

Determination of Specifics of Semantics of Phraseological Units with a Gender Component in the English and Tatar Languages

Ekaterina A. Khuzina*

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Rezeda Yo. Mukhtarova

Naberezhnye Chelny Pedagogical Institute, Russia

Abstract

The gender field in linguistics the subject of which is the language-gender correlation as a social factor studies the concepts such as gender, femininity, masculinity. Gender is expressed in semantics and in grammar of the language, forming a linguistic world image, which, in turn, depends on the conceptual image. The gender view of the world is not biologically determined in different cultures and language communities, the concepts of femininity and masculinity are determined by cultural and historical factors, in particular, by language stereotypes. Gender metaphor also influences the formation of conceptual and linguistic view of the world. The gender metaphor is understood as the transfer not only of physical features but also of the totality of spiritual qualities and properties united by the nominations of femininity and masculinity to the objects that are not related to gender. In different language communities the referents of femininity and masculinity often do not coincide, which creates difficulties in intercultural communication and translation. Phraseological unit is a peculiar unit of language, complex and contradictory as language and culture. Phraseological units (PhU), like a sponge, absorb all the original in language. It is in them, where, alongside vocabulary and aphorism, the cumulative function of language is manifested first.

Keywords: Semantics; Phraseological Unit; Metaphorical model of phraseological.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

The article aims to identify the specifics of the semantics of phraseological units (PhU) in the gender component in the English language and in the Tatar language (EL and TL). The gender component of phraseological unit is understood as a substantive component that has the seme of sex (male and female). Gender are numerous genonymum (mother, father, husband, wife and others), PhU nominating the person (man, woman, girl, boy, etc.), zoonyms and ornithonyms (cow, bull, chicken, rooster and others). Despite the abundance of works on gender, the comparison of phraseological units with the gender component in EL and TL has not been carried out previously. The goal of any comparison of languages is always the exposing of a common and a specific in the structure, semantics, and language image of the world of native speakers. The object of our comparison was the PhU, united by the semantics of the component expressing the conceptual category of sex. The juxtaposition is based on the material of the PhU, selected from modern one-and bilingual phraseological, etymological and explanatory dictionaries. We have selected 658 units in the English language, and 523 units in the Tatar language (Smith, 1970). Many linguists (Kunnin, 2018; Mukhtarova, 2014;2015; Rosemarie, 1998; Smith, 1970) studied the interaction between culture and language and the reflection of culture in different part of language. The mentioned studies have been done in the frame work of Phu. It is suggested the clarification of national and cultural of Rosemarie (1998) distinguished the ways of reflecting culture and national in phraseology. In the following we will pursue the aim study by identifying the marks of the interaction of language and culture, which is reflected in the images of the PhU and the history, customs, prescriptions and attitudes of culture mirrored in them.

2. Methodology

The study applies the following methods: The methods of phraseological identification (Kunnin, 2018) and phraseological analysis, the method of component analysis and the method of semantic analysis in combination with the method of analysis of dictionary definitions and context analysis, the method of comparative analysis, the statistical method (Mukhtarova, 2014;2015).

3. Results and Discussions

Unlike words, phraseology is a more complex level of linguistic units, which makes the task of the researcher more difficult but at the same time more interesting. In our previous studies we carried out a comparative analysis of the re-interpreted meanings of the genonym components, metaphorical and metonymic models of rethinking of the components of phraseological units, as a result of which we have concluded that the motivated PhU which have a transparent internal form are characteristic of the English and Tatar languages. Locutions are the Tatar PhU with a genonym which enables to say that the theme of family occupies a special position in the Tatar language. Also, the

*Corresponding Author

research finds out that the Tatar phraseological units are distinguished by a more vivid imagery due to the wider use of metaphorical comparisons and alogisms. Thus, one can assert with complete certainty that the specificity of the semantics of phraseological units is manifested, first, in the distinction of the figurative basis, this is explained by the difference in perception and interpretation of the surrounding reality of people belonging to different communities; secondly, the presence of the culture-specific words in the PhU, as well as the fact from history or custom underlying the PhU, which has no analogues in other nations, certainly makes the phraseology distinctive (Lullulangi and Sampebua, 2018; Moon, 1994a).

The material of phraseology traces all the basic mechanisms of the work of linguistic consciousness in the conceptualization of the reality. PhU stores information about 1) man, his external characteristics; 2) man, his internal characteristics; 3) the object (s) of reality (concrete or abstract); 4) the situation; 5) time; 6) action, process. The sources of the emerging PhU can be 1) the Bible (the EL) and the Qur'an (the TL); 2) history (typical for the EL); 3) literature (typical for the EL); 4) folklore (typical for the TL); 5) fables, stories; 6) real propositions. Speaking about the specifics of semantics, the scholars often mean the national and cultural specifics of a phraseological unit. The book *Phraseology in the Context of Culture* concerns the classification given by V.G. Gak, who suggests delineating the national specifics of the PhU and the cultural specifics of the PhU. We apply his classification to our examples. So, he differentiates

1) The national-specific PhU, which are culturally conditioned; in the EL: the first lady the wife of the president;

In the TL: кияү пилмәне pelmeni for the groom. In this group, one can trace the realities peculiar to the life of this people: the first lady is a woman who stands high in the state, this idea of a woman is not characteristic of either culture or the everyday life of the Tatar people.

2) The national-specific PhU, not determined by special facts of culture; in the EL: to be tied to one's mother's apron strings to be attached to the mother, to depend on someone;

3) The cultural-determined PhU, but being devoid of national specifics (they have the analogues in a compared language, usually from borrowed or common sources); in the EL: Mother Carey the Mother of God; in the TL: Мәръям ана Virgin Mary;

4) The PhU that are devoid of national specificity and cultural-historical determination, they are formed due to the similar imagery in the AL: mother tongue native language; in the TL: ана теле native language.

If we talk about indicators specific to the semantics of phraseological unit, it seems appropriate to highlight, first, an indication of realities that are not characteristic of the language being compared; secondly, a specific image, a discrepancy between conceptual metaphors. Proceeding from this, we do not see the need to separate the national and cultural specifics of the PhU. Moon (1994b) distinguishes four forms of manifestation of national specifics.

- The national and cultural specifics of semantics, which manifests itself in the absence of an appropriate lexeme in the languages being compared (лъыка не вязать / to be too drunk to make sense);
- The national-conceptual specifics of semantics, based on the difference of the systems of the images serving as the basis for the secondary nomination (hinter die Ohren schreiben – зарубить себе на носу / mark it well);
- The national-connotative specifics of semantics which is manifested in difference of the estimating senses of the compared phraseological lexemes (the absence of estimation in one language and the presence of a disapproving emoseme in another);
- The national system-determined specifics of semantics (difference in valency of phraseological lexemes and difference in stylistic marking) (Pimenova, 2015).

The contrastive research aims to reveal the hidden traces of language-culture interaction that reveal ethnic characteristics, that is, the characteristic only for a certain image of the world. It follows that the primary interest for contrastive research is represented by specific PhU that are less or more influenced by cultural facts and reflect the national notion of the surrounding world (including the system of values). Proceeding from the foregoing, we adhere to the classification proposed by Moon (1994b), and we distinguish three ways to reflect the national specifics in phraseology:

I. The national-cultural specifics of semantics, that is, the PhU involve an indication of a situation, realities, non-equivalent units that are specific to the people,.

II. The national-conceptual specifics based on the differences of the systems of images of PhU.

III. The national-connotative specifics of semantics which is revealed in differences of evaluative senses of the phraseological lexemes being compared.

Consider the phraseological units that reflect the national-cultural specifics of semantics.

Analyzing the PhU of unrelated languages, one cannot but notice differences in the culturological origins and extra linguistic mechanisms of the formation of semantics of phraseological units. A vivid distinctiveness is characteristic for PhU of the EL and the TL. There is little difficulty in identifying the national and cultural specifics. It is the components of the PhU that serve as the indicators of the national-cultural specifics: A lady of easy virtue - a light woman, a gentleman of the road – a highway robber; кияү бүләге – a gift of the marriageable young man, килен сөя бауы – to go for viewing of the bride. Actually, the components of the PhU, forming the image, contain the information about the life of the English and the Tatars: about life style of the native speakers: ladies who lunch – women, passing their time in restaurants and shops, a stag party – bachelors party, backroom boys – (literally: the boys from the secret room) people who perform confidential work; атаң малы түгел – (literally: not your father's cattle) wouldn't dispose the property of others; аналары бер кояшта киндер киптергән – (literally: their mothers were drying the hemp under one sun (for making fiber) на одном солнышке онучи сушили;

– About household utensils and appliances, implements: a Mrs Mop – (literally: missis floor-cloth) a cleaning woman; make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear – (literally: to sew a silk wallet using swine’s ear) to re-educate someone; сыер дагалап йөрү –to shoe a cow, сыерга япма ябу – (literally: like a coverlet on the cow) –to hold a candle to the sun;

– About clothes, head dress: абзыкаем Фәрхетдин, түбәтәен бәрхетдин – (literally: uncle Pharkhutdin, a velvet skullcap) –beauty is but skin deep; анасының итәгенә ябышып йөрү – (literally: to clutch at the skirts of mother) to be a spoiled child, you big girl’s blouse – (literally: блузка большой девочки) –a coward;

– About national dish, beverage and products: бу синең эниең пешергән элбә түгел –это тебе не мамыны пироги; анакаем маем – (literally: mummy – butter) –a pet name of mother or used to express fear, cock and bottle (pie) –петух и бутылка (пирог) – a badge of eating house, teach your grandmother/granny to suck eggs – (literally: учить бабушку пить яйца) advice when most needed is least beeded;

– About musical instruments: әтәче кубыз уйный – (literally: his cock fifes) –his cocks lay eggs; like a sow playing on a trump – (literally: like a swine playing the trumpet) ungracefully, awkwardly;

– About об rites and traditions: туй атасы –посаженный отец, кыз урлау –a custom to steal a marriageable girl, ask for a lady’s hand –to ask someone’s hand in marriage;

– About historical events: әби патша заманында –in the time of Catherine (a long time ago, never), хан кызы –khan’s daughter, the Iron Duke –Arthur Wensley, the duke of Wellington, the Virgin Queen –Queen Elizabeth I, the Iron Maiden (of Nuremberg) – (literally: железная дева (из Нюрнберга)

– About geography: Чистай малае – (literally: a boy from Chistopol) –chistopol vodka, the Queen City of the Mississippi –(literally: королева Миссисипи) –the city of Saint-Louis;

– About religion: яраткан Аллам түгел, тапкан анам түгел – (literally: not loved Allah, not my mother) I don’t care, the son of God –Jesus Christ;

– About myths and popular beliefs: су анасы кебек гүзәл – (literally: beautiful like water-sprite) very plain, the witch is in it – (literally: the witch has something to do with it here) magic came into the picture.

Let us advert to the question about the national-conceptual specifics of semantics. Distinction lies in different images, which are the basis of secondary nomination. For example, an English phraseological unit with the meaning to die (to be gathered to one’s fathers) is based on the image of fathers (ancestors). A Tatar phraseological unit with the similar meaning to send to kingdom come (әбиләрнең әбиләре янына олактыру – literally: to send to grandmothers) is based on the image of grandmothers. The PhU with the meaning tall stories is based on the image of old wives (old wives’ tale) in English, in Tatar – the image of grandmothers (әбиләр әкиятә – literally: a grandmothers’ tale). The image of an old woman is in the PhU with the meaning an old peasant woman, weakling (about male) in English, in Tatar – women without skirt (итәксез хатыннар).

4. Summary

The national-connotative specifics of the semantics of the PhU is manifested in the fact that the national specific character is reflected in the difference between the evaluative semes of the compared phraseological units, which casts light on the differences in the system of value of the compared languages. For example, the PhU with the component cow differ in their evaluativity in the EL and the TL. In Tatar, such PhU have negative evaluation: жебегән сыер –neither fish nor fowl; сукмакчыл сыер –a man who likes to dramatize everything. English phraseological; units with the component cow have negative, positive and neutral connotation: a sacred cow –an untouchable person; a cash cow – a source of income; a fair cow –villain.

5. Conclusions

Thus, a contrastive study of the phraseological part of languages makes it possible to identify the marks of the interaction of language and culture, which is reflected in the images of the PhU and the history, customs, prescriptions and attitudes of culture mirrored in them. The results of the contrastive study of the PhU characterize so different and at the same time similar cultural and linguistic images of the world. After [Sterin and Fleckenstein \(1994\)](#) we distinguish three ways of reflecting the national specifics in phraseology: 1) the national-cultural specifics of semantics, that is, an indication to a situation specific to the people, realities, non-equivalent units in phraseology, 2) the national-conceptual specifics of semantics, based on the difference of the systems of images of the PhU and 3) the national-connotative specific character of semantics, which manifests itself in the difference of the evaluative semes of the compared phraseological lexemes ([Antunnez and Gana, 2016](#); [Kunin, 1996](#)).

It stands exposed that the specificity of the semantics of the PhU with the gender component is formed not only from the semantics of the gender component, but from the image conveyed by the whole unit at large. The component can become an associative-figurative base of the PhU, carry a positive or negative evaluation, but it is not the only indicator of the specifics of the semantics of phraseological units.

Acknowledgements

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

References

- Antunnez, J. J. and Gana, F. (2016). Derechos sociales fundamentales: Consideraciones iusfilosóficas de sus dilemas. Aproximación utópica desde la Bioética Global. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 21(57): 93-111.
- Kunin, A. (1996). *A course of phraseology of modern English*. Dubna, Phoenix.
- Kunnin (2018). Structural conceptual model of forming readiness for innovative activity of future teachers in general education school. *Opción*.
- Lullulangi, M. and Sampebua, O. (2018). Tongkonan in Kalimbuang Bori'And its built environment in the north toraja regency of South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Astra Salvensis*.
- Moon, R. (1994a). *Frequencies and forms of Phrasal Lexemes in English, Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 491-538.
- Moon, R. (1994b). *The analysis of fixed expressions in Text. In advances in written discourse analysis*. Coulthard, Routledge: London. 117-35.
- Mukhtarova, R. (2014). Metaphoric and metonymic models of phraseological units with gender component in English and Tatar. In the world of scientific discoveries. *Krasnoyarsk, Research and Innovation Cente*: 126-31.
- Mukhtarova, R. (2015). The contrastive analysis of new meanings of the genonyms of english and tatar phraseological units. *The Herald of VSPU. Philology. Volgograd, BГIIY*, 6(110): 155-59.
- Pimenova, M. (2015). Types of concepts electronic resource. Available: http://www.kuzspa.ru/diss/conf_27_28/5_pimenova.doc
- Rosemarie, G. (1998). *The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the light of genre analysis. In Phraseology, Theory, analysis, and applications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 125-44.
- Smith, W. (1970). *The Oxford dictionary of English proverbs text*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Sternin, I. A. and Fleckenstein, C. (1994). *Studies on contrastive lexicology*.