

**SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH WORKS DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF
PROVERBS IN RELATED AND NON-RELATED LANGUAGES**

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7559199>



ELSEVIER



Izbosarova Xulkar Alisher qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Master's Degree, Linguistics(English), 1st year



Abstract: This article deals with the proverbs as one of the types of the phraseological units of a language and analysis of the research works devoted to the study of proverbs in the related and unrelated languages. There are two approaches as to composition of the phraseology as a linguistic science and this paper shares opinions and definitions from various linguists.

Keywords: proverbs, reproducibility, idiomaticity, phraseology, phraseological units, saying, expressions, semantic function, words

About: FARS Publishers has been established with the aim of spreading quality scientific information to the research community throughout the universe. Open Access process eliminates the barriers associated with the older publication models, thus matching up with the rapidity of the twenty-first century.

Received: 21-01-2023

Accepted: 22-01-2023

Published: 22-01-2023

Proverbs as one of the types of the phraseological units

A proverb is a short familiar epigrammatic saying expressing popular wisdom, a truth or a moral lesson in a concise and imaginative way. Proverbs have much in common with phraseological units, because their lexical components are also constant, their meaning is traditional and mostly figurative, and they are introduced into speech ready-made.

Reproducibility is regular use of phraseological units in speech as single unchangeable collocations.

Idiomaticity is the quality of phraseological unit, when the meaning of the whole is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the parts.

Stability of a phraseological unit implies that it exists as a ready-made linguistic unit which does not allow of any variability of its lexical components of grammatical structure.

Phraseology or a linguistic science came into being between the 50-ies and 70-ies of the 20th century. At present, it is considered to be as a separate linguistic science which has its own object and subject, its own methods of research.

In lexicology there is great ambiguity of the terms phraseology and idioms. Opinions differ as to how phraseology should be defined, classified, described and analysed. The word "phraseology has very different meanings in our country and in Great Britain or the United States, In linguistic literature the term is used for the expressions where the meaning of one element is dependent on the other, irrespective of the structure and properties of the unit (V.V. Vinogradov); with other authors it denotes only such set expressions which do not possess

expressiveness or emotional colouring (A.I. Smirnitsky), and also vice versa: only those that are imaginative, expressive and emotional (I.V. Arnold). N.N. Amosova calls such expressions fixed context units, i.e. units in which it is impossible to substitute any of the components without changing the meaning not only of the whole unit but also of the elements that remain intact. O.S. Ahmanova insists on the semantic integrity of such phrases prevailing over the structural separateness of their elements. A.V. Koonin lays stress on the structural separateness of the elements in a phraseological unit, on the change of meaning in the whole as compared with its elements taken separately and on a certain minimum stability.

In English and American linguistics no special branch of study exists, and the term "phraseology" has a stylistic meaning, according to Webster's dictionary 'mode of expression, peculiarities of diction, i.e. choice and arrangement of words and phrases characteristic of some author or some literary work'.

There are two approaches as to composition of the phraseology as a linguistic science: 1) narrow approach and wide approach [Koonin 1986: 25-26].

A.I. Smirnitskiy and N.N. Amosova are the supporters of the narrow composition of phraseology. N.N. Amosova thought that phraseological units and words are equivalents to each other and they both have lexical meaning and they nominate some object or phenomenon. But proverbs and sayings are the units of communication, therefore they cannot belong to phraseology as its object [Amosova 1963: 143-144].

A.I. Smirnitskiy also shared this opinion and considered that there should be equivalency between a phraseological unit and word. [Смирницкий 1956]. But the majority of the scholars who carried out researches in the field of phraseology are the supporters of the wide composition of phraseology. V.V. Vinogradov considers that proverbs should be studied as its object within phraseology [Виноградов 1977:133].

S.G. Gavrin is also a supporter of the wide volume of the composition of the phraseology. He approaches to the phraseological system of a language from the viewpoint of the functional-semantic complicativeness and includes all the proverbs and sayings in the volume of the phraseology. A.V. Koonin in his several research works and books on phraseology he devotes to the proverbs and sayings a special chapter naming them as communicative phraseological units [Koonin 1970, 1986, 1996].

The analysis of the linguistic literature on phraseology shows that majority of the scholars who are engaged in the research of phraseological problems of different languages. [Телия 1966, Шанский 1964, Арнольд 1966, Чернищева 1964 and etc.].

It is very interesting I.V. Arnold's opinion on this matter. Grounding her opinion about the wide volume of phraseology Arnold notes that proverbs should be studied within phraseology as its part and parcel and stresses: "another reason why proverbs must be taken into consideration together with set-expressions is that they often formed the basis of set expressions. E.g. the last straw breaks the camels back"; the last straw; a drawing man will clutch at a straw; clutch at a straw, it is useless to lock the stable door when the steed is stolen: lock the stable door" to take precautions when the accident they are meant to prevent has already happened". [Arnold 1986: 179-180]

"Proverbs are structurally and semantically completed laconic folk dicta in the cliché - like paradigmatic form having imaginary-poetic, allegorical and edifying character". [Bakirov 2007: 38-39]

Professor I.R. Galperin gives the following definition to proverbs: "Proverbs are brief statements showing in condensed format the accumulated life experience of the community and serving as conventional practical symbols for abstract ideas. They are usually didactic and image-bearing. Many of the through frequency of repetition became polished and wrought into verse-like shape, i.e., they have meter rhyme and alliteration [Galperin 1971: 179].

Phraseological units are considered as rich sources of social-historical information [Mamatov A.E., 1999: 53]. That's why their formation closely deals with extra-linguistic factors. Such units are able to reflect nature of any place, economic and social conditions and culture of a definite nation, history, way of living, folk art, literature, art, science, traditions, customs which are passed from generation to generation. The semantic or meaningful essence of idioms is a huge store of knowledge, which turns to be topical and is disclosed in the process of communication thus giving a chance to a reader/listener to comprehend the meaning of this or that phraseological unit. For example, let's analyze the English idiom Damon and Pythias, which means "very close friends", "good friends". When we call two friends by this expression we mean that they are very close and faithful to each other. In the Uzbek language such friends are called by a similar expression: *иккаласи бир тешикка тупуради*. But this idiom belongs to a colloquial style and can't be used in literary or official style.

Difference in terminology ("set-phrases", "idioms", "word-equivalents") reflects certain differences in the main criteria used to distinguish types of phraseological units and free word-groups. The term "set phrase" implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups.

The term "idiom" generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units is idiomaticity or lack of motivation.

The term "word-equivalent" stresses not only semantic but also functional inseparability of certain word groups, their aptness to function in speech as single words.

The essential features of phraseological units are: a) lack of semantic motivation; b) lexical and grammatical stability. As far as semantic motivation is concerned phraseological units are extremely varied from motivated (by simple addition of denotational meaning) like a sight for sore eyes and to know the ropes to partially motivated (when one of the words is used in a not direct meaning) or to demotivated (completely non-motivated) like tit for tat, red-tape.

Lexical and grammatical stability of phraseological units is displayed in the fact that no substitution of any elements whatever is possible in the following stereotyped (unchangeable) set expressions, which differ in many other respects; all the world and his wife, red tape, calf love, heads or tails, first night, to gild the pill, to hope for the best, busy as a bee, fair and square, stuff and nonsense time and again.

In a free phrase the semantic correlative ties are fundamentally different. The information is additive and each element has a much greater semantic independence where each component may be substituted without affecting the meaning of the other: cut bread, cut cheese, eat bread. Information is additive in the sense that the amount of information we had on receiving the first signal, i.e. having heard or read the word cut, is increased, the listener obtains further details and learns what is cut. The reference of cut is unchanged. Every notional word can form additional syntactic ties with other words outside the expression. In a set expression information furnished by each element is not additive: actually it does not exist before we get the whole. No substitution for either cut or figure can be made without completely ruining the following: I had an uneasy fear that he might cut a poor figure beside all these clever Russian officers (Shaw). He was not managing to cut much of a figure (Murdoch). The only substitution admissible for the expression cut a poor figure concerns the adjective.

About some theoretical bases of comparative-typological researches of the proverbs in the related and non-related languages

Studying the scientific literature on comparative linguistics shows that there exist different points of view on the tasks of this linguistic discipline. Some linguistics such as Akhmanova and others think that comparative linguistics should reveal isomorphic and allomorphic features between the compared languages [Akhmanova and others 1972:48; Abdurazzokov 1973:5].

But some other scholars look at this problem differently and think that the task of the comparative linguistics is to describe not only similarities and differences between the languages revealing their casual relationships [Avramov 1965:4]. The

third group of linguists come to the opinion that comparative linguistics should only establish differences between the languages being compared [Reformatskiy 1962: 25, Ladoga 1964:24].

According to B.L.Wharf, comparative linguistics is engaged in researching the most important differences in the languages, that is in grammar, logic and etc. [Wharf 1960:192].

The origin of Uzbek proverb according to Ibrahim and Ibrahim (2012) is derived from the interaction of traders of old that made the Uzbek people of that time get proverbs from their types of business. Apart from the fact that there have been various explanations about the origin of Uzbek proverbs, no one tells/says the exact origin, as it is as old as the language itself. But some scholars have gone to a limit in the forecast on its origin. Nevertheless, it is vital to appreciate how the Uzbek people make use of the technological elements of utterances in the language which involve wise thinking. Furthermore, this research has yielded some important results. Likewise, it is very important to get detail information on them, and the ways they could be derived are many among which includes:

- Through old people
- Through story telling
- Tracing the early historical researches.

The factors have yields vital information on the origin of Uzbek proverbs.

Comparative studying both related and unrelated languages is usually carried in the framework of the typological linguistics.

Linguistic typology (from Greak "types" - imprint, form pattern and logos - word, learning) is comparative studying both structural and functional properties of languages irrespective of their nature of genetic relations between them. Typology is one of the main aspects of studying a language together with the comparative-historic (genetic) aspect from which it differs analogical (on the essential of the characters of the research subject) and epistemological (on the sum-total of principles and research methods..." [Большой энциклопедический словарь. М.: Большой Российская энциклопедия, 2000:512].

Considerable numbers of linguistics were engaged in the comparative-typological researches. U.K.Yusupov tries to deepen by working out of the theoretical basis of the comparative linguistics and to summarize the results of numerous research works on the comparative studying of the languages [Yusupov 1980:4].

According to S.Turaqulova's opinion, it is rather complicated work to study contrasting languages belonging to the different language groups [Turaqulova 2006:20].

As to the question of the number of languages to be compared during the research the opinions differ. Dj.Buranov notes that there is not any unanimous opinion on this question. Some linguistics are the supporters of comparing of the unlimited number of languages during the research. Some others think that the number of related languages to be compared should be limited. And the third group of researchers affirm that in the linguistic typology the number of languages to be compared can be brought to the minimal number- up to two languages [Buranov 1983:14].

V.G.Gak points out that "comparative linguistics compares two languages irrespective of the degree of their relationship with the aim of finding out their similarities and differences between them" Gak 1989:7]. According to G.M.Khashimov, during the process of studying one can compare two, three or more languages [Khashimov 2002].

In an attempt to categorize proverbs in three main groups based on their form, Jamal (2012:3) states: "Proverbs fall readily into three main categories. Those of the first type take the form of abstract statements expressing general truths, such as Absence makes the heart grow fonder [...]. Proverbs of the second type, which include many of the more colorful examples, use specific observations from everyday experience to make a point which is general; for instance, you can take a horse to the river, but you can't make him drink and Don't put all your eggs in one basket. The third type of proverb comprises sayings from particular areas of traditional wisdom and folklore. In this category are found, for example, the health proverbs after dinner rest a while, after supper walk a mile [...]. In addition, there are traditional country proverbs which relate to husbandry, the seasons, and the weather, such as Red sky at night, shepherd's delight; red sky in the morning, shepherd's warning and When the wind is in the east, it is neither good for man nor beast". (Simpson/Speake 1998).

Every nation has its own national linguistic world picture which finds its representation in the structure of the language and its units such as phraseological units, proverbs, sayings and aphorisms and etc. It features for the theoretical and practical features for the comparative researches of the proverbs of the unrelated languages such as the English and Uzbek languages.

Universal and national-specific features of the proverbs as linguistic and methodological problem found its reflection in the research work done by M.Djusupov and N.B.Saparova [Djusupov, Saparova 2000:3-9].

R.U.Madjidova investigated anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages in the comparative axiological aspect and revealed their universal and culturally specific features in both languages [Madjidova 2019].

Some linguists consider that the logical-semiotics approach to the research of proverbs belongs to higher level than the level of a separate language. This approach can be as a basis for the universal classification of the proverbs because it stands higher than comparison of proverbs of separate languages and even the whole language families [Kuusi 1978:80].

P.U.Bakirov supporting the above mentioned idea, nevertheless thinks that first of all it is reasonable to study the stock of proverbs of a separate language, then carry out comparative researches of the proverbs of two or three languages, gradually increasing the number of languages to be compared [Bakirov 2007:43]. The fact is that, the proverbs of the related and unrelated languages having similarities both in the logical-semiotic and structural-grammatical plans can have considerable differences in their linguacultural features. Here are some examples of the proverbs of the non-related languages which are similar in the logical semiotic basis, but have nationally specific peculiarities in their image-bearing basis:

I. English proverbs:

1. He who has been bitten by a serpent I afraid of a rope.
2. Whom a serpent has bitten, a lizard alarms.
3. A burnt child dreads the fire.

II. Uzbek proverbs:

1. Ilon chaqqan ola arqondan qo'rqr.
2. Sutdan og'zi kuygan qatiqni ham puflab I hardly.

III. Russian proverbs:

1. Умалённый змеей верёвки боится.
2. Пугакая ворона куста боится.
3. Обжегшись на молоке, дуют на воду.

All the above-given proverbs denote one and the same situation: "He that suffered by careless treating some object or because of his wrong action, will be very careful in such situations next time.

Thus we can come to the conclusion that generalized meanings of the above mentioned proverbs of the unrelated languages are very close to each other, but the images underlying on the basis of the proverbs are culturally marked depending on the style of life of the nation, traditions, customs and mentality of a nation. So one can come to the conclusion that proverbs of the world languages combine universal and particular peculiarities which should be taken into account during comparative-typological researches of the proverbs of various languages.

Conclusion

Phraseology as a linguistic science came into being between the 50-ies and 60-ies of the 20th century. The founder of phraseology is considered Ch.Bally, a Swiss linguist who was the first scholar to classify word combinations in his linguistic

research works. Further V.V.Vinogradov's works on set Phrases who developed Ch.Bally's ideas gave a strong push to the development of phraseology as a linguistic science having its own object and subject, its own methods of research.

A.I.Smirnitskiy and N.N.Amosova are the supporters of the narrow composition of phraseology. They both considered that phraseological units and words are equivalents to each other. But the majority of the scholars who are engaged in the research in the field of phraseology such as V.V.Vinogradov, S.G.Gavrin, A.V.Koonin, V.N.Teliya, K.M.Shanskiy, I.V.Arnold, I.I.Chernisheva and others are the supporters of the wide volume of the composition of phraseology of different languages.

A.V.Koonin in his research works and books devoted to phraseology criticized those scholars who are against including proverbs and sayings in the volume of phraseology. In a number of his scientific works and books on phraseology he devotes to the English proverbs and sayings a special chapter naming them as communicative phraseological units.

At present there exist a lot of research works in which proverbs are investigated from the linguistic points of view. As examples one can mention the research works by Bakirov U.P., Madjidova R.U, Djusupov M, Tadjibaeva R.D and others. Such research works help to reveal the general peculiarities and nationally specific features of the proverbs of the different languages.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка (The English Word): Пособие для студентов английских и отделений педагогических институтов, М.-Л.,- (pages 145-180), 1970.
2. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка (The English Word): Пособие для студентов английских и отделений педагогических институтов, М.-Л., Просвещение, 1966- (pages 11-48)
3. Akhmanova O.S. at al. Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics. M., 1972
4. Ashurova D.U, Galieva M.R. Cultural linguistics. "Vneshinvestprom". Tashkent, 2019
5. Большой энциклопедический Словарь. В.Н. Ярцева. – М.: Большая Российская Энциклопедия, 2000
6. Буранов Дж. Сравнительная типология английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, 1983
7. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. Higher School Publishing House: Moscow, 1971
8. Кунин А.В. Фразеологии современного английского языка, Издательство "Международные отношения", Москва 1972.

9. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка, Дубна, Издательский центр «Феникс», 1996, Издание второе, переработанное
10. Кунин А.В. Англо-Русский Фразеологический Словарь. 4-е изд. перераб. и доп. М, «Русский язык», 1984
11. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка,
12. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. М., 2001
13. Маслова В.А. Современное направление в лингвистике, Москва. Изд. Центр "Академия", 2008 Москва "Высшая школа", 1986.
14. Mamatov A.E. Problems of the formation of Uzbek phrases: Abstract of Doctoral diss. - Tashkent, 1999. - 56 p.
15. Юсупов У.К. Проблемы сопоставительной лингвистики. - Ташкент: Фан, 1980