

Similarities and Differences between Genders in English and Persian: Family Related Proverbs and Expressions

Elham Kavandi *

Farhangian University, Iran

Hamid Reza Pakzad

Farhangian University, Iran

Esmaeil Shajeri

Farhangian University, Iran

Abstract

While considerable progress has been made in understanding the rich, complex, and dynamic interrelationship between language, culture, and thought, there is a long way left to be passed regarding gender perception as part of a community's inherited thought and culture and the effect of this gender sensitivity on the language of that society including proverbs and expressions. The present study is an attempt to shed more light on this interrelation through analysis of gender in English and Persian proverbs and expressions containing kinship terms and to uncover the similarities and differences of the image of the family and kinship relations between these two languages and delineate any possible gender-bound biases. Data was collected through utilizing different kinds of. Proverbs and expressions were classified into three broad groups and then scrutinized so as to detect the trace of gender-bias. The results, which were in line with cognitive version of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis substantiated the existence of cultural differences between these languages regarding family and kinship relations as well as the existence of the trace of gender-bias mostly against women, especially in Persian proverbs and expressions.

Keywords: gender, English, Persian, family related proverbs, expressions

INTRODUCTION

Proverbs and expressions are the indicators of "the subconscious attitudes of a society" (White, Catsambas, & Monnet, 2002, p.13). They are invaluable as a topic for discussion and analysis of inherent cultural beliefs that cannot be expressed explicitly. Among these covert cultural beliefs, gender roles and inequalities between men and women are controversial issues that steer lots of researchers' attention to themselves (Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2003). These sociolinguists and social psychologists (such as Weatberal, 2002; Lakoff, 1990; Wilson & Ng, 1988) have articulated that different implicit attitudes towards gender can be represented in language. This study seeks to account for these

gender roles above the word-level, e.g., proverbs and expressions; in other words, knowing how proverbs and expressions are used as means to express gender roles in different cultures and languages is the main concern here.

Proverb is generally defined as “a short, pithy saying in common and recognized use; a concise sentence, often metaphorical or alliterative in form, held to express some general truth” (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 2007, p.2383). Expression is “a spoken utterance, a written declaration: an action, state, or fact whereby some feeling, quality, etc., is manifested or symbolized; a sign, a token” (*ibid*, p. 903). Since the intriguing point behind the use of proverbs and expressions is that the knowledge of truth and the collective minds (i.e., culture), as well as culture’s biases including gender roles can be unearthed by delving into the proverbs and expressions found in a society (White, Catsambas, and Monnet, 2002), they are used as a source to find out more quickly and directly cultural beliefs and biases about gender and how society deals with it.

Since 1970’s feminist movement, there has been a considerable change in the meaning of gender throughout the world (Hudson, 1996; Camaron, 2003). This movement has brought about a conspicuous change from the prevailing belief of the dominance of men over women to the equal status of both sexes (Hudson, 1996). Before the movement, people used to accept the women’s subordination to men as an axiomatic concept. This movement had a pervasive impact and cast doubt on this assumption provoking the language scholars to reflect on the existence of gender-bias in different languages so as to put this idea to rest in the hope of neutralizing this bias; to put it in other ways, as the meaning of gender has changed, lots of attention has been drawn onto the analysis of gender-bias and whether or not the ideal theory of equality can be put into practice; therefore, this study, inspired by this issue, is an attempt to detect the discursive analysis of gender-bias in terms of proverbs and expressions. Considering the point that proverbs and expressions have a broad scope in every language and is likely unwieldy, the study has been narrowed down to the investigation of proverbs and expressions containing kinship terms (such as *aunt, mother, niece, father*) in two languages (Persian, the source language and English, the foreign language) and their cultures.

The focus is on unearthing the answers to the following questions: Is there any difference between genders in proverbs and expressions related to family in English and Persian? Is there any bias in the representation of gender in proverbs and expressions related to family in English and Persian? Where does this bias lie? And what does it indicate? To answer the questions, first of all, a brief description of existing theories and principles regarding the relationship between thought, culture, and mind are presented. Then the way data were gathered are explained. Based on theories mentioned in the theoretical framework section, the researcher classified the data (the English/Persian proverbs and expressions containing kinship terms) into three broad groups with some subgroups in each of them and after looking into the gender bias in each language, the similarities and differences between different English and Persian views in terms of gender bias are discussed. In the end, concluding that there is gender bias in both languages in favor of men, especially perceptible in proverbs and expressions related to family relationships,

the researcher found out that it has originated in the cultural beliefs of each society, which are actualized through language.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The complex relationship between language, culture, and thought has drawn lots of attention to itself. Edward Burnett Taylor (1981), an anthropologist, defined culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, customs and other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society” (cited in Riley, 2007, p.22). The stress in this definition is on social communication and the role society plays in the process of socialization i.e., the course of development in which children absorb the ‘social constraints on speech’ (Hudson, 1996, p. 107) so as to acquire the culture of that community. Brown (2000), in addition to this significant role, put the emphasis on interrelationship between culture, language, and thought asserting the point that “cultural patterns of cognition and customs are sometimes explicitly coded in language” (Brown, 2000, p.198). Hudson (1996) also put the emphasis on this relation and pointed out that “every language seems to have linguistic items that reflect social characteristics of the speaker, of the addressee or the relation between them” (p.120). Although there is considerable amount of research trying to uncover this relation, the literature has not been conclusive on questions such as whether language reflects a cultural world view or language actually shapes the world view.

A plethora of studies in the field of cultural psychology and sociolinguistics whose spotlight is on the intersection of culture, cognition, and action have been done in the hope of coming across the answer to these questions. In 20th century, American linguists and anthropologists overestimated the role of language in the perception of reality and formation of thought (Lund, 2003), i.e., reality is perceived and constantly filtered in the framework of language. Lucy (2000) believes that thought can be affected by language in three levels: 1) the semiotic or cognitive relativity in which symbolic (not iconic or indexical) system exert an influence on thought, 2) linguistic or structural relativity in which linguistic distinctions among language cause different perceptions of reality, and 3) functional or discursive relativity which directs the attention towards the use of language and its effect on thinking. Kramsch (2004) asserted “semiotic effects are associated with cognitive patterns that in turn are related to discourse regularities and cultural differences (p.240); it means that these three subsets of relativity are inevitably intertwined. Several studies, up to date, have found positive evidences in favor of this hypothesis and these levels. Kay and Kempton (1984), Roberson, Davis, and Davidoff (2000), and Roberson, Davidoff, Davis, and Shapiro (2005) who affirmed that linguistic terms available for color terms facilitate the discrimination of those colors by speakers explored relativity at the semiotic level. Martinez and Shatz (1996) focusing on the grammatical marking of gender in Spanish and English and Sera et al (2002) exploring the effect of grammatical gender attracted by the linguistic or structural relativity and Gumperz (1992) are interested in discursive relativity. These researchers found positive evidence in favor of the existence of these relativities.

Sapir and Whorf, among others, set forth to elaborate on diverse depictions of reality in different languages through linguistic relativity. Whorf (1956) propounded that the structure of different languages instigates cultural divergence and asserted that “rhetorical and stylistic preferences are culturally conditioned and vary widely from language to language” (cited in Kramersch, 2004, p.238); accordingly, the language can be a means to indicate that language speakers’ characteristics, or in Guiora et al’s (1972) terms ‘language ego’, manifested in their thoughts and behaviors. They maintained that the development of language ego or personality formation is the natural result of the interaction between language and cognition and is restricted to one’s language.

The early prominent proposals of the relation between language, culture, and thought were put forth and developed by Sapir and Whorf from 1925 to 1941 (Carroll, 2008). This is the strong version of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which suggested that it is language which shapes thought and constructs certain *nonlinguistic cognitive processes* (Carroll, 2008) i.e., *linguistic determinism* and speakers of different languages think in different ways since the formal characteristics of each language differs i.e., *linguistic relativity*. Carroll (2008) interpreted the profound assumptions of this strong version as follows: “languages ‘carve up’ reality in different ways...language differences are covert or unconscious [i.e., habitual thought pattern]...language differences influence our world view... the cognitive processes that are determined are different for different languages” (p. 396); to put it simply, grammatical dissimilarities exist between languages are ‘semantically significant’ (ibid.), and cause ‘semantic variation’ (Hudson, 1996), accordingly there isn’t just one absolute perception of reality as well as just one answer to the question of what reality is.

Due to the fact that different scholars couldn’t find any evidence in support of the strong version, putting forward the weak version was a matter of urgency. Riley (2007) asserted that “Each language describes the world quite literally *in its own terms* forming a unique mode of thought and expression” (p.9) which are more easily accessible comparing to other communities that don’t have these specific linguistic operations for those thoughts; thus, this weak version declares that language exerts an influence on, not creates, thoughts which can be retrieved and expressed with considerable ease. This cognitive version of relativity suggested that the absence of a term in a language does not mean that the speakers of that language cannot distinguish the concept of that term but it is not important enough for them to have that special linguistic term in their language. However, if they cognitively need that special concept, they would linguistically have it since “the presence of linguistic categories influences the ease with which various cognitive operations are performed” (Carroll, 2008, p.401) and having that word lessens the cognitive load in spontaneous situations and speeds up their performance.

Proverbs, expressions, and culture

Regarding the relation between language and thought, Sapir (2004) provides a good statement: “culture and language are in any true sense causally related. Culture may be defined as *what* a society does and thinks. Language is a particular *how* of thought” (p.180). Kramersch (2004), in line with this belief, also emphasized that “all the recent

developments focus on the way individual and collective thoughts and sensibilities are co-constructed, shaped, and subverted through language as communicative and representational practice" (p.251).

Proverbs and expressions as part of each language are indicative of the cultural attitudes of native speakers of that language (White et al, 2002). Proverbs and expressions are small packages of truth about people's values and beliefs. Values like ambition, virtue, generosity, patience are addressed in sayings from most every culture (Schuster, 1998); therefore, they can facilitate understanding of the similarities and differences of other cultures compared to our own. Since each culture has proverbs and expressions that are unique to it, by looking at proverbs and expressions, we are almost able to identify cultural differences. Through the sharing of proverbs and expressions, we can highlight the similarities and differences of people everywhere.

For the purpose of this study, the Persian culture and the English culture are compared. Riley argued that although some communicative practices such as the use of proverbs and expressions are apparently universal, they are still expressive of speakers' 'identities' peculiar to a specific community. He continued that proverbs are "extremely condensed version of cultural knowledge and values and are highly idiomatic, in the sense that they cannot be used or interpreted freely" (p.96). Based on what is mentioned, it is not surprising that great competence and knowledge are required for the appropriate interpretation and use of proverbs and expressions. This close relation between proverbs and expressions of each language and its culture indicates the need for thorough study of the culture of that language for better interpretation of the proverbs and expressions. In this study, the kinship relations, the oral tradition, and the Iranian/English values and attitudes as some cultural aspects are the aids to understand their proverbs and expressions.

Proverbs, expressions and gender

The link between language and gender was seriously taken into account by researchers along Feminist Movement in 1960s and early 1970s (Labov, 1966). Kramer et al. (1973) elaborated on the feminist outlook which looked at language as a means of reflecting men's power, in contrast with the powerlessness of women, in social communication. Women's "marginality and powerlessness...is reflected in both the way men and women are expected to speak and the ways in which women are spoken of" (Lakoff, 1973, p.45); therefore, these researchers deemed the power status as the profound issue in studying language and social interaction among speakers of that language.

Debates over the nature of gender inequalities and its social consequences brought about the emergence of two different views. The first one is the essentialist stance, which views gender "as a property of individuals and/or an unproblematic variable that could be correlated with assorted language behaviours" (Stokoe, 2005, p.119) or "what individuals *are* or *have*". This static view of gender follows the 'dominance' approach whose strong belief is that power and dominance belong to men rather than women and

men's higher status are reflected in the language used in everyday interactions (Cameron, 1992).

In the wake of the failure of static view by emergence of feminist movement, the second contrasting view has emerged as social constructivism or 'performative notion' of gender (Stokoe, 2005). This 'dynamic' view (Ehrlich, 2004) deemed gender "as an enactment, discursive construction or product of social interaction" p. 119) or "something individuals do" (West and Zimmerman, 1987, cited in Ehrlich, 2004, p.304). Bohan (1997) as the proponent of this view, asserted that gender and gender traits must be considered as a social construct [what individuals *do*] and 'contextually determined' (p.39) factor; in other words, gender is constructed through interactions in continuous social practices among speakers of the community (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992). West, Candace, Lazar, Michelle, Kramarae, and Cheri (1997) also articulated:

... that which we think of as "womanly" or "manly" behavior is not dictated by biology, but rather is socially constructed. And a fundamental domain in which gender is constructed is language use . . . Language does not merely reflect a preexisting sexist world; instead, it actively constructs gender asymmetries within specific sociohistorical contexts. (119-120)

The gender asymmetries (gender bias) exist because gender is conceived as "a system of meanings" that "organizes interactions" and governs "access to power, status, and material resources" (Crawford, 2003, p. 1414). The influence of gender and asymmetries in power relations and the way it is manifested in language have been major aspects of sociolinguistic discussion in recent years.

Lakoff (1990) strongly endorsed the idea that the link between gender inequalities and language "bring together some of the most agonizing, complex, diverse and ultimately insoluble issues facing our society" (p.199) since "the construction of gender takes different forms across cultures" (Cameron, 2003, p. 188) based on the context and collective beliefs of that society which is manifested in language used by the speakers of those cultural communities (Weatberal, 2002). Based on what was mentioned, it can be concluded that context, society, and culture exert influence on gender and gender bias, which can be expressed through some linguistic means. Hudson (1996) gave examples that "a strong given name [e.g., *John*] to be applied to junior relatives and role-based names [e.g., *Mum*] to senior relatives" (p.126).

People in each society depict different stereotypes, i.e., allocating "group characteristics to individuals purely based on their ...membership" (Brown, 2000, p.179); for example, at the discursive level, Genderlect, taken from the word dialect, is the accepted stereotypical dialect using by each sex while communicating (Llamas and Stockwell, 2002). The use of genderlect proposed some of the apparently systematic differences in the ways men and women use language. Generally speaking, these stereotypes are not in favor of women as Goddard & Patterson (2000) accentuated the 'negative connotation' carried by the term 'woman' who has "polite but trivial talk" and should be nice (p.92). Lakoff (1973), investigating women's language traits, also concluded that women are less

direct in requesting and use clear-cut grammar in order to be more polite, and employ more tag questions and rising intonations for declarative sentences which is a harbinger of their uncertainty.

METHODOLOGY

The present data have been collected through studying the various written sources and three kinds of dictionaries of proverbs and expressions: Persian dictionary of proverbs and expressions, English dictionary of proverbs and expressions, and bilingual (English/Persian) dictionary of proverbs and expressions. It is worth noting that the Persian and English expressions and proverbs analyzed in this study are common and contemporary ones and are related to family relations with kinship terms. In this section first, a brief analysis of kinship terms of both languages will be provided, then the proverbs and expressions will be categorized into three broad groups. Finally, gender-bias will be detected in some of the English and Persian proverbs and expressions.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A brief analysis of kinship terms in English and Persian

According to Trudgill (1983), the existence of kinship terms in a society paves the way for understanding family relations which exist in a society. In order to look into the family relations in English and Persian societies, a brief explanation of similarities and differences among kinship terms in these two languages are provided.

The contrastive analysis of kinship terms between languages can be categorized into two general categories: 1) one kinship term in the first language may have more than one equivalent in the other language, and 2) each kinship term has one equivalent in the other language. One example for the first category is the term "*aunt*" in English which refers to "*mother's sister*", "*father's sister*", and "*the uncle's wife*" while in Persian there are different terms for mother's sister and father's sister. One of the interpretations for such a difference in kinship terms in English and Persian can be explained according to the cognitive version of Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis which refers to English and Persian speakers' different standpoints on these family relations. In other words, in English culture there is no distinctive difference between "*mother's sister*", "*father's sister*", and "*the uncle's wife*" in the speaker's point-of-view and the speaker's emotional distance from these people is the same. While in the Persian culture, speakers must have distinct linguistic terms to express their different attitudes towards "*mother's sister*", "*father's sister*", and "*the uncle's wife*" because they have different cognitive perceptions of these family relations based on the degree of their intimacy and solidarity with these people.

Trudgill (1983) articulated that it can be supposed that the more important family relations in English language countries are those that are referred to by just one definite term. In his opinion, other family relations are not that much important to be referred to by just one definite term, so there may be two or more family relations referred to by one single term. Besides 'aunt', 'uncle' is also a term which refers to two distinct relations:

“father’s brother” and “mother’s brother”. Another example is two family relations of “the brother’s/sister’s female child” which are addressed by one single kinship term: *niece*. Persian speakers imply the kinship terms “the brother’s child” by *bæradærzade* and “the sister’s child” by *xahærzade* without paying attention to the sex of the child. Maybe one of the reasons behind this sensitivity to gender distinction in Persian language can be rooted in the Islamic religion advocated by its speakers. This religion lays emphasize on the gender distinction and asserted that there should be a defined distance between men and women so it becomes more significant for Muslims to keep more distance from the opposite sex.

The kinship term “cousin” in English can be also a good example. *Cousin* is used for addressing the aunt’s/uncle’s kids whether they are male or female, it can be concluded that the absence of gender-distinguishing terms for *cousin* does not mean that they cannot recognize the sex of *cousin* but it is not cognitively important for English speakers to refer to the gender of that kid. Another interpretation can be traced back to their cultural attitudes. In Christian religion, it is illegitimate that cousins marry each other and using just one term for all these relations puts emphasis on the importance of this belief.

The examples for the second category may be the kinship term such as mother which has one equivalent in Persian: [madær]. Similarities and differences between English and Persian kinship terms have been summarized in the following tables. In the first table each English kinship term has more than one equivalent in Persian; in the second table each Persian kinship term has more than one equivalent in English; in the third one each kinship term(in both languages) has one equivalent in the other language.

Table 1. English Terms with More Than One Equivalent in Persian

English	Persian
Aunt	<i>xale/zæme</i>
Uncle	<i>zæmu/dazi</i>
Cousin	<i>pesær-e zæme/ pesær-e xale/ pesær-e zæmu/ pesær-e dazi</i>
Niece	<i>doxtær-e bæradær/ doxtær-e xahær</i>
Nephew	<i>pesær-e bæradær / pesær-e xahær</i>

Table 2. Persian Terms with More Than One Equivalent in English

Persian	English
<i>Pesær</i>	Son, Boy
<i>Doxtær</i>	Daughter, Girl
<i>zærus</i>	Bride, Daughter-in-law, Sister-in-law
<i>Damad</i>	Groom, Son-in-law, Brother-in-law
<i>Zæn</i>	Woman, Wife

Table 3. Kinship Terms with One Equivalent

English	Persian
Father	<i>pedær</i>
Mother	<i>madær</i>
Brother	<i>pæradær</i>
Sister	<i>xahær</i>

The Analysis of the proverbs and expressions

In order to have a thorough understanding of the Iranian culture, as this study is presented in English, the translation mode is employed. This translation is done in such a way that the meaning and essence of the Iranian proverbs and expressions are not lost. First, Iranian source language (ISL) proverbs and expressions and the phonetic representation of the source language (PRS) will be provided; then a parallel word-to-word translation (WWT) of Iranian language into English was done, and lastly, a normal sentential translation into English (NST) was carried out. In the PRS, two abbreviations are used: GEN (generative marker) and ACC (acquisitive marker).

After analyzing the English and Persian proverbs and expressions thoroughly, they are classified into three broad groups:

- 1) This class consists of the expressions and proverbs which are present in one language but absent in the other.

Persian proverbs and expressions for which there is no equivalent in English,

for instance:

I) ISL: “بچه ی حلال زاده به دایی اش میره”

PRS: *bæʃe -je hælalzade be dazi -f mibæræd*

WWT: child GEN legitimate to uncle his/her is going

NST: The legitimate child takes after his/her uncle

Since the relationship between the person and her/his mother's brother in Persian is not the same as that relationship in English culture, there is not such a proverb with this concept in English. In Persian culture, legitimacy is related to the mother. If a mother has the fidelity to her husband, the born child is a legitimate one; thereby the child is similar in his characteristics to his/her uncle (mother's brother) who is the same as his sister. It is evident that the load of legitimacy is on the woman's shoulders, in other words, if a child is illegitimate, the society points its finger at the mother and blames her; no one knows the man as a culpable person, while everybody knows he is equally guilty of this happening.

II) ISL: “عروس با لباس سفید میاد با لباس سفید هم میرود”

PRS: *ʔærus ba lebas -e sefid miɔjæd væ ba lebas -e sefid hæm mirævæd*

WWT: bride with clothes GEN white is going and with clothes GEN white also is going

NST: Tolerate all the ups and downs of the marital life until death and never leave your husband in any condition.

In Persian culture, this proverb refers to the belief that divorce is ominous and must be avoided in any case. The bride (woman) has to endure all the ups and downs of the matrimonial life without complaining and the only way of her departure from this life (may be prosperous or disastrous) is her death. This may also refer to the fact that men can get a divorce in Iran but women cannot. While in English culture, the gender is not the determining factor in divorce, i.e. whoever is not happy with his/her life can get a divorce.

III) ISL: "مرد /پسر که گریه نمی کنه"

PRS: *mærd/pesær ke gerje nemikone*

WWT: boy/man ACC does not cry

NST: The man/boy who is supposed to be strong is not expected to cry.

This proverb indicates a strong gender bias in favor of men and their power in society. Crying is perceived as a weak point and the person weeping has a wishy-washy, dependent, and powerless character. In Persian culture, these characteristics are unmarked for girls and women, therefore there is not such a proverb for them. However, men/boys are not allowed to cry in any case since it would be the sign of their weakness which reduces their apparently high position to a lower position almost equal to women. But in English, even if there is such a concept, it is not that much strong to be present in a proverb.

IV) ISL: "دختر به تو میگویم ، عروس تو بشنو"

PRS: *doxtær be to migæm ʔærus to befno*

WWT: daughter to you I am saying daughter-in-law you hear

NST: No equivalent translation can be provided; required explanation is provided in the relevant analysis.

This proverb is used when somebody wants to say something indirectly to somebody else. It has no equivalent in English, because in English culture there is not such a relationship between the daughter-in-law and her husband's family as it does in Iran. This proverb is used when somebody wants to say something indirectly to somebody else and states it to a third person to make that second person understand it. In the Persian culture, because of the special relationship between the daughter-in-law and her

husband's family, there may be some words that may not be stated directly; for instance a mother-in-law can address her daughter to say something indirectly to her daughter-in-law.

2) These expressions and proverbs exist in both languages and are similar in at least one of these four aspects: Lexical, Structural, Semantic, or Functional

a) *Lexical Correspondence*

In this group, the corresponding proverb's and expressions' lexical items are mutually parallel. In other words, for each linguistic vocabulary item in the Persian (or English) proverb/expression, there is a lexically corresponding unit in the English (or Persian) proverb/expression which is considered as its equivalent unit in the other language.

I) ISL: "بهشت زیر پای مادران است"

PRS: *beheft zir -e pa -je madæxer -an zæst*

WWT: Heaven at GEN feet GEN mother s is

NST: "Heaven is at the feet of mothers"

The English proverb: "Heaven is at the feet of mothers" is lexically correspondent to the Persian proverb: "*beheft zire pa-je madæxeran zæst*" Their words are mutually correspondent to each other: "Heaven" is correspondent to *beheft*, "is" to *zæst*, "at" to *zire*, "feet" to *pa*, "of" to *-je*, "mothers" to *madæxeran*.

II) ISL: "آدم لا مذهب اسب لجام گسیخته است"

PRS: *zadæm -e la mæzhæb zæsb -e ledzæm gosixte zæst*

WWT: a man GEN without a religion horse GEN without a bridle is

NST: "A man without a religion is a horse without a bridle"

Each word in the English proverb has a corresponding word in the Persian one: "a man" is correspondent to *zadæm*, "without a religion" to *la mæzhæb*, "is" to *zæst*, "a horse" to *zæsb*, "without a bridle" to *ledzæm gosixte*.

b) *Syntactic Correspondence*

This class contains the proverbs and expressions which are "the same constituents in the same syntactic relationships" (Widdowson, 1996, p. 37); to put it differently, they are syntactically correspondent and their syntactic structures are the same.

I) ISL: "پسرچه ها شیطان هستند"

PRS: *pesæxer bætfæ-ha feitan hæstænd*

WWT: boy-s naughty are

NST: “boys will be boys”

It has the same structure as the English proverb “boys will be boys”. The structure of both of them contains Subject, Verb, and Object and the verb is in the form of *to be*.

II) ISL: “دایه ی مهربان تر از مادر”

PRS: *daje -je mehræban -tær æz madær*

WWT: nanny GEN kind -er than mother

NST: “More catholic than the pope”

It is structurally the same as “More catholic than the pope”. Both of them contain superlative adjectives, without any verb and subject.

III) ISL: “آش کشک خاله ات است”

PRS: *ʔash -e kæʃk -e xale -ʔæt ʔæst*

WWT: broth GEN curd GEN aunt your is

NST: “It’s Hobson’s choice”

This proverb is used when you are indulged in a situation in which you have no choice. Both *ʔash-e kæʃk-e xale-ʔæt ʔæst* and “It’s Hobson’s choice” consist of the verb *to be*.

c) Semantic Correspondence

The proverbs and expressions classified under this group are the ones whose denotation meaning and “semantic features encoded in lexical forms” (Widdowson, 1996, p. 57) are similar or the same. Widdowson labeled this kind of analysis as ‘componential analysis’. There is an example here:

I) ISL: “دهنش بوی شیر میده”

PRS: *dæhæn -æf bu -je fir midæhæd*

WWT: mouth his/her smell GEN milk is giving

NST: “He smells of mother’s milk”

Both *dæhæn-æf bu -je fir midæhæd* and its equivalent in English “He smells of mother’s milk” refer to a person who is inexperienced and inexpert.

d) Functional Correspondence

One Proverb/expression in one language is functionally correspondent to a (some) proverb(s)/expression(s) in the other language. In other words, both of them communicate the same function in the same contextual situation.

I) ISL: “دختری که مادرش تعریف کنه برای آقا دائیش خوبه”

PRS: *doxtær -i ke madær -ræf tærrifkone bæraj -e aqa dazi -f xub -e*

WWT: girl a ACC mother her praises for GEN Mr. uncle her good is

NST: “It is not as thy mother says, but as thy neighbors say”

The function of *doxtær -i ke madær-ræf tærrifkone bæraj-e aqa dazi -f xub -e* and “It is not as thy mother says, but as thy neighbors say” is almost the same. Both proverbs have the negative connotation which means that the mother’s admiration of her daughter does not show that girl’s real decent characteristics, but their difference is in the use of the kinship terms. The existence of *dazi*, *madær* and *doxtær* in the Persian proverb shows the close relation between mother, daughter, and uncle (mother’s brother). This close relationship also can be seen in the aforementioned proverb *bætfæ-je hælzade be dazi -f mibæræd*. It suggests that the admired girl is just precious for her mother who has a close relation to her brother (sibling relation). The English one applies the terms “neighbor” and “mother” which does not contain that much closeness found in the correspondent Persian terms.

II) ISL: “نابرده گنج رنج میسر نمیشود مزد آن گرفت جان برادر که کارکرد”

PRS: *na borde gændz rændz mojàsær nemifævæd*

mozd ran gereft dʒan -e bæradær ke kar kærd

WWT: not taken treasure suffering feasible would not happen

wage that gain spirit GEN brother ACC(that) worked

NST: “a faint heart never won a fair lady”

As it is clear, there is no lexical correspondence between these two proverbs. The Persian proverb is a part of a famous poem which consists of two sentences (one simple and one complex sentence) but the English one is just a simple sentence. Semantically, they are different. This difference can be traced in the difference in cultures and believes. Using the male term *bæradær* for hard working and gaining money indicates Iranian point of view on men to be the person who brings home bacons rather than women. In English proverb, “Won” has a negative connotation that a woman is an object and the man must try to have this possession. Both of these proverbs refer to a situation in which a person (either man or woman) is lazy and lethargy and somebody wants to advise him/her to be more active.

III) ISL: “خدا یارت باشد”

PRS: *xoda jar -et bafæd*

WWT: God assistant your is

NST: "Bob is your uncle"

xoda jar-et basæd is functionally equivalent to "Bob is your uncle". Both of these expressions are used when somebody wishes success to someone else. In the Persian one, the source of success is *xoda* (God) and this is the indicator of Iranian people's strong religious belief which is not found in the English expression's concept. In the English one, this success is believed to come from a heroic character called Bob. Since father/mother is supposed to be the protector of the person, the uncle (father's/mother's brother) who is close to them can protect that person as well. In this proverb, Bob as a male character (not a female) has the power to lead the person to the success and this demonstrates gender bias in favor of men and emphasizes their power.

- 3) These proverbs and expressions exist in both languages and are similar in all the putative aspects (i.e., Lexical, Structural, Semantic, and Functional); in another words, they represent complete one-to-one correspondence.

I) ISL: "احتياج مادر اختراعات است"

PRS: *ehtiadʒ madær -e exteraʒat ʔæst*

WWT: necessity mother GEN inventions is

NST: "Necessity is the mother of invention"

ehtiadʒ madær-e exteraʒat ʔæst and "Necessity is the mother of invention" are lexically correspondent: (*ehtiadʒ* & Necessity, *ʔæst* & is, *madær* & the mother, *exteraʒat* & invention); structurally both of them have *to be* as their verb and contain subject, verb, object; just once a person is really in need of something, his mind works best in order to obviate his/her need as soon as possible; therefore, inventiveness is stimulated by difficulty. The meaning of the statements (semantic aspect) and their use (functional aspect) in context are the same. Apparently the Persian proverb is the one-to-one translation of the English one. Of course, there is another proverb that has the same meaning, function and syntax but stated in different lexis, for example, "want is the mother of industry"

II) ISL: "انسان جائز الخطا است"

PRS: *ensan dʒaʔezolxæta ʔæst*

WWT: mankind fallible is

NST: "Mankind is fallible"

ensan dʒaʔezolxæta ʔæst and "Mankind is fallible" have almost the equivalent terms (*ensan* & mankind, *dʒaʔezolxæta* & fallible, *ʔæst* & is); there is a minor difference between *ensan* & mankind from gender point of view. The use of man (not woman) indicating human beings has a hint of bias in favor of men. By the way, nowadays, "human beings" is the term replaced by the word "mankind/men". Both contain the same structural components (subject, verb, and object) and are positive statements. Considering their

semantic and functional aspects, it is a common habit of human beings to make mistakes and this is a way they make experiences (i.e., trial and error). This meaning and function can be seen in both proverbs.

The analysis of gender-bias in the proverbs and expressions

The proverbs and expressions of each language “create a sense of fixed reality” (Freed, 2003), which contain some attitudes about different standpoints of the people in that society (White et al, 2002). For instance, the proverbs carry some beliefs about the style of women’s/men’s speaking (Lakoff, 1990), such as “verbosity, assertiveness, use of profanity, politeness” (Herring, 2003, p. 207) which are believed to be specific to their gender. In the English language some proverbs and expressions like:

- The way to a **man’s** heart is through his stomach.
- A **woman** is like a cup of tea, you will never know how strong she is until she boils.
- Never leave a **woman** to do a man’s job.
- A **woman’s** sword is her tongue.
- A **woman’s** tears are her strongest weapons.

are the indicators of their cultural views towards men and women. The Persian language also has its own special proverbs and expressions related to men and women:

- *Zæn-an por tfane-rænd* (**Women** are great talkers).
- *Zæn-an sælite-rænd* (**Women** are the devils’ nets/women are necessary evils).
- *fekæm-e mærd ke sir fod be fekr-e tædǰdid-e feraf mioftæd* (When the belly is full, the mind is among the maids).
- *doxtær-e dufize ra fuj-e dufize bafæd* (virgin **girls** deserve virgin **husbands**)
- *mærd bænde-je fekæmæf ræst* (The way to a **man’s** heart is through his stomach)

People’s viewpoint towards men and women in a special culture are clearly reflected in their proverbs and expressions. Unearthing any possible gender-bound biases in proverbs and expressions of English and Persian languages is the main concern here.

Gender-bias in favor of men

Having a close look at the English and Persian proverbs and expressions reveals some hints of gender-bias against women in both of these languages. In most of these proverbs and expressions, the powerfulness, active and influential characteristic and rationality are among the attributes of men, whereas weakness, passiveness, wordiness and emotionality are known as part of the nature of women’s personality, supporting an

underlying belief in the superiority of male over the female. Below you can see some of them along with the researchers' interpretations:

Proverbs and expressions demeaning women:

As for types of expressions degrading women, there are expressions emphasizing women's verbosity, fearfulness, dependability, deceitfulness, and so on:

- *zæn-an por tfane-zænd* (**Women** are great talkers).
- *xab-e zæn tfæp-e* (WWT: a **woman's** dream could never be trusted as coming true)
- *dæhæn-e zæn læq-e* (Many women, many words, many geese, many turds)
- *selah-e zæn zæbanæf æst* (A **woman's** sword is her tongue)

In both English and Persian languages, there may be found some proverbs and expressions which reflect women's verbosity as their negative characteristics. Spender (1980), instead of looking down on women and considering them as talkative, supporting women wrote "the talkativeness of women has been gauged in comparison not with men, but with silence. Any talk in which a woman engages can be too much" (p.42) even if it is not wordy. What is behind this statement is that in default condition, women should be silent and any word they utter is judged as being verbose and trivial.

I) Proverbs and Expressions degrading women's identity

"Language reflects the nature of gender identity" (Weatherall, 2002, p.84) which affects the "evaluations of speakers" (ibid, p.123) by people. Generally throughout the world, women's identity is seen as fragile and vulnerable in terms of both their physical abilities (i.e., physical power) and their personality (mental power). This view allowed men to consider themselves as powerful beings (of course, in comparison with women, not in absolute term). The worst part is that women themselves have accepted their inferiority in both physical abilities and their personality and acted based on this outlook towards them. Despite the fact that women's physical appearance may be delicate in comparison with that of men, judgment on women's personality is nothing to do with their physical power. Addressing women with their husbands' family name after their marriage or using some expressions such as *zæzife* (WWT: a weak being), and *mænzæl* (WWT: home) in Persian, to which most of women do not react, are plain examples of degrading women's personality.

II) Proverbs and Expressions accentuating women's low status and powerlessness

"Power is a pivotal concept for understanding gender relations within a social, political context" (Weatherall, 2002, p.79). Language is manipulated by human being to highlight the dominance and power of one group over another (Hudson, 1996), for instance using formal and informal style or politeness strategies. There is a trace of this dominance in proverbs and expressions, cited below, which emphasize on the point that women are not

able to take a high stake position in society because of their weakness in their physical and mental power, must be restricted to the trivial household drudgeries only, and should never interfere in the men's high-stake works. Surprisingly, most of these established views, which are accepted by most women indisputably, are from men's eyes, in which women's work at home is nothing and their job in the society is a high stake kind. The example of such proverbs/expressions are:

- *zæn bærāj-e kar-e xane saxte fode ræst* (Doing housework is for a woman)
- *mærd-e zæn zæilil* (a man who helps his wife in her housework)
- Never leave a **woman** to do a **man's** work. (WWT: Leaving\employing someone less qualified to do your work will produce undesired results)

These attitudes originate in the belief among Persian/English culture that female is not a public being and she must be limited to the restricted groups of people around them especially female beings and their handful friends. This is more touchable in the eastern culture in which women mostly (almost always) communicate with other female beings and feel more friendly with them (friendly-friendly relation) rather than with the opposite sex, male beings.

Another example of this dominance imposing on women is the use of these terms: Fireman, chairman, policeman, mailman (the job's name + 'man') which imposes the idea that traditionally these jobs are just apposite for men and must be kept for men.

Gender-bias in favor of women

Investigating Persian and English proverbs and expressions indicates the fact that generally gender-bias against men is not as strong as that against women. In spite of the existence of some handful number of proverbs and expressions that faintly and quite implicitly convey the negativeness of men, there is no tangible evidence witnessing conspicuously men's negative characteristics.

Ideology is "a systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view" (Kress & Hodge, 1979, p.6) which is often imposed by the dominant and powerful group (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). Since men *think* that they have had power over women and done their best to inject this outlook into women's mind, women have no power to criticize men regarding their behavior. Throughout the history, women uncritically accept the rampant ideology of their "self-marginalization" which means the way "members of the dominated group, knowingly or unknowingly, legitimize the characteristics of inferiority attributed to them by dominating group" ((Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p.219); in better words, women's voice has been stifled since they themselves have accepted this subordinate position vis-à-vis men's status in the society and as Kumaravadivelu also declaimed 'the practice of self-marginalization' is the cause of 'the process of marginalization' spreading out in the community; therefore, the main source of all these biases is women themselves who have accepted and passed this perspective

from one generation to the other. As a result, it is not surprising that there are just a rare number of proverbs and expressions in favor of women and against men.

One of the examples in which there may be found a sparing trace of gender-bias against men is the Persian *mærd bænde-je fekæm-æf ræst* and its English correspondence “the way to a man’s heart is through his stomach”. One interpretation is that the most important thing for men in the world is not being hungry and eating delicious food on time. This negative characteristic is the sign of giving more attention to being provided with luscious food. This interpretation contains gender-bias against men. There is another possible interpretation which is biased against women. It says that a man loves a woman who can cook (well). Even though apparently it is in favor of women, its presupposition is that cooking as a household is the women’s main responsibility. Another example is *fekæm-e mærd ke sir fod be fekr-e tædgid-e feraf mioftæd*. It means that a man who can support more than one wife thinks about the second wife. This proverb is correspondent to the English proverb “When the belly is full, the mind is among the maids” meaning that those men who have lots of money, think about lust. This negative connotation against men is also tangible in these proverbs.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

This study is an investigation into the relationship between language, culture, and thought. The relation between language and culture is clearly explained by Hudson (1996): “Each language ... [has] words to express most concepts relevant to the culture, and that most words in each language will express cultural concepts, definable only in terms of the culture concerned” (p.9); in other words, “‘knowledge of language’ may not in fact be clearly distinct, or distinct at all (even unclearly) from ‘knowledge of culture’” (Hudson, 1996, p.18). As previously mentioned, the relationship between language and thought are demonstrated in Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. The evident relationship between language and thought and also between language and culture is a clear reason to the existence of unavoidable relationship between all these three elements: language, culture, and thought. The analysis of proverbs and expressions as indicators of some cultural beliefs and biases shed the light into the presence of this relationship.

The intriguing finding drawn from classification of proverbs and expressions is that the number of proverbs and expressions of the second group, especially those in *functional correspondence* category, is considerably abundant. This indicates that speakers of both languages (English and Persian) have the commonalities in the general concepts but express those concepts in different linguistic means with different degrees of emphasis; in other words, in different languages, different linguistic means may be used to convey the same concept. The words used to express that special concept are those which represent the meanings that are cognitively important for the speakers of that language. This finding is in line with cognitive version of Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis which asserts that in each language, linguistic means are used to reflect the concepts which are more prominent for that special society with its special culture.

Another issue investigated in the present study is to find the potential difference between genders in proverbs and expressions related to family in English and Persian. The exploration of proverbs and expressions indicated that there is more gender imbalance in Persian proverbs and expressions in comparison with the English ones. This imbalance is the indication of the difference in Persian standpoint on family and the relationship between men and women in family relations. The analysis indicates that Persian speakers have more propensities towards respecting women's space in terms of their privacy, limiting their role as dominated social beings and highlighting their weakness and their dependency on men, which signifies the difference in Iranian and Anglo-Saxon culture.

PEDAGOGICAL APPLICATION AND IMPLICATIONS

The first application of the findings is related to the society. The results indicate the existence of the evident gender-bias in the minds of speakers and self-marginalization of women, which must be eliminated from the collective minds through the process of neutralization. One way to facilitate this process is through changing the biased proverbs and expressions into gender-free ones. Hudson (1996) declared that it can be done through *selection* in which based on some social and political issues, some parts of language are selected, *codification* in which these parts are put into books and dictionaries "so that everyone agrees on what is correct" (p.33), *elaboration of function* in which the parts are used in different real contexts in society, and *acceptance* stages in which the population accept those parts. This study can be an aid in the first stage of this process, *selection*.

The second application is related to language learning and teaching. The results provide a better understanding of the difference between proverbs and expressions in both English and Persian languages for second language teachers. Material developers, syllabus designers, and teachers mostly emphasize on the third group in the classification explicated in this study (those which are completely equivalent in both languages) and the fourth subcategory of the second group (functional correspondence) and fail to notice proverbs and expressions of the first group (those proverbs and expressions which are present in one language and absent in the other). This overlook causes some prominent concepts in English or in Persian to be neglected. This study helps them to be aware of all categories of this classification and add all of them to their books, syllabi, and classroom activities.

Those learners who are going to immigrate are in urgent need of knowing cultural differences, especially those which do not exist in their own culture. They must be aware of the shared knowledge exist in that community in order to communicate with L2 native speakers meaningfully and appropriately. Since after immigration, in foreign language context, they may be trapped in some situations in which they do not know the underlying meaning of some linguistic means which are absent in their native language. This may result in ambiguity and misunderstanding. One way of understanding this difference is through the contrastive analysis of proverbs and expressions done in this study.

REFERENCES

- Bohan, J (1997). Regarding gender: Essentialism, constructivism and feminism psychology. In M. Gergen and S. David (eds.), *Towards a New Psychology of Gender* (pp. 31-47). London: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cameron, D. (2003). Gender issues in language change. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 187-201.
- Carroll, D. W. (2008). *Psychology of language* (5th ed.). Thomson Wadsworth: Canada.
- Crawford, M. (2003). Gender and humor in social context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9/35, 1413-1430.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, 461-490.
- Ehrlich, S. (2004). Language and gender. In Davis, A. and Elder, C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp.304-366). Australia: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Freed, R. A. (2003). Epilogue: Reflections on language and gender research. In J.Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.). *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (pp. 699-721). UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Goddard, A., & Patterson L. M. (2000). *Language and gender*. London: Routledge.
- Guiora, A. Z., R.C., Brannon, C.Y., & Dull, (1972). Empathy and second language learning. *Language Learning*, 22, 111-130.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon* (229-252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Herring, S. C. (2003). Gender and power in on-line communication. In J.Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.). *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (pp. 203-228). UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson-Laird, P.N. (1981). Comprehension as the construction of mental models. *The psychological Mechanism of Language: Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 295, 353-374.
- Kay, P., & Kempton, W. (1984). What is the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis? *American Anthropologist*, 86, 65-79.
- Kramer, C., Thorny, B., & Heley, N. (1978). Perspectives on language and communication. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 3/3, 638-651.
- Kramersch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, C. (2004). Language, thought, and culture. In A. Davis, and C. Elder (Eds.), *the Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 235-261).Australia: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Kress, G. & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (Eds.). (2003). *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center of Applied Linguistics.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and women's place. *Language in Society*, 2, 45-80.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power: The politics of language*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Llamas, C. & Stockwell, P. (2002). Sociolinguistics. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 150-169). New York: Arnold.
- Lucy, J. (2000). Introductory comments. In S. Niemeier and R. Driven (eds.), *Evidence for linguistic relativity* (pp. ix-xxi). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lund, N. (2003). *Language and thought*. London: Routledge.
- Martinez, I. M., & Shatz, M. (1996). Linguistic influences on categorization in preschool children: A cross-linguistic study. *Journal of Child Language*, 23, 529-545.
- Pagin P. (2006, April 16). Intersubjective externalism. Retrieved February 23, 2010, from <http://people.su.se/~ppagin/papers/isubext.pdf>
- Riley, P. (2007). *Language, culture, and identity*. Athenaeum Press: Great Britain.
- Roberson, D., Davidoff, J., Davies, I. R. L., & Shapiro, L. R. (2005). Color categories: Evidence for the cultural relativity hypothesis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 50, 379-411.
- Roberson, D., Davies, I. R. L., Davidoff, J. (2000). Color categories are not universal: Replications and new evidence from a Stone-Age culture. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 129, 369-398.
- Rumsey, A. (2002). Aspects of Ku Waru Ethnosyntax and Social Life. In N. J. Enfield (ed.) *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in Grammar and Culture* (pp.259-286). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sapir, E. (1962). *Culture, language and personality: Selected essays* (D. Mandelbaum, Ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapir, E. (2004). *Language*. New York: Bruce and Company.
- Sera, M. D., Elieff, C., Forbes, J., Burch, M. C., Rodriguez, W., & Dubois, D. P. (2002). When language affects cognition and when it doesn't: an analysis of grammatical gender and classification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 131, 377-397.
- Schuster, E. (1998, February). Proverbs: A path to understanding different cultures. *Journal of Extension*, 36/1. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1998/february/ttz.php>
- Slobin, D. I. (1996). From "thought and language" to "thinking for speaking". In J. J. Gumperz and S. Levinson (eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity* (pp. 70-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shorter Oxford English Dictionary: On historical principle* (6th ed.). (2007). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, N. (1999). *Chomsky: Ideas and ideals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge.
- Stokoe, E. H. (2005). Analyzing gender and language. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9/1, 118-133.
- Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to society*. New York: Penguin Publication.
- Weatberall, A. (2002). *Gender, language, and discourse*. London: Routledge.
- West, C., Candace, Lazar, Michelle, Kramarae, Cheri (1997). Gender in discourse. In Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 119-143). Sage: London.

White, A. C., Catsambas, T., and Monnet, M. (2002). Language, Culture and Health: Using Proverbs to Tackle Gender Inequities in Health. *Journal of Health Management*, 4/2, 268-282.

Widdowson, H. G. (1996). *Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, E. & Ng, S.H. (1988). Sex bias in sexual images evoked by generics: a New Zealand study. *Sex Roles*, 18 (3/4), 159-168.

APPENDIX A

Below you can find the classification of contemporary and common English /Persian Proverbs and Expressions:

Table 1. Proverbs and Expressions Absent in One Language but Present in the Other

The proverbs and expressions absent in Persian but present in English
"Marry come up my dirty cousin"
"marry a widow Never, unless her first husband was hanged"
"Take the heed of a stepmother, the very name of her suffices"
"My heart belongs to daddy"
"The law is a jealous mistress"
"He is just a Kissing cousin"
Those absent in English but present in Persian
<i>Doxtær-e dufize ra fuj-e dufize bafæd</i>
<i>zægær doxtær bæd bud xoda be peiqæmbær-æf doxtær nemidad</i>
<i>bæradær qovæt-e zanust</i>
<i>madærzæn-æt/madærfohær-æt dust-et dare</i>
<i>nan væ pænir boxor ta hævu sær-æt næjajad</i>
<i>zæn-i ke dæhaz nædaræd in hæme naz nædaræd</i>
<i>hær kj zærus-e zæme fod sorx væ sefid væ pæmbe fod</i>
<i>hær kj zærus-e xale fod sær-æf tu tfale fod</i>
<i>zæn begir ta iman-æt hefz jævæd</i>
<i>hævu hævu ra xoşkel mikone dæari dæari ra zeræh</i>
<i>doxtær ke resid be bist bajæd be hal-efgerist</i>
<i>doxtær zæst ke be fekr-e madær-æf zæst</i>
<i>zæban-e madærfohær tælx zæst</i>
<i>bætfe-je hælalzade be dæri-f mibære</i>
<i>zærus ba lebas -e sefid miajæd væ ba lebas-e sefid hæm mirævæd</i>
<i>doxtær be to migæm zærus to befno</i>
<i>zæqd-e doxtærzæmu væ pesærzæmu ra dær aseman-ha bæste-ænd</i>
<i>pesær zæsa-je dæst-e pedær-e</i>
<i>mærd/pesær ke gerje nemikone</i>

Table 2. Expressions and Proverbs Which Exist In both Languages but are Similar in at Least One of the Linguistic Aspects

English	Persian
Lexical Correspondence	
"Heaven is at the feet of mothers "	<i>beheft zir-e pa-je madær-an zæst</i>
"A man without a religion is a horse without a bridle"	<i>zadæm -e la mæzhæb zæsb-e leðzam gosixte zæst</i>
" Mankind is fallible"	<i>ensan dæazezolxæta zæst</i>
"Necessity is the mother of invention"	<i>ehtiadæz madær-e extera-zat zæst</i>
"All men are mortal"	<i>zadæm-i fani zæst</i>
Structural Correspondence	
"A man 's wealth is his enemy"	<i>servæt bæla-je dæan-e ensan zæst</i>
" Wife and children are bills of charges"	<i>zæn væ bætfæ maje-je xærdæz-zænd</i>
"The wife is the key of the house"	<i>zæn bærekæt-e xane zæst</i>

"The wish is father to the thought"	<i>zæsas-e zarezu tæfækor zæst</i>
"If you don't know how to dance, you say that the drum is bad"	<i>zærus bæləd nist beræqsæd mige otaq kædʒ zæst</i>
" Women are great talkers"	<i>zæn-an por tfane-zænd</i>
"If my aunt had been a man, she 'd been my uncle "	<i>zæge xal-æm rif daft aqa dari-m mifod</i>
" Women are the devils' nets/women are necessary evils"	<i>zæn-an sælite-zænd</i>
"A man is known by the company he keeps"	<i>ensan ra be dust-æf mifenasænd</i>
Functional Correspondence	
"She is the daughter of the horse-leech"	<i>zæn hæz qædr hæm behæf bedi baz hæm mige kæm-e</i>
"Sloth breeds poverty"	<i>tæn pærvær-i madær-e fæqr-e</i>
"A man and his wife are of the same clay"	<i>xoda dær væ tæxte ra ba hæm dʒur mikone</i>
"The wife is the key of the house"	<i>zæn bærekæte xune zæst</i>
"Next to no wife , a good wife is best"	<i>zæn xub-ef hæm bæd-e tfe berese be bæd-ef</i>
"The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world"	<i>madær ba jek dæst gæhvare ra tekan midæhæd ba jek dæst donja ra</i>
"Nurses put one bit in the child's mouth and two in their own"	<i>madær be esm-e bætfe mixore qænd væ kolutfe</i>
" Brotherly love for brotherly love, but cheese for money"	<i>hesab hesab-e kaka bæradær</i>
"The wish is father to the thought"	<i>zæsas-e zarezu tæfækor zæst</i>
"Wealth makes many friends "	<i>zægær to ra zær bafæd zælæm-i bæradær-e tost</i>
"Do not business with friends "	<i>ba xod-i mozamele kærdæn xæst</i>
"If you won't work, you won't eat"	<i>mozd zan gereft dʒan-e bæradær ke kar kærd</i>
"To a mother , a bad son does not exist"	<i>buzine be tfej-m-e madær-æf qæzal zæst</i>
"The mistress stays at home from poverty not from piety"	<i>birun næræftæn-e zærus æz bi tfador-i zæst</i>
" Mother-in-law and daughter-in-law are a tempest and hail storm"	<i>dæva-je madærfohær væ zærus hæmifegi zæst</i>
"If I don't do it, I am a Dutchman "	<i>mærd-ef nistæm zæge in kar-o ændʒam nædæm</i>
"None but the brave deserves the fair"	<i>tærs bæradær-e mæрге</i>
"When the belly is full, the mind is among the maids "	<i>sekæme-e mærd ke sir fod be fekr-e tædʒdid-e feræf mioftæd</i>
"If you don't know how to dance, you say that the drum is bad"	<i>zærus bæləd nist beræqse mige otaq kædʒ zæst</i>
" Women are great talkers"	<i>zæn-an por tfane-zænd</i>
"If my aunt had been a man, she 'd been my uncle "	<i>zæge xal-æm rif daft aqa dari-m mifod</i>
"A man cannot leave by bread alone"	<i>mozd zan gereft dʒan-e bæradær ke kar kærd</i>
"Whatever man has done, man may do"	<i>æz dʒens-e do pa hæz tfe begi bæz miad</i>
"Women are the devils' nets/women are necessary evils"	<i>zæn-an sælite-zænd</i>
" Women and music should never dated"	<i>tænha raz-i ke jek zæn mitævanæd negæh daræd sen-e ust</i>
"She is a woman of easy virtue"	<i>Bænd-e tonbanæf fol fode zæst</i>
"A man of courage never wants weapons"	<i>zæslæhe-je mærd-e fodʒa dær del-e ust</i>
"A man is known by the company he keeps"	<i>ensan ra be dust-æf mifenasænd</i>

Table 3: Proverbs and Expressions Exist in both Languages and are Similar in all the Putative Aspects

English	Persian
Observe the mother , take the daughter	<i>madær ra bebin doxtær ra begir</i>
He is a man of his words	<i>mærd-e væ qolef</i>
All men are mortal	<i>xadæm-i fani zæst</i>
Heaven is at the feet of mothers	<i>behest zir-e pa-je madær-an zæst</i>
Marry your son when you will, your daughter when you can	<i>pesær-æt ra hæz væqt dust dafti zæn bede væli doxtær-æt ra hæz væqt ke dæst dad fohær bede</i>
Experience is the mother of wisdom	<i>tædʒrobe-je madær-e zæql zæst</i>

A man without a religion is a horse without a bridle	<i>ʒadæm -e la mæzhæb ʒæsb-e ledʒam gosixte ʒæst</i>
Call the bear “ uncle ”, until you are safe across the bridge	<i>ta æz pol ræd næfodi be xær begu aqa dazi</i>
A woman ‘s sword is her tongue	<i>ʒæslæhe-je zæn zæban-e ust</i>
A woman ’s tears are her strongest weapons	<i>ʒæʃk-e zæn qævi-tærin selah-e ust</i>
A man is slave to favors	<i>ensan bænde-je ehsan ʒæst</i>
The only secret a woman can keep is her age	<i>tænha razi ke jek zæn mitævanæd negæh daræd sen-e ust</i>

APPENDIX B

The following are some of the special proverbs and expressions related to men and women containing gender-bias:

Table 4. Gender-biased Proverbs and Expressions

Man can't leave by bread alone	<i>mozd ran gereft ʒʒan-e bæradær ke kar kærd</i>
When the belly is full, the mind is among the maids	<i>ʒekæm-e mærd ke sir fod be fekr-e tædʒdid-e feræf mioftæd</i>
The way to a man ’s heart is through his stomach	<i>mærd bænde-je ʒekæmæf ʒæst</i>
A man without a religion is a horse without a bridle	<i>ʒadæm -e la mæzhæb ʒæsb-e ledʒam gosixte ʒæst</i>
He that once born, once must die	<i>ʒadæm je bar donja mijad væ je bar hæm æz donja mire</i>
Men love to hear well of themselves	<i>ʒavaze hæz kæs bæraj-e xod-æf xof ʒæst</i>
Manners makes the man	<i>ʒædæb-e mærd særmaje-je ust</i>
Whatever man has done, man may do	<i>æz ʒʒens-e do pa hæz ʒfi begi bæz mijad</i>
Call the bear your uncle until you are safe across the bridge	<i>ta æz pol ræd næfodi be xær begu aqa dazi</i>
A woman ’s sword is her tongue	<i>ʒæslæhe-je zæn zæban-e ust</i>
A man of courage never wants weapons	<i>ʒæslæhe-je mærd-e fodʒa dær dele ust</i>
A woman ’s tears are her strongest weapons	<i>ʒæʃk-e zæn qævi-tærin selah-e ust</i>
A man is known by the company he keeps	<i>ensan ra be dust-æf mijenasænd</i>
A man is slave to favors	<i>ensan bænde-je ehsan ʒæst</i>
She is a woman of easy virtue	<i>bænd-e tonban-æf fol fode ʒæst</i>
Women are the devils’ nets/women are necessary evils	<i>zænæn sælite-ʒænd</i>
Women and music should never be dated/ the only secret a woman can keep is her age	<i>tænha raz-i ke jek zæn mitævanæd negæh daræd sen-e ust</i>
-----	<i>pesær-ha fir-ʒænd mesle ʒæmfir-ʒænd, doxtær-ha muf-ʒænd mesle xærguf-ʒænd</i>
Women are great talkers	<i>zænæn por ʒfane-ʒænd</i>
-----	<i>pesær ʒæsa-je dæst-e pedær-e</i>
Never leave a woman to do a man’s job	-----
-----	<i>jek pesær-e kakol zæri mijærzæd be sæd doxtær-e gis ʒæmbær-i</i>