

# Cultural Connotations of Zoonyms in Tatar and Turkish Proverbs<sup>1</sup>

*Gulshat Nailevna Galimova<sup>2</sup>, Alfiya Shavketovna Yusupova<sup>3</sup>, Gulnaz Rinatovna Mughtasimova<sup>4</sup>, & Mustafa Oner<sup>5</sup>*

## Abstract

This article presents an analysis of the semantics of zoonyms that function as components of the proverbs of the Tatar and Turkish languages. Such proverbs are interesting in that they reveal the features characteristic of animals, which a person transfers to himself and translates with their help certain positive, neutral or negative emotions. The names of animals in all languages have in the lexical meaning emotional expressive-evaluative features that serve as the basis for the formation of metaphorical nominations. Zoonomia components of Proverbs are defined as cultural phenomena. The purpose of the study is to identify the cultural connotations of animal names in Tatar and Turkish proverbs. The main methods used in the work are the methods of contextual analysis and linguocultural interpretation. The material for our reasoning was the Tatar and Turkish proverbs extracted from dictionaries, which include the names of animals. The results of the study of proverbial sources indicate a high particular designation of animals as structural components of proverbs. The frequency of animal names in the proverbs is explained extralinguistically, since animals played an important role in human life, the habits of animals served as the basis for the emergence of many proverbs in the Tatar and Turkish languages. The study of zoonyms, which are part of the Tatar and Turkish proverbs, contributes to a deeper understanding of their national-cultural specifics.

**Keywords:** Tatar; Turkish; Proverb; Zoononym; Semantics.

## 1. Introduction

Proverbs are translators of the wisdom and spirit of the people, and knowledge of the proverbs of a particular people helps not only a better knowledge

---

<sup>1</sup> Please cite this paper as follows:

Galimova, G. N., Yusupova, A. S., Mughtasimova, G. R., & Oner, M. (2019). Cultural connotations of zoonyms in Tatar and Turkish proverbs. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(SP), 903-910.

<sup>2</sup> Kazan Federal University

<sup>3</sup> Kazan Federal University

<sup>4</sup> Kazan Federal University; *Gulnaz-72@mail.ru*

<sup>5</sup> Ege University

of the language, but also a better understanding of the way of thinking and the nature of the people. Proverbs are a kind of regulators of human behavior. These are clichéd judgments that express the people's experience regarding moral or categorical imperatives.

When comparing the proverbial funds of different nations, it is striking that these peoples have so much in common, which, in turn, contributes to their better understanding and rapprochement. An analysis of the proverbs of different cultures can give us a clear idea of the characteristics of these cultures and help us find common and ethnic features between them. We are in solidarity with Pimenova is that “The folklore picture of the world is an important, fundamental part of the conceptual picture of an ethnic group” (Pimenova, 2012; Abdul Rahman, 2019).

The relevance of the issue highlighted in this article is determined by the fact that until now the features of Tatar proverbs with a component-zoononym have not been consistently considered in the linguistic and cultural terms in comparison with similar Turkish proverbs. Meanwhile, proverbial units with zoonyms vividly reflect many features of national culture and mentality, which is of practical value in the description of national pictures of the world.

Recently, the interest of researchers in studying the problems of the proverbial language has naturally increased in Tatar linguistic science. Various aspects of the study of Tatar folk proverbs (Tarasova & Mukharlyamova, 2014; Zamaletdinova, 2014; Kajumova et al., 2017; Shcherbinina et al., 2016) are quite fully presented in the works. Interest in the proverbs of the Tatar people, in the study of its language, artistic and structural identity continues to grow. The prevailing attention is to those elements of folk poetry that make up its specificity. Numerous modern studies are devoted to the general problems of the folklore picture of the Tatars. In line with our research, extremely useful appeared the works of Zamaletdinov & Zamaletdinova (2010), Gabdrakhmanova, Sattarova, and Nurmukhametova (2016), Sibgaeva, Salakhova, and Mukhamedova (2017), Yazdekhasi, et al., (2015). Gilazetdinova, Edikhanova, and Aminova (2014), Fakhrieva, Kirillova, and Alkay (2017), Galimova, Nabiulina, and Oner (2017) as of other scientists.

The source of material for the study was the dictionaries of proverbs of the Tatar (Isənbət, 2010) and Turkish languages (Aksoy, 1999).

## **2. Methods**

To implement the tasks posed in the article, a set of methods and techniques was used. In the course of the study, a descriptive method was used that included observations and classification of the material under study: zoonyms recorded in the proverbs of the Tatar and Turkish peoples were sequentially examined. This is the most common synchronous analysis method. To study the content side of the

significant units of the language, one of the techniques of the descriptive method was used - component analysis. An attempt is made in the work to reveal the features of the use of zoonyms and their meanings from the point of view of both linguoculturology and the features of their use in Tatar and Turkish folk proverbs.

### 3. Results and Discussion

From a semantic point of view, all the proverbs considered in this work can be divided into the following thematic groups: “livestock”, “domestic animals”, “domestic birds”, “wild animals”, “wild birds”, “fish and reptiles”. An analysis of the lexicographic source made it possible to identify the following zoonyms found in the proverbs of the Tatar language: at (horse), sarık (sheep), teke (ram), kece (goat), sıyr (cow), et (dog), pesi (cat), büre (wolf), tölke (fox), kuyan (hare), ayu (bear), arıslan (lion), yulbarıs (tiger), etc. One of the largest thematic groups in our sample is the livestock thematic group. Among the listed animals, a special place is occupied by at (horse), sarık (sheep), sıyr (cow). Animals were not only a source of food and clothing for people, but also a measure of many human qualities - both physical and moral. Therefore, the origin of many proverbs is associated with the characteristics of wild and domestic animals, birds, insects, fish.

Evaluation can be expressed in proverbs with zoonymic components, both openly and implicitly. Units that openly express their assessment include proverbs that include the lexemes “yachsha”, “yögerek”, “naçar”, “simez”, “yaman”, “alama”, “yürük”, “arık”, “yavuz”, “Ahmak”, “kısmetsiz”, “aç”, “garip” and others. For example, Altın iyer alama atnı yahşırtmas (lit. A golden saddle will not improve a horse); At yahşısı büz bulır (lit. A good horse will be gray); Yaman sıyr sukmaçıl (lit. An old cow - The Prodigal Cow). Examples of Turkish proverbs: Yürük ata kamçı olmaz, Yürük at kamçı değdirmez (lit. The horse will not get the whip); Yürük ata paha olmaz (lit. Horse not to rate); Arık ata kuyruğu da yüktür (lit. For a thin horse and tail cargo); Yavuz atn çiftesi pek olur (lit. The evil horse hits hard); Ahmak iti yol kocaltır (lit. Foolish dog and the road is aging); Itin (köpeğin) ahmağı baklavadan pay umar (lit. Stupid dog is waiting for a piece of pakhlava); Kısmetsiz köpek sabaha karşı uyuyakalır (lit. The loser dog falls asleep before dawn); Aç köpek fırın deler (lit. A hungry dog will pierce the stove); Garip itin kuyruğu bacağı arasında olur (lit. A resigned dog has a tail between his legs).

Among the proverbs of the Tatar language with an openly expressed assessment, there are quite a few units in which there is a contrast or comparison of a negative assessment with a positive one. For example, Yahşı sıyr kış bozaular, yaman sıyr yarda bozaular (lit. A good cow calves in the winter, a bad cow calves on the shore).

Proverbs that do not include such tokens express implicitly, that is, hidden, not explicitly. For example, Argamak at yul başlar (lit. The horse will start). As can

be seen from the example, the leader in the Tatar linguistic culture is associated with a horse. Such associations are associated with the original mentality of the ethnos.

In the worldview of the Tatars, the positive connotation associated with the zoononym “horse” indicates the high status of the person who owns the horses, as well as a respectful attitude to his driving and fighting qualities: Tatarga at teyge mehebbete kebek kaderle (lit. for Tatars, a horse is expensive like the first love); Tatarga heykelne kanatlı atka atlandırıp kuyarga kirək (lit. Monument to the Tatars should be put in the form of a rider on a winged horse); Dönya atlı tatarnı gına tanıy (lit. The world recognizes only Tatars having a horse).

In the everyday life of the Tatars, the horse always had a special status, as, for example, say proverbs like: Atın belen maktanma, atın belen maktan (lit. Do not show off your father, show off your horse).

Accompanying the edifying connotation are such Tatar proverbs with the zoononym “horse”: Alabutaga at beyleme (lit. Do not tie the horse to the swan); At belen hatınga ısanma (lit. Do not trust the horse and wife); Atnın başın katı tot (lit. Hold your horse’s head tight). We find similar proverbs in Turkish: At almadan ahır dikme (lit. Do not build a shed without a horse); Atın varken yol tanı, ağın varken el tanı (lit. There is a horse - be aware of the roads, there is a brother - be aware of the countries). All of the above emphasizes the commonality of the compared languages.

The goats and sheep in the proverbs in the compared languages are often spoken not very respectfully. They personify stupidity, stubbornness, cunning, the ability to find profit, adapt: Kəxənən sakalı özün da, akılı kıska (lit. The goat has a long beard but a short mind). In the Tatar language, two completely opposite people who do not get along in one place are usually spoken: Ike kuynın başı ber kazanga sıymas; Ike təkə başı ber kazanga sıymas; Ike kuçkarnın başı ber tabakka sıymas. We find a similar proverb in Turkish: İki koç kafası bir kazanda kaynamaz.

Proverbs Ber sarık kurıksa, men sarık kubar (lit. One scared sheep scares thousands of sheep), Ber kuy arkasında men kuy su eçkən (lit. Because of one sheep, thousands of sheep drank water); Kece koyrık kütere dip, sarık ta koyrığın kütergen di (lit. Seeing the goat raise its tail and the sheep raise its tail); Ber sıyrının koyrığı men sıyrını pıçrata (lit. The tail of one cow will stain thousands of cows) characterize a person who has a negative effect on everyone around him. Consider the proverbs of the Turkish language: Keçi nereye çıkarsa oğlağı da oraya çıkar (lit. Where the goat, goat there).

A negative characteristic of human actions is presented in proverbs with the zoononym “wolf”. Examples of the Tatar language are of interest: Bürenen uylaganı - burlık (lit. Thoughts of a wolf only about theft); Büre tuyı kan belen (lit. A wolf’s wedding is not without blood); Iyese yuknı büre aşar (lit. Who does not have an owner will be eaten by a wolf). In the Turkish language there are not so many proverbs with

the component-zoononym “wolf” with a negative characteristic: Kurttan korkan ormana girmez.

Speaking about the limitations of one's capabilities, the Tatars use proverbs with the tonyk zonym: Tawık kanat kaksa da oçmas (lit. The chicken flaps its wings but does not fly); Tawık kunsa - kirtege (lit. Chicken sits on the fence); Tawık oçıp tau aşmas (lit. Chicken does not fly over the mountains).

It should be noted that some proverbs with the zoononym component Tatar and Turkish are ambivalent. Ambivalence is “the duality of sensory experience, expressed in the fact that one and the same object causes two opposite feelings in a person simultaneously ... Ambivalence is rooted in the ambiguity of a person’s attitude to the environment, in the inconsistency of the value system” (Petrovsky, 1970). Among the ambivalent proverbs with zoonyms in the languages we compare are proverbs that include images of a dog, a cow, a horse. Let's take a look at some of them.

On the one hand, the image of a dog is used in Tatar proverbs when describing such negative qualities as sneakiness, sneakiness, and shamelessness: Ak et belase kara etke (equiv. From a sick head to a healthy one); Et digende bit yuk (the dog has no face); Et korsagina sarı may kileşmes (lit. Ghee does not suit the dog); Et simerse, iyeseñ teşler (lit. A fat dog bites his master).

A negative connotation in the Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures is received by a silent dog, which is associated with a dangerous person: Eten örgenennen kurıkma, örmegenennen kurık (lit. Do not be afraid of the barking dog; be afraid of the silent); Havlayan köpek ısırmas (lit. The barking dog does not bite).

In Turkish proverbs, such negative qualities as greed, laziness, arrogance are recorded: It kağrı gölgesinde yürür de kendi gölgesi sanırmış (lit. The dog, walking in the shadow of the cart, thinks that this is her shadow); Köpeğe gem vurma, kendisini at sanır (lit. Do not put on a dog a bit, think that she is a horse). In the Turkish language there are a number of proverbs with the component-zonym “it” related to the semantics of anger, secrecy: Isıracak it dişini göstermez (letters. A biting dog does not show its teeth); İtle çuvala girilmez (lit. Do not go into the bag with the dog); Issız eve it buruk (lit. In an abandoned house the owner is a dog); İtin kuyruğu kalıba konmakla doğrulmaz (lit. The tail of the dog will not straighten, pulling on the block); Üşüntü köpek mandayı paralar (lit. A dog herd tearing a cow apart).

On the other hand, in the proverbs of the Tatar and Turkish peoples, the image of a dog personifies loyalty to the owner, patience: Aşagan cirene et te kayta (lit. The dog returns to where he ate); Hucası kemne kabul itmäsen, et şuna koyırık bolgar (lit. Whom the owner accepts, the dog waving his tail); Et iyeseñ beler (lit. The dog knows the owner). Examples of Turkish proverbs: İt yal yediği kapıyı bekler (lit. The dog will wait at the door where it was fed); Köpek ekmek veren (yediği)

kapıyı tanır (lit. The dog recognizes the door at which they gave bread); Köpek sahibini ısırmaz (lit. The dog does not bite its owner).

The image of a cow is also ambivalent, which in proverbs of the Tatar language can be used both in positive and in negative meaning. A positive edifying mark is noted in the following proverbs: Ber sıyr asra, beregeylene asra (lit. Keep one cow, but the best); İşegaldında sıyrın bulsa, östel östende sıyrın bulır (lit. In the courtyard - a cow, on the table - refreshments); Sıyırılı keşe - sıyılı keşe (lit. One has a cow, one has a treat); Sıyr - may çülmege (lit. Cow - a pot of oil), etc. Examples from Turkish: Komşunu iki inekli iste ki kendin bir inekli olasın. Deve arayan düşmana rastlar, inek arayan düğüne rastlar. These sayings show a respectful attitude towards the cow, the breadwinner of the family.

The negative name “cow” is used in the Tatar and Turkish proverbs: Müklek sözme, sözse - özmi kuymas (lit. The hornless one does not gouge; if it is gored, it will break); Sıyr sıypagannı belmes (lit. The cow does not understand affection); Sömsez sıyr üz ırın tanımas (lit. The impudent cow will not recognize its kind); İnek, boynuzunda kabahatli olur.

#### **4. Summary**

Thus, in the course of this comparative analysis, cases of the use of seven animal names were considered: dog, cow, goat, sheep, horse, wolf, chicken. Based on the linguistic material, it can be concluded that, in general, the proverbial semantics of zoonyms most often shows a mixed evaluative connotation with a predominance of a negative evaluative component. As amplifiers of the negative semantics of zoonyms, adjectives and adverbs with the corresponding coloring can be used. Also, taking into account all of the above, it can be argued that the zoonyms used in proverbs often have the same or similar connotative shades in the Tatar and Turkish languages. That is, the results of the study suggest that the ideas about animals in the Tatars and Turks are approximately the same, but they do not always give people the same qualities or characteristics of these animals. Which, in turn, indicates that the connotative properties of zoonyms in the Tatar and Turkish proverbs are very diverse.

#### **5. Conclusions**

Zoonyms in proverbs are an extremely interesting and original language layer, revealing the specifics of the worldview of native speakers of language and culture.

## Acknowledgments

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

## References

- Aksoy, Ö. A. (1999). Deyimler ve Atasözleri Sözlüğü I, Atasözleri Sözlüğü. *İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi*.
- Abdul Rahman, S. (2019). Example construction as a device to reveal awareness of calculus integration. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 14(1), 233-241. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/3999>
- Fakhrieva, L. K., Kirillova, Z. N., & Alkaya, E. (2017). Metaphors in Russian poetry translations into Tatar. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(6), 153-158.
- Gabdrakhmanova, F. H., Sattarova, M. R., & Nurmukhametova, R. S. (2016). Traditions and customs as means of formation of eating behavior of Tatar people. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 169-172.
- Galimova, G. N., Nabiullina, G. A., & Oner, M. (2017). Speech stereotypes in the linguistic ethicsof tatar and turkish ethnocultures. *Revista QUID*, 1(1), 2587-2591.
- Gilazetdinova, G. Kh., Edikhanov, I. Zh., & Aminova, A. A. (2014). Problems of ethnocultural identity and cross-language communication. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 39-42.
- Isənbət, N. (2010). Tatars halyk məkalləre. *Kazan: Tat. Chit. nəshr*.
- Kajumova, Z. M., Galiullina, G. R., & Yusupov, A. F. (2017). The anthroponymicon ofsmall genres of Tatar folklore in the context of the Sufi picture of the world. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 9(1), 1149-1157.
- Pimenova, M. V. T. (2012). Folklore paintings of the world of the Russian and Tatar peoples. *Philology and culture*, 2(28), 95-98.
- Shcherbinina, T. S., Denmukhametova, E. N., & Denmukhametov, R. R. (2016). Landscape components during phraseologism in the Tatar language. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 353-356.
- Sibgaeva, F. R., Salakhova, R. R., & Mukhamedova, S. (2017). Representation of person emotional state in the Tatar language picture of the world. *Ad Alta-Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 260–262.

- Tarasova, F. H., & Mukharlyamova, L. R. (2014). Modeling of phraseosemantic groups in the system of the Tatar, Russian and English paroemias (On the examples of proverbs and sayings with “food” component). *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 196-202.
- Zamaletdinov, R. R., & Zamaletdinova, G. F. (2010). On the role of proverbs in the study of national-cultural characteristics of linguistic consciousness”. *Philology and Culture*, 20, 73-78.
- Zamaletdinova, G. F. (2014). Realities as a reflection of the identity of the Tatars (On the example of paremias). *Philology and Culture*, 4(38), 101-105.
- Yazdekhashti, A., Erfan, N., & Nazari, N. (2015). Investigating the relationship between spiritual intelligence and social adaptation among girl high school students in Shahreza city. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 20-23.