

<http://doi.org/10.29162/pv.41.1.541>

Original scientific paper

Received on 3 January 2024

Accepted for publication on 27 April 2024

CRISTINA TEJEDOR MARTÍNEZ

OPPOSITENESS IN PROVERBS. A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH PROVERBS WITH THEIR SPANISH AND ROMANIAN EQUIVALENTS

Abstract: The aim of the study is to emphasize the importance of antonymy in proverbs through the analysis of opposite relationships of words within English proverbs and comparing them with their equivalents in Spanish and Romanian. Based on a semantic perspective, a classification of opposites has been established and the English proverbs selected from the corpus categorized accordingly. Subsequently, the English proverbs containing opposites have been contrasted with their Spanish and Romanian equivalent proverbs. The objective is to analyse the equality, near-equality, or equivalence of oppositeness found in the proverbs extracted from the corpus in all three languages. The study examines if the Spanish and Romanian equivalents of the English head proverbs also contain pairs of opposite words and if they can be classified in the same group of opposites. Thus, the similarity or equality of oppositeness in the proverbs across the three languages is analysed and contrasted. The quantitative results of the study are presented in this paper, along with reflections that have emerged from the research.

Keywords: oppositeness, proverbs, contrastive analysis, English, Spanish and Romanian proverbs containing opposites

1. Introduction

Oppositeness has a “unique fascination” as Cruse (1986: 197) noted. It is obvious that we live with and are surrounded by ant-

onyms. Just think of an ordinary day of our everyday life. Most people wake, turn the light on, get off the bed, put their clothes on, go out for work, hop on/off the bus, sit down, stand up, and so on. Then they go back home, take their clothes off, get into bed, turn the light off, etc. Our entire life is based on reversed activities implying opposites of different kind. We turn the TV on and off, we see or hear good and bad news, we use hot and cold water, we have a left and a right hand, we are sad or happy, short or tall, rich or poor, we have bitter or sweet memories, and the list can go on and on. Cruse (2000: 167) considers that “oppositeness is perhaps the only sense relation to receive direct lexical recognition in everyday language.” Similarly, Jones (2002: 181) states that “it is no exaggeration to say that antonyms are a ubiquitous part of everyday language and culture.”

In languages, antonyms are those correlative words between which a relation of semantic oppositeness is established. Commonly, antonyms are defined as words with opposite meaning, terms, which are the opposite or antithesis of another counter terms. They exist in the form of pairs of words having a standard value. In fact, Jones (2002: 179) defines antonyms as “pairs of words which contrast along a given semantic scale and frequently function in a coordinated and ancillary fashion such that they become lexically enshrined as ‘opposites.’” Furthermore, Palmer (1981: 94) states that “antonymy is a regular and very natural feature of language and can be defined fairly precisely.” For that reason, Murphy (2003: 40) considers that universality is one of the features of antonymy and implies the fact that it is a semantic relation relevant to the description of any language’s lexicon, because antonymy is “arguably the archetypical lexical semantic relation” (Cruse 2000: 169). Moroianu (2008: 7) classifies antonyms into five groups:

- lexical antonymy, represented by words opposed in meaning;
- prefixal antonymy, established mainly between homolexic words prefixed with prefixes opposed in meaning;
- affixal antonymy, established between prefixes or suffixes which give birth to antonymous terms, most of them being scientific terms;

- phraseological antonymy, established between phraseological units;
- mixed antonymy, the lexical-phraseological antonymy, established between words and expressions, usually within the same morphological class.

Although most attention has been dedicated to prefixation in the process of coining pairs of antonyms (for example, Bauer et al. 2015), some authors, such as Sánchez Fajardo (2020) studies the analogical suffixation of paired antonyms in English. This linguistic formation process has been described in Hungarian (Rounds 2013), in Russian and Uzbek (Žanpera et al. 2020) and Croatian (Yuldosheva and Suleymanova 2021).

Opposites of various types are to be met frequently in English phraseology. In fact, opposites appear in a great number of phrases and proverbs, e.g. *day and night*, *by yea and no* (archaic), *through thick and thin*, *to put this and that together*, *the short and the long of it*, *to take for better or worse*, *from top to bottom*, *Good to begin, better to end well*, *Make your enemy your friend*, *The buyer needs a hundred eyes, the seller but one*, *If you love the boll, you cannot hate branches*, *Not so good to borrow, as to be able to lend*, etc. Various types of oppositeness relations are established not only within proverbs, but also between proverbs. There are antonymous proverbs such as *Where there's a will there's a way* versus *You can't have your cake and eat it too*; *Look before you leap* versus *He who hesitates is lost*; *Too many cooks spoil the broth* versus *Many hands make light work*; *You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear* versus *Clothes make the man*; *The cowl does not make the monk* versus *Fine feathers make fine birds*; *Absence makes the heart grow fonder* versus *Out of sight, out of mind*, etc. According to Gao and Zheng (2014: 237), "when antonyms are used in proverbs, the rhetorical effect of phonological harmony, formal beauty and conciseness are achieved."

In this study, the oppositeness relations of antonymous word pairs within English proverbs are analysed and these proverbs are grouped according to the types of opposites they include. Following this, a comparison is made between these English proverbs and their Spanish and Romanian equivalents to exam-

ine the inclusion of oppositeness relations. The aim of the contrastive analysis is to answer the following questions: Do the Spanish and Romanian equivalent proverbs corresponding to an English head proverb that contains a pair of opposite terms also include a pair of opposites? And do the opposite terms present in the Spanish and Romanian equivalent proverbs belong to the same group of opposites as the ones found in the English head proverb? Our intention is to discover the extent to which the similarities of the oppositeness relations found in the three languages overshadow or, conversely, are eclipsed by the differences in the same relations of oppositeness. Therefore, our major interest is in analysing the equality, near equality, or equivalence of oppositeness relations found in the proverbs extracted in our corpus in the three languages. This paper develops the quantitative part of the study and provides some reflections, which emerged from the results.

2. *The study*

2.1. *Corpus*

The main sources which provide the corpus of this study were the following bi/multilingual works. We present them with the related abbreviations used and their corresponding number of proverbs between brackets, when provided by the author:

FLO (3246): Flonta, Teodor (2001). *A Dictionary of English and Romance Languages Equivalent Proverbs*. DeProverbio.com.

ISC: Iscla Rovira, Luis (1995). *English Proverbs and Their Near Equivalents in Spanish, French, Italian and Latin*. New York: Peter Lang.

CAR (700): Carbonell Basset, Delfin (2005). *The New Dictionary of Current Sayings and Proverbs, Spanish and English*. Barcelona: Ediciones de Serbal.

LEF (2313): Lefter, Virgil (2002). *Dicționar de proverbe englez-român și românenglez*. Bucharest: Teora.

SEV (1001): Sevilla Muñoz, Julia and Jesús Cantera Ortiz de Urbina (2001). *1.001 Refranes españoles con su corre-*

spondencia en ocho lenguas (alemán, árabe, francés, inglés, italiano, polaco, provenzal y ruso). Madrid: Ediciones Internacionales Universitarias.

GHE (364): Gheorghe, Gabriel (1986). *Proverbele românești și proverbele lumii romanice*. Bucharest: Albatros.

The starting point was selecting all the English proverbs including opposite words from the FLO dictionary. The FLO dictionary was chosen as the main source of our corpus for two reasons: on the one hand, it assembles the largest number of proverbs among the listed dictionaries; and, on the other hand, it includes equivalent proverbs in five national Romance languages: French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian. This inclusion covers the other two languages besides English that are the focus of our work. The CAR and LEF dictionaries are bilingual, showing English proverbs with their equivalents in only one of the other two languages of interest. The other dictionaries—ISC, SEV and GHE—are multilingual, but in each of them one of the three languages we are interested in is missing: Romanian is missing in ISC and SEV, and English in GHE, which includes only proverbs in Romance languages.

Out of the 3,246 English proverbs recorded in the FLO dictionary, 471 proverbs containing at least one pair of opposite words were selected. This count includes 28 proverbs that repeat because they contain more than one pair of opposites. From these 471 English proverbs, 70 were excluded because the opposites they included could not be classified according to the six types of opposites listed in the Methodology section.

When no equivalent Spanish or Romanian proverb was provided by the FLO dictionary, other sources were consulted to find an equivalent. These sources were also consulted in order to identify variants of one proverb. The 471 English proverbs, along with their English variants and their Spanish and Romanian equivalent proverbs, make a total of 1,532 analysed proverbs. If we add the 70 unclassified English proverbs mentioned above, it means that 1,602 proverbs (English, Spanish and Romanian) were included in our study.

2.2. Methodology

Our classification of the proverbs is based on the opposites' categorization from a semantic point of view, since this classification makes a direct reference to the oppositeness relations established between lexical units. In order to establish our classification, two proposals for the categorization of opposites have been used. On the one hand, Löbner's (2002: 88-93) description of opposites in five groups:

- a) antonyms (pairs of opposites which admit intermediate terms between them), e.g. big-small, good-bad, rich-poor, long-short, hot-cold, young-old, difficult-easy, etc.
- b) complementaries (pairs of opposites between which no intermediate term is admitted), e.g. male-female, war-peace, alive-dead, single-married, on-off, true-false, possible-impossible, etc.
- c) directional opposites (opposites implying a certain axis and a point of orientation), e.g. up-down, front-back, north-south, above-below, left-right, here-there, etc.
- d) converses (opposites implying a reversed relation), e.g. husband-wife, debtor-creditor, sell-buy, give-take, offer-accept, etc.
- e) heteronyms (opposites involving more than two words), e.g. Monday-Tuesday-Wednesday, red-green-blue, etc.

On the other hand, one more group has been added, reversives, which was included in Cruse's (2000: 171) classification of opposites:

- f) reversives (opposites denoting movement, change in opposite directions), e.g. read-write, pack-unpack, dress-undress, enter-exit, etc.

According to these types of opposites, English proverbs with their equivalents in Spanish and Romanian languages have been classified into six main groups: proverbs including antonyms, proverbs including complementaries, proverbs including directional opposites, proverbs including converses, proverbs including reversives and proverbs including heteronyms.

In order to represent the corresponding relations of oppositeness found in the selected proverbs in the three languages under

study and the corresponding connections among them, a system of formulae has been implemented. As it can be seen in Table 1, the corresponding relations of oppositeness identified in the three languages have been transcribed through 32 distinct formulae (see complete formula column). Since our major interest is in the equality, near-equality, or equivalence of the relations of oppositeness identified in the three languages, the complete formulae have been reduced to simpler forms (see the reduced formula column) in order to clearly illustrate the main relations between languages.

Table 1: Corresponding relations of oppositeness in the three languages formulae

	COMPLETE FORMULA	FORMULA INTERPRETATION	REDUCED FORMULA
1	$E = S \neq R [-]$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. No Romanian equivalent.	$E = S$
2	$E \neq (S[-] = R[-])$	No Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverbs.	$S = R = [-]$
3	$E = S = R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian.	$E = S = R$
4	$E (\neq S[-]) = R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. No Spanish equivalent proverbs.	$E = R$
5	$E = S \neq R[0]$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb.	$E = S$
6	$E \neq S[0] \neq R[-]$	Zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb. No Romanian equivalent proverb.	$E \neq S$
7	$E \neq S[-] \neq R[0]$	No Spanish equivalent proverb. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb.	$E \neq R$
8	$E \approx S \neq R[-]$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. No Romanian equivalent.	$E \approx S$
9	$E \neq (S[0] = R[0])$	Zero relations of oppositeness in the Spanish and the Romanian proverbs.	$S = R = [0]$

10	$E \Leftrightarrow S = R$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian.	$E \Leftrightarrow S = R$
11	$E = S \Leftrightarrow R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian.	$E = S \Leftrightarrow R$
12	$E = S \neq R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, different from the relation of oppositeness found in the Romanian proverb.	$E = S$
13	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[-]$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. No Romanian equivalent proverb.	$E \Leftrightarrow S$
14	$E(\neq S) = R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian, different from the relation of oppositeness found in the Spanish proverb.	$E = R$
15	$E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian.	$E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$
16	$E(\neq S[0]) = R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb.	$E = R$
17	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[0]$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb.	$E \Leftrightarrow S$
18	$E \neq S \neq R[-]$	Different relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. No Romanian equivalent proverb.	$E \neq S$
19	$E \neq (S = R)$	Equal relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian, different from the one found in the English proverb.	$S = R$
20	$E \neq S[-] \neq R$	Different relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. No Spanish equivalent proverb.	$E \neq R$
21	$E(\neq S[-]) \Leftrightarrow R$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. No Spanish equivalent proverb.	$E \Leftrightarrow R$
22	$E \neq S \neq R[0]$	Different relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb.	$E \neq S \neq R$

23	$E \approx (S = R)$	Equal relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian, near-equal to the relation of oppositeness in English.	$E \approx (S = R)$
24	$E \approx S \neq R[0]$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb.	$E \approx S$
25	$E \neq (S \Leftrightarrow R)$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian, different from the relation of oppositeness found in the English proverb.	$S \Leftrightarrow R$
26	$E \neq S[0] \neq R$	Different relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb.	$E \neq S \neq R$
27	$E (\neq S[-]) \approx R$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian. Zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb.	$E \approx R$
28	$E = S \approx R$	Equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, near-equal to the one found in Romanian.	$E = S \approx R$
29	$E \approx S \approx R$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian.	$E \approx S \approx R$
30	$E \approx S \Leftrightarrow R$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, equivalent to the one found in Romanian.	$E \approx S \Leftrightarrow R$
31	$E \approx S = R$	Near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, equal to the one found in Romanian.	$E \approx S = R$
32	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R$	Equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, different from the relation of oppositeness found in the Romanian proverb.	$E \Leftrightarrow S$

Here is an explanatory chart of all the symbols used in our analysis's formulae:

Table 2: Explanatory chart of symbols

SYMBOL	MEANING	COMMENT
=	Equal (totally equivalent) to	When the same relation of oppositeness found in the English proverb appears in its equivalent Spanish or Romanian proverb.
≈	Near-equal	When the relation of oppositeness in one language is nearly totally equivalent to the relation of oppositeness in the other language.
<=>	Equivalent to	When the same relation of oppositeness found in the English proverb appears in its equivalent Spanish and/or Romanian proverb, but the terms are not totally equal.
≠	Different from	When the relation of oppositeness in one language is different from the (non)existing or the [0] relation of oppositeness in the other language(s).
[-]	No equivalent proverb	Used when no equivalent proverb of the English head paroemia was found in the language it refers to.
[0]	No opposite term	It represents the missing opposite term. When a proverb and its equivalent in one of the other two contrastive languages contains no antonymic pair.
()	To pay attention the relations of the corresponding relation of oppositeness	When the corresponding relation of oppositeness formula can be wrongly interpreted, parentheses are used to help the reader to clearly decode the distinctions/equivalences of the oppositeness relations.

In Table 1, we used different colours to group together formulae, or, more specifically, similar relations established among all or between two of our contrastive languages. Those formulae with a white background have been left aside because they include no equal, near-equal or equivalent relation of oppositeness between the English head proverbs and their Spanish or Romanian counterparts. Most of them contain, in their reduced forms, the '≠' symbol for different relations of oppositeness between the corresponding languages in which such a relation of oppositeness exists, e.g.: formulae number 6, 7, 18, 20, 22, 26, while this symbol does not appear in any of the coloured background reduced formulae. Even though the '=' symbol can be found in the

short forms of the second ($S = R = [-]$) and the ninth ($S = R = [0]$) formulae, its interpretation in these cases (no Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverbs and zero relations of oppositeness in the Spanish and the Romanian proverbs respectively) leads us to the same decision of excluding them from our valid formulae. According to the similarity of the relations of oppositeness established between two or three of our languages, based on the reduced formulae, the yellow colour indicates equal, near-equal or equivalent relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian ($=/\approx/ \leq => E \& S \& R$); the pink colour signals equal, near-equal or equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish ($=/\approx/ \leq => E \& S$); the green colour indicates equal, near-equal, or equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian ($=/\approx/ \leq => E \& R$); and, finally, the blue colour marks equal, near-equal, or equivalent relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian ($=/\approx/ \leq => S \& R$).

3. *Contrastive analysis results*

The initial findings focus on the number of the proverbs examined in our study. We reviewed 3,246 English proverbs, from which 471 English head proverbs were selected. These include 28 repeated proverbs that were incorporated into more than one category: 27 proverbs were included in two classes, while the proverb *Fire and water are good servants, but bad masters* was classified into three categories because it contains 3 pairs of opposites. Additionally, 70 proverbs were excluded because their opposites could not be classified according to the six types listed in the Methodology section. The 471 English proverbs, including their English variants and their Spanish and Romanian equivalents, make up the corpus of our study. This brings the total number of analysed proverbs to 1,602, distributed as follows: 649 English proverbs (counting the repeated ones mentioned above) – which include 579 proverbs, being the 471 English head proverbs with their 80 English variants, plus the 70 unclassified proverbs –, 631 Spanish proverbs and 322 Romanian proverbs.

The 471 English head proverbs were classified into six groups, according to the opposites they include. If we take a brief look at the English proverbs' classification according to the op-

posite words included in them (Table 3), it may be said that all of the six groups of opposites are represented.

Table 3: Proverbs' class number (English)

RANK	PROVERBS' CLASS	N° OF PROVERBS	PERCENTAGE
1	Proverbs including ANTONYMS	254	53,93 %
2	Proverbs including COMPLEMENTARIES	75	15,92 %
3	Proverbs including CONVERSES	43	9,13 %
4	Proverbs including REVERSIVES	34	7,22 %
5	Proverbs including HETERONYMS	33	7,01 %
6	Proverbs including DIRECTIONALS	32	6,79 %
TOTAL		471	

From the six types of opposites, the first one, namely that of the antonyms, is the most productive, detaching considerably from the other groups with 254 English proverbs, while the last one, proverbs including directionals, is the least productive with 32 English proverbs.

Regarding the corresponding relations of oppositeness found in the selected proverbs in the three languages, as can be seen, the 32 formulae are listed in descending order according to their frequency (see Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency of corresponding relations of opposite-ness in the three languages

	COMPLETE FORMULA	REDUCED FORMULA	FREQUENCY
1	$E = S \neq R [-]$	$E = S$	119
2	$E \neq (S[-] = R[-])$	$S = R = [-]$	95
3	$E = S = R$	$E = S = R$	89
4	$E (\neq S[-]) = R$	$E = R$	21
5	$E = S \neq R[0]$	$E = S$	19
6	$E \neq S[0] \neq R[-]$	$E \neq S$	19
7	$E \neq S[-] \neq R[0]$	$E \neq R$	16
8	$E \approx S \neq R[-]$	$E \approx S$	11
9	$E \neq (S[0] = R[0])$	$S = R = [0]$	11
10	$E \Leftrightarrow S = R$	$E \Leftrightarrow S = R$	9
11	$E = S \Leftrightarrow R$	$E = S \Leftrightarrow R$	7
12	$E = S \neq R$	$E = S$	6
13	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[-]$	$E \Leftrightarrow S$	6
14	$E(\neq S) = R$	$E = R$	5
15	$E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$	$E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$	5
16	$E (\neq S[0]) = R$	$E = R$	4
17	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[0]$	$E \Leftrightarrow S$	3
18	$E \neq S \neq R[-]$	$E \neq S$	3
19	$E \neq (S = R)$	$S = R$	2
20	$E \neq S[-] \neq R$	$E \neq R$	2
21	$E (\neq S[-]) \Leftrightarrow R$	$E \Leftrightarrow R$	2
22	$E \neq S \neq R[0]$	$E \neq S \neq R$	2
23	$E \approx (S = R)$	$E \approx (S = R)$	2
24	$E \approx S \neq R[0]$	$E \approx S$	2
25	$E \neq (S \Leftrightarrow R)$	$S \Leftrightarrow R$	2
26	$E \neq S[0] \neq R$	$E \neq S \neq R$	2
27	$E (\neq S[-]) \approx R$	$E \approx R$	2
28	$E = S \approx R$	$E = S \approx R$	1
29	$E \approx S \approx R$	$E \approx S \approx R$	1

30	$E \approx S \Leftrightarrow R$	$E \approx S \Leftrightarrow R$	1
31	$E \approx S = R$	$E \approx S = R$	1
32	$E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R$	$E \Leftrightarrow S$	1

The results indicate that the most common formula is $E = S \neq R[-]$, occurring in 119 instances where the English and Spanish proverbs share equal opposites, but no Romanian equivalent is found. This is followed by 95 cases in which the head-English proverb has neither Spanish nor Romanian equivalent that could be found in our corpus, represented by the $E \neq (S[-] = R[-])$ formula. Notably, perfect concordance ($E = S = R$) is seen in 89 instances, indicating equal opposites in all three languages. The fourth place is taken by the $E (\neq S[-]) = R$ formula, with 21 cases in which no Spanish equivalent proverb was provided by the sources of our corpus, while the relations of oppositeness found in the English head-proverb and its Romanian equivalent are equal. The following two formulae, $E = S \neq R[0]$ and $E \neq S[0] \neq R[-]$, occupy the same position with a frequency of 19 appearances. They are both characterized by the fact that one of the English head-proverb's equivalents contains a zero relation of oppositeness due to the lack of one or both opposite terms. Number 7 formula - $E \neq S[-] \neq R[0]$ - is very similar to the previous one ($E \neq S[0] \neq R[-]$) but with less appearances, 16 instead of 19. We notice that the difference lies in the inverted situations of the Spanish and Romanian equivalents, with a '0' relation of oppositeness when they exist in the sources of our corpus. Regarding the formulae numbers 8: $E \approx S \neq R[-]$ and 9: $E \neq (S[0] = R[0])$, we see again an equal rate, namely 11 appearances, but this is the only particularity these two formulae have in common.

The next two formulae, $E \Leftrightarrow S = R$ (9 entries) and $E = S \Leftrightarrow R$ (7 entries), are very similar because they both include an equal and an equivalent relation of oppositeness. The 12th ($E = S \neq R$) and the 13th ($E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[-]$) formulae share the same number of entries (six) and the fact that the relations of oppositeness that interest us are established in both cases between the English and the Spanish proverbs. Formulae numbers 14 ($E (\neq S) = R$) and 15 ($E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$) also have the same frequency, i.e. five entries each. Moreover, the 14th one is near-equal to

the 16th with the only difference that the latter includes a zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb. $E \Leftrightarrow S \neq R[0]$ and $E \neq S \neq R[-]$ formulae, corresponding to numbers 17 and 18, are connected only by the same frequency number, namely three. The following nine formulae (from 19 to 27) share an identical number of appearances, i.e. two. Last but not least, our formulae 28-32, unique by their one entry, are among the most important corresponding relation of oppositeness formulae due to the equal and equivalent relations of oppositeness established between the English head-proverbs and their Spanish and Romanian counterparts.

In the previous table, we used different colours to group together formulae, or, more specifically, similar relations established among all or between two of our contrastive languages. Formulae with a white background have been left aside because they include no equal, near-equal or equivalent relation of oppositeness between the English head proverbs and their Spanish or Romanian counterparts. Most of them contain, in their reduced forms, the \neq symbol for different relations of oppositeness between the corresponding languages in which such a relation of oppositeness exists, e.g.: formulae number 6, 7, 18, 20, 22, 26, while this symbol does not appear in any of the formulae with coloured background. Even though the $=$ symbol can be found in the short forms of the second ($S = R = [-]$) and the ninth ($S = R = [0]$) formulae, its interpretation in these cases (no Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverbs and zero relations of oppositeness in the Spanish and the Romanian proverbs respectively) leads us to the same decision of excluding them.

According to the similarity of the relations of oppositeness established between two or three of the languages in this study, based on the reduced formulae, we reached the following results:

Table 5: Rates of equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness

COLOUR	MAIN RELATION	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
	Equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian	116	24.63 %
	Equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish	167	35.46 %
	Equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian	34	7.22 %
	Equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian	4	0.85 %
TOTAL equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness		321	68.15 %

As it has already been explained, what interests us the most is the yellow zone, to be precise the equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian. In our study, 116 English head proverbs establish such relationship with their Spanish and Romanian counterparts, namely:

- 89 groups¹ of proverbs have equal relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian ($E = S = R$ - this is the ideal formula. In 25 cases the perfect equality is due to the common biblical origin of the proverbs);

- 9 groups of proverbs have equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, and equal relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian ($E \Leftrightarrow S = R$);

- 7 groups of proverbs have equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, and equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian ($E = S \Leftrightarrow R$);

- 5 groups of proverbs have equivalent relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian ($E \Leftrightarrow S \Leftrightarrow R$);

- 2 groups of proverbs have equal relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian, near-equal to the relation of oppositeness in English [$E \approx (S = R)$];

- 1 group of proverbs has equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, near-equal to the one found in Romanian ($E = S \approx R$);

- 1 group of proverbs has near-equal relations of oppositeness in English, Spanish and Romanian ($E \approx S \approx R$);

- 1 group of proverbs has near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, equivalent to the one found in Romanian ($E \approx S \Leftrightarrow R$);

- 1 group of proverbs has near-equal relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish, equal to the one found in Romanian ($E \approx S = R$).

It draws our attention that the most representative set is the pink one, specifically, that of the equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish. Thus, 167 English proverbs contain similar relations of oppositeness to their Spanish counterparts. We have three variants: identical relations ($E = S$) - 144 cases; near-equal relations ($E \approx S$) - 13 groups of proverbs; and equivalent relations ($E \Leftrightarrow S$) - 10 groups of proverbs.

¹ By group of proverbs we mean an English head-proverb with its English variants and its Spanish and Romanian equivalents, which are the object of the contrastive analysis.

The third position in our ranking is occupied by the green zone, i.e. that of the equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian, with 34 occurrences. The same three variants as in the previous case appear: identical relations ($E = R$) - 30 groups of proverbs, being the most representative variant in this case, near-equal relations ($E \approx R$) - two groups of proverbs, and equivalent relations ($E \Leftrightarrow R$) - also two groups of proverbs.

With only four occurrences, the blue area occupies the last position in our ranking, representing the equal ($S = R$ of proverbs) relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian. To these four groups of proverbs we should add the 11 cases of similarity between the two languages, both containing zero relations of oppositeness ($S = R = [0]$).

We have just seen that, from the 471 analysed groups of proverbs, 321 (68.15 %) are linked by at least one equal/near-equal/equivalent relation of oppositeness, combined in different ways (either the three languages together or two by two of them). This percentage represents more than a half of the total number of the analysed groups of proverbs. The rest of 150 groups of proverbs are all characterized by the fact that the relation of oppositeness identified in the English head proverb is different from the Spanish and Romanian counterparts when these exist. The difference is due to various causes, namely:

- no Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverbs were found in the sources of our corpus ($E \neq (S[-] = R[-])$);
- there is a zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb and no Romanian equivalent proverb was found in the sources of our corpus ($E \neq S[-] \neq R[-]$);
- no Spanish equivalent proverb was found in the sources of our corpus and there is a zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb ($E \neq S[-] \neq R[0]$);
- there are zero relations of oppositeness in the Spanish ($S[0] = R[0]$);
- there are different relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverb was found in the sources of our corpus ($E \neq S \neq R[-]$);

- there are different relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian and no Spanish equivalent proverb was found in the sources of our corpus ($E \neq S[-] \neq R$);

- there are different relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish while there is a zero relation of oppositeness in the Romanian proverb ($E \neq S \neq R[0]$);

- there are different relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian while there is a zero relation of oppositeness in the Spanish proverb ($E \neq S[0] \neq R$).

In the table below, the number and the percentages of the cases in which the equivalent proverb in one or both of the contrastive languages (Spanish and Romanian) is either missing or it contains a zero relation of oppositeness, are presented:

Table 6: Frequency of no or zero relations of oppositeness

[-] / [0] RELATION OF OPPOSITE-NESS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
No Spanish and no Romanian equivalent proverbs	95	20.17 %
No Spanish equivalent proverbs	43	9.13 %
No Romanian equivalent proverbs	158	33.55 %
Zero oppositeness in the Spanish equivalent proverb	25	5.31 %
Zero oppositeness in the Romanian equivalent proverb	42	8.92 %
Zero oppositeness in both the Spanish and the Romanian proverbs	11	2.34 %

4. Reflections on the results

The quantitative analysis of the proverbs in the three languages leads us to several reflections on the results of the research. To begin with, putting English, Spanish and Romanian languages and proverbs side by side might seem surprising at first sight. Simpson, in the Foreword of Carbonell Basset's dictionary, confesses he was surprised to find out that the proverb *It takes all sorts to make a world* came from a 17th century translation of Don Quixote into English. The author himself declares:

I'm not sure why I wasn't expecting this: after all, English (at least since the Norman Conquest) shares much of its proverb heritage with the countries of continental Europe. (...) this European heritage of proverbs is strong. Many exist in parallel in a number of European languages, as the records of these languages show. Proverbs often arise as a response to the trials and tribulations of human existence, and the European experience meant that a proverb that was relevant to Spaniards, or to the French, may well be equally relevant to the English. (Foreword, Carbonell Bassett 2005: 11)

Although a Germanic language, let us not forget that English suffered significant influences from Latin and French. Part of Britain was under the Roman Empire in ancient times, and Latin heavily influenced the language. Later, the Norman Conquest in 1066 introduced French into English, particularly during the Middle Ages when Latin was “the language of church and of education” while French was “the language of law and of the Norman rules” (McDowall, 1989: 41). Nowadays English vocabulary is approximately half Germanic (from the Saxons and Vikings) and half Romance (from French and Latin). Similarly, Hispania was also under Germanic invasions, the Visigothic domination lasting 300 years, from 409 to 711 (del Moral, 2002: 180). This historical context explains why, despite belonging to different language families, English and Spanish share many similarities, as evidenced by the proverbs analysed in our study. It also illustrates why the pink set of proverbs representing the equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Spanish is the most representative.

Normally, one would expect the highest rate to be represented by the blue set of proverbs, which pertains to the equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in Spanish and Romanian. This expectation arises from the close kinship of these two languages, both being Romance languages with Latin as their common ancestor. Curiously, this was not the case. Interestingly, it is the green set of proverbs, i.e. those showing equal/near-equal/equivalent relations of oppositeness in English and Romanian, that surpasses the blue set. This is notable considering that English is a Germanic language and Romanian is a Romance language, unlike the direct relationship between Spanish and Romanian.

This anomaly can be attributed to the socio-linguistic and historical factors influencing the similarities among proverbs in these three languages. In fact, many of the proverbs linked by the $E = S = R$ formula have the same biblical origin. It is also important to acknowledge the significant role of Latin in the English language, particularly since the first English translation of the Bible was overseen by John Wycliffe, an Oxford professor, who translated it from Latin, completing the work in 1396 (McDowall, 1989: 49). At the same time, as Iscla Rovira (1995: XI) observes “Latin has traditionally been a source for proverbs and aphorisms in science, medicine, law and philosophy. In addition, Latin writers collected and preserved many Oriental and Greek proverbs and sayings for posterity”. Mieder also refers to these aspects:

There is no doubt that many of our proverbs originated in classical antiquity. (...) A large number of proverbs from various ancient languages and cultures entered the Latin language and eventually reached many of the vernacular languages when medieval Latin proverbs were being translated. Proverbs like ‘One hand washes the other’, ‘Love is blind’, and ‘A sound mind in a sound body’ all followed this path and became translated proverbs in many languages. In fact, these classical proverbs are today some of the most widely disseminated proverbs, some of them enjoying international currency. Biblical proverbs went the same route, and such proverbs as ‘Man does not live by bread alone’ (Matthew, 4: 4), ‘Pride goes before the fall’ (Solomon, 16: 18), ‘It is better to give than to receive’ (Apostles, 20: 35) are known in dozens of languages. (Mieder 1993: 12-13)

Apart from the common and/or intersected roots of the three languages that make the object of our research study, we must take into consideration another very important aspect, namely the universality of proverb legacy. As Simpson (1992) observed, English shares a great part of its proverb legacy with the countries of continental Europe. Teodor Flonta is one of the paroe-miologists who became aware of this reality, and his dictionary (2001) undoubtedly proves that thousands of English proverbs have their equivalents in five national Romance languages: French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish and Romanian. The other

mentioned and used dictionaries we used in our corpus are also the living testimony of the correspondence of English proverbs with counterparts from other languages such as German, Arabian, Polish, Provençal and Russian. This makes proverbs an indisputable world patrimony. As Lomotey (2019: 161) points out, “They are universal in nature as they can be found in all societies around the world”.

The proverb is usually interpreted as the expression of the outlook on world or on life. It is not at all weird or extraordinary to find the same or similar views on life among different peoples. As Álvarez Curiel (2008: 88) points out, “las lenguas, las costumbres, los modos de vida pueden ser diferentes; pero los miedos, los anhelos, los tabués de los hombres de cualquier tiempo o lugar han sido siempre los mismos”.² Furthermore, the author adds “la conciencia, la ética, la moral y las costumbres constituyen un tejido común para el hombre de todos los tiempos sobre el que se han ido elaborando normas de conducta y de prejuicios sociales que modulan el comportamiento de la comunidad”³ (Álvarez Curiel 2008: 134-135). Similarly, Načisčione (2022: 6) considers that “proverbs reflect the whole gamut of human thoughts and emotions, and the external world with its various personal, political, social and cultural experiences”. In fact, proverbs are viewed as multidimensional language units, which form part of a cultural heritage.

John B. Carroll (qtd. in Negreanu, 1983: 56) considers that it is not plausible that the speakers of distinct languages have different concepts about the world, “in spite of the languages they speak”. He believes that “there are more similarities than differences in the manner in which the linguistic codes symbolize concepts because these concepts are the result of the transactions made by the human society with a social and physical environment that has many uniformities throughout the world”. Ovidiu Bârlea observes that the Romanian proverb repertoire includes

² Author’s translation: “languages, customs, ways of life may be different; but the fears, the yearnings, the taboos of humans in any time or place have always been the same”.

³ Author’s translation: “conscience, ethics, morals and customs constitute a common fabric for mankind of all times on which norms of conduct and social prejudices have been elaborated, modulating the behaviour of the community”.

many proverbs equivalent to the Latin ones, some of the former even seem to be the translation of the latter. No matter how tempting the hypothesis that we are in front of an inheritance transmitted at the same time with the language would be, we cannot exclude another hypothesis, that of an amazing independent creation, born out of the perception of the same reality. (Bârlea quoted in Tabarcea, 1982: 36)

Based on Carroll's theory and related to proverbs, Negreanu comes with another assumption, namely that

Due to their long use, the paroemiological units of different languages polished themselves and acquired a very concise form. We think that the identity of proverbs belonging to distinct languages - the same proverb appears in many tongues, often being a sort of a literary translation (...) - may be an argument which does not deny the hypothesis of linguistic relativity, but reduces it. (Negreanu 1983: 57)

Referring to the great number of equivalent paroemias included in his *Romanian-English Dictionary of Proverbs*, Virgil Lefter declares himself not surprised by this fact since

It is unanimously accepted that the paroemiological literature is a very mobile field in which interferences and borrowings are very frequent. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that the analogies are also due to the influence of the Romance literatures (French, Italian, Spanish) on the English culture, mainly during the Renaissance period. (Lefter 1978: 6-7)

Sevilla Muñoz and Cantera Ortiz de Urbina (2001: 17) refer to the type of proverbs included in our analysis with the syntagm "universales paremiológicos", defining them as "paremias existentes", *mutatis mutandis*, "en las distintas lenguas de sentido e incluso, a veces, forma muy parecida".⁴ Tabarcea (1982: 36) uses a synonymous concept when talking about the "spiritual paremiologic universal" ('universal paroemiological spirit'), while Álvarez Curiel (2008: 133) gives those equivalent proverbs coming from different languages and cultures the name "refranes ge-

⁴ Author's translation: "paroemias existing in the different languages, sometimes with a very similar meaning and even a very similar form".

melos” (‘twin proverbs’). Trying to explain the universality of proverbs in his *Los refranes filosóficos castellanos* (1962), Pablo León Murciego considers that the proverbs

están extendidos por todos los países y a través de los siglos, porque siendo la Humanidad una, una la conciencia universal, y uno el orden moral, unas han de ser, en todas partes, las leyes que presiden el raciocinio, unas la inducciones y deducciones y unas, por tanto, las normas que, basadas en la razón y en la experiencia, regulen los pensamientos y acciones de los hombres. De ahí la unidad prodigiosa que tiene ese idioma mental y ese código manual.⁵ (León Murciego 1962: 31)

The same idea is reiterated by the Moroccan paroemiologist Boichta El Attar, as Álvarez Curiel (2008: 135) explains, this author believes that “Los refranes, como expresión de una civilización, permiten dibujar el tipo de hombre o de sociedad de donde provienen. Pero lo que es expresión de una civilización, muchas veces es reflejo de toda la humanidad”.⁶ At the same time Mircea Duduleanu-Pelendava (qtd. in Avram, 2002: 10-11) remarks that “Proverbs contain truth similarly or identically expressed at different peoples from wide geographical areas. This proves not only the homogeneity of the human thought on several levels, but also a strong closeness of the human spirit regarding the good relations and collaborations of peoples”.

Of course, we must not ignore the fact that there are also unique proverbs, belonging exclusively to one language. These are, in our case, those English proverbs linked with Spanish and Romanian by the $E \neq (S[-] = R[-])$ formula, meaning that no Spanish or Romanian equivalent proverb exist, at least not in the sources of our corpus. Nevertheless, the unicity and singularity

⁵ Author’s translation: “(Proverbs) are widespread in all countries and throughout the centuries, because Humanity being one, the universal conscience being one, and the moral order being one, the laws which govern reasoning, inductions and deductions, and therefore the rules which, based on reason and experience, regulate the thoughts and actions of men, must everywhere be one and the same. Hence the prodigious unity of this mental language and this manual code”.

⁶ Author’s translation: “Proverbs, as an expression of a civilization, allow us to draw a picture of the type of man or society they come from. But what is an expression of a civilization is often a reflection of the whole of humanity”.

of a proverb is relative, meaning that, in our case, the English head proverb is not always singular and alone in the international paroemiological world; sometimes it has counterparts in other language(s).

Example 1:

English: *Bear with evil and expect good.*

Spanish: [-]

Romanian: [-]

Italian: *Soffri il male e aspetta il bene.*

Example 2:

English: *Old men go to death, death comes to young men.*

Spanish: [-]

Romanian: [-]

French: *Les vieux vont à la mort et la mort vient aux jeunes.*

Another similar and eloquent example is “the strange coincidence which builds unexpected bridges over centuries and continents” (Tabarcea, 1982: 14) represented by the equivalence of the Romanian proverb *’A ars moara dar și șoarecii s-au dus dracului’* (lit. transl. ‘Not only the mill burnt but also the mice went to hell’) with its counterpart Western African Wolof proverb *’Când arde coliba, plesnesc ploșnițele’* (lit. transl. ‘When the cabin burns, the bedbugs are bursting’). This near-perfect equality raises the following question which Tabarcea (1982: 14-15) launches rhetorically: “Can we even talk about a proverb having its origin in a certain language or in a particular people if there is always a possibility of discovering a parallel proverb in a culture which it is impossible to prove any filiations with?” At a more profound thought, it is true that, as Álvarez Curiel (2008: 135) explains “sucesos de idéntica o parecida índole, ocurridos en distintos países, han dado como resultado sentencias muy semejantes en el fondo, con corta diferencia en la forma”.⁷ Therefore, proverbs in different languages similar in form reveal instances of cultural sharing but, at the same time, they may reflect the diversity in world views.

⁷ Author’s translation: “events of the same or similar nature in different countries have resulted in judgments that are very similar in substance, with little difference in form”.

5. *Conclusions*

The classification of the English head proverbs according to the opposites they include indicates that, among the six types of opposites, antonyms are the most productive, though all types are represented. In addition, more than half of the total number of the analysed groups of proverbs, 321 (68.15 %) are linked by at least one equal/near-equal/equivalent relation of oppositeness, in either all three languages under study or in pairs. The remaining 150 (36.6 %) groups of proverbs are characterized by the fact that the relation of oppositeness found in the English head proverb is different from the Spanish and Romanian counterparts when these exist.

Regarding the analysis of the equal/near-equal/ equivalent relations of oppositeness, the most representative group of proverbs in our study was the pair English and Spanish with 167 proverbs, significantly more than the pair Spanish and Romanian with just 11 cases, whereas the pair English and Romanian had 34 occurrences. In total, this relation of oppositeness across the three languages under study accounted for 116 groups of proverbs. Alongside the similarities found in our contrastive language study, which imply that the three linguistic communities share paroemiological elements based on identical or analogous conceptualizations and perspectives, we must not forget those cases where, instead of similarities, differences were observed among English, Spanish and Romanian. This fact often proves the peculiarity and individuality of each language, shaped by the metaphorical structures inherent to each culture. Nevertheless, it is notable that English and Spanish, as well as English and Romanian—pairs from different linguistic families—share more proverbs in common than Spanish and Romanian, despite both being Romance languages.

There is obviously a common repertoire of proverbs shared by English, Spanish and Romanian languages and cultures. In all the cases we have analysed in this study, the similarity (often equality) among these triplets is primarily rooted in the meaning of the proverbs, the main idea and the message they convey. Sometimes similarities also arise from their structure, form, and lexicon, further reinforcing this resemblance. Therefore, we can only agree with Maurice Molho's assertion (qtd. in Álvarez Cu-

riel, 2008: 133), according to which a great number of proverbs “poseen un sello internacional y se encuentran de forma idéntica, o ligeramente cambiados, entre los pueblos más antiguos como entre los más modernos”.⁸ To illustrate this point, consider the following well-known proverb present in various languages, which underscores the universality of proverbs and their status as a cultural heritage of humanity, enduring across temporal and spatial boundaries:

Latin: *Una hirundo non efficit ver.*

English: *One swallow does not make a summer.*

Spanish: *Una golondrina no hace verano.*

Romanian: *Cu o floare nu se face primăvară.*

French: *Une hirondelle ne fait pas le printemps.*

Italian: *Una rondine non fa primavera.*

German: *Eine Schwalbe macht noch keine Sommer.*

In this group of equivalent proverbs, we observe two notable points of similarity. First, the protagonist, which is a bird (swallow) in all languages, except in Romanian where it is a plant (*floare* ‘flower’), though fauna and flora usually go hand in hand. Second, there is a temporal reference to a season (spring in Latin, Romanian, French and Italian, and summer in English, Spanish and German) across all languages.

From these observations, we can conclude that the similarity or equality of oppositeness in the proverbs in the three languages under study is primarily based on the similarity/equivalence of the corresponding proverbs, which is largely rooted in the origins of these proverbs. On the one hand, we have those with biblical origin; on the other hand, those deriving mainly from Latin that have transcended time through translations. Additionally, there are also proverbs that have emerged from a shared perception of reality among different peoples, transcending borders and cultures.

⁸ Author’s translation: “A large number of proverbs have an international character and are found in identical or slightly changed form among both ancient and modern peoples”.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Ana Maria Marinescu for generously sharing her data and insights on the study of proverbs. Her contributions have been invaluable in preparing and publishing this paper, which is dedicated to her honour.

References

- Álvarez Curiel, Francisco. *Mil refranes y trece ensayos*. Málaga: Editorial Arguval, 2008.
- Avram, Arina. *Arta de a reuși în viață. Să învățăm înțelepciunea din proverbe*. Bucharest: Editura Tritonic, 2002.
- Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber, and Ingo Plag. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Carbonell Basset, Delfin. *The New Dictionary of Current Sayings and Proverbs, Spanish and English*. Barcelona: Ediciones de Serbal, 2005.
- Colombi, Maria Cecilia. *Los refranes en el Quijote: texto y contexto*. Maryland: Scripta Humanistica, 1989.
- Cruse, Alan. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Cruse, Alan. *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Del Moral, Rafael. *Diccionario de las Lenguas del mundo*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2002.
- Flonta, Teodor. *A Dictionary of English and Romance Languages Equivalent Proverbs*. DeProverbio.com, 2001.
- Gao, Chunming and Qianzhen Zheng. „A Linguistic Study of Antonymy in English Texts”. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2014, pp. 234-238.
- Gheorghe, Gabriel. *Proverbele românești și proverbele lumii romanice*. Bucharest: Albatros, 1986.
- Jones, Steven. *Antonymy. A corpus-based perspective*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Iscla Rovira, Luis. *English Proverbs and Their Near Equivalents in Spanish, French, Italian and Latin*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Lefter, Virgil. *Dicționar de proverbe român-englez*. Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1978.

- Lefter, Virgil. *Dicționar de proverbe englez-român și românenglez*. Bucharest: Teora, 2002.
- León Murciego, Pablo. *Los refranes filosóficos castellanos*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1962.
- Löbner, Sebastian. *Understanding Semantics*. London: Arnold, 2002.
- Lomotey, Benedicta Adokarley. „Towards A Sociolinguistic analysis of the current relevance of androcentric proverbs in Peninsular Spanish”. *Legon Journal of the Humanities*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2019, pp. 161-177.
- Lomotey, Benedicta Adokarley, and Ildiko Csajbok-Twerefou. „A pragmatic and sociolinguistic analysis of proverbs across languages and cultures”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, no. 182, 2021, pp. 86-91.
- McDowall, David. *An Illustrated History of Britain*. Harlow: Longman, 1989.
- Mieder, Wolfgang. *Proverbs Are Never Out of Season. Popular Wisdom in the Modern Age*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Moroianu, Cristian. *Dicționar etimologic de antonime neologice*. Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 2008.
- Murphy, M. Lynne. *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Načisčione, Anita. „Proverbs in the system of language and their creative use: A cross-cultural view”. *Cultural Crossroads*, no. 16, 2022, pp. 4-15.
- Negreanu, Constantin. *Structura proverbelor românești*. Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1983.
- Palmer, Frank Robert. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Pamies Bertrán, Antonio, Juan de Dios Luque Durán, and Patricia Fernández Martín, editors. *Paremiología y herencia cultural*. Granada: Granada Lingvistica, 2011.
- Rounds, Carol H. *Hungarian: An Essential Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Sánchez Fajardo, José Antonio. „On the Analogical Suffixation of Paired Antonyms: The Case of English *innie* and *outie*”. *ATLANTIS. Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2020, pp. 189-211.
- Sevilla Muñoz, Julia, and Jesús Cantera Ortiz de Urbina. *1.001 Refranes españoles con su correspondencia en ocho lenguas (alemán, árabe, francés, inglés, italiano, polaco, provenzal y ruso)*. Madrid: Ediciones Internacionales Universitarias, 2001.

Simpson, John. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Tabarcea, Cezar. *Poetica proverbului*. Bucharest: Editura Minerva, 1982.

Žanpera, Natalija, Kristina Kocijan, and Krešimir Šojat. „Negation of Croatian Nouns“. *Formalizing Natural Languages with NooJ 2019 and its Natural Language Processing Applications*, edited by HÉla Fehri, Slim Mesfar, and Max Silberstein, 2020, pp. 52-64.

Yuldoshevna, Abdurakhmonova Zeva, and Shodiyeva Shakhnoza Suleymanovna. „Comparative Analysis of Structural Types of Antonyms“. *Journal of Ethics and Diversity in International Communication*, vol.1, no. 7, 2020, pp. 67-72.

Cristina Tejedor Martínez
Universidad de Alcalá
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Dpto. de Filología Moderna
Colegio San José de Caracciolos. C/ Trinidad, 3.
28801 Alcalá de Henares (Madrid)
E-mail: cristina.tejedormartinez@uah.es

