Metaphor belongs to one of the most important concepts of modern linguistics. A significant breakthrough in the study of metaphor was achieved in the 20th century by the interaction theory of metaphor postulated by M. Black and the theory of conceptual metaphors developed by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson.

The theory of conceptual metaphors of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [5] is widely used for the description of various semantic groups of words and phraseological units, and can most definitely be also applied for the analysis of proverbs. Proverbial metaphor, whether it is considered the differential characteristic of a proverb or whether it is regarded as a typical, but not an obligatory proverbial characteristic, deserves most close attention and detailed description. The analysis of metaphors in proverbs allows us to contribute to the investigation of the metaphorical conceptualization of the world in general.

Besides, it is necessary to take into account that the proverbial metaphor possesses some peculiar features that differ it from other types of metaphor and let scholars penetrate deeper into the nature of metaphor taken as a whole. On the basis of the study of the proverbial metaphor it is possible to discover similar metaphorical variations in other language signs.

According to G. Lakoff, two conceptual spheres interact and one is seen through the other, which allows us to consider separate, at first sight independent metaphors as a result of the realization of one and the same conceptual metaphor, as it happens for example in the case of the metaphor LOVE is a JOURNEY, in which love is seen through the prism of travelling [4].

One of the most frequent proverbial conceptual metaphors is MAN is an ANIMAL. Proverbs are “densely inhabited” by wild and domestic animals and birds, to a lesser extent – by fish and insects. The tight inherent tie between human and animal worlds resulted in the fact that a man has always drawn analogies between himself and animals. [4, p.74], which finds extensive manifestation in the language, especially in its phraseological units and proverbs. The analysis of the associations connected with this or that animal and the knowledge about the animal contained in the literal meaning of proverbs allow us to describe the people’s perception of this animal and the vision of the person’s character through this animal’s habits, real, exaggerated or ascribed.

The wolf may lose his teeth but never his nature.
When the cat’s away, the mice will play.
In the first proverb the unchangeable nature of a wicked and treacherous man even in his old age is seen through the incorrigible nature of a wolf, while in the second the relationship between a person in power and his subordinates is perceived as the relationship between a cat and mice.

Various emotions and feelings of a person can be described by the realization of the conceptual metaphor FEELINGS are WATER, FEELINGS are FIRE.
The stream stopped swells the higher.
Fire that’s closest kept burns most of all.
The first proverb asserts that the suppression of feelings results in their strongest expression in the end. The condition of suppression is seen through the situation of creating an obstacle for the flow of water
In the second proverb the necessity of keeping the feeling of love going, is described through the situation of keeping a fire burning.

This conceptual metaphor is closely connected with another more general conceptual metaphor ABSTRACT is CONCRETE, and could be considered as one of its numerous types. The metaphor ABSTRACT is CONCRETE is widely realized in English proverbs. Abstract concepts are most often perceived as human beings or material objects:
Truth has a scratched face.
Honour and profit lie not in one sack.
Seeing abstract entities through concrete ones is an integral feature of human perception of the world [4, p. 61; 1, c.12], has its roots in ancient times and is characteristic of the language system taken as a whole.

Apart from the metaphors considered above it is possible to trace a different type of metaphor. In some proverbs one situation is seen through the other, but besides the concrete-abstract relationship...
between the literal meaning (inner form) and the meaning there exists the specific-generic relationship, which we can discover, for example, in the proverbs "Feather by feather, the goose is plucked"; "Step after step the ladder is ascended.

Both proverbs have the meaning "(Important) things are done gradually". In these proverbs concrete situations of plucking a goose and climbing a ladder represent the general and more abstract situation of doing some work gradually and patiently, i.e. the relation "concrete – abstract" is present, but besides we can trace the relation "specific – generic". The relation between the situations described in the literal meanings (inner forms) of the proverbs and the situations connected with their meanings is both concrete and abstract and specific and generic. Concrete situations are in a sort of way illustrations of the generalized abstract situations, they serve as real examples of this situation.

In the metaphor LOVE is a JOURNEY or in the proverbs about feelings, the connection between concrete and abstract situations can be expressed by the comparative conjunctions “as if”, “like”, while in this type of metaphorical proverbs it is expressed by "such as" / "for example": (Important) things are done gradually, for example, feather by feather, the goose is plucked; step after step the ladder is ascended.

In the latter case there is no allowance for the similarity of heterogenic entities which V.N. Teliya regards as "the basic nerver of any metaphor" [3, e.39]. One situation is included into the other, there is the "type example" (category – subcategory) relation between the generic and specific situations.

The following proverbs are also examples of the combined (duplicate) type of relationship between the inner form and the meaning: Don't stitch your seam before you've tacked it; Score twice before you cut once. In these proverbs the literal meanings contain the knowledge about the proper actions in two specific situations. These actions and situations illustrate a generalized action in a generalized situation: "Don't hurry to do anything before all the necessary provisions are made".

Another proverb: "There is a scorpion under every stone" - illustrates the situation "Danger is everywhere", and the proverb "No safe wading in an unknown water" – the situation "Unknown things are dangerous". It is possible to paraphrase them in the following way: Danger is everywhere, for example, there is a scorpion under every stone; Unknown things are dangerous, for example, there is no safe wading in unknown water.

This type of relationship between the literal meaning (inner form) and the meaning is less characteristic of other complex language signs, e.g., derivatives with suffixes. The relationship between the inner form of an idiomatic derivative, which reflects the motivation of the word, i.e. the feature on which the nomination is based, and the meaning could be with some approximation equalled to the relationship "part – whole". The approximation means that we consider the referent, which is named by the word, as something whole, consisting of a number of parts – certain features. E.g. in the word cleaner the feature one / something cleans is reflected, while the semes «animate/inanimate» (Cleaner-1 – a person whose job is to clean other people’s houses or offices; cleaner-2 – a machine or substance that is used for cleaning) and «professionally» for cleaner-1 are not explicit.

A similar kind of relationship between the inner form and the meaning can be found in the derivative sticker (a label which is stuck on something) or in the metaphoric compound land-bucket (a fat man). The specific-generic relationship is clearly not relevant for them. The feature reflected in the inner form and the entity to which it belongs reflected in the meaning are both concrete. In the derivative the object (a label) and its feature (sticks) are concrete; in the compound one object (an obese man) is seen through another concrete object (a bucket filled with lard). But in some expressive words formed both by composition and derivation, like coffee-cooler (a shirker), characterizing some quality of a person, the specific-generic relationship could be traced. The explicit feature (one cools coffee) is the result of the implicit feature (one is cautious). Caution is an abstract trait of a person, general in respect to concrete, specific forms of its revelation. Caution is revealed not only in the fact that a person cools his coffee before drinking it, but also in a number of other concrete actions, which did not result in the formation of new words. So we can say that the action of cooling coffee is an example, an illustration of the quality of being cautious in general.

As far as phraseological units are concerned, it is not possible to find the specific-generic relationship in substantive phraseological units, but it does exist in verbal phraseological units, like to put a spoke in one’s wheel (to hinder somebody from doing something). You can hinder a person in many ways, in particular, by pushing a spoke into a wheel.

The presence of the specific-generic relationship in verbal phraseological units is accounted for by the fact that like proverbs they denote a situation, though not all the components of this situation are known on the level of the language system (the doer of the action is missing). The position of the doer of the action is filled in only on the level of speech.

Words of the coffee-cooler type formed by composition-derivation also correspond to a situation, which is present in them in a latent state. The verb-derived component in these words often means that the situation with which they are connected is dynamic like the situation to which some verbal phraseological units and proverbs correspond. Due to this similarity the specific-generic relationship occurs in such words as well.

To sum up we can say that in complex language signs there exists a variety in the relationship between the inner form and the meaning. The specific-generic relationship is typical of a small number of words, a significant number of phraseological units and a big number of proverbs.

A question may arise why these language signs, proverbs in the first place, with the ‘‘illustrating’’ kind of the relationship between the meaning and the inner form should be looked upon as metaphorical.

The answer is that apart from the specific-generic relationship there exists the concrete-abstract relationship in them, corresponding to the metaphor ABSTRACT is CONCRETE, universal for all languages.

The concrete-abstract relationship is not present in signs formed on the base of purely specific-generic relationship (spoon – teaspoon; cloth – tablecloth; bird – songbird) or on metonymy (redhead – a red-haired person). Expressive words based on metonymy and metaphor at the same time (like four-eyes – a person wearing glasses) do not have the specific-generic relationship. Of the signs based on the specific-generic relationship imagery, hence metaphor are not typical, so the concrete-abstract relationship cannot be found in them.

The conclusions to be drawn from the above analysis are as follows:

1. The concrete-abstract relationship and the specific-generic relationship may be easily combined, resulting in a double type of connection between the inner form and the meaning.

2. The coexistence of concrete-abstract and specific-generic relationships between the inner form and the meaning of some proverbs and other complex language signs once again confirms the fact that there are no sharp boundaries between various language phenomena.

3. The nature of metaphor could be varied in many ways, sometimes closely approaching totally opposite semantic phenomena, like the specific-generic relationship, which are incorporated into the model of its realization.
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