

MAN AS AN OBJECT OF EVALUATION IN THE PHRASEOLOGICAL PICTURE OF THE WORLD (ON THE MATERIAL OF TATAR LANGUAGE)

^aFIRUZA R. SIBGAIEVA, ^bRAUSHANIYA S. NURMUKHAMEDOVA, ^cMADINA R. SATTAROVA, ^dGULDARKHAN N. SMAGULOVA

^aKazan Federal University, Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, 18 Kremlevskaya Street, Kazan, 420008, Russia

^bKazan Federal University, Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, 18 Kremlevskaya Street, Kazan, 420008, Russia

^cAl-Farabi Kazakh National University, National University in Almaty, Kazakhstan

^dKazan Federal University, Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, 18 Kremlevskaya Street, Kazan, 420008, Russia

email: ^aFiruzaRS@mail.ru, ^bRusia@Prescopus.Com, ^cm.r.sattarova2015@gmail.com, ^dg.n.smagulova2015@gmail.com

Abstract: The lexical system of each language is characterized by numerous stable phrases, which reflect life, traditions, relations between people, the assessment of the surrounding reality, etc. In many phraseological terms a person becomes an object of evaluation. The article is devoted to the analysis of some phraseological units with an estimated human component (on the material of the Tatar language). In order to study the phraseological units of the Tatar language, the descriptive method and the method of continuous sampling are used during the collection and the systematization of the materials; lexical-semantic method is introduced at the system analysis of factual material; the methods of linguistic-cultural, component and semantic analysis were used to highlight the cognitive features of linguistic unit functioning; comparative method was used in the translation of phraseological units. The result of the semantic analysis of the units under study is the description of a person from the set of positive, negative and neutral features. The analysis confirms that the phraseology reflects the qualities of people: they are approved, ridiculed or criticized by allegory. In the course of the study, the private assessments characterizing human qualities and behavior were identified; Some features of the Tatar phraseological picture of the world, as well as general and national aspect in the thinking of native speakers are analyzed, reflecting the features of the national worldview in the evaluation of a person and the world around him.

Keywords: Tatar language, vocabulary, phraseology, man, evaluation, mentality

1 Introduction

The way of seeing the world through the linguistic images embodied in the phraseological system, being deeply national, rests, nevertheless, on logical-psychological and linguistic grounds common to all people. Their explication will help, on the one hand, to uncover the mechanism of figurative thinking, and on the other hand, those immanent laws of language as the system of signs that are responsible for the internal organization of the phraseological system.

Linguistic and cultural specifics of phraseological units became the object of linguistic research at the beginning of the 21st century. First of all, they were studied in the works of such scholars as: N.D. Arutyunova, A. Vezhbitskaya, E.M. Vereshchagin, S.G. Vorkachev, V.I. Karasik, Yu.N. Karaulov, G.V. Kolshansky, V.G. Kostomarov, V.V. Krasnykh, D.S. Likhachev, V.A. Maslova, E.V. Rakhilina, V.N. Telia, V.I. Ubiyko, E.V. Uryson et al. These works served as a scientific and methodological basis for this research.

Serious research in the field of Tatar phraseology began only in 40-ies. During the years of Tatar phraseology and phraseography development, the emergence of works by such researchers as L. Jalay, Sh. Ramazanov, L. Makhmutova, N. Burganova, K. Sabirov, G. Akhunzyanov, H. Kurbatov, G. Akhatov and others played an important role. The works of these scholars were reflected in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Tatar Language (1977-1981, 2005), in which the phraseological units were presented in the framework of dictionary entries. The first work that initiated Tatar phraseology is "Tatar phraseology, proverbs and sayings" by L. Zalay, N. Burganova, L. Makhmutova, which was published in 1957 (Ayupova et al, 2010). Two-volume "Phraseological Dictionary of Tatar Language" (1989, 1990),

compiled by N. Isanbet, is the most significant phraseological work of Tatar language. More than 12,000 units are represented in it (Isanbet, 1989 ; Isanbet, 1990).

Thus, stable units have long been the subject of scientific research. In Turkic, in particular, and in Tatar linguistics, there are works devoted to the description of lexical and phraseological units in order to identify national specifics (Zagidulina et al, 2016; Denmukhametov et al, 2015; Gabdrakhmanova et al, 2016; Galimova et al, 2016 ; Nurmukhametova et al, 2014; Shcherbinina et al, 2016 ; Sibgaeva et al, 2015; Sibgaeva , 2014; Sibgaeva et al, 2014 ; Smagulova et al, 2016; Fatkhullova et al, 2014).

This paper is devoted to the study of stable units in terms of people evaluation: the evaluation of a person by himself and the evaluation of others. The Tatar phraseological units reflect the rich life experience of the people, the historical features of ethnogenesis, labor skills, love for the Motherland and other moral qualities. They express the attitude of people to human dignity and shortcomings. Actual materials show that Tatars condemn passivity, idleness, hypocrisy, pretense, meanness, irresponsibility, deceit, boasting, greed, cowardice, etc. In Tatar phraseology, as in other languages, the units with negative evaluation are significantly larger than units with positive connotations (hard work, truthfulness, responsiveness, kindness, masculinity, strength, pride, etc.).

The considered material allows us to conclude that valuation phraseology is an interesting layer of vocabulary that demonstrates the features of ethnic and cultural identity of Tatar people.

2 Materials and methods

The methodological basis of the study is the combination of a number of general scientific and private linguistic methods. In order to study the reflection of people character in the stable phrases of Tatar language, the following research methods were used: the descriptive method and the method of continuous sampling were used to collect and systematize the materials on research topic; using the lexical-semantic method, the systematic analysis of the lexical material was carried out; the methods of linguistic-cultural, component and semantic analysis were used to highlight the cognitive features of linguistic unit functioning; comparative methods were used in the translation of phraseological units. Phraseological units of Tatar language with an estimated value are considered by us as a single historical and cultural phenomenon. From the point of view of scientific research theory, the chosen methods are the best ones.

3 Main part

Phraseological units are deeply national units, they reflect all areas of human existence: the attitude of a man to work, to other people, personal dignity and qualities, shortcomings, etc. The ability of phraseological units to reflect the character of a person is considered as one of their main properties. "Character traits among people of any nationality are the same, but they are distributed and manifested in different ways depending on national traditions, culture, national temperament and mentality. Phraseology records either the features most characteristic of a given ethnos or the most vivid and therefore distinctly memorable" (Verenich, 2012). This fact remains unchallenged, considering the presence of language units reflecting the most characteristic qualities of people (Verenich, 2012; Sibgaeva, 2014; Zamaletdinov et al, 2014).

The character of people consists of many positive, negative and neutral traits. Different character traits of people receive a different evaluation from the people around them, provide a very

different attitude. Phraseology reflects those qualities of people that are inherent in this people: they are approved, ridiculed or criticized by allegory.

The character of a person leaves an imprint on all his actions. By his nature, a person either performs some actions in accordance with generally accepted norms of conduct or refrains from doing anything. Depending on a person relation to a case, and the result of his collision with reality, his behavior will be assessed by others. The approval or condemnation of any people qualities is expressed in a greater degree by the means of language, in particular by the means of phraseological units.

A man, his experience and knowledge are at the center of every phraseological unit. He compares the world around things, compares them with people, draws analogies with actions and with the qualities of people. According to A.V. Kunin, "the overwhelming majority of phraseological units is of anthropocentric character, that is, it refers to a person or to the things associated with him" (Kunin, 1986). These turns are usually estimation units. The negative (pejorative), positive (meliorative) and neutral components of phraseological significance are singled out (Ayupova, 2015; Bagautdinova, 2006; Bayramova et al, 2006).

V.A. Maslova argues that "different types of phraseological units reflect culture differently. The easiest way is to understand and explain the cultural aspect of those phraseological units, in the meaning of which a denotative aspect plays a large role, that is, an object or prototype situation is considered that initially corresponded to the literal meaning of phraseological turn" (Maslova, 2001).

In Tatar linguistics, phraseological units that assess the intellectual characteristics of people and their moral qualities positively or negatively have not been studied sufficiently. Therefore, the study of Tatar people mentality reflection problem in language, in particular, by vocabulary and phraseology, is very relevant. This work is a definite contribution to this field.

Let us consider some of character qualities inherent in Tatar people and verbalized by phraseological units.

In the phraseological picture of the Tatar language, diligence and the working capacity of people are presented widely: ağachtan sandugach kynä yasamyj (lit. he can't make only a nightingale of wood, that is, he can make everything); ishäk aldynda qychytqan üstermi (lit. py does not grow nettle in the yard, i.e. he is a very hardworking owner); jök aty uryynä ehshläü (literally, to work as a dray horse), bolamyqny talqan itär (literally, make fine porridge, that is, very skillful); ehsh räten belü (lit., know the sense in the business, i.e., be able to work), etc. However, phraseological units predominate among the stable units, the semantics of which has the condemnation of a lazy person, a man who does not like to work: ike quly kesäsändä (both hands in his pockets, i.e. a lazy person); jon da yuq, söt tä yuq (neither wool nor milk, that is, no use); karavat ülchäp yatu (lit. lie and measure bed, i.e. to linger); ikmäk köyäsä (lit. bread moth, i.e. parasite); keshe cilkäsändä yashäü (lit. live on someone else's hump, i.e. lazy), etc.

An inept, weak-willed, clumsy, timid person also becomes an object of evaluation in the phraseological picture of Tatars: jomshak avyz (lit. soft mouth, i.e., жеберән, кыюсыз, юаш); apara chumary (lit., gnocchi from the sponge, i.e., frail, flabby); arpa talqany (lit. porridge from barley, i.e. sluggish); Zarif qojmaq yaratmyj (lit. Zarif does not like pancakes, i.e. he is shy), sapsiz sänäk (lit. forks without a handle, i.e. a useless person), etc.

Carelessness is also often a topic condemned by people: aña ike qalach ber tien (literally, two rolls is a penny for him, i.e. he does not know life, he is unadapted); safa sörü (lit. to be blissfully happy) yaña tunyn tunar, iske tunyn yamar (he will cut off a new fur coat, and will patch an old one); aña bärängä birsän

- tamyr, salma birsän - kamyr (lit., you give him potatoes - this is the root, you give him dumplings - this is dough, i.e. illegible), etc.

The people created phraseological units that characterize experience / inexperience: alma shalqan, kom talqan (lit. apple-turnip, sand-oatmeal); syirğa qamyt kiderü (lit. to put a collar on a cow); urman äüliyäse (lit. forest saint, i.e. naïve person); yshqy artynnan balta (lit. there is an axe behind a plane, a person who does everything the other way around), etc.

Stable units have numerous phraseological units that characterize the intellectual abilities of a person, since mind is valued for its highest quality in the world of Tatars: jomry bash (lit., a round head, i.e. with a sharp mind); saqaly üskän, aqyly üsmägän (lit. beard grew, and the mind didn't, i.e., he became old but he didn't become clever or experienced); salamğa ğyna üskän (lit. he grew only for straw, i.e. without brains), saryq bash (lit., sheep's head, i.e. illiterate); unike tel belü (lit. to know twelve languages, i.e. very educated), etc.

Often Tatars use phraseology to describe a talkative person or, conversely, a taciturn person, condemn an indistinct speech: avyzda botqa peshherü / avyzynda bärängä peshherü (literally: to boil porridge / potatoes in your mouth); suğan satu (to sell onions, i.e. to say empty words); süz botqasy (lit. verbal porridge); ürdäk telen ashağan (lit., ate a duck tongue), etc. In the opinion of Tatars, a person should be able to express his opinion and sometimes keep silent, depending on a situation.

The following qualities were not left without naming by expressive means: anger - qatyğy küpcheğän (lit.: his / her sour clotted milk became sour); resentment - salpyq avyz (lit., drooping mouth); rudeness - ashtan bash tartu (lit. to refuse from food); duplicity - ike bitle qom ikmäk (lit. bilateral sand bread); arrogance - zur bavyrly (lit. with a large liver); greed - qaty keshe (lit. - a hard man), boastfulness - qalaj ätäch (lit. tin cock); importunity - suqyr cheben (lit. a blind fly); sneakiness - sözgäk tana (lit. a cussed cow); charity - zur jöräkle (lit. with a big heart); cunning, insidiousness - elan yashen yalağan (lit. he was licking snake tear); cowardice - eraqtan jodryq kürsäti (lit. to show fist from afar); generosity - irken küjelle (lit. a big heart); vigilance - joqlağanda da küze achyq (lit. he sleeps with his eyes open); stubbornness - süzen birmi (lit. he won't give way); stinginess - tash borchaq (lit. stone peas); boastfulness - tel belän kosh totu (lit. he catches a bird with a tongue); conscientiousness, truthfulness - tury keshe (lit., a direct man); modesty - chäch töbenä kadär kyzaru (lit. to blush to the roots of hair); rudeness - yunmağan tayaq (lit. an uncut bullet), etc.

The study of phraseological units with an appraisal component allows one to assert that the phraseological system of Tatar language has mainly the units with a negative evaluation of person personal qualities.

4 Conclusions

Let's consider several examples in which it is easy to trace the cultural aspect of Tatar phraseological units besides the characteristics of a person. The part of phraseological units, göbädiyagä art kujğan (göbädiyā-the - the national kind of pie; lit. he stands behind the Gubadiya. By this expression Tatars mean not very polite person), üz öendä umach umağanny keshegä baryp toqmach jäğgän (lit. he does not even make zatiruha at home and he makes noodles when he makes a visit; the phraseological unit has the meaning "inept, talentless") there are components - the names of Tatar dishes - göbädiyā, umach, toqmach. The meaning of the phraseological units and the disapproval in them were formed taking into account the meanings of these lexemes. For example, göbädiyā is a complex kind of a national pie that people bake only on holidays, not to try it is the disrespect to a host, guests, hence the disapproval. Umach, toqmach - kinds of national seasonings for soup. Cooking a home tokmach (noodles) is more difficult than umach (zatirukha), besides umach is an obsolete word that denotes

everyday dish of common people. Thus, they wanted to humiliate a person: if he failed to prepare the simplest dish at home, then it is impossible for him to prepare such a complex meal at a party. It is impossible to explain the negative connotation of this phraseology without this background knowledge.

5 Summary

Thus, the phraseological composition of language is a national phenomenon and their source is the speech of native language speaker. It reflects the culture of people, its customs, traditions; phraseological units preserve the mentality of an ethnos, transfer its culture from generation to generation. Undoubtedly, the phraseological composition of a language is a very valuable linguistic heritage. A careful study of phraseological units will help to create an idea about the peculiarities of the national character of Tatars; about the perception of surrounding reality by people, about the richness of expressive linguistic means, the emotional and the mental life of some ethnoses.

Acknowledgement

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

References

1. Ayupova R.A. *Phraseology and phraseography of Tatar Language* // Almanac of Modern Science and Education. - Tambov: Diploma, 2010. - No. 7 (38). pp. 173-175.
2. Ayupova R.A. *The role of paradoxes in the development of a phraseological unit as a linguistic sign*. - Philology and Culture. - 2015. - No. 4 (42). - pp. 35-40.
3. Bagautdinova G.A. *Man in phraseology: anthropocentric aspect*. - Kazan: Publishing house of Kazan. University, 2006. - 356 p.
4. Bayramova L.K., Bagautdinova G.A. *Aksiologizm of human emotions (laughter and crying) and its reflection in language* // Scientific reports of higher education. Philology. - 2006. - No. 1. - pp. 81-89.
5. Denmukhametov R.R., Denmukhametova E.N. *Geographical Terms and Concepts as the Evidence of Material and Spiritual Culture of the Tatar Language* // Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2015. - Volume 6. - No. 3, May 2015. - pp. 777-780.
6. Fatkhullova K.S., Kirillova Z.N., Yusupova A.S. *Linguistic-didactic peculiarities of Tatar language teaching course* // Life Sci Journal. - 2014. - №11 (8). - pp. 507-511.
7. Gabdrakhmanova F.H., Sattarova M.R., Nurmukhametova R.S. *Traditions and customs as means of formation of eating behavior of Tatar people* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2016. - Volume 7, Issue: 2. - pp. 169-172.
8. Galimova G.N., Yusupova A.Sh., Denmukhametova E.N., Mugtasimova G.R. *Tatar proverb language as the reflection of western and eastern* // Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. - December 2016, Special Issue. - pp. 161-165.
9. Isanbet N.S. *The phraseological dictionary of Tatar language*. In two volumes, V. I. - Kazan: Tatar publishing house, 1989. - 495 p.
10. Isanbet N.S. *The phraseological dictionary of Tatar Language*. In two volumes, V. II. - Kazan: Tatar publishing house, 1990. - 366 b.
11. Kunin A. V. *The course of modern English language phraseology*. - M., 1986. - 336p.
12. Maslova V.A. *Linguistic culturology: Textbook for university students*. - Moscow: Academy, 2001. - 208 p.
13. Nurmukhametova R.S., Zamaletdinov R.R. and Sattarova M.R. *The vocabulary of Tatar literary language (the first half of the XX century)* // Life Science Journal. - 2014. - 11(10). - pp. 670-673.
14. Shcherbinina T.S., Denmukhametova E.N., Denmukhametov R.R. *Landscape components during phraseologism in the Tatar language* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2016, Volume 7, Issue: 2. - pp. 353-356.
15. Sibgaeva F.R., Zamaletdinov R.R., Zamaletdinova G.F. *Reflection of Tatar inner world through concepts* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2015, Volume 6, Issue: 3. - pp. 115-118.
16. Sibgaeva F.R. *Lexis connected with person in tatar language* // International multidisciplinary scientific conferences on Social sciences and arts Sgem 2014. - Albena, Bulgaria. - pp. 123-129.
17. Sibgaeva F.R., Salakhova R.R. *Space in a world view of poetic phraseology of the tatar lan* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2014. Volume 5. - № 3. - pp. 271-274.
18. Sibgaeva F.R., Zamaletdinova G.F., Nurmukhametova R.S. *Linguoculturological specific features of phraseological units of the Tatar language* // Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. - December, 2016. - pp. 116-119.
19. Smagulova G.N., Dingjing Z., Ybyraiym A., Chukenayeva G.T., Amanzholova A.A., Rakhimova A.M. *Lingua ecological aspects of speech culture of modern youth (on material of the Kazakh phraseological units)* // Journal of Language and Literature. - Volume 7, Issue 4. - 2016. - pp. 99-103.
20. Sibgaeva F.R. *Phraseological units as the way of Tatar language person representation* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2014. - Volume 6. - № 2. - pp. 101-103.
21. Verenich T.M. *The features of national character in the phraseological picture of the world (on the basis of French and Russian languages)* // Philology and linguistics in contemporary society: materials of the intern. sci. conf. (Moscow, May 2012). - M.: Your polygraphic partner, 2012. - pp. 51-53.
22. Zamaletdinov R.R., Zamaletdinova G.F., Nurmukhametova R.S., Sattarova M.R. *The lexicon and its reflection in the inner world of the individual (on the basis of the Tatar language)* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2014. - Vol.5, №4. - pp. 333-335.
23. Zagidulina A.F., Gilazetdinova G.Kh., Islamova E.A. *Associative fields of lexemes "homeland" and "vatan" in Russian and Tatar linguistic consciousness* // Journal of Language and Literature. - 2016. - Vol. 7. No. 2. - pp. 289-292.