

## PROHIBITIVE IN THE INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

M.A. Kulkova, E.A. Denisova, Th.H Zinecker  
Kazan Federal University, 2 Tatarstan Street. Kazan, 420021, Republic of Tatarstan. Russian  
Federation. E-mail: mkulkowa@rambler.ru

### Abstract

In this study, we talk about such a phenomenon of verbal communication as prohibitive. Using the examples of German and Russian proverbs the pragmatic linguistic analysis of ethnic-cultural characteristics concerning the language objectification of speech intentions associated with the expression of prohibition. The material is based on the comparison of statistical data obtained during the pragmatic linguistic analysis of 1500 German and 1500 Russian proverbs with the prohibition semantics. The authors identify a number of prohibitive structures differing by the greatest frequency of use in German and Russian languages. The peculiarities of prohibitive structure use are revealed by the representatives of German and Russian ethnic-cultural societies.

In terms of tectonic structure the prohibitive statements can be divided into mono- and polyintentional offers, the latter in its turn can be prepared in the form of reasoned and unreasoned statements. The presence / absence of arguments explaining the need of refusal from a particular action is the "indicator" of categorical prohibition degree in a certain sense.

The specific methods of article issues study include: the collection and the systematization of proverbs from various paremiographic sources, the structural and semantic analysis of language material and the analysis of proverb contextual environment containing prohibitive structures in an artistic and a poetic discourse.

**Key Words:** prohibitive, prohibitive structures, proverbs, prohibition semantics, pragmatic linguistic analysis, intercultural communication.

### 1. Introduction

As you know, the prohibition is rooted in ancient times, where the notion of "taboo" took place, prescribing a human behavior in certain situations in order to protect it and prevent undesired consequences of his behavior. Therefore, those who wanted to live a long life, observed a set of rules created by society. Many of these rules come down to us through the centuries of our ancestor oral folklore, in particular, from paremiological texts. Proverbs, namely, the proverbs and sayings are the fount of knowledge and experience from previous generations. Besides prohibition plays a special role in the culture and the life of any nation. It is related to the various spheres of social life, and, according to some researchers ([Wierzbicka, 1999]; [Karasik, 2002]; [Shatunovsky, 2004], and others.), it plays an important role and has a certain structure in German language.

Prohibition represents a multifaceted term of modern pragmatic linguistics. A number of researchers, the advocates of a pragmatic approach (E.V. Astapenko, E.I. Belyaeva, A. Wierzbicka, Shatunovsky I.B. et al.) refer prohibitive to the directives, declaratives, coupled with their constitutive function and exercitives which says about the lack of arguments for prohibitive for its subsequent release in a separate speech act. It is worth noting that the study of typological features in pragmatic presented statements would not be possible without the works of such renowned scientists as G. Austin, [Austin, 1946], G. R. Searle [Searle, 1986], G. Leach [Leech, 1963], S. Levinson [Levinson, 1983], and others. Studying prohibition as a separate communicative and pragmatic frame, it should be noted that it exists in contact with lots of other frames (request, advice, warning,

caution, order, instruction, etc.) combined by prescriptive intention. It is also not necessary that the frame "prohibition" can have the points of contact only with the neighboring frames, for example, an "order" and an "instruction". Having placed it between the frames "council" or "caution", we can easily observe their partial overlapping. For example: Do not do good and you won't get evil. This proverb demonstrates the prohibition (the prohibition to perform good deeds), and then we see the reason which explains the abandoning from this action (in order not to get evil). This argument also contains the warning, in which the negative impact of a forbidden action is reflected immediately. The mobility of frames is realized in a particular communicative situation.

## 2. Materials and methods

The study material was based on the data of continuous and special sampling of proverb sayings from various paremiographic sources (K.F.W. Wander "Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon", S. Ch. Wagener "Sprichwörter-Lexikon", K. Simrock "Die deutschen Sprichwörter", H. und A. Beyer "Sprichwörterlexikon", V.I. Dal "Russian people proverbs", I.M. Snegirev "Russian proverbs and parables", V.P. Anikin "Russian proverbs" I.I. Illustrov "The collection of Russian proverbs and sayings"). The files of the study have only 3,000 proverbs, 1500 German and 1500 Russian ones.

An integrated approach was taken during the study concerning collected material, based on the analysis of structural and semantic objectification features of a particular intention in proverbs [Kulkova et al. 2015]. Besides, the methodology of elementary statistics and the graphical representation of results was applied.

## 3. Results

In the course of the performed study we determined a number of structures, implementing the prohibition illocution as the part of German and Russian proverbs. Based on the analysis of 1500 German proverbs we highlight 9 major structures, characterized by a high frequency of use:

1. «Imperativ 2. Person Singular+Negationswort» (24%): Sei nicht Allerwelts Freund; Achte keinen Ort ohne ein Ohr; Abbitte nicht, aber Halsstarrigkeit ist Schande;
2. «Man/es+Modalverb+Negationswort+Infinitiv» (21%): Man muß das Pferd und nicht den Ritter zäumen; Man darf wohl alles wissen aber nicht alles tun; Es darf nicht jeder die Glocke ziehen; Es soll nicht gelten, was Mein und Dein, sondern was nützt der ganzen Gemein.
3. «Man+Verb+Negationswort» (3%): Man ruckt den Esek nicht eher zu Hofe, er solle denn Sache tragen; Man ruft den Esel nicht zu Hofe, denn dass er Säcke trage; Man sagt nicht zu der Kuh Bläßle, wenn sie nicht wenigstens einen Stern hat;
4. «Schlimm sein» (1%): Es ist schlimm für junge Hunde, wenn sie mit jungen Bären spielen; Mit Narren ist schlimm spaßen; In heissem Oel ist schlimm baden;
5. «Sein+nicht+zu+Infinitiv» (9%): Allen Worten ist nicht zu glauben; Dem Stammelnden ist nicht zu trauen; Den Hungrigen ist nicht zu predigen;
6. «Verboten sein» (1%): Fasten und feiern ist der Christenheit verboten; Ausschlagen ist verboten, nur nicht sich wehren; Schlagen ist verboten, widerschlagen nicht;
7. «Was... das...» (3%): Was Gott zusammenfügt, das soll der Mensch nicht scheiden; Was schon vor Jahr und Tag geschehn, das lass nicht wieder auferstehn; Was dich nicht brennt, sollst du nicht löschen (das blase nicht). The presence of modal verbs or imperative denial may also occur here and in the following two structures.
8. «Wenn..., so» (2%): Wenn du Bergluft athmen willst, so gehe nicht in die Sümpfe; Wenn ein alter Gaul in Gang kommt, so ist er nicht mehr zu halten; Wenn man nicht jagt, soll nicht laufen;
9. «Wer/wem..., der/dem...» (20%): Wer andere betrügt, muss nicht über Untreu klagen; Wer den Nagel am Hufeisen nicht achtet, der verliert auch das Pferd; Wer ein Ding zuviel lobt, dem traue nicht; Wem der Arzt Alaun verschreibt, der muss nicht Zucker brauchen.

In addition to these 9 structures, we can highlight the presence of a number of lexemes that serve as the prohibitive semantics expression, for example, the verb "schweigen" (to be silent) (1%). Using this verb in the imperative: be quiet, silence, and so on, we trace here the connotation of

prohibition, i.e., shut up = do not say anything: Schweig, Herz, und rede, Maul; Schweig, Maul, ich geb dir ein Wecklein; Verschweige, was du tun willst, so kommt dir niemand dazwischen.

As for Russian proverbs, we revealed 6 basic structures, used in proverbs to express prohibition:

- 1) "No + imperative + 2nd person, singular" as the main form of prohibition expression in Russian language, it makes 60% of the 1500 selected Russian proverbs. Here are some examples of use: Do not rush to grab; Wipe your hands!; Do not poke your nose forward, not to be back; Do not boast with a beggar bag when people give something;
- 2) "He forbids / they forbid" (1%): I am glad to get married, but May forbids; The house is small, and forbids to lie; Thief is being beaten and they forbid him to cry;
- 3) 1% of the Russian proverb expresses the prohibition due to the structure "can not + infinitive": He can not be a judge in his own home; You can not say there is a lot of knots in the house (the audience); The Russian land can't be without a sovereign;
- 4) 1% of proverbs contains the following structure: "do not + infinitive": Do not spoil when a priest censes; Do not beat baldness in vain; Do not speculate by hands, if God did not give the mind;
- 5) impersonal forms "do not + verb in 3rd person singular" (6%): A dead man is not carried by a church; There is no execution without a court. There is no punishment without a court; Guns, wives and dogs are not borrowed;
- 6) "The sin / it's a sin + infinitive" (2%): It's a sin to cross a cross (i.e., to pass in front of a worshiper); Curse is a sin, and praise is god punishment; You can grow and sell potatoes, but it is a sin to eat it.

Among 1500 Russian proverbs expressing the prohibition, like in German proverbs, a number of implicit options of prohibition expression is met, which can not be classified: Perhaps, suppose and somehow won't do any good; Fight does not allow to gain mind; If you are bad, the God will not give, etc.

The peculiarity of Russian prohibitive proverbs is that many of them contain not only a prohibition but also a model of behavior in a particular situation, developed with the adversative conjunction "and", "but": Talk, but do not argue, and do not say nonsense; Do not buy if it's expensive and do not take for free; Make haste to help someone else in trouble, but do not hurry for a feast to him.

Having examined the basic structures of German and Russian proverbs which express prohibition, let's proceed to the definition of an addressee's speech intentions. In this case, all prohibitive proverbs encourage to abstain from any act. Many of the selected proverbs consist of two parts: a prohibition itself and its cause, that is the argument. Let's consider the implementation of communication tactics using the example of Russian proverbs: The representation tactics of negative consequences in the case of a prohibition non-compliance: Do not hit the wrong gate with a whip or yours will be hit by a club; Presentation tactics of positive consequences of action: Do not touch a horse - and it won't kick; Explanation tactics: Do not hurt, calling bad: it is impossible to know what will happen; do not flatter to a good thing: it is impossible to know what it will be; The tactics of "behavior pattern attraction": Do not grieve, pulling all tugs; and when you are asked - come down and help; Inversion tactics: If you want to eat cakes, do not lie on a bed. According to the performed analysis the prohibitive structures can be determined by a high or a low degree of a prohibition illocutionary force. Russian proverb express the most categorical prohibition using the structures "do not + imperative of the 2nd person, singular". They also have the highest frequency of use: Do not take an excess burden, and if you take it, carry it on no matter how hard it is; Do not look for the truth in others, if you do not have it yourself; Do not scare me: death will come without your threats, etc. In order to mitigate the illocutionary force of prohibition in Russian proverbs the structures with the indicative form of the verb in 3rd person, plural and the negation 'not' are used: Do not visit a strange monastery with your regulations; There is no execution without a court, etc. At the same time, a prohibition situation correlates with the situation of caution in such cases.

The cases of paremiological statements in literature are interesting. Nectar is sweet but not two spoons of it in a mouth:

"- Drink green wine, my sister, do not spoil your expensive mind, my sister. Honey is sweet, but not by a handful in a mouth". M. Golubkova, "Two centuries in half a century".

Drink at the table, but do not drink near a post" - Why not drink when a good man brings - the host continued. - There is no harm from it, brother Anton, ... drink at the table, good people tell, but do not drink around the corner ... ". Grigoryevich, Anton Unfortunate. Do not be afraid of the dog that barks, and fear the one which is silent but is wagging with its tail "Bugrov came, gave goodies, said a few words and left. And he said these few words not to Lisa, but to Grokholsky. He was silent with Lisa. And Grokholsky was at peace ... But there is a Russian proverb, which Grokholsky should remember: "Do not be afraid of a dog that barks, and fear the one that keeps silent". One day, walking through the garden, he heard two voices ... The first belonged to Bugrov, the second one belonged to Lisa. Grokholsky listened, turned pale as death, and walked toward talkers silently". (A.P. Chekhov, "Living Goods").

In German language:

*Man soll kein Öl ins Feuer gießen:*

„Lieber Herr Doktor, Sie haben doch einen so großen Einfluß - können Sie da nicht etwas Öl ins Feuer gießen?“ Wolfgang Borchert: ...tatsächlich die einzige Hoffnung - Briefe aus den letzten Monaten.

*Einem dreschenden Ochsen soll man nicht das Maul verbinden:*

„Da sich die Leute aber zu arbeiten weigerten, wenn sie nicht ihre Cigarre dabei rauchen dürften, und sogar die Bibelstelle mit dem dreschenden Ochsen und dem Maul verbinden citierten, sah sich die Frau Gräfin genöthigt, in ihrer Strenge nachzulassen.“ (Friedrich Gerstäcker, „Die Colonie“).

*Trink und isß, Gottes nicht vergiß:*

„Trink und isß,  
Gott nicht vergiss,  
Bewahr dein Ehr,  
dir wird nit mehr  
Von all deiner Hab`

Denn ein Tuch ins Grab“ (Berthold Auerbach, „Auf der Höhe“).

These examples demonstrate the lexical changes in paremiological statements easily. An author can reduce a proverb, to replace one lexeme by another one, etc. Since proverbs belong to the genre of folklore, these metamorphosis are easily understandable: despite the cliché nature of proverb structures, a talker varies it in his own way.

#### 4. Conclusions

The performed study of prohibitive structures used by the representatives of German and Russian ethnic-cultural communities, the example of proverbs made it possible to identify a number of similarities and differences within a communicative and a pragmatic level, and at the level of a prohibition intention language verbalization.

For example, German language determined 9 basic models of prohibitive structures with a high degree of frequency followed by the frequency index indication: 1) „Imperativ 2. Person Singular+Negationswort“ (24%); 2) „Man/es+Modalverb+Negationswort+Infinitiv“ (21%); 3) „Man+Verb+Negationswort“ (3%); 4) „Schlimm sein“ (1%); 5) „Sein+nicht+zu+Infinitiv“ (9%); 6) „Verboten sein“ (1%); 7) „Was..., das...“ (3%); 8) „Wenn..., so“ (2%); 9) „Wer/wem..., der/dem...“ (20%).

The differences of prohibitive structural models were revealed in Russian language, which found its expression in a structural aspect, and in terms of lexical content. The following structures were determined as the most frequent models of structures with the prohibition semantics in Russian: 1) "do not + imperative of the 2nd person, singular" (60%); 2) "he does not allow / they do not allow" (1%); 3) "it is forbidden + infinitive" (1%); 4) "do not + infinitive" (1%); 5) impersonal forms "not + the verb in the 3rd person singular" (6%); 6) "sin / it's a sin + infinitive" (2%).

#### 5. Summary

Thus, according to these results, we can draw the conclusion about the coincidence an intentional conceptual sphere in German and in Russian ethnic-cultural societies that are based on the

principle of communicative pragmatic concepts universalization in the national and global consciousness of mankind, and the divergence in the linguistic methods of explication concerning the prohibition intention highlighted in this study. The established differences in prohibitive linguistic reflection are explained by the mental differences of compared linguistic culture representatives that determine the specific ethnic social cultural codes of information. The presence of a single intentional conceptual sphere in the minds of Russian and German peoples is determined by empirical prerequisites for the socio-cultural organization of their life, the standardized patterns of behavior for these national communities, an invariant nature of actions, the actions of individuals, the universalization of human communication principles by the virtue of verbal behavior common standards in comparable linguistic cultures.

#### 6. Acknowledgements

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

#### References

1. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and universals. *Journal Language Design*, pp. 23-69.
2. Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Language circle. personality, concepts, discourse. monography*. Volgograd: "Peremena".
3. Shatunovsky, B.I (2004). *Imperative and type*. Moskow. Maks-Press.
4. Austin, J.L. (1953). *Other Minds*. Oxford: the clarendon press.
5. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
6. Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman Group Ltd.
7. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Kulkova, M.A., Rakhimova, A.E., Zinecker, T. (2015). Hermeneutical analysis of paroemiological texts with semantics of permission. *Journal of Language and Literature*, Volume 6, Issue 1, pp. 297-300.