

On the Classification of Macedonian Proverbs in an Electronic Database

George Mitrevski

As linguistic constructs, proverbs are characterized by rigidity of form and complicated structure. As phenomena of folklore, proverbs are oral in nature and are easily spread in a number of variants and adaptations in variety of languages and cultures. As metaphoric constructs, proverbs can also be found in literary texts and in the visual arts. Although proverbs traditionally have been collected, classified, and studied by folklorists and paremiologists, they have also been an object of research by literary scholars, linguists, sociologists, ethnologists, philosophers, and educators. The research on a body of proverbs is often limited by the format in which they have been compiled, classified and presented. An essential question for the compiler is, how should proverbs be systematized and classified so that they can be studied comparatively and as objects of interest to scholars in seemingly disparate fields and in a multitude of languages and cultures?

This paper describes a system for compiling a database of Macedonian proverbs using the technology of a standard relational database management system and a set of thematic and linguistic classification systems that can reveal information and the characteristics of proverbs on the formal, structural, linguistic and figurative levels. Unlike a flat database, a relational database is organized into tables, in which data is defined so that it can be reorganized and accessed in a number of different ways. It is a method of structuring data in the form of records, so that relations between different entities and attributes can be used for data access and transformation. Using structured query language, reports and comparisons can be generated by selecting fields of interest from the original database.

Paremiologists agree that the classification of proverbs by any criteria is a complex question, and no comprehensive and acceptable solution has been offered to date. Each type of classification has its own validity, its own practical uses, and also its drawbacks. In any undertaking to classify proverbs there are issues of selection and organization that need to be resolved to make the collection as useful and as easy to consult as possible, while keeping in mind space considerations and the economics of publishing. An attempt to compile an exhaustive publication of proverbs encounters the additional issue of proverb variants and equivalents. Permyakov (1978) warns that the field of paremiology cannot progress until it resolves the root question of proverb classification. Proverb scholarship thus far has proposed classifications that are often designed to accomplish one specific purpose, and in the process they disregard characteristics of proverbs that are irrelevant to that purpose, but which may be relevant for some other approach. Permiakov was mostly interested in the shaping of logical thought in proverbs, and while he had no ready comprehensive classification system to propose, he felt that such a classification is possible in principle.

It is my contention that the essence of the problem of proverb classification lies in the very approach, or methodology of constructing a classification system itself. Traditionally, proverbs have been collected and classified in a form that is appropriate for publishing in book format. The publication medium itself, with its linear access format and its economic limitation on the number of proverbs that can be included, imposes a limit on the types of classifications that can be implemented. This format excludes the possibility of constructing a multi-dimensional classification system that can be applied to an infinite number of proverbs and variants, in an infinite number of languages and dialects, from an infinite number of sources and locations, which may produce an infinite number of linguistic,

thematic, structural, and many other kinds of relations among them. The various types of proverbs and the complicated linguistic structures and the semantic relations among proverbs are not easily made evident in a standard printed compilation.

In developing a database of Macedonian proverbs we turned to the relational database model and the logical data modeling approach to develop a multi-dimensional classification system that takes into consideration the poly-functionality of proverbs and the disparate approaches to their study. We use a design methodology that is a structured approach for discovering, analyzing and modeling a set of requirements in a standardized, organized manner. A relational database, when designed and implemented appropriately, can support a wide variety of access patterns. Users can search for information by asking many different questions employing a variety of query and analysis tools. All data that is stored in and retrieved from the relational database proposed here is cast in the form of relations. The database does not have any predefined access paths; data in the database is defined so that it can be reorganized and accessed in a number of different ways depending on specific needs. The main problem to be solved was how to compile a large number of proverbs into a single collection in a way that makes it more convenient to access proverbs of a specific type.

The first important question we needed to resolve was how to distinguish proverbs from their close relatives, proverbial sayings. Considering the lack of a good definition of a proverb, compilers often tend to group the two types together under the title “proverbs”, or frequently under the title of “proverbs and proverbial sayings”. There is hardly a volume of Macedonian proverbs that does not also include proverbial sayings. Our database is designed strictly for compiling proverbs. We adopt as a working distinction between the two the definition of Starchević (1996:23).

“The difference between proverbs and sayings lies in the first instance in their ‘completeness’ in terms of sentence structure and, consequently, in whether the utterance can function as an independent minimal speech unit. In addition, the proverbs refer to any number of actualities of its referent in the reality, whereas the saying is mono-referential...Unlike proverbs, proverbial sayings are more like clauses, incomplete sentences, and thus not a proverb.”

The second important consideration was to determine which properties of the proverb we want to index in the database, and what external information, such as bibliographic references, or geographic location, is relevant for indexing. We resolved this issue by taking the approach that no information about a proverb is irrelevant, since it may be relevant to someone now or sometime in the future. We took additional measures to make the classification system and the relational database structure extendable; additional proverb characteristics and tables can be added at any time as need arises, which then can be easily linked to the original table of proverbs.

The initial step in designing a classification system for proverbs is to determine the purpose of the compilation and the type of information we intend to extract from it. From that we can determine what facts about each proverb we need to index. When a collection of proverbs of a culture can number in the tens, or even hundreds of thousands, it makes little sense to compile several separate sets of the same set of proverbs using several unique classification systems for conducting folkloristic and linguistic research. Currently, the most widespread systems for classifying proverbs are alphabetical, thematic, and by base words. The alphabetical classification system is typical of most collections. In the Balkans, when confronted with this problem, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić took the course taken by many other

folklorists, and that is to order proverbs alphabetically. Although this is the easiest method for classifying proverbs for the purpose of publication, it is the least convenient method for searching particular types of proverbs if one is interested in conducting comparative, linguistic or thematic studies. Its main drawback, as noted by Permiakov (1988) and others, is that it is difficult to locate variants that begin with a different word, or to search for equivalents in another language. Proverbs are prone to change, they can assume different forms at different times and in different geographic regions. Some compilations of this type frequently provide an index that is either thematic, or more frequently, consists of words with references to realia. For example, the editor of the Marko Cepenkov collection of 5000 Macedonian proverbs (Cepenkov 1972) provides an index of all nouns in their basic grammatical form.

Building a classification, or an index that is based on words that refer to realia (verbs, nouns, etc.) is an enormous task when one has to consider that most proverbs contain several such items, and indexing each word can easily double the size of the compilation. More importantly, as Permiakov (1979:29) notes, “in folklore many images have a symbolic value which has nothing to do with their primary meaning (for example, in Russian folklore a birch-tree is often a symbol of a young girl, and in Indonesian folklore a butterfly symbolizes a boy, etc.)” We do not mean to imply here that the study of realia in proverbs is not a valid approach, but only that a compilation of a very large set of proverbs based on this type of classification for publication in book form is practically an impossible task. Below we present a much more effective method for studies of proverb content and realia that is based on concordancing methodology.

The classification of proverbs by keyword, or base word, seems to offer more options for comparative proverb studies within and across cultures. This is the system used by the authors of *A Dictionary of American Proverbs* (Mieder et al. 1992). In that volume, proverbs are alphabetized according to their most significant word, usually a noun or a verb. In his *Macedonian-English and English-Macedonian Proverb Parallels*, Velichkovski (2002) employs a combination of the alphabetical and the keyword systems. In the first part of the volume, the Macedonian proverbs are classified alphabetically and each proverb is accompanied by its English translation. In the second part, the English proverbs are listed alphabetically by keyword, and each proverb is followed either by its Macedonian equivalent or by a translation into Macedonian where no equivalent exists. The drawback of the keyword system is that one is confronted with the problem of having to select from each proverb a base word from a list of several possible words, as most proverbs consist of at least two nouns and one verb. In her review of Mieder et al. 1992, Arora (1994:312) correctly notes that selecting a keyword “is often a judgment call, and what appears to be the appropriate choice to one collector or reader will not necessarily appear so to another.” One possible solution to this problem is to crosslist proverbs according to two or more base words, which, as in the alphabetical listing, can make accessing particular proverbs unmanageable. Nevertheless, an arrangement of proverbs by keyword makes the compilation much more useful if the goal is to study the meaning of proverbs.

In thematic classification, proverbs are grouped based on the ideas they express. Given the wide variety and immense number of proverbs, one might wonder how a group of proverbs can be classified as thematically similar. Before such a classification system can be implemented one is confronted with the difficult task of generating a concise lexicon of

themes that can be used to classify all proverbs irrespective of their language and their geographical and cultural origin. The Aarne-Thompson system (Aarne 1961) for the classification of folktales, which can be used for searching tales that have similar motif contents, follows a similar approach. There is no doubt that such a system offers researchers the most efficient way to access folktales of a particular type, although it is not an efficient system for arranging folktales in book format, as the number of folktale types would most likely far exceed the number of tales that can be included in a single volume. The Aarne-Thompson system is much more practical when used in electronic compilations of folktales, as there is no limitation on the number of tales that can be included in the database or the manner in which they can be accessed.

The Aarne-Thompson system of classification and the relational approach in database design are the two most important models for the system developed by Kuusi (1970, 1972) and Laukahangas (2001) for classifying, storing and accessing proverbs. Their system grew out of a need to easily access proverbs of a specific type and to find proverb equivalents within one culture and across cultures.

Kuusi based his studies on a large corpus of proverbs from numerous cultures and constructed his lexicon of proverb themes and classes based on “archetypes of human thinking” (see Laukahangas 2001:62). In this system proverbs are classified into the following thirteen main themes:

- A Practical knowledge of nature
- B Faith and basic attitudes
- C Basic observations and sociologic
- D The world and human life

- E Sense of proportion
- F Concepts of morality
- G Social life
- H Social interaction
- J Communication
- K Social position
- L Agreements and norms
- M Coping and learning
- T Time and sense of time

The thirteen main themes are then divided into 52 main classes, which are further divided into 325 subgroups. As an illustration, the main theme **G Social life** is divided into the following main classes:

- G1 kinship
- G2 development – a person’s background
- G3 child : parents / upbringing
- G4 man : woman / ranking and position of both sexes
- G5 marriage
- G6 youth : old age
- G7 health : illness
- G8 death / the dead

According to the author, proverbs under the main themes are arranged “according to their most basic level of interpretation, closest to their supposed original use” (Laukahangas 2001:33). Clearly, the emphasis in this system is on the meaning of a proverb as perceived by

the culture of its origin. The code for each subgroup of proverbs consists of the code for the main theme (upper case letter), the main class (digit), and the subgroup (lower case letter). As an illustration, the proverbs “Blood is thicker than water” and “A man’s enemies shall be they of his own household ” (Matt. 10:36) have the classification **G1a family solidarity : lack of family solidarity**.

The Kuusi-Laukahangas system is based on the observation of tens of thousands of proverbs from numerous cultures, and is the most extensive and inductive system to date to classify proverbs based on their meaning. Each of the 325 subgroups of proverbs is intended to represent an invariant proverb, which “could be a basic image or a common formula with a common idea” (ibid.:23). The authors admit that by abstracting a small set of the proverb’s semantic and structural characteristics they neglect other pertinent information and that their system of themes and classes is arbitrary. For this classification system to be practical for research the authors had to forgo the option of compiling and accessing the proverb collection in book format. It is important to note that unlike the alphabetical and the keyword classifications, their system was designed specifically for classifying and accessing proverbs that are stored electronically in a database. This approach allows for constructing a net of internal references between and among proverbs based on the similarity of their ideas, and for searching the database using quite complicated inquiries.

The Matti Kuusi classification and the relational database approach developed by Laukahangas are the inspiration and model for our system of classification, storage and access of Macedonian proverbs. We adopted the Kuusi classification because it provides a practical solution to the problem of classifying proverbs based on their meaning, though it is not perfect and perhaps not necessarily the best available. But, the system can be applied to

classify proverbs from different languages and cultures, which is important for any parallel study of proverbs across cultures. Most importantly, the system is extendable; as need arises one can eventually add additional themes and classes, as well as expand the depth level of the coding system. For example, the third level classification **G1a family solidarity : lack of family solidarity** can be expanded to a fourth level to separate proverbs that deal with family solidarity from those that deal with lack of it. Our implementation of the Matti Kuusi coding system makes it more convenient for conducting comparative studies between Macedonian proverbs and the tens of thousands of proverbs stored in the Kuusi database.

As the authors of the Kuusi system have noted, their classification was designed specifically with a focus on proverb meaning, which makes it unsuitable for studying structural aspects and other linguistic phenomena. As no system for classifying proverbs based on their linguistic features has been proposed, scholars are faced with the burden of having to browse through a large number of proverb samples in order to find ones with the desired unique linguistic characteristics. Recognizing the fact that our database of Macedonian proverbs will be compiled only once, and that it is intended for research using a variety of approaches, we opted to include descriptions of most proverb features, even those which at present might not appear to be directly relevant. For example, a study of the poetic function of proverbs, such as Rothstein (1968) or Jakobson (1979) requires the indexing of the linguistic (syntactic) characteristics of proverbs. Work in dialectology and semantics (Friedman 1999; Norrick 1981) also requires thorough examination and indexing of the linguistic peculiarities of proverbs.

The linguistic structure of proverbs is possibly the most examined characteristic of proverbs (see Barley 1970; Dundes 1981; Giovannini 1978; Levin 1964, 1968; Silverman-

Weinreich 1981; Zholkovsky 1978), but this has not necessarily led to its use as the base for a classification system. One principal structural characteristic of proverbs that has been pointed out by Levin (1964), Starchević (1996), Jang (1999) and others is their binary syntactic structure. Levin (1964) claims that all Russian proverbs are essentially composed of two parts. Jang (1999:86) defines the bipartite structure of Hausa proverbs as “a structure of proverbs that can be divided into two sections of equal or nearly equal length, and by length I mean the number of syllables within each section.” He also claims that the division according to quantitative length “coincides with the bisectional division according to grammatical relationship” (ibid.:87). In his comparative study of Russian and Serbian proverbs Starchević approached his analysis of the linguistic structure of proverbs “with the assumption that repetition of various linguistic devices is a fundamental modeling principle of the proverbial discourse” (ibid.:2). According to Starchević, the appearance of any item, structure, category or device twice in a proverb constitutes repetition. Starchević (1996:203) further describes a typical Russian and Serbian proverb as having a combination of the following features: “1. It either has a binary structure, which typically means two coordinated clauses; or it shows some kind of ternary structure: three words or three stress units in particular; 2. The two parts of a binary proverb are typically parallel (symmetrical) to one another in terms of syntactic structure and grammatical categories such as tense (present), mood (infinitive, imperative), aspect (imperfective), case (nominative), person (third), and number (singular); 3. the semantic relationship between the two propositions is typically either that of cause-effect or contrast (antithesis) or comparative correlation.”

Arvo Krikmann (2006) has looked at proverb syntax to come up with a list of what he considers to be syntactic prototypes in Estonian proverbs. In his view, syntactic clichés are

the “clearest and most effective indicators of the stereotypicality of proverbs.” His list of syntactic prototypes includes the following main classes:

- A. Non-equative simple sentences
- B. Non-equative sentences with recurrent parts
- C. Equalities and comparisons
- D. Inequalities (including preferences)
- E. Symmetric implicational patterns
- F. Units with parallel list supra-level
- G. Units with an imperative verb form
- H. Rhetorical questions
- I. Exceptional forms

Each main class is further divided into three possible levels of sub-classes, which total 144 syntactic types. One example of a type from the lowest level sub-class **F4b1**.

Parallelisms consisting of two or more implications with an *If...*, *then...* - or *When...*, *then...* is the proverb “If swans fly low, there’ll be a shallow winter, if swans fly high, there’ll be a deep winter.”

We adopt structural classification characteristics and reduce the concept of “proverb structure” to include only syntactic units, as these are limited in types and are easily recognizable and definable. In this way we avoid having to rely on subjective decisions as to which “words” in a proverb are significant enough to determine whether a proverb is bipartite or tripartite, as well as having to define what constitutes a “stress unit” (the first feature given in Starchević 1996:203). Rather than indexing the grammatical category of every word in a proverb to accommodate searches based on grammatical categories, we

export the entire set of proverbs into a text corpus, where each word is marked for grammatical category, which permits quite complex searches based on grammatical characteristics.

On the syntactic level Macedonian proverbs are made up of a single sentence. Some proverbs consist of one part and some consist of two or more phrases that are linked by conjunctive markers. The markers indicate the relationship between syntactic structures and establish a type of semantic relationship between them. Indexing the conjunctive markers in proverbs is important since a given type of marker often determines the meaning of the proverb (see Alarcón 2003). In our relational database we construct a table of categories of syntactic patterns. Initially, we define three syntactic patterns that reflect the sentence structure: a simple sentence, a compound sentence, and a complex sentence. Compound and complex sentences are further marked with a code that indicates the type of conjunction used. We then create a linking table that links each proverb with the appropriate conjunctive marker. Our table of conjunctive markers includes, but is not limited to the following:

Conjunction

copulative: и, па, та, да, исто и, не само, туку и

adversative: а, ама, ами, туку, пак, а пак, но, меѓутоа, само што, камо ли

correlative: или - или, а - а, било - било, ем - ем, ја - ја, ни - ни, ниту - ниту,
нити – нити

exclusive: само, само што, освен што, единствено, единствено што

purposive: да, за да

temporal: кога, кога што, кога да, а, дури, дури да, додека, пред да, откако,
откако, штом, штотуку, тукушто

modal: како што, како да, колку што, колку да, отколку, одошто, камо, а камо, камо ли, божем

declarative: дека, оти, како, што

causative: дека, оти, зашто, бидејќи, затоа што, пошто

consequential: така што

conditional: ако, ако ли, да, ли

concessive: ако, иако, макар да, макар што, при се што

relative: кој, којшто, чиј, чијшто, колкав што, каков што

Dash ellipsis: Во село без пци – и без стап се оди. *In a village without dogs you can walk without a stick.*

Comma: Умре старио, падна од куќата дирекот. *When the old man dies, the support beam of the house falls.*

Semicolon: Ако е чокот кус од алиштето, можеш да му го придаиш; ама ако е од умот – не можеш. *If a man's pants are short, you can extend them; if he is short in his brain – you can't.*

Colon: Сам си свире, сам си игра: кој го гледа му се чуди. *He plays alone, he dances alone; whoever sees him wonders.*

In a separate table in the database we encode the “communicative-modal” (Silverman-Weinreich 1981:71) meanings of each proverb, in which we include the following proverb/sentence types:

Declarative: Крушата под круша паѓа. *The pear falls under the pear tree.*

Imperative (may be command, prohibition, recommendation, warning, prescription):

Не клавај змија в пазуа да не те укаса. *Don't put a snake in your pocket, and it won't bite you.*

Interrogative: Дека е медот благ, тики прстите да си изееме? *Just because the honey is sweet, do we have to eat our fingers?*

Conditional: Ако да знаев кога ќе умрев, сам гробот ќе си го ископав. *If I knew when I was going to die I would dig my own grave.*

Comparative: Поарно твое јајце одошто туѓо коковче. *Better your own egg than someone else's chicken.*

We have described what we consider to be the essential internal characteristics of proverbs to be indexed in a relational database which would then allow the researcher to assemble a set with unique attributes. We create several additional tables where we index information that is external to the proverb. Two such tables index the source of the proverb, which is either a printed publication or an informant. When the source is a publication we enter complete bibliographic reference. When the source is an informant, and in instances where the informant is noted in a publication, we record references to the informant's name, the ethnographic region, and the date when the proverb was recorded. We agree with Taylor (1934:14) that by "arranging chronologically and geographically the occurrences of a proverb we may discover the circumstances of its origin and its shifting interpretations and uses." However, in most publications of proverbs the name of the informant and the time and place of the collection are unidentified.

Although the text of a proverb can be further decomposed into individual words, we consider the totality of the proverb text as a non-decomposable unit, because further

decomposition of the text will lead to a set of words that don't necessarily make up a proverb. But since the words themselves may be of significance for linguistic analysis, we link the database to separate utilities that are designed for specific tasks. For example, it is not necessary to index some other properties of proverbs in a relational database, such as statistical data, word frequencies, the average number of words in a certain category of proverbs, and the percentage of a certain type of proverbs, because such data can be easily extracted through a query. Using SQL (Structured Query Language) one can also query the database for proverbs with words that have specific grammatical characteristics, or words that end in certain letters. In our approach to encoding the morphological characteristics of words we pass each proverb through a morphological analyzer that marks each word with a morphological description to allow for detailed linguistic analysis on the morpheme level. For this purpose we developed a set of morphosyntactic specifications for Macedonian (Mitrevski 2007) that are based on the MULTEXT-East specifications for ten East European languages (Erjavec 2004). MULTEXT-East provides harmonized lexical specifications for the included languages and formulates the notations for encoding word attributes, which can also be used for developing lexicons and annotated corpora. Below is an example of a proverb with the appropriate morphosyntactic notations. The words in parentheses show the expanded form of the notation and are not included in the corpus text.

Види му го умот, крој му капа. *Make him a hat to fit his mind.*

Види *Vmi2-s* (Verb, main, imperative, second person, singular)

му *Pp3msd-y* (Pronoun, personal, third person, masculine, singular, dative, clitic)

го *Pp3msa-y* (Pronoun, personal, third person, masculine, singular, accusative, clitic)

умот	<i>Ncms-y</i> (Noun, common, masculine, singular, definite)
,	<i>comma</i>
крој	<i>Vmi2-s</i> (Verb, main, imperative, second person, singular)
му	<i>Pp3msd-y</i> (Pronoun, personal, third person, masculine, singular, dative, clitic)
капа	<i>Ncfs-n</i> (Noun, common, feminine, singular, indefinite)
.	<i>period</i>

Owing to the dialectal variants and archaisms in Macedonian proverbs, much of the morphological description is to be done manually. Using a corpus query language the corpus can be searched with fine details for proverbs that contain words with specific grammatical characteristics. To reveal the semantics of individual words in proverbs we construct a concordance of all proverbs with a KWIC (Key Word In Context) index, which allows one to analyze the meanings of words as they are used in different proverbs. Below are several such example of proverbs with the conjunction **ама** ‘but’, with left and right context.

Left context Word Right context

Ако го менал рувото, **ама** табитот не.

Ако е виното кисело, **ама** срцето ни е весело.

Арната овца многу не блејт, **ама** многу млеко дат.

Бело му е лицено, **ама** црно му е срцено.

Верви му на момокот, **ама** и на окото.

Although proverbs are primarily an oral genre, we often find them in folktales, in literary works, and in variety of other print media, such as newspapers and magazines. The study of how proverbs are used in various contexts opens up new possibilities for researchers. One such study, which was based on the British National Corpus and the Czech

National Corpus, by Chermak (2005) focuses on text introducers, or the combination of words that signal the coming of the proverb. Foley (1994), for example, examines the use of proverbs in South Slavic and Russian epics. Folsom (1997) focuses on proverbs in the context of American country music hits. Lau (1996) used the Lexis/Nexis database to collect instances of proverbs from newspapers and magazines in order to study how they achieve meaning in their context. In order to search for proverbs in context we construct a search form to select proverbs of a desired type, and we link each proverb programmatically to a search request in a corpus of Macedonian electronic texts and to a Google search. For example, a sample search in the database may produce these three proverbs:

1. Брзата кучка слепи кучиња раѓа. *A dog in a hurry gives birth to blind puppies.*
2. Без алат нема занает. *No tools, no profession.*
3. Го извлекол подебелиот крај. *He got the thick end (of the stick).*

Using the PHP scripting language, each proverb is presented to the user as a link to a Google search in the format `Го извлекол подебелиот крај.`, which produces results of web pages on the Internet that contain the given proverb. Searching currently for examples of the first proverb produces ten results, including a title in a newspaper article dealing with the need to quickly elect a new premier, an editorial that focuses on the fast pace of life nowadays, and two blogs. Search for the second proverb produces five unique results, including a joke, a column in a newspaper on sex advice, an item in a newspaper on designing tools for making jewelry, and an advertisement for painting tools. Search for the third proverb produces twelve results that include several newspaper articles describing

altercations. Most often than not the results at this time are empty, since there are very few Macedonian texts available on the Internet. Nevertheless, this feature in the database will be of value in the future.

The need to index variety of relevant data about each proverb, and to be able to construct complex queries when selecting proverbs with specific characteristics has led us to take another look at information technology and the relational database approach. The data in the database is defined so that it can be reorganized and accessed in a number of different ways depending on specific needs. The database is designed to facilitate the incorporation of additional classifications at any time. Since the proverbs reside in a separate, independent table, a new table representing a new classification scheme can be easily linked to the current one. The larger purpose in constructing the database is to advance to study of Macedonian proverbs in the Balkan context and in the context of other cultures.

Auburn University

REFERENCES

Aarne, Antti. 1961. *The Types of the Folk-Tale: A Classification and Bibliography*.

Translated and enlarged by Stith Thompson. Helsinki.

Alarcón, Irma. 2003. "The Polysemy of the Conjunction *y* in Spanish Proverbs." IULC

Working Papers Online, Volume 3. <https://www.indiana.edu/~iulcwp/pdfs/03-alarcon02+.pdf>.

Arora, Shirley. 1994. Rev. of *A Dictionary of American Proverbs* by Wolfgang Mieder,

Stewart A. Kingsbury and B. Kelsie New York, 1992. *Proverbium* 11:307-13.

Barley, Nigel. 1970. "A Structural Approach to the Proverb and Maxim with General

Reference to the Anglo-Saxon Corpus," *Proverbium* 20:737-50.

- Cepenkov, Marko. 1972. *Poslovici, pogovorki, kletvi, gatanki*, ed. Tome Sazdov. Skopje.
- Chermak, Frantisek. 2005. "Text Introducers of Proverbs and Other Idioms," *Jezikoslovlje* 6 (1-2):57-77.
- Dundes, Alan. 1981. "On the Structure of the Proverb," *The Wisdom of Many. Essays on the Proverb*, ed. Wolfgang Meider and Alan Dundes, 43-64. New York.
- Erjavec, Tomaž, ed. 2004. "MULTEXT-East Morphosyntactic Specifications," Online <http://nl.ijs.si/ME/V3/msd/html/index.html>.
- Foley, John Miles. 1994. "Proverbs and Proverbial Function in South Slavic and Comparative Epic," *Proverbium* 11:77-92.
- Folsom, Steven R. 1997. "Dictionary of Proverbs in American Country Music Hits (1986-1996)," Online. <http://www.deproverbio.com/DPbooks/FOLSOM/cmdictionary.html>
- Friedman, Victor. 1999. "Proverbial Evidentiality: On the Gnomical Uses of the Category of Status in Languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus," *Mediterranean Language Review* 11:135-55.
- Giovannini, Maureen J. 1978. "A Structural Analysis of Proverbs in a Sicilian Village," *American Ethnologist* 5(2):322-33.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1978. "Notes on the Makeup of a Proverb," *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, IV*, ed. W. Winter, 83-85. The Hague.
- Jang, Tae-Sang. 199. "A Poetic Structure in Hausa Proverbs," *Research in African Literatures* 30(1):83-115
- Krikmann, Arvo. 2007. "On the Relationships of the Rhetorical, Modal, Logical, and Syntactic Planes in Estonian Proverbs," Online. <http://www.folklore.ee/folklore/vol8/syntmod2.htm>.

- Kuusi, Matti. 1970. "How Can a Type-Index of International Proverbs be Outlined: An Experiment and Five Questions," *Proverbium* 15:57-60.
- . 1972. "Towards an International Type-system of Proverbs," *Proverbium* 19:699-736.
- Lau, Kimberly J. 1996. "'It's About Time': The Ten Proverbs Most Frequently Used in Newspapers, and Their Relation to American Values," *Proverbium* 13:135-160.
- Laukahangas, Outi. 2001. *The Matti Kuusi International Type System of Proverbs*. FF Communications No. 275. Helsinki.
- Levin, Maurice I. 1964. *Repetition as a Structural Device in the Russian Proverb*. Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.
- . 1968. "The Structure of the Russian Proverb," *Studies Presented to Roman Jakobson by His Students*, ed. Charles E. Gribble, 180-87. Cambridge, MA.
- Mieder, Wolfgang, Stewart A. Kingsbury and Kelsie B. Harder. 1992. *A Dictionary of American Proverbs*. New York.
- Mitrevski, George. 2007 (to appear). "A Proposal for Macedonian Morphosyntactic Descriptions," *Proceedings of the Sixth International Macedonian-North American Conference on Macedonian Studies*, Ohrid 2006.
- Norrick, N. R. 1981. *Proverbial Linguistics: Linguistic Perspectives on Proverbs*. University of Trier, Series B, No. 69. Trier.
- Permiakov, Grigorii L. 1979. *From Proverb To Folk-Tale. Notes on the General Theory of Cliché*. Moscow.
- . 1988. "Klasifikatsiia poslovychnykh izrechei. Sistema logicheskoi transformatsii poslovits," *Osnovy strukturnoi paremiologii*, Moscow. Online.
<http://center.fio.ru/som.fsio/getblob.asp?id=10007406>.

- Rothstein, Robert A. 1968. "The Poetics of Proverbs," *Studies Presented to Roman Jakobson by His Students*, ed. Charles E. Gribble, 265-74. Cambridge.
- Silverman-Weinreich, Beatrice. 1981. "Towards a Structural Analysis of Yiddish Proverbs," *The Wisdom of Many. Essays on the Proverb*, ed. Wolfgang Meider and Alan Dundes, 65-85, New York.
- Starchević, Zoran. 1996. *Linguistic Repetition and Discourse Structure in Russian and Serbian Proverbs*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Alberta.
- Taylor, Archer. 1934. "Problems in the Study of Proverbs." *Journal of American Folklore* 47:1-21
- Velichkovski, Bone. 2002. *Makedonsko-Angliski i Anglisko-Makedonski poslovice i paraleli*. Skopje.
- Zholkovsky, A. K. 1978. "At the Intersection of Linguistics, Paremiology and Poetics: On the Literary Structure of Proverbs," *Poetics* 7:309-32.