



Verbalization of the Binary Opposition *Man–Woman* in Paroemias: A Cross-Cultural Study

Saltanat Beiskhanova^{1a}, Zhanyl Zhunussova^{2a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received June 2023
Received in Revised form August 2023
Accepted September 2023
Available online September 2023

KEYWORDS:

Binary opposition
Paroemia
Contrastive study
Lexical components
Semantic categories

Abstract

The current paper is devoted to studying the lexical components variations of the binary opposition *man–woman* on the material of Russian and English paroemias in the linguoculturological aspect that is particularly valuable for cross-cultural and contrastive studies. The data were revealed by using continuous sampling from different sources, including published collections and dictionaries of proverbs and sayings, and online references. The study aims to review and describe such expressions by identifying lexical components. This makes it possible to reveal the verbalization of the binary construction *man–woman* in more detail. Among other things, the research is based on a contrastive analysis of paroemias. The authors focus on considering the semantic categories of the opposition of examined binary constructions within selected proverb samples to identify similar and special aspects in both linguocultures. The feasibility of using this methodological approach enables a comprehensive examination of how the binary opposition *man–woman* is realized within paroemiological contexts of both Russian and English languages.

¹ PhD Candidate, Email: saltanat.beiskhanova@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

Tel: +7-721-2703045

² Professor, Email: zhanyl08@mail.ru

^a L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2023.2010532.3151>

© 2023 Beiskhanova and Zhunussova.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of duality constitutes the cornerstone of both conceptual and language categories. Using language, we classify what we perceive as objective reality and categorize the circumstances around us into fragments that are conveyed through different binary oppositions (*yes/no, true/false, alive/unalive, male/female*, etc.). The crucial principle governing the functioning of binary opposition is “mediation between its extreme elements” (Rudnev, 1999, p. 38).

The concept of binary opposition was introduced within structuralism and semiotics, which are fields of study in linguistics, anthropology, and philosophy. Derrida had a significant influence on how we think about binary opposition. He is known for his critical approach to binary oppositions. His work challenged the traditional treatment of binary oppositions, highlighting the complexity and ambiguity inherent in all communication forms (Derrida, 1973). In linguistics, the term *binary opposition* is used to define those words or concepts that are contrasted in meaning (De Saussure, 1933). They are frequently employed for the description and classification of words, and they also play an essential role in the structure and organization of language.

The present paper aims to analyze Russian and English proverbs with the binary opposition *man–woman*. The purpose is to consider its representation and study their linguocultural values of contrast within proverbs. The essential aspects are to reveal variations of lexical components of the discussed binary opposition and identify similarities and differences in semantic categories of their contrast in proverbs of different linguocultures. Studying the content of examined units helps to understand how the opposition of considered binary construction is reflected in language and culture.

2. Theoretical Framework

The distinctive feature of the contemporary stage of linguistics is its many-sidedness and poly-paradigmatic nature. It strives to integrate various methodological approaches and establish intersubjective connections with other scientific disciplines to gain a deeper understanding of the language system and its significance in

society. In this regard, particular significance is attributed to research from the perspective of “the interdisciplinary approach to interpreting the essence of language as a specific human phenomenon” (Moiseev & Gicheva, 2009, pp. 18-19). Such an approach to studying binary oppositions is represented in linguistic research.

In this vein, Izutsu (2008) focused on the issues related to the concept of contrast and opposition in linguistic semantics. The study provided an analysis of binary opposition relations and their relevance in a certain context within the framework of cognitive grammar. Moreover, Martinek (2019) analyzed the data extracted from thesauri of different languages to explore specific cognitive mechanisms related to the perception of the binary opposition (light–darkness) and how these concepts are presented in the examined languages. The study was based on the method of associative experiment. Podsievak et al. (2020) aimed to consider the verbal representation means of binary opposition and reveal frame models of its components in science fiction writings using a cognitive-linguistic approach.

Binary oppositions prevail in various cultural, social, and linguistic contexts. They are often used to create meaningful concepts in language and convey information about the worldview, as well as to express cultural values and mindset. Contemporary linguistic science considers “the word not only as a linguistic category but also as a concept of culture” (Sultanbaeva et al., 2021, p. 152). Studying from the perspective of linguoculturology has gained particular significance. Its comprehensive approach involves identifying the peculiarities of the linguistic and cultural uniqueness of the examined linguistic units, as “human cognition and understanding of the world are realized through systems of binary coordinates embedded in culture and language” (Temirgazina & Andryushchenko, 2023, p. 72). Its main focus is on studying various aspects related to understanding how language shapes cultural representations, values, customs, and traditions and influences the thinking of individuals within a specific culture. The data analysis provides valuable insights into culture, language universality, and semantic patterns for cross-cultural studies.

The diversity of proverbs existing in many cultures serves as a source for such linguistic studies (Bredis, 2017; Golembovskaya, 2014; Osheva, 2013). In academic and scientific literature, there are definitions of proverbs, such as “aphorisms of folk origin” (Alefirenko & Semenenko, 2009, p. 240), and “a general concept used to designate a whole class of linguistic folkloric clichés” (Zhunussova & Yermakova, 2017, p. 53). Proverbs are traditionally considered as the commonly vivid type of proverbs, which are “short, generally known sentences of folk which are handed down from generation to generation” (Mieder, 1993, p. 5). As linguistic signs, they represent one of the ways of organizing the surrounding reality and often carry universal accumulated knowledge and national-cultural information that reflect the traditions, experiences, and worldview of an ethnic group. One aspect which seems to be significant is the relationship between culture and language. Pishghadam (2013) has called it *culturing*. It implies that culture can be found in language. Researchers should find cultural memes in a language which are transmitted from one generation to another. These memes can be found in proverbs, sayings, literature, etc. (Pishghadam et al., 2020). Therefore, proverbs can be one of the sources of *culturing*, as they reflect the cultural values and beliefs of a language community through the use of opposition.

Opposition is a common feature of proverbial expressions, as they often contain contrasting concepts or words. It is a common belief that binary components within proverbs are often interconnected by relations of similarity or opposition. Hence, the most common figurative and expressive means are comparison and opposition (contrast, antithesis). Pairs of components form the basis of the proverbs and are connected not only by relations of opposition but also by relations of thematic proximity and associative similarities. According to Seliverstova (2010, p. 34), this is “a stable fragment of the proverbial text, recurring in various proverbs, consisting of two contact-positioned or distantly-positioned elements”. The presence of such binary pairs in these expressions is a pivotal aspect of verbal and cultural language organization. They serve as a means of categorizing concepts.

Consequently, the analysis of binary oppositions found in proverbs contributes to understanding the connection between language and culture, identifying the peculiarities of the linguocultural context, the specifics of thinking and values, and the ways of organizing knowledge within a particular culture.

3. Methodology

3.1. Materials

The language material sampling was extracted from several collections of proverbs and sayings (Apperson, 2006; Dal, 2009; Speake, 2008; Zhukov, 2000), and some examples were retrieved from online sources (<https://sbornik-mudrosti.ru/>; <https://www.englishclub.com/>). It is important to note that a substantial number of samples with the mentioned binary opposition was extracted from well-known lexicographic issues, including the collection “Proverbs of the Russian People” and the publication “The Wordsworth Dictionary of Proverbs”. The present lexicographic sources are monolingual types of dictionaries in which proverbs are not followed with meanings and interpretations.

3.2. Procedure

The present study used several methods for analysis: a componential one aimed at identifying the lexical elements of the examined binary construction and a descriptive analysis, which involves interpreting the semantic implications of their opposition in the context of Russian and English proverbs. The study also involved conducting a contrastive analysis of factual material. This method allows consideration of different languages regardless of their genealogical relationships. The factual material was obtained from proverbs by using continuous sampling.

4. Results

Language and culture are interrelated, and the analysis of cultural dimensions can provide a deeper understanding of how these factors are reflected in language. The most famous cultures typology is the theory of Geert Hofstede (1980), one of the aspects of which is “masculinity–femininity”. Using this aspect in cross-linguistic studies may include the analysis of lexical and semantic features associated with “masculinity–femininity” in different linguo-cultures. With

this in mind, the present paper intends to analyze Russian and English paroemias with the binary opposition *man–woman*. In the course of sampling, Russian and English paroemias were selected, containing the binary opposition *man–woman*. The lexical units constituting the basis of these paired constructions are opposed according to the principle *masculine–feminine*.

Based on a sampling of Russian and English paroemias, the following lexical varieties of binary opposition *man–woman* were identified (Table 1). They are listed as presented in the dictionary entries of various lexicographic sources.

Table 1
Lexical Varieties

in Russian paroemias	in English paroemias
мужчина–женщина	
мальчик–девочка	
мужик–баба / баба–мужик	man–woman
мужики–бабы	men–women
муж–жена / жена–муж / муж–баба	males–females
хозяйин–хозяйка / хозяйка–хозяйин	husbands–wives
баба–дед / дед–баба	Jill–Jack/ Jack–Jill
Иван–Марья, Флор–жена	wife–husband / husband–wife
отец–мать	father–mother
сын–дочь, дочери–сыновья	son–daughter
свекр–свекровь	
невеста–жених	

In order to categorize the selected material, the proverb samples containing similar lexical components (which are varieties of the binary opposition *man–woman*) were analyzed together. Examples of such binary constructions are provided from both Russian and English proverbs samples under each section. These illustrative examples serve as supportive evidence for the interpretation of semantic categories of opposition for identifying the similarities and differences between Russian and English paroemias. This approach enables a detailed analysis of the binary construction *man–woman* in the examined paroemias.

4.1. The Binary Opposition Мужчина–Женщина / Man–Woman

In analyzing Russian and English paroemias, extracted through continuous sampling from lexicographic and online sources, the lexemes *мужчина–женщина* [muzhchina–zhenshchina] and *man–woman* were chosen as initial binary oppositions.

The samples with the binary opposition *мужчина–женщина* (man–woman) were identified within Russian beliefs and superstitions: *Лоб свербит – челом бить: с правой стороны – мужчине, с левой – женщине* (the forehead itches – to bow: on

the right – to a man, on the left – a woman); *Правая бровь чешется – кланяться мужчине, левая – женщине* (the right eyebrow itches – to bow to a man, the left – to a woman).

A similar contrast is found in the other Russian paroemia between lexical components *мальчик–девочка* (boy–girl): *Мать левой ногой вперед выступает – мальчик родится, правой – девочка* (mother tread forward with her left foot – a boy will be born, with her right foot – a girl).

In the above Russian paroemias, we can observe that the contrast of components *мужчина–женщина* (man–woman) and *мальчик–девочка* (boy–girl) are realized through the words *right – left*, which signify “positions on opposite sides” (Ozhegov, 2010, p. 468). However, in the presented samples, there is no clear division that *masculine* symbolizes the *right side* and *feminine* with the *left*.

The binary nature of the opposition *мужчина–женщина* (man–woman) within the examined Russian proverbs is intensified by the following lexical elements: *мужик–баба / баба–мужик, мужики–бабы* [muzhik–baba / baba–muzhik, muzhiki–baby]. These lexical items are more inherent to colloquial speech, as the language of proverbial expressions is closest to

authentic folkloric texts. The Russian proverb samples below imply the following:

– difference in the action pattern: *Мужик тянет в одну сторону, баба в другую* (man pulls in one direction, woman (pulls) in the other); *Мужики дерутся в расходку, а бабы в кучку* (men fight individually (i.e., acting alone), and women together);

– difference in the characteristic features and division of traditional roles that are illustrated through the opposition of spatial characteristics, i.e., *man* is outside, while *woman* is inside: *Мужик да собака всегда на дворе, а баба да кошка всегда в избе* (man and dog are always in the yard, and woman and cat are always in the izba [house]).

In English proverbs, the binary opposition *man–woman* is also represented. The opposition in these examples is demonstrated through evaluative characteristics of their physical condition. In the following English proverb, the age characteristics of *man* are identified according to his own internal perception (how he feels), while *woman* is judged by her external appearance (how she looks): *Man is as old as he feels, and a woman as old as she looks; A man is as old (or young) as he feels (and a woman is as old as she looks).*

Furthermore, the presence of English proverb samples with components, presented in the plural form *men–women* and *males–females* should be highlighted. These are derivatives of the binary opposition *man–woman*. The discussed expressions illustrate the following:

– distinctive roles in family life, wherein *men* are involved in the construction of physical space (building a house), while *women* are responsible for creating an internal atmosphere within the home (domestic comfort): *Men make houses, women make homes;*

– diverse representation of *men* and *women*, demonstrating *masculine* through deeds and actions, and *feminine* through speech and words: *Deeds are males, words are females.*

4.2. The Binary Opposition Муж–Жена / Husband–Wife

In proverbs, the discussed binary opposition is quite frequently observed. This is evidenced

by various lexical elements of this binary construction, representing a married couple. Thus, in Russian proverbs, a married couple can be represented in the form of lexical pairs: *муж–жена / жена–муж / муж–баба, хозяин–хозяйка / хозяйка–хозяин, баба–дед / дед–баба, Иван–Марья / Флор–жена* (husband–wife / wife–husband / husband–baba (wife), host–hostess / hostess– host, baba–ded / ded–baba, Ivan–Maria / Flor–wife); in English proverbs: *husband–wife / wife–husband / husbands–wives, man–wife / wife–man, Jill–Jack.*

In the Russian proverbial fund, selected samples imply the opposition which can illustrate the difference in the degree of actions intensity performed by *муж* (husband) and *жена* (wife) in similar situations: *Муж задурит, половина двора горит, а жена задурит, и весь сгорит* (husband does foolish thing, half the yard is on fire, and wife does a foolish thing, and the whole burns down); *Муж возом не навозит, что жена горшком наносит* (husband does not dung with a cart what a wife dung with a pot); *Муж от жены на пядень, а жена от мужа на сажень* (husband from his wife by a pyaden [measure of a quarter of an arshine; arshine – unit of length (Dal, 2006, p. 260)] and wife from her husband by a sazhen [measure in 3 arshines, in 12 quarters (Dal, 2006, pp. 276–277)]).

Some Russian proverbs emphasize the difference in behavior between a married couple towards each other. Thus, the actions of one against the other may be frivolous or inappropriate. For instance, the actions of a wife may be criticized in relation to a husband, and conversely: *Муж пашет, а жена пляшет* (husband plows, and wife dances); *Муж за бороною, жена за меледою* [to trifle (Dal, 2001, p. 384)] (husband pulls harrows, wife trifles); *Жена мелет, а муж спит* (wife grinds, and husband sleeps); *Жена прядет, а муж пляшет* (wife spins, and husband dances).

Among Russian proverbs, there are examples where the contrast in actions of *husband* and *wife* is characterized by different ways and means: *Муж кочадыком* [awl for weaving bast shoes (Vasmer, 1986, p. 357)], *баба языком* (плетут) (husband with an awl (i.e., ability to act using physical, practical skills),

woman with a tongue (ability to communicate)); *Муж клином, баба блином, а доймает* (husband with a wedge, woman with a blin [thin pancake], but she will catch). Some Russian paroemias can also imply the difference in domestic responsibilities of husband and wife: *Муж молоти пшеницу, а жена пеки паланицы* (husband grinds wheat, and wife bakes bread); *Жена пряди рубашки, а муж тяни гуж* [in harness: leather loop that is reinforced in draft collar (Dal, 2006, p.52)] (wife sews a shirt, and husband pulls a harness).

The Russian proverb samples analyzed in this section can also illustrate the division of roles of husband and wife: *Муж жене отец, жена мужу венец* (husband is a father to his wife, wife is a crown to her husband); *Муж–голова, жена–душа* (husband is a head, wife is a soul).

The contrast in the following Russian paroemia occurs based on evaluative characteristics, such as distinctions in personal appearance: *Борода кажет мужа, а жену – нужа* [poverty, need, lack of the daily life needs (Dal, 2006, p. 176)] (the beard points to husband, and the need – wife).

The following examined Russian proverbs samples contrast some aspects linked to the age of husband and wife: *Муж стар, а жена молода – дожидайся детей; муж молод, а жена стара–дожидайся плетей* (husband is old and his wife is young - wait for the children; husband is young and his wife is old – await whips).

Among the selected English paroemias, we found an example with binary construction *husbands–wives*. The semantic content of opposition in this expression demonstrates a difference in emotional perception caused by specific situations: *The calmest husbands make the stormiest wives*.

It is important to note that some of the analyzed Russian and English proverbs can express the semantics of opposition. The following samples below suggest the mutual interdependence of husband and wife and balance in their relationship: *Где муж, там и жена* (where the husband is, there is wife); *У мужа толсто (в кармане), и у жены широко в угощении* (if husband's pocket is full, wife is generous with a treat); *У мужа*

полтина, и у жены половина (husband has half, and wife has half); *A deaf husband and a blind wife are always happy; The wife should be blind and the husband deaf; When the husband drinks to the wife, all would be well: when the wife drinks to the husband, all is well; A good wife and health is a man's best wealth; A man's best fortune, or his worst, is his wife.*

In some discussed Russian and English proverbs, the binary opposition *husband–wife* can be observed in one of their parts. The semantic meaning of such samples is not also based on opposition but rather on representing husband and wife as a bipolar unity: *Муж да жена – одна душа* (husband and wife are one soul); *Муж (да) жена – одна сатана* (husband and wife are alike they share similar interest and opinions); *Husband and wife are indeed of the same breed; Husband and wife are one bone (and) one flees.*

Furthermore, in Russian proverbial expressions, such interrelation of the examined lexical pairs form the foundation of married life, and its absence leads to a loss of unity: *Без мужа, что без головы; без жены, что без ума* (without a husband is like without a head; without a wife is like without mind); *Без жены, что без кошки, а без мужа, что без собаки* (т.е. некому оберегать) (without a wife is like without a cat, but without a husband is like without a dog [i.e. no one to protect]).

It is noteworthy that proverbial expressions containing a binary construct with the lexemes *husband* and *wife* can illustrate in Russian paroemias, a preferred action of one of the partner, while in English, this typically pertains to wife: *Не всяку правду муж жене сказывает, а и сказывает, так обманывает* (husband does not tell his wife all the truth, but he does, he deceives); *Чего жена не любит, того мужу век не едать* (what wife does not like, that husband should never eat); *An obedient wife commands her husband; The cunning wife makes her husband her apron.*

Moreover, in Russian paroemias, the binary opposition *husband–wife* can be presented as lexical units *хозяин–хозяйка / хозяйка–хозяин* (host–hostess / hostess–host). These proverbs samples highlight the distinct roles in domestic life and relationships: *От хозяина чтоб*

пахло ветром, от хозяйки дымом (host should smell of wind, hostess should smell of the hearth smoke); *Хочешь быть сыт, садись подле хозяйки; хочешь быть пьян, садись подле хозяина* (if you want to be full, sit down next to the hostess; if you want to be drunk, sit next to the host).

The binary opposition *husband–wife* was identified in some Russian proverbial expressions. The lexical components *баба–дед* [baba–ded], present an aged married couple. In the following proverbial expression, we can also notice the traditional attitudes and roles of married partners: *Баба с кромою* [slice; hunch of bread (Dal, 2006, p. 115)], *а дед с сумою* [purse, bag is worn on shoulder or on belt (Dal, 2006, p. 303)] (baba [wife] with a hunch of bread, ded [husband] with a purse. Another proverb with the same opposition illustrates the difference in their perception of the same situation: *В чем деду стыд, в том бабе смех* (what for husband [ded] can cause shame, for wife [baba] can cause laughter).

In the process of continuous sampling, a few Russian and English proverbs were found where *husband* and *wife* are marked by anthroponyms. In Russian proverbs, these are the names *Ivan*, *Maria*, and *Flor*. The sample of the Russian proverb *Иван Марьи не слушается: сам приказывать горазд* (Ivan does not obey Maria: he prefers to command) demonstrates the preference for action from male perspective. The following proverb *Флор плачет, а жена скачет* (Flor is crying, and his wife is dancing up) contrasts the actions of *wife* and *husband*.

In English proverbs, we can observe names like *Jill* and *Jack*. In other versions, these anthroponyms may be represented as lexical units like *wife–husband*. The semantic meaning of the proverb samples indicates that the positive qualities and actions of one can have a beneficial impact on the behavior and character of the other: *A good Jill may mend the bad Jack; A good wife makes a good husband; A good Jack (husband) makes a good Jill (wife)*.

4.3. The Binary Opposition *Отец–Мать/ Father–Mother*

The contrasting elements in proverbs of both languages are presented in the form of the

following lexical components: *отец–мать; father–mother / mother–father*. In the factual data of this section, we can observe various social roles of parents within the family, their involvement in the upbringing process, as well as their attachment to their children: *Отец про походы, мать про расходы* толкуют (father talk about campaigns, mother talk about expenses); *Без отца – полсироты, а без матери и вся сирота* (without a father – half-orphan, and without a mother – orphan); *Experience is the father of wisdom, and memory the mother; Children suck the mother when they are young, and the father when they are old*.

4.4. The Binary Opposition *Сын–Дочь/Son–Daughter*

Binary constructions of this section were revealed in both Russian and English proverbs. These expressions have a direct connection to the previous section *отец–мать/ father–mother*, as the following examples characterize different social roles of children as perceived by parents: *Сын – домашний гость, а дочь в люди пойдет* (son is a home guest (means that son stays at home with his parents), and daughter will go to people (indicates that daughter is likely to marry and leave her parental home)); *Сын на мать походит, дочь на отца – к счастью* (son looks like his mother; daughter looks like her father – luckily); *My son is my son till he gets a wife, but my daughter is my daughter all the days of her life; Marry your son when you will; your daughter when you can*.

Moreover, in the Russian proverbs, we identified a derivative of this binary construction in the form of the lexical pair *дочери – сыновья* (daughters – sons): *Дочерьми красуются, сыновьями в почете живут* (flaunt daughters' beauty and be proud of sons' honor).

4.5. The Binary Opposition *Свекр–Свекровь*

In the lexicographic sources of Russian proverbs, we identified the binary opposition of *свекр–свекровь* (father-in-law–mother-in-law). The semantics of the following example demonstrates the wife's representation of her *husband's* parents: *Свекор батюшка–застояшка, свекровь матушка–заборонушка* (говорит сноха, льстя) (father-in-law is a supporter, mother-in-law is a prohibitor (daughter-in-law says flattering)).

4.6. The Binary Opposition *Невеста–Жених*

In an analysis of the selected Russian proverbial units, we examined examples with lexical components *невеста–жених* (bride–groom). These proverbs convey semantic aspects of traditions and customs of the pre-wedding period that characterize the status of a woman as a bride and a man as a groom: *Невеста родится, а жених на конь садится* (bride is born, and groom rides a horse); *Невеста без места, жених без ума* (без уса) (a bride without a place, a groom without a mind (without a mustache)).

5. Discussion

The paroemias analysis showed that contrasting *masculine* and *feminine* covers a range of semantic categories and reflects various aspects in both linguocultures. Examined proverbs contrast “*defining characteristics*” associated with man and woman. Russian proverbs present external and age features and reactions to the same situation; English samples present physical condition and emotional perception. It should be noted that contrasting in some Russian paroemias occurs by using other binary oppositions (right–left) to symbolize masculine and feminine.

Another semantic category of opposition in the considered proverbs samples is “*roles and responsibilities*”. These paroemias reflect the division of traditional roles and distinguish male and female activities in family life. The samples often associate male roles with activities related to external factors (outside) and female roles – with internal ones (inside). Furthermore, some Russian paroemias use figurative expressions to contrast *man* and *woman* connected with behavior patterns and also ways and means to denote male and female activities. The examined proverbs of both languages illustrate the difference in roles between parents (father–mother) and children (son–daughter). Some identified Russian proverb samples represent the status of man and woman as groom and bride.

The analysis of semantic categories within examined paroemias provides to reveal cultural perspectives on the contrasting attributes, roles, and responsibilities of man and woman in family life. It highlights the creative use of language to convey these

distinctions and the cultural significance of such expressions.

The verbalization of examined binary opposition can be represented with the following initial lexical components in the discussed expressions: *мужчина–женщина, мальчик–девочка, мужики–бабы; man–woman, men–women, males–females*. Moreover, the binary construction *man–woman* in the examined factual material is realized through other variety of lexical elements and can be presented as follows: *married couple*: муж–жена / жена–муж / муж–баба, хозяйин–хозяйка / хозяйка–хозяйин, баба–дед / дед–баба, Иван–Марья / Флор–жена; husbands–wives, Jill (wife)–Jack (husband)/Jack (husband)–Jill (wife); *parents*: отец–мать, свекр–свекровь (husband’s parents), father–mother; *children*: сын–дочь, дочери–сыновья, son–daughter. Furthermore, in the discussed Russian paroemias, the examined binary opposition is also represented as the lexical pair *невеста–жених* (bride–groom).

Some of the identified lexical components have plural forms. These plural variations contribute to the cultural and linguistic aspects of paroemias. It is noteworthy that the dichotomy according to *masculine–feminine* in the examined samples is presented in different age categories.

A contrastive study revealed similarities and differences in the opposition semantics of the examined paroemias. A continuous sample of the obtained data revealed more lexical variations of the discussed binary opposition in Russian proverbs. It is important to note that the representation of *man–woman* in the majority of proverb samples is caused by lexical units that mean a married couple. This is confirmed by illustrative proverbial expressions reflecting the roles and interaction of man and woman in marriage.

Thus, the study of the binary opposition *man–woman* in proverbs makes it possible to take into account its cultural meanings and linguistic aspects. As shown in the present paper, paroemias afford an opportunity to understand aspects of verbalization of binary oppositions in the considered linguocultures. Moreover, analysis of lexical constructions that are used in paroemias provides information about how language reflects and forms

representation of the examined binary oppositions. In sum, the study reveals the significance of the binary opposition *man–woman* in proverbs and the interconnection between its components in linguocultures.

References

- Alefirenko, N. F., & Semenenko, N. N. (2009). *Frazeologiya i paremiologiya* [Phraseology and proverbs]. Nauka.
- Apperson, G. L. (2006). The Wordsworth dictionary of proverbs. In M. Martin & S. Curtis (Eds.), *Dictionary of proverbs*. Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Bredis, M. A. (2017). *Predstavleniya o deneznykh otnosheniyakh v posloviatsakh (na materiale Russkogo, Latyshskogo, Litovskogo, Nemetskogo i Angliiskogo yazykov)* [Ideas about money relations in proverbs (based on Russian, Latvian, Lithuanian, German and English languages)] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Rossiiskii Universitet Druzhby Narodov.
- Dal, V. I. (2001). *Tolkovyi slovar' Russkogo yazyka. Sovremennaya versiya* [Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. Modern version]. Eksmo.
- Dal, V. I. (2006). *Bolshoi illiustrirovannyi tolkovyi slovar' Russkogo yazyka: Sovremennoe napisanie* [The great illustrated explanatory dictionary of the Russian language: Modern composition]. Astrel.
- Dal, V. I. (2009). *Posloviatsy Russkogo naroda* [Proverbs of the Russian people]. Russkii yazyk.
- De Saussure, F. (1933). *Kurs obshchei lingvistiky* [Course of general linguistics] (A. M. Sukhotina, Trans.). Sotsekgiz. (Original work published 1916)
- Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and phenomena* (D. B. Allison & N. Garver, Trans.). North-western University Press.
- Golembovskaya, N. G. (2014). *Lingvokul'turnye antinomii v Russkikh i Litovskikh paremiyakh* [Linguistic and cultural antinomies in Russian and Lithuanian proverbs] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Volgograd State University.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage.
- Izutsu, M. (2008). Contrast, concessive, and corrective: Toward a comprehensive study of opposition relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 646-675. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.07.001>
- Martinek, S. (2019). Light and dark: Oppositional metaphor as the interaction of cognitive mechanisms. *Jezikoslovlje*, 2(2), 279-302. <https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2019.10>
- Mieder, W. (1993). *Proverbs are never out of season. Popular wisdom in modern age*. Oxford University Press.
- Moiseev, M. V., & Gicheva, N. G. (2009). *Sopostavitelnaya lingvokulturologiya Angliiskogo i Russkogo yazykov* [Contrastive linguoculturology of English and Russian languages]. Omsk.
- Osheva, E. A. (2013). *Lingvokulturnaya spetsifika paremiologicheskogo prostranstva: Na materiale Russkogo i Angliiskogo yazykov* [Linguocultural specificity of the paremiological space: On the basis of Russian and English] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Perm State National Research University.
- Ozhegov, S. I. (2010). *Tolkovyi slovar' Russkogo yazyka* [Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language] (27th ed.). Oniks.
- Pishghadam, R. (2013). Introducing cultuling as a dynamic tool in culturology of language. *Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, 45(4), 47-62.
- Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Cultuling analysis: A new methodology for discovering cultural memes. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 8(2), 17-34.
- Podsievak, K., Sieriakova, I., & Franko, O. (2020). Binary opposition “man – machinery”. In R. Bradbury (Ed.), *Science fiction works: A cognitive linguistic approach* (pp. 321-329). Arab World English Journal. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt3.26>
- Rudnev, V. P. (1999). *Slovar' kul'tury XX veka* [Dictionary of culture of the 20th century]. Agraf.
- Seliverstova, E. I. (2010). *Russkaya posloviatsa v paremiologicheskome prostranstve: Stabilnost' i variativnost' (lingvisticheskii aspekt)* [Russian proverb in paremiological space: Stability and variability (linguistic aspect)] [Unpublished doctoral

- dissertation]. Saint Petersburg State University.
- Speake, J. (Ed.). (2008). *The Oxford dictionary of proverbs* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Sultanbaeva, K., Abdullina, L., Gimasheva, G., Ganeeva, G., Kaskinova, G., & Samirkhanova, G. (2021). Linguocultural analysis of the conceptual framework “family” in the works of Mustai Karim. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 9(2), 151-159.
- Temirgazina, Z., & Andryushchenko, O. (2023). Mifonimy kak etalony urodstva i krasoty [The mythonyms as the standards of ugliness and beauty]. *Orbis Linguarum*, 21(1), 72-84. <https://doi.org/10.37708/ezs.swu.v21.i1.8>
- Vasmer, M. (1986). *Etimologicheskii slovar' Russkogo yazyka* [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language] (Vol. 2, 2nd ed., O. N. Trubachev, Trans.). Progress.
- Zhukov, V. P. (2000). *Slovar' Russkikh poslovits i pogovorok* [The dictionary of Russian proverbs and sayings]. Russkii Yazyk.
- Zhunussova, Z. N., & Yermakova V. A. (2017). *Analogiya v paremiyakh s kognitivno-kulturnym komponentom "svoi-chuzhoi" (na materiale Russkikh i Angliiskikh slovarej)* [Analogy in paroemias with the cognitive-cultural component “own-other” (based on Russian and English dictionaries)]. In Y. N. Aznacheeva (Ed.), *Analogovye protsessy v lingvokreativnoi deyatelnosti yazykovoï lichnosti* [Analogue processes in the linguistic creative activity of a linguistic personality] (pp. 53-81). Chelyabinsk State University.