



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

SEMINARIO BRASIL
AS REPRESENTAÇÕES SOCIAIS NO CONTEXTO DO BRASIL

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Número Especial Octubre / Diciembre

2019

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Ruropa del Este

Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Sr. Felipe Maximiliano Estay Guerrero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Rosario Castro López

Universidad de Córdoba, España

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Per

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas

Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia

Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López

Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo

Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques

Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez

Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec

Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía

Santiago – Chile

Representante Legal

Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

PROVERBS WITH THE COMPONENT “DWELLING” IN TATAR, RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH

Dr. Liliya Mukharlyamova

Kazan Federal University, Russia
mega.sppa@mail.ru

Dr. Assiya Sulkarnayeva

Kazakhstan Branch of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia
mukharlyamova@mail.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 09 de junio de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 19 de junio de 2019

Fecha de Aceptación: 28 de agosto de 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 25 de septiembre 2019

Abstract

Proverbs and sayings express a certain pattern of everyday or moral plan, which is based on certain concepts and areas of their interaction, information about the culture of the ethnos (characterize important moments of the history of the people, assess the meaning of life, and convey the customs and traditions of the speakers of a particular language). They reflect the features of relationships between people, the socio-historical context, and particularities of life, customs and traditions as well. In this article, an attempt is made to consider proverbs and sayings with the component “dwelling” in the Tatar, Russian and English languages. According to the analysis, the most frequent tokens expressing the semantics of “dwelling” were found: “oy” and “yort” – in the paroemiological fund of the Tatar language, in Russian it is the lexeme “house”, and in the proverbial fund of the English language it is the lexical unit “home”. Also, the proverbs were considered from the point of view of the expressed meanings, and it was determined that in all three difference-structured languages, there were paroemias with the values “home-residence”, “family”, “native land”, “human characteristics”, and “counseling-instruction”.

Keywords

Proverb – Paroemia – Tatar language – Russian language – English language

Para Citar este Artículo:

Mukharlyamova, Liliya y Sulkarnayeva, Assiya. Proverbs with the component “Dwelling” in Tatar, russian and english. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 6 num Especial (2019): 759-765.

Introduction

Paroemiological fund helps to express a certain pattern of everyday or moral plan, which is based on certain concepts and areas of their interaction, information about the culture of the ethnos (characterize important moments of the history of the people, assess the meaning of life, convey the customs, customs and traditions of the speakers of a particular language). Paroemias reflect the features of relationships between people, the socio-historical context, particularities of life, customs and traditions.

The national and cultural significance of paroemia is realized on the basis of unconscious or conscious correlation of meaning with the “code” of culture, known to the speaker, which is the content of the national cultural connotation. Being a reflection of the people’s experience, proverbs and sayings give a complete description of the mentality of a nation, describe and regulate verbal behavior.

When using paroemia in speech, the subject of communication correlates its content with the life situation, in the context of which the meaning of proverbs and sayings can be subjected to a different interpretation. This allows us to evaluate the text of paroemia as a culturally marked statement, correlated with a variety of situations.

Investigating the semantics of paroemia, Z.K. Tarlanov points out the ability of the proverb not only to express figurative and metaphorical significance, but also to transmit age-old experience and people’s observations, generalizing them and raising the rules of life to the rank of socially recognized regularities¹. This ability makes the proverb the best way of transmitting the mindset of the whole nation.

G.L. Permyakov expresses the idea that proverbs and sayings are nothing but signs of certain situations or certain relations between things². According to T.G. Bochina, the minimum volume and aphoristic content of the proverb defines its desire to use the most effective, sharply expressed means of achieving expressiveness of speech. <...> The laconic form, which has gone through many centuries of running-in and perfecting in living colloquial speech, and the deep content, stereoscopic imagery of the folklore cliché make the proverb a reference sample of stylistic admission, its necessary minimum³.

Methods of the research

The work uses the theoretical method (analysis of scientific literature on the topic under study); descriptive method (collection of factual material and its classification); statistical method (processing of linguistic material).

Results

Paroemias are an integral part of language and culture. Proverbs and sayings are still actively used both in fiction and in everyday spoken language. This explains the interest of researchers in the versatile study of proverbs of various languages. In our work, proverbs and sayings of the difference-structured Tatar, Russian and English languages with the component “dwelling” were analyzed.

¹ Z. K. Tarlanov, *Russkie poslovitsy: sintaksis i poetika* (Petrozavodsk: PGU, 1999).

² G. L. Permyakov, *Osnovy strukturnoy paremiologii*. 1988.

³ T. G. Bochina, *Stilistika kontrasta* (Kazan: KSU, 2002).

It should be noted that the term “dwelling” can be understood as a well-constructed and organized for the living building, and a simple hut or any habitable premises. In the course of our work, we found that in the Tatar language, the component “dwelling” is basically achieved through such lexical units as “oy” (house), “yort” (house), “kuysh” (hut). In total, 221 proverbs containing the given units were analyzed. In the Russian language, in the collected and analyzed material, 97 paroemias with the component “dwelling” were found. This component was expressed by the lexemes “house”, “hut”, “nest”, “hatka”, “kennel”. And in English this component is given by the words “home”, in rare cases “house” and “nest”, only 27 proverbs and sayings with given units were found.

Discussion

The most numerous are proverbs and sayings, in which the component “dwelling” is transmitted with the help of the lexical unit “oy” (house). This unit occurs in 168 paroemias of 221, which is 76% of the total. During the analysis we encountered dialectal use of the word “oy” – “ong”, and it was considered expedient to include the paroemias with this lexical unit in the group. Paroemias containing the component “dwelling” can have a different semantic meaning. Here we have identified several meanings the Tatar paroemias with the component “oy”:

Paroemias with the meaning “home – dwelling, intended for living”. Here the word “oy” is used in the direct meaning, in other words as a building or room. For example: *Yaman bulsa da, oyen bulsyn. (Let you have your home, even a bad one). Yana oyne utynga yakmyilar. (The new house is not allowed for firewood). Oye bulgach, chae da bulyr. (If there is a house, there is tea too).*

Paroemias with the semantic meaning “family”. During the analysis, we were faced with the fact that “oy” (house) is not just a building or a place to live, but rather the house is perceived as a family, or people living in this house. These paroemias have a double meaning, because you can say that they mean the premises as they are, but at the same time they have some subtext that refers us to the family as a whole. Thus, we consider it's necessary to call this group as a paroemia with the semantics “family”. For example: *Khuzhasyz oy tarkalyr. (The house without the owner will fall apart). Ike oyem, ber tubam. (Two houses, one roof). Oyenda rakhat tapmagan uramda tapmas. (Who is not comfortable at home, will not be comfortable in the street too).*

Paroemias with the meaning “native place”. In many cultures, the country of residence, native land, and hometown are perceived as one big house, as a native place. Tatar culture is not an exception; we see it in the Tatar language. Here are some examples: *Oly oyga ni kirak, keche oyga shul kirak. (What a big house needs, a little one needs as well). Oye bashkanyn mony bashka. (Who has another house, has another song as well). Oyena kitermagan, ilena kitermas. (Who does not admit you to his house, will not allow up to the country).*

Paroemias with the meaning “characteristic of a person”. Proverbs and sayings containing the component “dwelling” can display or appeal to human qualities, point to certain characteristics such as diligence, laziness, good breeding, etc.: *Oyena kura ilage. (What is the house, such is the sieve). Tugyz oynen tubasen tishuche. (The devastator of the roofs of nine houses).*

Paroemias with the meaning “advice-instruction”. Almost all the proverbs and sayings are instructive in nature, they contain some kind of moralizing, edifying, etc. But there are also those who have a direct appeal to a person, and they have an instructive context: *Oyne sala bashlaganchy nigezen nygyt. (Before you start building a house, strengthen its foundation). Oy echendage serne chitka soylama. (Do not tell the secret that is in the house). Oyendagen uramga chygarma. (Do not take out what is in the house).*

Proverbs and sayings, with lexical unit “yort” are used in the meaning “home – dwelling, intended for living”: *(Iske yortnyn kaderen yanasynda belasen. (The value of the old house you will find out in the new one). Yort zhitkeru yon tetteru tugel. (Building a house is not making linen). Oly yortka ni kirak, keche yortka shul kirak. (What a big house needs, a little one needs as well).), “family” (Iyasez yort misez bash kebek. (A house without a master as a head without brains). Yort zhilke ostenda. (House is on our back). Tavvyshly yortta barakat bulmas. (There is no wealth in the house with fights)), “characteristic of a person” (Yorty yansa da ashykmas. (He doesn’t hurry, even if his house burns). Yortym chitan bursa da, sortym butan. (Even if my house is made of twigs, I am different). Bar yorttan chyga. (What is inside the house is coming out of the house)), “advice-instruction” (Yort khuzhalygy chabata yasau tugel. (Household is not the making the bast shoes). Yort zhitkeru yon tetteru tugel. (Building a house is not making linen). Nachar bursa da uz yortyn bursyn. (Let the bad, but let you have your own home)).*

The component “dwelling” is given by the word “kuysh” as well (2%). Kuysh is a hut intended for shelter from the rain, or other weather conditions, it is an unstable or seasonal structure and it is made mostly by improvised objects (sticks, branches, boards, clay, etc.) in a hurry. Here it is possible to single out only the meaning: “a house is a dwelling intended for living”: *Kory oydan kuysh yakhsy. (Shed is better than an empty house). Uz kuyshyn – zhan tynychyn. (Your own shed is a peace for a mind). Nachar bursa da uz kuyshyn bursyn. (Let the bad, but let you have your own shed).*

In the collected and analyzed material we found 85 Russian proverbs with a lexical unit “house”, which have the following meanings:

“home – dwelling, intended for living”: *Your house is not a stranger, you cannot leave it. The house is small, but it is spacious.*

“family”: *What is at home, is the same. Though the house is thin, the roof is strong. Who knows how to live at home, then do not go fortify. When you get married sooner, so it will be better in the house.*

“native place”: *It’s good to someone who is in his own house. At home everything is good, living at the other one’s place is worse. You can come home and find bread and salt.*

“characteristic of a person”: *In the forest there is a bear, and the stepmother is in the house. Where they work, there is dense, but it is empty in a lazy house.*

“housekeeping”: *Keeping a house is not shaking your mustache at all. The house is not large, but do not leave it. Without the owner the house is like the orphan.*

“protection”: *In your own home do not bow to anyone. My home is my castle. Master is in the house, like Abraham is in paradise.*

“advice-instruction”: *Follow the old friend, but the new house. Praise the seas, but stay at home. You must escape at home, but go to church.*

Also, the component “dwelling” can be transmitted with the help of such lexemes as “hut” (The hut is covered with the Ilyinsky lodge. The yard is as the city, the hut is as the house. If the house is poor, the housekeeper is bad.), “nest” (The cuckoo also cuckles that it has no nest. The bird that makes its nests dirty is a bad bird. The bird that doesn’t like its nest is stupid.), “kennel” (Give the God its kennel to the dog as well.) and “hatka” (His hut is his own mom).

The paroemias with these units are few in number

In the proverbial English fund, paroemias, in which the component “dwelling” is transmitted using the lexical unit “home”, constitute an absolute majority. This unit occurs in 16 proverbs out of 30, which is 58% of the total. Here are their meanings:

“family”: *Men make houses, women make homes. Far from home is near the harm. Go abroad and you’ll hear news of home.*

“native place”: *East or West – home is best. There is no place like home. Home is where the heart is.*

“characteristic of a person”: *Every dog is a lion at home.*

“advice-instruction”: *Wash your dirty linen at home.*

“home – dwelling, intended for living”: *The furthest way about is the nearest way home. A home can be made a heaven or a hell.*

Paroemias, in which the component “dwelling” is transmitted using the lexical unit “house”. We counted them 12 out of 30, which is 34% of the total.

Proverbs with the meaning “family”: *The house is a fine house when good folks are within. House divided against itself cannot stand. When the house is open, the honest man sins.*

Proverbs with the meaning “characteristic of a person”: *Curiosity is ill manners in another’s house.*

Proverbs with the meaning “advice-instruction”: *Burn not your house to rid it of the mouse. Grace your house, and not let that grace you. Owner should bring honor to the house, not the house to the owner.*

Proverbs with the meaning “home – dwelling, intended for living and which is protecting a person”: *Houses are built to live in, and not to look on. My house is my castle. An Englishman’s house is his castle.*

Paremia, in which the component “dwelling” is transmitted using the lexical unit “nest” in the meanings “native land” and “family”: *Every bird likes its own nest. It is a foolish bird that soils its own nest.*

Conclusion

As a result of our study of the paroemiological units with the component “dwelling”, we came to the following conclusions: paroemias with the lexeme “oy” are more common than with the units “yort” and “kuysh” in the Tatar language, as for the English language, the lexical unit “home” is used more often than “house” and “nest”, in the paroemiological fund of the Russian language among the proverbs with the component “dwelling” the most numerous are the paroemias with the lexemes “house”, “hut”, “hatka”, “kennel” and “nest”.

As for the meanings that the paroemias with the component “dwelling” express, there are paroemias with the meanings “home-residence”, “family”, “native land”, “characteristics of the person”, “advice-instruction” in all three different-structure languages. In Russian and English, along with the above, the meaning “protection” is added, which we do not observe in the Tatar language. It should be noted that in the Russian paroemiological fund, we can also distinguish the meaning of “housekeeping”. Thus, we see that in Russian, the paroemias with the component “dwelling” have a more diverse semantic coloring. Here, we consider it expedient to cite the data that we obtained in the semantic analysis of paroemias:

- in the Tatar language, the number of paroemias with the meaning “home – place of residence” predominates (32%);
- in Russian the meaning of “housing” prevails (31%);
- in English the dominant meaning is “native place” (34%).

And this gives us the right to draw the following conclusions:

- in the Tatar language paroemias with the component “dwelling” have a direct meaning, i.e. the meaning of a building, a room, a house in which people live directly;
- in the Tatar language paroemias with the component “dwelling” are not of direct significance, but with the meaning “home place”, “home”;
- and in Russian the component “dwelling” is connected with the ownership and management of the house, farm management.

In proverbs and sayings with the component “dwelling” of the three difference-structured languages, the meaning “family” is the dominant meaning, because for family relationships, kinship, home perceptions are more than just a room, and attitudes toward home as a family hearth are also an important aspect for people and culture.

Acknowledgement

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

References

- Bochina, T. G. *Stilistika kontrasta*. Kazan: KSU. 2002.
- Permyakov, G. L. *Osnovy strukturnoy paremiologii*. 1988.

Tarlanov, Z. K. Russkie poslovitsy: sintaksis i poetika. Petrozavodsk: PGU. 1999.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.