

The Research of the Structural Organization of Metaphorical and Metonymical Models 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 subject of the study of the article is the question of models of phraseological units (PhU) with gender component (a substantive component that expresses the category of gender) formed on the basis of metaphorical and metonymic reinterpretation of the components. The category of gender is considered as a semantic category, correlated with the conceptual category of sex. The analysis is based on the English and Tatar languages. The object of the study are the PhU with a gender component, formed on the basis of metaphorical and metonymic re-interpretation of the components. The article aims to define the common and the different in the patterns of phraseological units, based on metaphorical and metonymic reinterpretation, in English and Tatar. The study of metaphorical models results in identification of metaphorical personification, antonomasia, periphrasis, comparison, and algorism. The most common pattern turned to be periphrasis, in the Tatar language there are a lot of phraseological units – algorisms and comparisons. Common is a synecdoche among the metonymic models (in the Tatar language), metonymic paraphrases (rare in both languages) and metonymical antonomasia (used in English). The author comes to the conclusion that metaphoric transfers are common in both languages, but the Tatar phraseology is more vivid through the use of comparisons, algorisms. English phraseology is more “restrained” but it is diverse as it has deeper roots.

Keywords: Phraseological unit; Metaphorical model of phraseology; Metonymic.

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

1. Introduction

The article is aimed to consider the PhU model with a gender component in the English and Tatar languages (hereinafter, the EL and the TL), based on metaphorical and metonymic reinterpretation, thus identifying the general and various phraseological units in the mechanisms of formation. The gender component is a substantive constituent part expressing the semantic category of gender, correlated with the conceptual category of sex (woman, boy, bull, chicken, etc.). Despite the previous study of the problem of metaphorical and metonymic reinterpretation of the components of the PhU, this study is topical, since the PhU with a gender component in two unrelated, different-structural languages have been analyzed for the first time. The material of the study was the data of modern mono- and bilingual phraseological, etymological and explanatory dictionaries. The selected material is 658 in the English language, and 523 units in the Tatar language. The study uses the semantic and statistical analyses, comparison and generalization (Smith, 1970).

Metaphor has long been an object of concern in linguistics. Traditionally, metaphor is viewed as a trope based on comparison. To compare something that is incomprehensible, unusual or difficult to explain with what it is habitual in everyday life is inherent in man. Our material often involves people, animals, and birds of both sexes. Metaphor is not the only mechanism for forming images of phraseological units. “Following (Pimenova, 2015), some linguists argue that in our conceptual system there are various metonymic models that underlie the use of multiple figurative and stereotyped expressions.” In most cases, images of phraseological units are based on metaphorical rethinking, for example: In the EL: mother hen “a mother who makes fuss of her children like a sitting hen”; a sacred cow “an untouchable person”. In the TL: *тәкә мәрәзә күрәтү* (literally: to show the horns of the sheep) “to cock a snook at”; *мүкләк сыег* “a hornless cow, an unceremonious person” (Pimenova, 2015; Villalobos Antúnez and Bello, 2014).

2. Methods

The authors of the article use semantic and statistical analysis, juxtaposition and generalization.

3. Results and discussions

Consider the models based on metaphorical rethinking in more detail. Metaphorical personification is quite common in the phraseology of both languages, especially in the EL. Personification or embodiment is the transfer of human properties to an abstract concept. It is natural for a person to personify nature, time and other abstract concepts, the echoes of mythological thinking are manifested in this. In both languages, the components of the PhU personification are the genonyms: In the EL: Mother Nature “Nature is mother”; Father Time (literally: time is

*Corresponding Author

father) “Grandfather Time”. In the TL: Кыш бабай “winter, Grandfather Frost”; Ramadan агай килде (literally: uncle Ramadan has come) “the month of Ramadan has come”. The metaphorical application of the proper name, known from literature, history, mythology, etc. to designate a person endowed with certain properties of the bearer of this name is called antonomasia. The components of antonomasia are the components boy, man, girl, lady, queen, ана, бабай, жиңги, as well as the zoonyms тәкә, әтәч. For example, in the EL: Teddy boy “a stylish man” (Teddy is a diminutive name of Edward, from the name of English King Edward VII, who had a distinctive manner to dress, Teddy boys / girls – his followers among the youth in the 50s years of the twentieth century, trouble-makers and scrappers); in the TL: Ихсан тәкәсә is about a man who manages someone through a person who is a social inferior (before the revolution in Kazan there lived poor Ihsan who bought a large goat for the money he had collected.) The goat became the chief in the herd, so Ихсан became famous all over Kazan) (Ibrahimova, 1993; Karabatyrova et al., 2018).

Comparison is a rather simple means of reinterpretation. Despite the fact that there is an opinion that the comparative PhU can lose their figurativeness to a different degree (A.V. Kunin), we, after Molostova (2000), believe that the comparative PhU are one of the main forms of the linguistic image. Most often the comparison is metaphorical. In both languages, especially in the TL, comparisons-alogisms and comparisons-hyperboles are common. In the TL: сьер шикелле яту (literally: lying like a cow) “doing nothing”; кырык итәкле кыз кебек назлы (literally: capricious like a girl who wears forty skirts) “very capricious. The metaphoric periphrasis is most common among the PhU with a substantive constituent expressing the category of gender. Periphrasis is the replacement of the name of the subject with a descriptive expression. Most of the components of the PhU with the gender component are the nouns that designate the person. Such PhU characterize a person, his actions, life situations. In the EL: son of the soil – “peasant”. In the TL: урам хатыны – “a tramp”. In both languages, there is a tendency towards the use of female theme to characterize both genders, usually to show a mean spirit of a person. This is uncharacteristic for the PhU with male components, also often having a negative connotation. But the asymmetry is evident (Moon, 1994a;1994b).

Compare the PhU with a component designating person. An English component of feminine gender ‘girl’ adds a negative seme in the PhU girl boy – “an effeminate boy”. In the PhU old wife- “gossip”, old woman – “a timid, fussy man”, to play the woman – “to be a coward, to behave the man does not do”. Gossip, cowardice, feebleness are the indicators of the lack of correspondence to behavioral norm. The PhU mother’s boy, to be tied to one’s mother’s apron strings; in Tatar анасы яламаган малай – “an untidy, sloppy boy”, ‘ана итәгенә ябышып йөрү – “to cling to one’s mother apron string” are negatively connotated. Attachment to, dependence on one’s mother characterize a man as weak, unworthy of approving. In the EL the words ‘woman’, ‘wife’, ‘girl’, ‘queen’ in the phraseological units drag queen – “homosexual”, old wife – “scandal-monger, gossip”, old woman – “a timid, fussy man”, you big girl’s blouse – “a coward person” are applied to designate a man as one with female qualities, a man who is not approved by certain society. The words ‘man’, ‘boy’, ‘guy’, ‘king’, to compare, are not used to characterize a woman. Concerning the male, the PhU with these components have a positive, neutral or balanced evaluativity:

To be a man – “to play the man”;
A good boy – “to be on one’s best behavior”;
The king of the streets.

The use of Tatar words ‘кыз’, ‘жиңги’, ‘маржа’ ‘хатын’, ‘кодача’ to characterize male also shows his mean spirit:

Итәксез хатыннар - “a weak-willed man”, “bun-duster”
Туйдан качкан кыз – “a man who disappears in times of need”;
Пудыр жиңги – “a man who uses make-up”;
Сакаллы маржа – “a squealer”;
Кондырлы кодача – “a fanciful person”.

Coquetry, slackitude, inability to keep tongue between teeth are considered to be exceptionally female qualities. If a man behaves himself like a woman, he is ridiculed by the society.

Unlike the EL, the Tatar component ‘ир’ (man) is rare, but it is applied to characterize a woman:
Ирдавай хатын – “a manlike woman”.

A mannish woman does not correspond to the ideal of womanliness, therefore, this is not approved by the society (Samsonova, 2000).

When studying gender stereotypes, it should be noted that the PhU that characterize a person are divided into thematic groups: 1) appearance, physical qualities; 2) character; 3) intellectual and other abilities; 4) marriage, marital status, relations between a man and a woman; 5) moral qualities; 6) social status, occupation; 7) general characteristic.

Compare male and female stereotypes in the PhU of different thematic groups in English and Tatar.

A great number of English phraseological units referring to the thematic group “appearance, physical qualities” characterize a woman. The PhU with positive connotation describe her as being attractive, often sexual:

A sweater girl – “a girl with large bosom”;
A pin-up girl – “a cover girl, beautiful”;
A glamour girl – “beauty”;
The belle of the ball – “the first beauty, the queen of the ball”.

The PhU of this group characterizing a woman, a girl are not numerous in Tatar. It is the right of a husband or a relative, as well as of a man who is engaged to this girl, to estimate the girl’s appearance, moreover her sexual attractiveness. The PhU in Tatar that describe the girl’s appearance have the meaning ‘the best there is’:

Ипи—тоз матур кыз – “a beautiful girl”.

The PhU with negative evaluativity describe a girl as being unattractive:

In the EL:

A slip of a girl – “thin”.

In the TL:

Ат күк кыз – “a muscular girl”

Уклай бикә — “swallowed like a stake”.

In English the PhU that describe man’s appearance put emphasis in many cases on his physical strength, power:

As strong as an ox (bull) – “in the full of one’s health”;

As hearty as a buck – “very strong”.

The PhU that describe male appearance are few in the EL, for being handsome for an English man is not obligatory:

A Teddy boy – “stylish”;

A slip of a boy – “thin, a thin reed”.

It is an obligatory quality for a Tatar man to be handsome:

Чибәр егет - “a handsome guy”.

But he is should not to dress up and brag about being handsome, since to dress oneself up is not a good idea for a man:

Тәти егет – “fop”.

Кәлтәфи егет – “fop, decked out”.

In English the thematic group “character” singles out woman’s talkativeness – old wife – “gossip; an inclination for telling tall stories” — an old wives’ tale — “grandmother’s tales”; bitchiness — a grey mare – “a wife who likes to rule”. There are positive qualities as well: a woman of her word – “a woman who is true to her word”, girl Friday – “the right hand”. Such PhU are formed by analogy with the PhU of male theme, as one can suspect, these qualities are not considered typical. The TL highlights analogous negative traits of women: talkativeness – кодачаның калдырчасы жеп катудан бушамый — “to talk without a pause, tale-bearer”; an inclination to make up – кем әбие әйтте? — “who has told it to you?, This is untrue”; bitchiness – кыз чагында бар да яхшы, кайдан чыга усал хатыннар? – “whence come the bad wives?”

Men are characterized as ones having bent for entertainment and having a soft spot for women (Prosekova, 2018; Rosemarie, 1998).

A ladies’ man – “a womanizer”;

Хатын пәрәст - “a ladies’ man”.

The EL has the PhU that put stress upon miserliness of men, their disposition for drinking and undue familiarity. In Tatar, these are hot temper, intractability, arrogance:

In the EL:

Rah-rah boys – “the students who pretend entertainment to studies”;

A penny father – “a miser”;

As drunk as a lord – “very drunk”;

Jack the Lad – “an unduly familiar man who likes beer, male companies, who accounts himself to be sexually attractive”.

In the TL:

Үгез кебек кире – “stubborn as a bull”;

Өтәч кебек кукыраеп йөрү – “to turn up one’s nose”;

Ике әтәч кебек - “like two roosters”.

The PhU with positive connotation highlight the male qualities, such as manliness, courage, self-restrain, consistency:

In the EL:

To be a man – “high stepper”;

A man of character – “a strong-willed”;

A man of his word – “one who keeps a true word”.

In the TL:

Ир йөрәге – “a courageous heart”;

Егет сүзе бер булып – “a man who is the master of his word”.

Strength of will, the ability to overcome difficulties are considered to be exceptionally male qualities of character.

Intellectual incompetency of women is observe in the thematic group “intellectual and other abilities”. The PhU woman’s reason in the EL and хатын-кыз логикасы in the TL mirror the social opinion about woman’s intellect as illogical. In the PhU of the EL mother wit – “common sense” – the component ‘mother’ is an intensifier, and it does not refer to women at all.

The PhU of this group referring to man are closely echoed with the PhU of the thematic group “social status, occupation”. It is observed that in the EL there are a wide range of spheres where men are engaged in: they can be poets, soldiers, they can do practically everything:

A son of Muses – “a poet”;

A son of Mars – “military”;

A man of all work – “a man who does all the job about the house” (Zhukov, 1986).

4. Summary

Metonymic models also occupy an important place among the mechanisms of the formation of the PhU. Metonymy is based on an association of contiguity, when instead of one object another that is associated with it is called. В АЯ: you big girl's blouse (букв. ты блузка большой девочки) “трус”. В ТЯ: беренче эгэч (букв. первый петух) “первый крик петуха, очень рано”. Phraseological synecdoche is formed by replacing one name with another on the basis of the quantitative relationship (in our material synecdoche is found predominantly in the TL), for example: Тавык баш - (literally: chicken head) – “a stupid person”. Here the name of the part of body (head) is used in the meaning of “mind”. Metonymic antonomasia is the special use of common names as proper ones to indicate the type of activity or occupation of a particular person. In the EL, this kind of reinterpretation is more common. In the EL: Mr Fixit – “Mister “Fix-and-repair””; Mrs Right (literally: Missis Right) – “spouse”. In the TL: чаршау бикэ чаршау биби (literally: a hanging girl) – “a prostitute, mistress”. Metonymical periphrases are not so frequency than metaphorical periphrases. For example: in the EL: son of the soil – “a peasant”; in the TL: урам хатыны (literally: a woman of the street) – “sluttish” (Molotkov, 1977).

5. Conclusions

So, according to the type of reinterpretation of the PhU with a gender component, they are divided into a metaphorical model (52, 2% in the EL, 54, 6% in the TL) and metonymic reinterpretation (47, 8% in the EL, 45, 4% in the TL). The metaphoric periphrases constitute the majority (32, 2% in the EL, 38, 7% in the TL). A large number of alogisms are observed in the Tatar language (8, 2% versus 1, 4% in the EL) and comparisons (5, 4% versus 2, 6% in the EL). As follows from the above analysis, metaphorical models predominate in both languages. Tatar phraseology is characterized by a more vivid figurativeness due to the wider use of metaphorical comparisons and alogisms. English phraseology is somewhat more “restrained”, “refined”, however, it is represented by a wide variety of models, since it has a richer history.

Acknowledgements

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

References

- Ibrahimova, I. I. (1993). Contrastive study of somatic phraseological units (in english and tatar), Thesis for candidate of philology Kazan.
- Karabatyrova, A., Bozhbanbayev, B., Turgenbayeva, A., Aubakir, A. and Zhanabayev, K. (2018). The role of the environment, Silk road in the history of turkic people. *Opción*, 34(85).
- Molostova, E. P. (2000). An expressive component of semantics of the phraseological units with anthropocentric components of the russian and french languages, Thesis for candidate of philology Kazan.
- Molotkov, A. I. (1977). Fundamentals of russian phraseology. L, Nauka. 283.
- Moon, R. (1994a). *Frequencies and Forms of Phrasal Lexemes in English. Phraseology, Theory, analysis, and applications*, ed. by A.P. Cowie, 79100. Language. Clarendon Press Oxford. 70: 491-538.
- Moon, R. (1994b). *The Analysis of Fixed Expressions in Text. Advances in written discourse analysis*, ed. by R.M Coulthard. Routledge: London. 117-35.
- Pimenova, M. V. (2015). The types of concepts [electronic resource]. Available: http://www.kuzspa.ru/diss/conf_27_28/5_pimenova.doc
- Prosekova, M. N. (2018). Project-based learning method in the philosophical dimension. *Astra Salvensis*:
- Rosemarie, G. (1998). *The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the light of genre analysis. Phraseology, Theory, analysis, and applications*, ed. by A.P. Cowie. Clarendon Press.: Oxford. 125-44.
- Samsonova, E. V. (2000). National and cultural component of expressiveness (in the language of Australian prose), thesis for candidate of philology.
- Smith, W. G. (1970). *The Oxford dictionary of english proverbs text*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 679:
- Villalobos Antúnez, J. V. and Bello, M. (2014). Ethics for a global society, bioethics as a bridge for the technological twist. *Revista Lasallista de Investigación*, 11(1): 70-77.
- Zhukov, V. P. (1986). Russian phraseology. M, vysshaya shkola.