

МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 811.161.1'373.7

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/43-3-13>

Hanna SADOVA,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8412-3865

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professor at the English Language and Literature Department

V. O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv

(Mykolaiv, Ukraine) anna123sadova@gmail.com

Mariia SADOVSKA,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6793-5191

Graduate student at the Faculty of Philology

V. O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv

(Mykolaiv, Ukraine) sadovskaya.mr@gmail.com

PECULIARITY OF COMPARATIVE PROVERBS IN FOLKLORE DISCOURSE (ON THE MATERIAL OF PROVERBS OF THE SLAVIC AND TURKMEN PEOPLES)

The article examines the national character through the significant, and defining features of the nation. The aim of the article is to identify the traits of a person by analyzing the images presented in the comparative proverbs of the Slavic and Turkmen peoples. The structure of comparative proverbs has been found out to correspond the linguistic model of comparison and to have a semantic and structural originality, associated with the peculiarity of proverbs as a folklore genre.

The study of Russian and Turkmen proverbs with different images has revealed a significant group of proverbs containing human characteristics based on figurative and metaphorical connections with the world of nature, as well as the real one. The idea of animals in comparative proverbs is reflected in the models of comparative phrase-semantic groups, demonstrating various characteristics of human qualities and traits that are realized as a result of figurative rethinking of animal names. These expressions have been shown to be culturally conditioned, but not specific, as they are motivated by ideas common to Christians' and Muslims' spiritual cultures. The study of a common cultural component presence in the phraseology of different languages has led to the assumption that cultural connotations are partially translated and the cultural component in the language is not equal to the national one.

It has been proved that in proverb constructions the laws of comparison of arguments are based both on the figurative rethinking of components, and national, symbolic value of the component of comparison. As a result of such interpretation of animals in proverbs, moral, intellectual, emotional qualities of people, and also their social, behavioral characteristics, the description of appearance, visual perception, etc. are represented. The use of different images in the comparative proverbs helps to identify the qualities and new expressive possibilities of the components included in them. They cultivate hospitality, modesty, nobility, truthfulness, honesty, courage, generosity, and a number of other qualities. The study of Russian and Turkmen proverbs contributes to the expansion of ideas about the national character features and the ability to build a generalized image for each people.

Key words: *comparative proverb, culture, model, image, semantics, semantic sequence, folklore, qualities.*

Ганна САДОВА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8412-3865

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри англійської мови і літератури

Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського

(Миколаїв, Україна) anna123sadova@gmail.com

Марія САДОВСЬКА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6793-5191

магістрант філологічного факультету

Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського

(Миколаїв, Україна) sadovskaya.mr@gmail.com

СПЕЦИФІКА КОМПАРАТИВНИХ ПАРЕМІЙ У ФОЛЬКЛОРНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ПРИСЛІВ'ІВ ТА ПРИКАЗОК СЛАВ'ЯНСЬКОГО ТА ТУРКМЕНСЬКОГО НАРОДІВ)

У статті досліджено національний характер через значущі, визначальні риси нації. Метою статті є виявлення якостей слов'янського та туркменського народів шляхом аналізу образів, що представлені в компаратив-

них пареміях. Встановлено, що структура паремії зі значенням порівняння відповідає мовній моделі порівняння, але має семантичну та структурну своєрідність, яка пов'язана з її специфікою як фольклорного жанру.

Дослідження російських та туркменських паремій з різними образами дозволило виявити, що серед них вагомою є група, в якій містяться характеристики людини на основі образно-метафоричних зв'язків з царством природи, а також з речовим світом. Уявлення про тварин у компаративних пареміях відображено в моделях компаративних фразосемантичних груп, що демонструють різноманітні характеристики людських якостей і властивостей, що усвідомлюються в результаті образного переосмислення назв тварин. Показано, що ці обороти культурно зумовлені, але не специфічні, оскільки мотивовані уявленнями, загальними для духовної культури християн та мусульман. Дослідження наявності загального культурного компонента в фразеологізмах різних мов призвело до припущення, що культурні конотації частково перекладаються та культурний компонент у мові не дорівнює національному.

Доведено, що в паремійних конструкціях закони зіставлення аргументів спираються на образне переосмислення компонентів, а також на народне, символічне значення компоненту порівняння. В результаті такої інтерпретації тварин у пареміях подано моральні, інтелектуальні, емоційні якості людини, а також її соціальні, поведінкові характеристики, опис зовнішнього вигляду, зорового сприйняття тощо. Використання різних образів у пареміях зі значенням порівняння сприяє виявленню якостей і нових експресивних можливостей компонентів, що входять у компаративну паремію. Вони культивують гостинність, скромність, шляхетність, правдивість, чесність, сміливість, душевну щедрість тощо. Вивчення російських і туркменських паремій сприяє розширенню уявлення про риси національного характеру і можливості побудувати збірний образ для кожного народу.

Ключові слова: компаративна паремія, культура, модель, образ, семантика, семантичний ряд, фольклор, якості.

Statement of the problem. National character is the most significant, defining features of a nation, by which one can distinguish representatives of one nationality from another. Each nation has its own peculiar character. "The nationality's character and the fate of the country are in close connection, they are influenced by each other along the entire historical path" (Grachev, 1998: 25). National character is reflected in literature, philosophy, art and, of course, in language. The authority of the generations who created proverbs and sayings is reflected in them. Therefore, "proverbs and sayings do not argue, do not prove – they simply affirm or deny something in the belief that everything said in them is a firm truth" (Mamontov, 2002: 89). Moral problems worried thinkers of all ages and ordinary people. What should a real person be? What traits should he/she have? What qualities are considered positive and what are negative? The answers to these questions can be sought in proverbs, which along with fixing universal human priorities at the same time reflect the people's ideas about the world and their being in it.

Research analysis. Due to the fact that national and cultural specificity is most fully and clearly manifested in proverbs and sayings, they are valuable material for research in cognitive linguistics in the works of M. E. Bokhonnaya, S. G. Vorkachev, I. O. Golubovskaya, O. N. Rakitina, A. B. Savenkova, etc. The study of proverbs makes it possible to judge national logic (logical conceptualization of reality) and national assessment of the world (emotional and evaluative conceptualization of reality).

The purpose of this article is to identify the traits of a person by analyzing the images presented in the comparative proverbs of the Slavic and Turkmen peoples. The object of the research is Russian and Turkmen proverbs (Dahl, 1989 a; Dahl, 1989 b; Karryev, 2000), among which the majority (about 650 units) are constructions containing various images.

Presenting main material. Although the structure of a proverb with a comparative meaning corresponds to the language model of comparison and includes the subject and the prototype of comparison, the basis of comparison and the indicator of comparative relations, it has a semantic and structural originality associated with its peculiarity as a folklore genre (Sadova, 2021: 103]. Thus, their study is relevant.

The tradition of using a word in folklore texts (in particular, in proverbs) determines the interaction of its direct and figurative – metaphorical, symbolic, figurative, and associative meanings. Comparative proverbs as elements of the folklore picture of the world can be directly nominated. As an example, let us take the Russian proverb *Сытый волк смиреннее завистливого человека* (A well-fed wolf is humbler than an envious person) and the Turkmen proverb *Лучше благополучный конец, чем хорошее начало* (Better a happy end than a good start). However, it is often that the proverbs of these peoples are replete with images that are always national, specific, and dependent on the genre: *Счастье, что волк: обманет да в лес уйдет, Добрался, как волк до овчарни, Солдат, что волк: где попал, там и рвет* (Happiness is like a wolf: deceives and goes into the forest, Got like a wolf to a sheepfold, A soldier is like a wolf: wherever he is, there he tears). In this regard, it seems appropriate to study the peculiarity of human traits, which are illustrated using a comparison prototype.

Most of the proverbs were originally produced with figurative components. Perceiving reality, a person was figuratively aware of his surroundings. This was especially evident in the perception of nature. So, animals, plants, as well as elements of inanimate nature were perceived as carriers of certain fixed characteristics and relationships (*fox – cunning, oak, stone – fortress, etc.*). As a result of further metaphorical rethinking of

the components of the proverbs, semantic changes and transformations were carried out. The primary image acquired a symbolic meaning.

Proverbs have somewhat changed their meaning over the centuries of existence. The primary (direct and figurative) nominations of the proverb components expanded their meaning, which led to the enrichment of semantics and the emergence of a wide range of associations around them. Associative connections have grown stronger, become generally recognized, and the meaning of proverbs has gone far beyond the direct content of the proverb utterance – the prototype. As a result, each proverb is perceived by the speaker as a sign unit with a certain set of meanings.

In the interpretation of proverbs, as in the interpretation of phraseological units originating in ancient times, certain difficulties often arise. They are due to the fact that the type of the worldview reflected in proverbs often differs significantly from the modern one. Therefore, when interpreting the primary meaning of a proverb, it is impossible to confine oneself to linguistic analysis only. As a result, the problem of their content deciphering goes beyond the framework of a purely linguistic study and covers a wide range of historical, ethnographic, national and cultural problems.

In the creation of proverbs, as well as in the creation of phraseological units, a great role belongs to extra-linguistic factors, since phraseological units are associated with people's traditions, material and spiritual culture.

In the study of Russian proverbs with various images, we have found out that among them a significant place is occupied by a group in which a person's characteristic is presented on the basis of figurative and metaphorical connections with the world of Nature, as well as with the material world: *Любит, как собака палку, Солдат, что волк: где попало, там и рвет, Смирен, как теленок, кроток, как ягненок* (*He loves as a dog likes a stick; A soldier is like a wolf: wherever he is, there he tears; Meek like a calf, placable like a lamb*).

In comparative proverbs, as in folklore in general, images of various animals are widely represented, however, unlike other folklore genres, in proverbs these images receive a different interpretation. If, for example, the main characters of fairy tales are animals, which, although they speak and behave like people, remain and are perceived as animals, then in proverbs, through a prototype with the meaning of an animal, a metaphorical characteristic of a person is presented.

In comparative proverbs, the names of animals contribute to the figurative characterization of various human qualities and traits. This is evidenced by many examples in which as an object of comparison there

are images, based on visual representations of some animals, from the point of view of the corresponding various human characteristics. These representations constitute the figurative and metaphorical basis of the semantics of the proverbs. In metaphorization, there is a kind of two-fold, step-by-step mechanism: before you call a cunning person a fox, a cowardly person a hare, a clumsy person a bear, etc., you need to associate these qualities with animals – i.e. qualify each animal accordingly.

The concepts of animals in Russian comparative proverbs can be reflected in the models of comparative phrase-semantic groups, similar to the models studied by A. A. Ivchenko (Ivchenko, 1996) and I. V. Kuznetsova (Kuznetsova, 2005).

1. Moral qualities of a person.

The semantic sequence is “very cowardly”:

Model 1. “As cowardly as + wild animal = very cowardly”: *Труслив, что заяц...* (*As cowardly as a hare...*) (Dahl, 1989 b: 400).

Model 2. “As timid as + wild animal = very cowardly”: *роблив, что заяц...* (*as timid as a hare ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 226).

Semantic sequence “very humble/meek”:

Model 1. “As humble as + a domestic animal = very humble/meek”: *смирен, как корова...* (*as humble as a cow ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 222).

Model 2. “As humble as + a baby of a domestic animal = very humble/meek”: *Смирен, как теленок...* (*As humble as a calf ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 217).

Model 3. “As meek as + a baby of a domestic animal = very meek”: *кроток, как ягненок...* (*as meek as a lamb ...*) (Dahl, 1989 b: 217).

The semantic sequence is “very cunning”:

The model “As cunning as + a domestic animal = very cunning”: *лукав, как змея...* (*as cunning like a snake ...*) (Dahl, 1989 b: 153).

Semantic sequence “to lie shamelessly”:

The model “Lies like + a domestic animal = lies shamelessly”: *врет, как сивый мерин...* (*he lies like a gray gelding ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 359).

Semantic sequence “very wicked”:

The model “As wicked as + a reptile = very wicked”: *зла, что змея...* (*as wicked as a snake ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 112).

Semantic sequence “very mischievous”:

The model “As mischievous as + a domestic animal = very nasty”: *пакостлив, как кот...* (*as mischievous as a cat ...*) (Dahl, 1989 a: 226).

2. Intellectual characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “very stupid”:

Model 1. “As stupid as + a domestic animal = very stupid”: *глуп, как свинья...* (*as stupid as a pig ...*) (Dahl, 1989 b: 204).

Model 2. “As simple as + a domestic animal = very stupid”: *прост, как свинья... (as simple as a pig ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 153).

Model 3. “Clever but not as + a baby of a domestic animal = very stupid”: *мудер, а не как теленок... (clever but not as a calf ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 76).

3. Emotional characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “to love very much”:

Model “Loves like + a domestic animal + a stick = loves very much”: *любит, как собака палку... (loves like a dog a stick ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 227).

Semantic sequence “not to love at all”:

Model “I love it like + an insect = I don’t love it at all”: *люблю, как клопа в углу... (I love it like a bug in the corner ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 227).

4. Social characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “very poor”:

Model “As poor as + a wild bird = very poor”: *гол, как сокол... (poor as Job’s turkey ...)* (Dahl, 1989 a: 225).

5. Physical characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence is “very healthy”:

Model “As healthy as + a domestic animal = very healthy”: *здоров, как бык... (as healthy as a bull ...)* (Dahl, 1989 a: 346).

6. Behavioral characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “very thievish”:

Model “As thievish as + a domestic animal = very thievish”: *блудлив, что кошка... (as thievish as a cat...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 400).

Semantic sequence “get out well”:

Model “Get out like a + wild animal + tail = get out well”: *отыгрывается, как лиса хвостом... (get out like a fox with its tail ...)* (Dahl, 1989 a: 151).

7. Characteristics of a person's appearance.

Semantic sequence “turn red”:

Model “Turn as red as + arthropod = turn red”: *покраснел как рак... (turn as red as a lobster ...)* (Dahl, 1989 a: 413).

8. Human visual perception.

Semantic sequence “to look in surprise”:

Model 1. “Looks like + a domestic animal + at a pictured gate = looks in surprise”: *смотрим, что корова на писанные ворота... (looks like a cow at a pictured gate ...)* (Dahl, 1989 a: 76).

Model 2. “Looks like + poultry + at the glow = looks in surprise”: *глядит, как гусь на зарево... (looks like a goose at the glow ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 76).

Semantic sequence “look with curiosity”:

Model: “Looks like + a domestic animal + into a jug = looks with curiosity”: *заглядывает, как собака в кувшин... (looks like a dog into a jug ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 165).

Semantic sequence “look with fear”:

Model “Looks like + a domestic animal at the butcher = looks with fear”: *поглядывает, как коза на мясника... (looks like a goat at the butcher ...)* (Dahl, 1989 b: 162).

We also researched the richest stock of proverbs and sayings of the Turkmen people (Karryev, 2000) and identified several thematic groups among them. Let us have a look at the most numerous ones.

1. Moral qualities of a person.

Semantic sequence “very meek”:

Model “Better + a domestic animal = very meek”: *Лучше собаке никого не видеть и не лаять (It is better for a dog not to see anyone or bark)* (Karryev, 2000);

2. Emotional characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “to love very much”:

Model “More dear + a wild animal = to love very much”: *Зайцу родной холм дороже всего (The native hill is most dear to the hare)* (Karryev, 2000).

3. Intellectual characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “very stupid”:

Model 1: “Better + a domestic animal = very stupid”: *Осел сам себя считает лучше коня (The donkey considers himself better than the horse)* (Karryev, 2000).

4. Physical characteristics of a person.

Semantic sequence “very fast”:

Model “Faster + a domestic animal = very fast”: *...с каждым бегом конь резвее (...with each run the horse is faster)* (Karryev, 2000).

Semantic sequence “very lively”:

Model “Better + a wild animal = very lively”: *Живая мышь лучше мертвого льва (A live mouse is better than a dead lion)* (Karryev, 2000).

5. Characteristics of a person's appearance.

Semantic sequence “very large”:

Model “Larger + a wild animal = very large”: *Больше верблюда есть еще слон (There is also an elephant larger than a camel)* (Karryev, 2000).

As it can be seen from the above-given examples, all these and many other qualities add up to the ethnic picture of these nations’ world. Each nation has its own mentality, certain qualities peculiar to this particular people.

Proverbs reflect people’s eternal interest to their essence – the inner world and external characteristics – through the linguistic interpretation of the surrounding reality. Due to the fact that folklore traditions have deep philosophical roots, proverbs are a kind of “code” of moral, aesthetic, ethical and many other human values.

The presented models demonstrate that the characteristics of human qualities and traits, realized as a result of the figurative rethinking of the names of animals in proverbs, are extremely diverse.

The constructions considered in the composition of the proverbs are culturally conditioned, but not specific, since they are motivated by the ideas which are common to the spiritual culture of the Slavs and Muslims. The study of the presence of a common cultural component in phraseological units of different languages leads to the assumption that cultural connotations are partially translatable and that there should not be an equality sign between the cultural and the national in the language.

Conclusions. When identifying the semantic peculiarities of proverbs with the meaning of comparison, it has been found out that in proverb constructions, the laws of comparison of arguments are based on the figurative rethinking of the components, as well as on the popular, symbolic meaning of the object of comparison. The basis for the structuring

of such proverbs is the allocation of thematic groups with the meaning of various images. As a result of the animal figurative interpretation both moral, intellectual, emotional qualities of a person and social, behavioral characteristics, appearance description, visual perception are represented in proverbs. The use of various images with the meaning of comparison in proverbs helps to identify the qualities of the subjects, as well as new expressive possibilities of the components included in the comparative proverbs. They cultivate hospitality, modesty, nobility, truthfulness, honesty, courage, spiritual generosity and a number of other qualities. Thus, having studied a number of Russian and Turkmen proverbs, one can expand the understanding of the national character features and imagine a generalized character of a respected, worthy, from the both peoples' point of view, person.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Гачев Г. Д. Национальные образы мира. Москва : Академия, 1998. 430 с.
2. Даль В. И. Пословицы русского народа : В 2-х т. Москва : Художественная литература, 1989. Т. 1. 431 с.
3. Даль В. И. Пословицы русского народа : В 2-х т. – Москва : Художественная литература, 1989. Т. 2. 447 с.
4. Івченко А. О. Українська народна фразеологія: ареали, етимологія. Харків : ОКО, 1996. 160 с.
5. Кузнецова И. В. Мифологические корни устойчивых сравнений. Славяноведение. 2005. № 2. С. 99–109.
6. Мамонтов А. С. Номинативные единицы – афоризмы (пословицы, поговорки) в аспекте сопоставительного лингвострановедения. *Вестник Московского университета. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация*. 2002. № 2. С. 88–97.
7. Мудрость отцов: пословицы и поговорки народов Средней Азии [Текст] / перевод Н. И. Гребнева. Ашхабад : Магарыф, 1984. 192 с.
8. Туркменские пословицы и поговорки / собрал и перевел Б. А. Каррыев. URL: <http://litena.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000065/st046.shtml>. (дата звернення: 10.10.2021).
9. Хорленко А. Т. Основы лингвокультурологии : Учебное пособие. Москва : Флинта: Наука, 2004, 43 с.
10. Язлыева Ш. А. Пословицы и поговорки русского и туркменского народа как средство формирования лингвистической компетенции учащихся. *Международный журнал социальных и гуманитарных наук*. 2016. Т. 4. № 1. С. 148–151.
11. Sadova H. Comparative model conjunction verbalizers in folklore discourse. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук: міжвузівський збірник наукових праць молодих вчених Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка*. Випуск № 35. Т.5. 2021. С. 103–107.

REFERENCES

1. Gachev G. D. Natsionalnye obrazy mira [National images of the world]. Moscow: Academy, 1998. 430 p. [in Russian].
2. Dahl V. I. Poslovitsy russkogo naroda [Proverbs of the Russian people]: In 2 volumes. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1989. Vol. 1. 431 p. [in Russian].
3. Dahl V. I. Poslovitsy russkogo naroda [Proverbs of the Russian people]: In 2 volumes. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1989. Vol. 2. 447 p. [in Russian].
4. Ivchenko A. O. Ukrainska narodna frazeolohiia: arealy, etymolohiia [Ukrainian folk phraseology: areas, etymology]. Kharkiv: OCO, 1996. 160 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Kuznetsova I. V. Mifologicheskie korni ustoychivyykh sravneniy. [Mythological roots of set comparisons]. *Slavyanovedenie*. 2005. No. 2. pp. 99 – 109 [in Russian].
6. Mamontov A. S. Nominativnye edynitsy – aforizmy (poslovitsy, pogovorki) v aspekte sopostavitel'nogo lingvostranovedeniya [Nominative units-aphorisms (proverbs, sayings) in the aspect of comparative linguistic and cultural studies. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya*. 2002. No. 2. pp. 88–97 [in Russian].
7. Mudrost' otsov: poslovitsy i pogovorki narodov Sredney Azii [The wisdom of the fathers: proverbs and sayings of the peoples of Central Asia] [Text] / translated by N. I. Grebnev. Ashgabat: Magaryf, 1984. 192 p. [in Russian].
8. Turkmenskie poslovitsy i pogovorki [Turkmen proverbs and sayings] / collected and translated by B. A. Karryev. URL: <http://litena.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000065/st046.shtml>. (date of the beast: 10/10/2021) [in Russian].
9. Horlenko A. T. Osnovy lingvokul'torologii [Fundamentals of linguocultorology]: textbook. Moscow: Flint: Nauka, 2004, 43 p. [in Russian].
10. Yazlyeva Sh. A. Poslovitsy i pogovorki russkogo i turkmenskogo naroda kak sredstvo formirovaniya lingvisticheskoy kompetentsii uchashchikhsya [Proverbs and sayings of the Russian and Turkmen people as a means of students'linguistic competence formation]. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 2016. Vol. 4. No. 1. pp. 148–151 [in Russian].
11. Sadova H. Comparative model conjunction verbalizers in folklore discourse. *Topical issues of the humanities: an intercollegiate collection of works of young researches of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University*. Issue 35. Vol. 5, 2021, pp. 103–107