

Indira Tukhvatullina
Kazan Federal University
itukhvatullina@mail.ru

Firdaus Vagapova
Kazan Federal University
vagap.art@mail.ru

SYNTAX OF METONYMIC PAREMIAS IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND TATAR LANGUAGES

Metonymic proverbs and sayings are the least studied part of modern paremiology. The relevance of this work is associated with the growing interest in Eastern and European languages and intercultural communication, since the study of the paremiology of languages of different structures increases the efficiency of the study of the lexical-semantic and morphological structure of the language, contributes to the enrichment of linguistic and cultural knowledge reflecting the historically established way of life of different peoples. The purpose of the research is to classify and analyze the main lexical and grammatical features of proverbs and sayings of a metonymic nature in three languages: English, Russian and Tatar.

Keywords: paremia, metonymy, proverbs, sayings, study, education.

1. Introduction

This article will consider metonymic paremias from the point of view of their syntactic structure, which is an interesting and noteworthy aspect, since such paremias have not been thoroughly studied before.

Paremiology as a philological science of modern times dates back to the 19th century. It studies paremias which attract the attention of both folklorists and linguists who use literary and linguistic research methods.

However, an active study of proverbs began in the second half of the 20th century. Since that time the number of monographic researches, collections of scientific works, selected articles devoted to this problem have increased, a generalizing theory was outlined. Such well-known scientists as S. Adalberg, V. Dal, V. Mokienko, M. Nomis, G. Permyakov, I. Snegirev, K. Tarlanov, I. Franko, F. Cermak were involved in study of paremiology.

A proverb is a genre of folklore, an aphoristically concise, figurative, grammatically and logically complete utterance with an instructive meaning, in a rhythmically organized form (“What you sow, so will you reap”). It is “a short parable, judgment, sentence, lesson, expressed bluntly and put into circulation, under the coinage of the nationality.” “A proverb is a flower, a proverb is a berry” [Dal’, 1994].

In accordance with the aims and targets referring to this article, it is necessary to solve the following tasks: 1) to give a brief definition of metonymy and show the place of its use in paremias; 2) to investigate some main syntactical features of metonymic proverbs and sayings in three languages.

The words *metonymy* and *metonym* come from the Greek μετωνυμία, *metōnymía*, “a change of name”, from μετά, *metá*, “after, post, beyond”, and -ωνυμία, *-ōnymía*, a suffix that names, figures of speech, from ὄνομα, *ónyma* or ὄνομα, *ónoma*, “name”.

Metonymic type of proverbs is based on association between something literally named and the thing intended: “who has a fair wife needs more than two eyes” in which the eye stands metonymically for the “sight”.

Metonymy became important in French structuralism through the work of R. Jakobson [12]. In his 1956 essay “The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles”, Jakobson relates metonymy to the linguistic practice of [syntagmatic] combination and to the literary practice of realism. He explains: “the primacy of the metaphoric process in the literary schools of Romanticism and symbolism has been repeatedly acknowledged, but it is still insufficiently realized that it is the predominance of metonymy which underlies and actually predetermines the so-called ‘realistic’ trend, which belongs to an intermediary stage between the decline of Romanticism and the rise of symbolism and is opposed to both” [12].

Lakoff (1989) defines proverbs as metaphoric in nature, but recently there have been some studies that oppose to this view, and defend that they are metonymic. Metonymy is as much an important cognitive mechanism as metaphor: in both of them we find a mapping process, either from a source domain to a target domain or from a target domain to a source domain. According to Ruiz de Mendoza (1999b: 54), the limits between metaphor and metonymy are not very clear, since we can use metaphors predicatively or metonymies referentially, and we can give a potential metonymy a metaphoric trait, among other things. In fact, the only “distinguishing criterion between metaphor and metonymy is that metonymic mappings are domain internal — they hold a domain inclusion relationship, while domain external mappings are proper of metaphors — that is, mapping takes place across domains” (Kövecses and Radden, 1999; Panther and Thornburg, 1999). This explains why the authors seem to defend the view that metonymy is essential for the interpretation of proverbs. Their recent accounts have convincingly argued that the generic/specific distinction is metonymic in nature, ‘specific’ being a subdomain of ‘generic’. In addition to this observation, we note that the relationship between different language proverbs is not an identifying one but rather of the ‘stand-for’ kind.

It must be admitted that proverbs of metonymic nature are of great interest and exceptional importance to historians and dialectologists of the language. They capture the long-term cultural and historical relationships of different peoples.

Thus, the main target and relevance of this research is the scientific lighting of the ethno-linguistic, stylistic and syntactic peculiarities of Russian, Tatar and English metonymic proverbs and sayings, identified on the basis of samples from dictionaries and literary texts.

The theoretical and methodological corpus of the research is the ideas and concepts of Russian and foreign paremiology presented in the works of N. Arutyunova [1], V. Dal [2], R. Gibbs [3], N. Isanbet [4], J. Lakoff [5], R. Langacker [6], K. Makhmutov [7], V. Meader [8], N. Norrick [9], G. Permyakov [10], A. Potebnya [11]. It has also been extracted from a number of compilations of English, Russian and Tatar proverbs and sayings taken from different dictionaries, such as: “Dictionary of modern English proverbs and sayings”, “English proverbs and sayings and their Russian correspondences”, edited by V. S. Modestov, V. Dahl’s dictionary “Proverbs of the Russian people”, including 30,000 proverbs, Mehmutova L. Ruscha-Tatarcha phraseologik suzlege, Kazan, 1959; Isenbet N. Tatar telenets phraseologik suzlege: 2t, Kazan, 1989–1990; Isenbet N. Tatar halyk mekallare: 3 t, Kazan, 1959–1967; Bayramova L. K. Russian Russian phraseological dictionary of the language Kazan, 1980; Bayramova L. K. Educational thematic Russian Tatar phraseological dictionary, Kazan, 1991; Safiullina F. S. Tatar-Russian phraseological dictionary, Kazan, 2001, which were irreplaceable in doing this research.

2. Materials and Methods

The choice of linguistic analyses is determined by the specificity of researched material. In order of the complex analysis of the metonymic proverbs language the following methods were used: descriptive, comparative, historical and lexical-semantic, contrastive method. The main method of research is a descriptive method, which includes such methods as the study of the actual material, compilation, interpretation and classification. By the comparison analysis of the words functioning in different stages of language development as well as for the typological characteristics of the language is used the proverbs comparative method. Comparative-historical method is used for identification of changes in semantics and syntax, for identification of the genetic affiliation of the proverbs vocabulary.

3. Results

3.1. *Simple sentences as linguistic forms of paremia. One-part and two-part sentences.*

In this section an analysis of original Russian, Tatar and some English proverbs and sayings was carried out, based on comparing simple sentences subdivided into many structural and semantic varieties.

Depending on the structure of the predicative nucleus, one-part and two-part sentences are distinguished, from the way of expressing the subject — nominative-subject and infinitive-subject: *Шутка и веселье — двигатель жизни* (*Joke and fun are the engine of life*); *В здоровом теле- здоровый дух* (*A sound mind in a sound body*); *За невинную кровь ружье ответ потребует* (*For innocent blood, the gun will demand an answer*); *Печаль не уморит, а с ног соьет* (*Sadness will not kill you, but will knock you off your feet*).

The characteristic features of these sentences in paremias: 1) the postulated nature of the utterance; 2) the expression of the ascertaining modality.

One-piece sentences.

A one-part sentence, like a two-part one, is one of the structural-semantic types of a simple sentence, but, unlike the latter, its predicative basis is represented by one main member.

Proverbs and sayings with incomplete constructions, in the grammatical structure of which one or more members of sentences are missing, can act as an independent statement, while the meaning of the proverb is not lost: *Деревянный тулуп* (*coffin*), *Время — деньги* (*Time is money*).

Grammatical incompleteness of a sentence may arise due to the absence of both the main and secondary members of the sentence.

1. Skipping a subject or predicate, in which different subjects are compared: their similarity, or difference, or opposition to each other within a single situation is emphasized: *Кровь людская — не водица* (*Human blood is not water*) — *Кеша каны су тугел*; *Дружба дружбе рознь* (*Friendship friendship strife*), etc.

2. Skipping of the minor members of the sentence, which are not always very important in meaning: *Время лечит* (*Time heals*) — *Vakyt davaliy*; *Глаза боятся, руки делают* (*The eyes are afraid — the hands are doing*) — *Koz kurka — kul yolka*.

In English one-piece proverbial sentences are not often found. As a rule, they consist of two nuclear components — subject and predicate: *Promise is debt*; *Appearances are deceitful*; as well as with homogeneous dependent components: *Truth has a good face, but bad clothes*. There are paremia with a compound nominal predicate as one of the means of expressing a constant feature: *Love is blind*; *Poverty is no sin*.

All parts of a proverbial sentence perform important functions and are very closely related to each other and interdependent. Omitting one or another part of a sentence usually leads to a distortion of the meaning of the proverb, for example, if you omit the definition in the proverb: *A watched pot never boils*.

You can often find one-piece pairs with an ellipse, which most often has the character of skipping a predicate, the semantic content of which is obvious from the context. At the same time, the proverb presents the secondary members of the sentence that depend on this predicate, which “attach” this sentence to reality: *Платье черненько, да совесть беленька* (*The dress is black, but the conscience is white*); *Совесть без зубов* (*Conscience without teeth*).

The syntactic status of elliptic sentences is not fully defined. A number of researchers attribute them to incomplete sentences due to the unsubstituted position of the predicate, others refer them to a special type of two-part full sentences, since their communicative self-sufficiency is obvious: *Разум — душе во спасенье, Богу на славу* (*Reason is for the soul to salvation, for God's glory*) — *Belem yörakkə kuət*.

Elliptical structures are a capacious, laconic means of stating a fact in the context of circumstances: *Стенка на стенку* (*Wall to wall*); *Деньги к деньгам* — *Money to money*; *Тауак ике bashly*, etc.

One-piece sentences do not function as a linguistic form of paremias, only verb sentences that are diverse in structure, grammatical meaning and semantic content function: 1) definitely personal: *Тихо идешь — беда догонит; шибко пойдешь — беду догонишь* (*You walk quietly — trouble will catch up; if you go briskly, you will catch up with trouble*); 2) vaguely personal: *Легко пришло, легко ушло* — *Easy came, easy left*; 3) generalized personal: *Сердце руками не уймешь* (*You can't calm your heart with your hands*); 4) impersonal: *Хлеб — соль сном золотят* (*Bread — salt is golden in sleep*); 5) nominative (nominative): *Red speech*.

A special group is made up of generalized personal sentences with the main predicate member, which tells about the action performed by the speaker himself in the past, moreover, the action is prolonged, ordinary or repeated several times: *Домашнее зло к людям не потащишь* (*You cannot drag domestic evil to people*); *Голода за пазухой не спрячешь* (*You can't hide hunger in your bosom*).

Since generalization can be the basis for a conclusion, these sentences easily cross that conditional line beyond which there is no longer a specific narration, but a generalization of personal experience and its expression as “obligatory” for everyone. For example: *Слово не воробей, вылетит — не поймаешь; Слово пуще стрелы разум* (*The word is not a sparrow, if it flies out, you won't catch it; The word more than arrows strikes*) — *Әйткән соз — аткан ук*.

An important feature of generalized personal sentences is their use when expressing only those observations that seem to the speaker to be obligatory, indisputable, since they follow from the objective features of the observed phenomena and situations. The main semantic component in generalized personal sentences is the personal involvement of any person in the observations that make up the content of these sentences, they summarize the speaker's life experience or the collective experience he has learned: *Голь на выдумки хитра* — *Аптыра-сан аптыра* — *nuzha yukna taptyra*.

The productivity of the form of generalized personal sentences for proverbs is not accidental: their generalized form is combined with an edifying meaning; however, these sentences are extremely used in speech and as created from verbal material, and not only as reproducible.

3.2. Impersonal sentences.

The semantics of impersonal sentences is characterized by:

1) the state or change in the state of nature, the state of a person or an object (physical, psychological, emotional): *Живет на Кромах, в разных домах* (*Lives on Kromy, in different houses (friendship)*); *Yua bashlasa, ker balaliy* (*Start washing — things multiply*).

2) an action taking place against the will of the subject: *Сердцу не прикажешь* (*You cannot order the heart*).

In the Tatar language, the adverb in *-yp* together with the verb *bul* acts as the subject in the impersonal sentence — perhaps, less often, the infinitive with the predicative word *ardent* can be used as the main member: *Ashtan oly bulip bulmy*. In Russian, this type of semantics is conveyed by infinitive sentences: *Без соли, без хлеба — худая беседа* (*Without salt, without bread — bad conversation*).

The English language uses sentences introduced by the pronoun *it*: *It is an ill wind that blows no good*.

3.3. Compound proverbial sentences with metonymic hyphens.

Along with simple sentences, a fairly frequent way of structuring is complex, first of all, non-union and complex sentences. They have the ability to give speech liveliness, simplicity and expressiveness, they constitute an active link among complex sentences. These constructions play the role of a genre model in many proverbs.

A complex sentence is a structural-semantic and intonational unity of two or more predicative parts, correlated with simple one-part and two-part sentences.

The selection of subtypes within complex sentences is based on taking into account the nature of the unions connecting their parts. Conjunctions *a / and; but / but* in Russian and English proverbs serve to express the comparative relations between parts of a compound sentence: *Ртом болезнь входит, а беда выходит* (*With the mouth, the disease enters, and the trouble comes out*); *Bread is the staff of life, but beer's life itself*.

A more active adversary alliance is in Russian proverbs: *Все хвалят добро, да не всех хвалят оно* (*Everyone praises good, but not everyone is praised by it*); *Мал грех, да большую беду несет (творит)* (*Small sin, but great misfortune (creates)*); *Хоть гол обман, да прав* (*Though the goal is a deception, it is right*); *Казна с голоду не уморит, да и досыта не накормит* (*The treasury will not starve to death, and will not feed them to their fill*).

While the Tatar language is aimed at non-union sentences: *Жулы сыак сыдырты, сalkын җанны тындырты; Авыру batmanlap керә, мыскаллап чыга*.

Unionless compound sentences, parts of which are interconnected by intonation of opposition, are the most common constructions. They express the attitude of opposition, which establishes the general pattern of judgments and the

peculiarity of this genre of folklore. The relationship of opposition is complicated by various semantic shades.

1) With complete opposition, the combined components oppose each other term by term: *Добро не умрет, а худо пропадет* (*Good will not die, but badly will disappear*) — *Yakhshylyk tora, yamanlyk yugala*; *Правда горькая, а ложь сладкая* (*The truth is bitter, but the lie is sweet*) — *Накыкат ачы, yalغان tatly*; *Ученье — свет, неученье — тьма* — *Gylemlek — nur, nadanlyk — hur* (*Learning is light, ignorance is darkness*), etc.

A complete opposition is sometimes created due to the general context of the proverb: *Гора с горой не сходится, а человек с человеком сходится* — *Tau tauga kushylmas, il ilgə kushylyr* (*A mountain does not converge with a mountain, but a person converges with a person*).

2) When combining units are opposed in some of their parts (subject and predicate; definition and predicate; subject and complement; secondary members, etc.), at the same time having a common point of contact, expressed in the community of a member or group members (lexical repetitions); in this case, an incomplete opposition is formed: *Совесть без зубов, а загрызет* — *Oyatnuң teshe bulmasa da khimerə* (*Conscience has no teeth, but it will gnaw*), *Хмель шумит — ум молчит, etc.*

3) The relation of moderate opposition, in which the affirmation is opposed to denial or vice versa: *Богатство — не опора, единство — опора* — *Altyn dəyləyt tygel, goylem dəylət* (*Wealth is not a support, unity is a support*), etc.

4) Opposition of such constituent parts of a complex whole, which denote the gradation of the same meaning. At the same time numerals (especially in Russian and Tatar languages), counting words, adjectives and adverbs in a comparative or superlative degree play an important role: *Один с сошкой, а семеро с ложкой*; *Үөзнә дә ак иткән — ики, сүзнә дә ак иткән — ики*; *Язык мягок: что хочет, то и лопочет (чего не хочет, и то лопочет)* — *The language is soft: what it wants, it babbles (what it doesn't want, it babbles)* — *Тәмле дә тел, тәмsez дә тел*; *Слово острее меча (The word is sharper than a sword)* — *Tel kylychtan ytken, kaləm teldən дә ytken*; *Сказанное слово — серебряное, не сказанное — золотое (The spoken word — silver, not spoken — golden)* — *Suzeң көmesh bulsa, endəштəвeң altyn, etc.*

Often in proverbial sentences, various linguistic means are used to express opposition relations, the most important of which is antonymy. In proverbs, not only ready-made lexical already existing in the language are used, but also contextual antonyms. They are especially colorfully reflected in Russian paremias: *Волосы длинные, ум короткий* (*The hair is long, but the mind is short*) — *Chəch озун, акыл куска*; *Плоть немощна, а душа грешна* (*The flesh is weak, and the soul is sinful*); *Сказка складом, песня ладом красна* (*A fairy tale in a warehouse, the song is red in color*); *Доля во времени живет, бездолье в безвременье* (*A share in time lives, an empty space in timelessness*); *Белое — венчальное, черное — печальное* (*White is wedding, black is sad*).

It should be noted that in some Russian and Tatar proverbs, the affixes of belonging related to the word in the second component play a decisive role. Russians: *Плоть немощна, а душа грешна* (*The flesh is sinful, but the soul is good*); *Видит глаз, да рука не сгнет* (*The eye sees, but the hand will not bend*). Tatar: *Дөня үтәр дә китәр, Калган безгә җитәр*.

Discussion

The study of syntactic metonymy in proverbs is undoubtedly consistent with new trends in the coverage of metonymy in linguistics.

R. Gibbs describes metonymy as an integral part of everyday thinking and speech activity (Gibbs 1999: 61). That is why people of different nations have always used the expressive means of speech in paremias to make them more vivid and colourful.

R. Langacker puts forward the idea of a metonymic grammar within the framework of cognitive grammar (Langacker 2009). According to R. Langacker, the metonymic nature of grammar consists in the fact that the information transmitted by its means is not exhausted by their generally accepted meanings (Langacker 2009: 46).

In our article, we made an attempt to compare the metonymic proverbs of different structured languages in terms of syntax, which in the end turned out to be quite complex and voluminous work. In addition, not all proverbs can be observed pure metonymic transfer, in some of them there are similarities with metaphor. However, we relied on the works of well-known linguists (Apresyan, Arutyunova, R. Gibbs, R. Langacker, Lakoff), who gave arguments regarding various cases of metonymy: ‘...one entity used to refer to another one. Metaphor and metonymy are different types of processes. A metaphor is primarily a way of comprehending one thing in terms of another, and thus its main function is to provide understanding’ (Lakoff 1980: 62). Like a metaphor, metonymy cannot be considered ‘as a set of random and arbitrary contexts of use. Metonymic concepts are also organized systematically’. Their consistency can be illustrated by the following representative examples that are characteristic of our culture: *На воре шапка горит; Бритва скребет, а слово режет; Капля такта дороже потоков остроловия*.

However, it should be said that the syntax itself is given a very modest place in the study of metonymic processes that has been outlined in recent linguistics. We could hardly find a lot of papers with deep research on this topic.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to note that the analysis of proverbs and sayings made it possible to identify the most common sentence structures in the Tatar and Russian languages. A characteristic feature of the syntactic structure of these languages is the simultaneous functioning in the language of several syntactic

structures of the sentence (nominative and binominative) and the dependence of the syntactic structure of the sentence on the semantics of the predicate verb.

In the system of Tatar paremias, repetitions, antonyms, synonyms are widely used to support structural and semantic relations along with grammatical means (affixes of belonging, indicators of negation); syntactic parallelism, semantic contraction, ellipsis, etc. The syntactic structure of the paremias is fixed by rhythmic organization, rhyme and euphony.

However, it should be noted that it is not always easy to find complete equivalents with metonymic hyphens for different-structured proverbs. It was especially difficult to find English paremias of a metonymic nature, since they are characterized by a number of features: 1) indefinitely personal and impersonal proverbs without a subject are characteristic only of the Russian language (rarely Tatar); the same content can be designed grammatically in different ways: in some cases, the subject is represented in the sentence in the form of the subject: *Hunger is the best sauce*, in others — the subject is outside the sentence. English paremias are more homogeneous: *Appetite comes with eating*.

The scientific novelty and theoretical significance of the study lies in the fact that for the first time it considers metonymic paremias in three languages (Russian, English and Tatar), identifies the features and differences in different linguistic aspects.

REFERENCES

- Arutyunova Nina (ed.). "Metonimiya". *Yazykoznanie. Bol'shoj enciklopedicheskij slovar'*. Moskva: Bol'shaya Rossijskaya enciklopediya, 2000.
- Dal' Vladimir. *Posloviy russkogo naroda*. Moskva: NNN, 1994.
- Gibbs Raymond. "Speaking and Thinking with Metonymy". K-U Panther & G. Radden. *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999: 61–76.
- Isanbet Naki. *Tatar halik mekal' lere*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2010.
- Jakobson Roman. "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles". Dirven René, Pörrings Ralf (eds.). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1956: 41–48.
- Lakoff George, Johnson Mark. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Langacker Ronald. *Metonymy in Grammar. Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009: 40–59.
- Mahmutov Huziahmet. *Aforisticheskie zhanry tatarskogo fol'klora*. DOKtorskaya dissertaciya. Kazan', 1995.
- Mieder Wolfgang. *Proverbs: A Handbook*. London: Greenwood Press, 2004.
- Norrick Neal. *How Proverbs Mean? Semantic Studies in English Proverbs*. Amsterdam: Mouton, 1985.
- Permyakov Grigorij. *Ot pogovorki do skazki (Zametki po obshchej teorii klishe)*. Moskva: Nauka, 1970.
- Potebnya Aleksandr. *Iz lekcij po teorii slovesnosti. Basnya. Poslovica. Pogovorka*. Moskva: Krasand, 2011.

Индира Тухватулина, Фирдаус Вагапова

СИНТАКСА МЕТОНИМИЈСКИХ ПАРЕМИЈА
У ЕНГЛЕСКОМ, РУСКОМ И ТАТАРСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

Метонимијске изреке и пословице су најмање изучени део модерне паремиологије. Актуелност овог рада је повезана с растућим интересовањем за источне и европске језике, као и за интеркултуролошку комуникацију, будући да проучавање паремиологије језика различитих структура повећава ефикасност изучавања лексичко-семантичке и морфолошке структуре језика, али и доприноси богаћењу лингвистичког и културолошког знања, које осликава историјски одређен начин живота различитих народа. Циљ рада јесте анализа и класификација главних лексичких и граматичких обележја пословица и изрека метонимијске природе у три језика: енглеском, руском и татарском.

Кључне речи: паремија, метонимија, пословице, изреке, проучавање, образовање.