

An aerial photograph of Kazan, Russia, showing the Kazan Cathedral and the Spasskaya Tower. The image is overlaid with a semi-transparent yellow rectangle containing the title text. The background is a mix of blue and green tones, suggesting a clear sky and lush vegetation.

**Linguistic means of
expression in proverbs of
Tatar, Russian, Turkish**

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSION IN PROVERBS OF TATAR, RUSSIAN, TURKISH

MEDIOS LINGÜÍSTICOS DE EXPRESIÓN EN PROVERBIOS DE TÁRTARO, RUSO, TURCO

ABSTRACT

Literary and linguistic means of expressiveness adorn proverbs, and help to disclose the semantic meaning that lies in these works of oral folk art. This article attempts to compare literary and linguistic means of expressiveness in Tatar, Russian and Turkish proverbs. In the process of studying the proverbs about language, natural phenomena, relations between people, wealth and poverty, and others, the authors compared them in terms of using literary and linguistic means of expressiveness in them. The proverbs of all three languages revealed the use of comparisons, although this device is used more often in Tatar and Russian. In the proverbs of the Tatar and the Russian languages, comparison is often commented on, the antonyms are used to compare. In Russian proverbs, comparison was built with the help of conjunctions “как” (“like”), “что”, “ровно” (“just like”), “словно” (“as if”); expressed by instrumental case; by means of syntactic parallelism. There were non-conjunctive and negative comparisons. There were less common in Turkish proverbs than in Tatar and Russian. In this language, comparisons were expressed by syntactic parallelism, by the form of ablative case -tan / -dan, the form of negation, the intonation of opposition, the nominal predicate, as well as the non-conjunctive forms of negation. The use of different forms of the verb was characteristic for the Tatar, the Russian and the Turkish languages. In all three languages metaphors, personifications, and synecdoche were the favorite proverbial devices.

KEYWORDS: the Tatar language, the Russian language, the Turkish language, proverbs, literary devices, linguistic means, devices, linguistic means.

Copyright © Revista San Gregorio 2017. eISSN: 2528-7907 ©

RESUMEN

Los medios de expresividad literarios y lingüísticos adornan proverbios y ayudan a revelar el significado semántico que se encuentra en estas obras de arte popular oral. Este artículo intenta comparar medios literarios y lingüísticos de expresividad en proverbios tártaros, rusos y turcos. En el proceso de estudiar los proverbios sobre el lenguaje, los fenómenos naturales, las relaciones entre las personas, la riqueza y la pobreza, y otros, los autores los compararon en términos de usar medios literarios y lingüísticos de expresividad en ellos. Los proverbios de los tres idiomas revelaron el uso de comparaciones, aunque este dispositivo se usa con mayor frecuencia en tártaro y ruso. En los proverbios de las lenguas tártara y rusa, a menudo se comenta la comparación, los antónimos se usan para comparar. En los proverbios rusos, la comparación se construyó con la ayuda de las conjunciones “как” (“me gusta”), “что”, “ровно” (“al igual que”), “словно” (“como si”); expresado por caso instrumental; mediante el paralelismo sintáctico. Hubo comparaciones no conjuntivas y negativas. Las comparaciones fueron menos comunes en los proverbios turcos que en tártaro y ruso. En este lenguaje, las comparaciones se expresaban mediante el paralelismo sintáctico, la forma de ablative case -tan / -dan, la forma de negación, la entonación de la oposición, el predicado nominal, así como las formas no conjuntas de negación. El uso de diferentes formas del verbo fue característico de las lenguas tártara, rusa y turca. En los tres idiomas, las metáforas, las personificaciones y la sinécdoque fueron los dispositivos proverbiales favoritos.

PALABRAS CLAVE: el idioma tártaro, el idioma ruso, el idioma turco, proverbios, dispositivos literarios, medios lingüísticos.

Copyright © Revista San Gregorio 2017. eISSN: 2528-7907 ©



DAMIR H. HUSNUTDINOV



Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation



domer1982@mail.ru



LILIYA M. GINIYATULLINA



Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation



SHUKRU HALUK AKALIN



Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.



RAMILA K. SAGDIEVA



Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation

ARTÍCULO RECIBIDO: 20 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2017

ARTÍCULO ACEPTADO PARA PUBLICACIÓN: 25 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2017

ARTÍCULO PUBLICADO: 31 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2017

1. INTRODUCTION

Proverbs and sayings are recognized as the oldest genres of oral folk art. All the peoples of the world have these kinds of folklore, and the peoples who lived even before our era are not an exception. The Tatar language, as any other language of the world, contain set expressions, that is, proverbs. A certain stylistic function is assigned to them.

A. Karimullin in his work “Татар фольклоры. Аннотация лэнгэн дэбият күрсәткече: 1612-1981” (“Tatar Folklore. Annotated Index of Literature: 1612-1981”) pointed out the first printed source on Tatar folklore [Karimullin, 1993]. This is “Грамматика кыпчакского языка и словарь” (“Grammar of the Kipchak Language and the Dictionary”) by Hieronymus Megisser, published in 1612 in Leipzig [Megiseri, 1612]. This book contains more than 220 proverbs and sayings.

University scholars Karl Fuchs, I. Berezin, V.V. Radlov, N.F. Katanov and others made a great contribution to the collection and study of works of folk art. In the 19th century, Tatar folklore studies began to develop as a separate science. And this is connected with the name of Kayum Nasyiri.

The earliest ancient Russian monuments of literature have delivered information about the existence of proverbs and sayings from ancestors. “The Tale of Bygone Years”, an ancient chronicle, records a number of proverbs: “Не идет место к голове, а голова к месту”, “Мир стоит дорати, а рать домира”, “Не погнет щипчел – меду не едать” [Nikitin, 2005] and others.

Turkish folklore is rich in proverbs and sayings, which have been collected since the middle of the 19th century in Turkey itself. The Turkey proverbs and sayings have the characteristic name аталар сөзү (the word of ancestors). Ancient Turkish proverbs represent a

reflection of the state of society. Psychology, world outlook of peoples, national character, which had been formed by the described period, are mirrored in proverbs.

Turkish folklore has been so far poorly studied. The first scholar who undertook investigation of it was Russian scholar V.V. Maksimov (the middle of the 19th century). It is also worth listing the names of the following scientists who contributed to the further study of Turkish folklore: M. Kunosh (Hungarian scholar), V.D. Smirnov, V.A. Gordlevsky (Russian scholars), F. Gize (German scholar).

This study is aimed at a comparative study of the use of artistic means in Tatar, Russian and Turkish proverbs.

Despite the fact that in linguistics in this direction there is a large arsenal of works [Anikin, 1976; Akhmedshina, 2000; Makhmutov, 1995 and many others], there remains a number of unresolved problems requiring a detailed investigation in the scientific aspect. The relevance of this topic is determined by the fact that a comparative study of the use of literary devices in Tatar, Russian and Turkish proverbs will be a definite contribution to the international classification of proverbs.

In Tatar, Russian and Turkish, the proverbs are an expression of folk wisdom. It should be noted that the spheres of life and the situations that are reflected in proverbs are similar in all languages under our consideration.

METHODS

We used the following methods. The method of analysis and synthesis allowed us to carry out a logical study of the collected facts, to work out concepts and judgments, to make inferences and theoretical generalizations. The method of comparison was used to compare proverbs in the three chosen languages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

When comparing the proverbs of the three languages, the authors revealed the use of literary devices and linguistic means such as comparison, metaphor, personification, set epithets, the use of proper names in the meaning of common nouns. In the proverbs of the Tatar and the Russian languages, comparison is often commented, antonyms are used for comparison, the use of different forms of the verb is characteristic. It is revealed: proverbs

of all three languages are diverse in form of expression.

Folkloric works should quickly influence human mind, feelings. That is why, they very actively use all kinds of literary device sin Tatar, Russian, and Turkish. The proverbs, as is customary, narrate something abstract, but each of them reflect a certain good quality: diligence, intelligence, wit, education, etc. Or, on the contrary, they condemn negative qualities: laziness, stupidity, rudeness, etc.

As a rule, complex concepts, feelings and specific, visible images are contrasted in the proverbs. This explains the frequent use of comparisons in proverbs. They are revealed in Tatar, and in Russian and Turkish.

Let us provide illustrations which express witticism of words, tongue:

In Tatar: Усалтелкышкебек,
яхшытелязкебек.

In Russian: Язык не стрела, а пуще стрелы.

In Turkish: Dilkılıçtankeskindir.

It should be noted that the Tatar and the Russian languages are richer in comparisons. Comparisons in proverbs have a variety of forms.

In the Tatar language, comparison is more often expressed by postposition кебек; the affix, forming adverbs -дай/-дәй, -тай/-тәй [Shakirova et al., 2016]; the affix of the ablative case -дан/-дән, -тан/-тән, -нан/-нән; an auxiliary verb булып; syntactic parallelism; the form of negation; the contrasting intonation, nominal predicate.

The following proverbs can be offered as an example: Тышы гөл кебек, эче көл кебек. Күрше тавыгы каз кебек, йомыркасы баз кебек. Аяз көнне яшен суккандай. Бар чагында – бүредәй, юк чагында – шүредәй. Бала баласы балдан татлы. Исереккә дингез тубыктан. Дус – акчадан кыйммәт. Күрше тавыгы күркә булып күренә. Дошман, кырмыска булса, фил булып күренер. Вақыт комны ташка, ташны комга әйләндерә. Авыр тормыш тилмертә, жиңел тормыш тилертә. Авызыңны ач та айны әйт, күзеңне ач та көнне әйт. Бурдан кала, уттан калмый. Көчәң белән мактанма, акылың белән мактан. Агач

күрке – яфрак, адәм күрке – чүпрәк. Авыл башы – манара, акыл башы – замана. Тышы мамык, эче кабык. Вақыт белән якут табып була, якут белән вақыт табып булмый [Isanbat, 1959]

The comparisons in proverbs are sometimes commented:

Заман кош кебек: очып киткәч, кире кайтмый. Ярлының бер яман чир: әдәпләне үтермәс, үтерсә дә көлдермәс [Isanbat, 1959].

In Russian proverbs the comparison is built with the help of the conjunctions “как”, “что”, “ровно”, “словно” (“like”, “as though”, “exactly like”, “as if”), is expressed by instrumental case; syntactic parallelism. Non-conjunctive and negative comparisons are fixed.

For example: Богатый в деньгах – чтомышь в крупях. Вертится, словно на ежа сел. Сердце петухом запело. У рака мощь в клеще, а у богача – в мешке. Чужая душа – темный лес. Наше счастье – вода в бредне. Не в бровь, а прямо в глаз [Anikin, 1976].

The Russian proverbs, as well as the Tatar ones, often comment comparison: Горь – что море: непереплыть, невыпить. В народе, что в туче: в грозу все наружу выйдет. Счастье – не палка, вруки не возьмешь [Anikin, 1976].

The proverbs may contain two or more comparisons at one and the same time.

In Tatar: Бауның озыны, сүзнең кыскасы яхшы. Ай кебек калыкты, кояш кебек балкыды.

In Russian: Молодец – что орел, а ума что у тетерева. На словах – что на гусях, а на деле – что на балалайке [Anikin, 1976].

We must admit that antonyms are used for comparing in Tatar and Russian [Husnutdinov, 2015]

In Tatar: Башланган эш – беткән эш.

In Russian: Хороша веревка длинная, речь короткая.

It has been already mentioned above, in Turkish proverbs comparison is less frequent than in Tatar and Russian proverbs. It is ex-

pressed by syntactic parallelism, the form of ablative case -tan/-dan, the form of negation, intonation of contrasting, nominal predicate. There are also non-conjunctive forms of negation.

Aldatmak alçaklık, aldanmak ahmaklık. Az uyku, az yemek insanı eder melek, çok uyku, çok yemek insanı eder helak. Çirkin karı evini toparlar, güzel karı düğün (sokak) gezer. Aç kalmak borçlu olmaktan iyidir. Arif düşman ahmak dosttan daha iyidir. Bugünkü tavuk yarınki kazdan iyidir. Acıkmış kudurmuş-tan beterdir. Adamın yüzü değil, özü güzel olsun. Gece gözü – kör gözü. Bekârlık mas-karalık. Ağaç sevgisi olmayanda evlat sevgisi olmaz. Muhabbet özge halattır, giriftar olma-yan bilmez. Namussuz yaşamaktansa namus-lu ölmek yeğdir. Vakit nakittir. Borç en kötü yoksulluktur. Rüya boş gezenlerin sermayesi-dir. Sağlık varlıktan yeğdir. Bir çocuktan bir deliden al haberi [Ömer Asım Aksoy, 1994].

There are the proverbs where comparison is expressed by antonymy and antithesis.

İnsan yedisinde ne ise yetmişinde de odur. Aşık ile delinin farkı biri gülmez biri ağlamaz imiş[Ömer Asım Aksoy, 1994].

Comparisons are sometimes commented, as well as in Tatar and Russian. Aşkbirderyadır, dalmayanbilmez.

“The proverbs of all three languages under study are diverse in form of expression. In Russian proverbs, it is often built on indirect speech (Велика святая русская земля, авездесолнышко), monologue (Излука – немы, изпищали – не мы, аопить дапопаясать против нас несыскать), dialogue (Тит, подимолотить! – Брюхоболит. – Тит, подивинопить! – Ох, дайоблокочусь дакак-нибудь доволокусь)” [Zueva, 2002].

In Tatar proverbs: indirect speech (Буяучыдан: «Кайсытәснәбигрәксәясең?» – дигәнгә, – «Алтынсарысыбеләнкөмешагын», – дигән. Кыш көне эт тә: «Жәйгә чыксам сөяктән сарай салыр идем», – дип әйтер, ди.)

In Turkish proverbs: indirect speech (Devekuşuna «yükgötür» demişler, «benkuşum» demiş. «Uç» demişler «deve uçar mı?» demiş. Tembел «kudretim yok» der.) [Ömer Asım Aksoy, 1994].

From the point of view of syntactic structure, the proverbs are often simple sentence: Азыклы ат арымас. Острый язык змею из гнезда выманит. Ağrısız baş yastık istemez. Adam adamı bir defa aldatır, orasyndetic compound: Абзар сатып алма, күрше сатып ал. Кончил дело - гуляй смело. Akılsız başa devlet konmaz, konya bile çok durmaz. Akıllı düşününceye kadar deli oğlunu everir. Akıllı babanın akılsız oğlu olur. Akıl olmayınca ne yapsın sakal? Ağladım başaramadım, güldüm günümü geçirdim.

In the Russian there are fixed the proverbs built with the help of the adversative conjunction “а”: На языке медок, а на сердце ледок.

In the Tatar language there are a lot of proverbs, which are a compound sentence of a synthetic type in their composition: Ай яктыртканда, йолдыз күренми.

In all three languages studied, metaphors, personifications are often used as art devices.

In Tatar: Дәрәслек утта да янмый, суда да батмый. Ярлы кеше акчасы, торна булып кычкыра. Кесәдә жил сызгыра.

In Russian: Правда в огне не горит и в воде не тонет. Хмель шумит - ум молчит. В кармане соловьи свищут.

In Turkish: Yalancı topaldan kolay tutulur. Para isteme benden, buz gibi soğurum senden. Şeytan paranın bulunduğu yerdedir.

In Russian proverbs, proper names are often used in the meaning of common nouns. The names are used for the rhyme, and sometimes quite recognizable figures. For example, a man who chatters incessantly is associated with the name of Emelya. Often frequent are the names, such as Makar, Ivan.

The use of different forms of the verb is characteristic of The Tatar, the Russian and the Turkish languages [Husnutdinov, 2016; Yusupov, 2015].

Акыллыатынмактар, юләрхатынынмактар, шыртилеузенмактар (Future Indefinite Tense). Акыллыдошманнанкурыкма, ахмакдустанкурык (Imperative Form). Ачхәлентукбелмәс (Infinitive). Алдыңаберкарасаң, артыңабишкара [Isanbat,

1959] (Conditional Form, Imperative Mood) as soon.

Кто рано встает, тому Бог подает (PresentTense). Бог дал, Бог и взял (PastTense). Скажиктотвойдруг, ияскажуктоты (ImperativeMood, FutureTense) and others.

Tatlı dil çok adam aldatır. (Future Tense). Yüz dinle, bin düşün, birkonuş (Imperative Mood) Allah güle güle verdirsin, ağlaya ağlaya istetmesin(Imperative Mood) and so on.

In the Tatar and the Turkish languages there are often antonymous pairs:

Акка кара белән язылган. Акка кара тиз йога. Аяз көнне бар, болытлы көнне юк. Аяз-аяз көннәрдә жиләк жыяр аппагым, болыт-болыт көннәрдә урак урыр аппагым. Зур күтәрәп бәләкәй суккан.

Ак акча karagüniçindir. Azsöyle, çokdinle.

In the proverbs of all the languages under study, there are a lot of fixed images of animal and birds, which are used to denote the nature of people, their relationships:

Аптыраган үрдәк арты белән чума ди. Узеңә тимәгән елан мең яшәсен. Аерылганны аю ашар, бүленгәнне бүре ашар.

Спит лиса, а во сне кур щиплет. Пожалел волк кобылу: оставил хвост да гриву. Не велик кулик, а все-таки птица. От вороны павы не жди.

Irmaktan geçerken at değiştirilmez. Bir taşla iki kuş vurmak. Balık baştan kokar. Öküz altında buzağı aranmaz. Havlayan köpek ısırmaz. Vakitsiz öten horozun başını keserler. Eşek hoşaftan ne anlar (anlamaz). Kuzguna yavrusu şahin görünür

In Russian proverbs, there are very often set epithets (evaluative or pictorial): Великасыяторусскаяземля; МатушкаМосквабелокаменная.

Various forms of tautology are used: homonymous(Здоровомувсездорово; Играйданезаигривайся), synonymous (Изогнядавполымя; Изпустоговпорожнее) [Zueva, 2002]. In the proverbs of the other two languages, they are not fixed.

SUMMARY

It can be concluded that figurative characteristics in all three languages are very close but have often a national character. When studying the proverbs of different nations, this fact must be taken into account. In comparative study of the proverbs, similarities and differences are found constantly. It follows from this that one cannot translate the proverbs literally and understand their meaning, but it is necessary to look for the equivalents.

The proverbs of Russian, Tatar and Turkish express the wisdom of the people, one can find a historical memory in them. This is a set of life rules, people's philosophy. They reflect all spheres of life and situation.

We have studied and compared the proverbs of the Tatar, the Russian and the Turkish languages and have drawn certain conclusions: the proverbs in all three languages are rich in artistic devices, but in Russian and Tatar, comparisons are used more frequent in different forms and variants, and the Turkish language is stingy for vivid and emotional comparisons, it is more laconic, strict and restrained.

CONCLUSION

The proverbs of every people is the wealth of the nation. They are not literally translated into other languages, since every word of the proverb has a certain meaning, peculiar only to a given language. One must recognize the fact that proverbs express the thoughts figuratively and emotionally, bearing at the same time the imprint of a unique national color for rendering of which the artistic devices and the means of language are actively used.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Каримуллин А.Г. Татар фольклоры: Аннотациялэнгән әдәбият күрсәткече: (1612-1981). – Казан, 1993.
2. Megiseri H. Institutionum linguae Turcicae: Liber primus: Seu Isagoges Grammaticae Turcicae / H. Megiseri – Leipzig, 1612. – 258 p.
3. Nikitin A. The Tale of Bygone Years as a Hystorical Source. – M.: Sputnik, 2005.
4. Anikin V.P. On Logic-Semiotic Classification of the Proverbs and Sayings // Russian Folklore, вып. Issue 16. The Historical Life of Popular Poetry. L., 1976. – P.263-279.
5. Akhmedshina A.R. Semantics of Tatar Proverbs (in Comparison with Russian and French Proverbs). The Author's Thesis for Candidate of Philological Sciences. – Kazan, 2000.
6. Makhmutov Kh.Sh. Gnomical Genres of Tatar Folklore. Dissertation in the Form of a Paper for Doctor of Philology. – Kazan, 1995.
7. Shakirova G.R., Kharisova C.M., Kharisov F.F. The development of language competence of students in the study of native language morphology // Journal of Language and Literature, ISSN:2078-0303, Vol. 7. No.1. February, 2016. pp. 227-230
8. Shakirova G.R., Kharisova C.M., Kharisov F.F. Methodical support of teaching of parts of speech in teaching of the native language // Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. – 2016. - Special Issue, pp. 155-160.
9. Исәнбәт Н. Татар халык мәкаләләре. III томда.- Т.И.- Казан. – 1959.
10. Husnutdinov D.H. Functional and semantic of tatar language verbal sinlexis // JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. - Baku, Azerbaijan, - №6 - May, 2015. - P. 348-350
11. Ömer Asım Aksoy. Ata sözleri ve deyimler sözlüğü. Deyimler sözlüğü. 2. İstanbul, İnkilap kitap evi, 1994. – 1205 s
12. Zueva T.V., Kirdan B.P Russian Folklore: Textbook for Higher Educational Establishments. – M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2002.
13. Husnutdinov D.H, Sagdieva R.K, Mirzagitov R.H., Comparative constructions in G. Ibragimov's works//Journal of Language and Literature. - 2016. - Vol.7, Is.4. - P.42-45.
14. Yusupov R.A., Aidarova S.H., Sagdieva R.K, Harisova G.F. Improving efficiency of teaching the Tatar language to a foreign audience. International Education Studies. 2015. V.8.№5. P. 158-164.

