Thomas, and Waller R. (1993) Being Maasai: Ethnicity and identity in East Africa. London, England.

Ungerer .F. & Schmid. H .J (1996). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Longman http://www.academicjournals.org/ij/ Journals of English and Literature Vol. 2(2), pp. 19-27 February 2011