THE ANALYSIS OF THE STATUS OF THE COMPONENTS OF THE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN THE ENGLISH AND TATAR LANGUAGES (BASED ON THE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH NOUN-COMPONENTS EXPRESSING THE CATEGORY OF GENDER)

[a]EKATERINA ALEXANDROVNA KHUZINA,[b] REZEDA YOLDYZOVNA MUKHTAROVA

[a]*Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan 420008, Russia*
[b]*Naberezhnye Chelny Pedagogical Institute, Nizametdinov St, 28, Naberezhnye Chelny, Tatarstan, 423806, Russia*
email: [a] *Eka5551@rambler.ru.* [b]*russia@prescopus.com*

Abstract. The article considers the linguistic status of the components of phraseological units with a substantive component expressing the gender category. The gender category is considered as a semantic category. The analysis is based on the material of the English and Tatar languages. As a result of the study, the authors concluded that the applied and motivated phraseological units make up the majority in both languages, which confirms the opinion about the genetic connection of the components of phraseological units and words. Phraseological units with a darkened internal form are more common in English. A semantic analysis of the components showed that most of the components in the English language are feminine, in the Tatar language is masculine.

Keywords: phraseological unit; component of the phraseological unit; word; (un) applied phraseological units; (un) motivated phraseological units; lexical and semantic group; sema.

1 Introduction

 As you know, the phraseological unit includes at least two components. Are the components of a phraseological unit (phraseological unit) words - one of the pressing issues of linguistic research along with such problems as the correlation of phraseological units and words and the correlation of phraseological units and its prototype (nonrethinked combination of words).

The purpose of this study is to determine the status of the phraseological component and to study the semantic changes that occur with the component as a result of phrase formation on the material of phraseological units with a substantive component expressing the category of the genus in English and Tatar languages (AYA and TYA). By the category of gender, we mean the semantic category of gender, correlated with the conceptual category of gender. The question of the nature of the components of phraseologism particularly worried scientists in the second half of the 20th century. There are different opinions on the status of components of phraseological units. Let's take a look at some of them. Firstly, this is the point of view of A.I. Smirnitsky on lexical components as words, only specifically used, secondly, the opinion of A.I. Molotkova, according to which the lexical components of phraseological units "are not words, but specific units, only genetically ascending to the word" (Molotkov, 1977), and, thirdly, the point of view of V.V. Vinogradova: "The degree of tightness, isolation and cohesion of phrases, the nature of imagery, and as a result the degree of non-independence of verbal components can be very different" (Vinogradov, 1953: Rosemarie, 1998: Moon, 1994).

We are of the opinion of A.I. Molotkova on the genetic connection of words and components. Components are a kind of "descendants" of words. As children may and may not have similarities with their parents, the component of the phraseological unit can retain and lose individual values (Ibragimova, 1993: Smith, 1970).

2 Methods

Through a comparative analysis of the data of linguistic phenomena, an attempt is made to identify common and unique features in the phraseology of the languages studied.

3 Results and Discussion

Phraseologisms are formed not by adding up values, but as a result of various semantic transformations. For example, the

phraseology "*old man*" has the meanings: 1) husband, 2) father, 3) master, boss, chef, 4) friend (male), 5) "old man" (about the captain of the ship, regiment commander). Each of these meanings has arisen as a result of semantic changes occurring inside phraseologism. Although these values are close "genetically", they did not arise from the addition of the semem "old" and "man". Each of the values developed independently, depending on the context.

After analyzing the lexical-semantic relationships of phraseological units and their components, one can find a variety of phraseological derivation methods.

V.P. Zhukov gives such a definition of the phraseological unit component: "A component is a component of the phraseological unit, devoid of the basic features of the word. A component is a deactivated word (words are deactivated most often due to a metaphorical rethinking ... When re-interpreting a word combination, the words included in it (especially the primary nominative meaning) are deactivated semantically, losing their former ability to be divided into differential semantic characters "(Zhukov, 1978) . The number of phraseological units that can be compared with free combinations is small (Zhukov, 1986).

So, the component of phraseological units is not a word but genetically goes back to the word.

To determine the correlation of the phraseologism component with the corresponding words, the possibility of contrasting phraseology with a free phrase and the characteristics of figurative phraseology and its internal form, component activity, and phraseologism, we used the method of phraseological application V.P. Zhukov. Its essence is to determine the absence or existence of a parallel phrase at present. Two parameters - motivation and applicability are important for characterizing the internal form of phraseological units - the verbal image that formed the basis of the name. These parameters help to trace the degree of rethinking in phraseological units. During the study, the following groups of phraseological units were identified:

1. Historically applied and motivated phraseological units, that is, a phrase that is homonymous with them arose in the past and went down in history, and the etymology of phraseological unit can be ascertained only by studying the history and conditions of its creation, that is, it is possible to understand the meaning of phraseological units only through diachronic research. For example, *Mrs. Grundy* from the phraseology *'What will Mrs. Grundy say*?' - "what will people think, what Princess Mary will say" - the character of Thomas Morton's play "Speed the Plow" (1798), in which she never appears, but Mrs. Ashfield is constantly mentioned, who was worried about what Mrs. Grandi would think or say.

2. Applicable and motivated phraseological units. Such phraseological units have a phrase that is homonymous to them and, accordingly, the motivation of phraseological units is transparent and its image is clear. Each component of this phraseological unit carries a semantic load and usually, the interpretation of phraseological units does not cause difficulties. For example, *əniseneŋ itəgenə yabysyp yөrү* - "to be dependent on the mother". It is easy to understand the meaning of this phraseology, as it is easy to imagine a child clinging to the hem of his mother so as not to fall. In English - phraseological unit *favorite son* - "favorite of the people" has a corresponding free phrase. MS. He is his mother's favorite son). The image of this phraseologism is also quite clear, the beloved son receives more attention and love than others (The International Dictionary of English language, 1997).

3. Unapplicated, but motivated phraseological units. The phraseological units of this group do not apply for a free

phrase, but understanding the meaning, however, is not difficult, that is, the components of phraseology create the necessary figurative basis. In the Tatar language - *əbi avyz* - "toothless mouth". There is no such phrase in the Tatar language, but its internal form is transparent since the components (grandmother, mouth) create a fairly clear image. The same in English phraseology *brother in arms* - "brother in arms".

4. Phraseologisms are unmotivated but applied. Their number is small both in English and in Tatar. In TYA - *uc bise əshkergun* (lit. 'grandmother spoke') - "I won't give it, I need it myself", they usually say if you don't want to give something. The motivation is unclear, the inner form is hidden. In AYA *mother's ruin* (literally 'ruining the mother') - "ale, alcoholic drink". Why mother busting means an alcoholic drink is unclear.

5. Unapplicated and unmotivated phraseological units. In TYA *ata kaz botkasy* (literally 'porridge of a gander') - "shag". In AYA *a widow's peak* (literally 'widow's peak') means the type of hairstyle in which hair is combed back from the center of the forehead. These phraseological units do not have a homonymous free phrase and have a darkened internal form, which indicates the complexity of the semantic transformation of the meaning of the components. There are very few such phraseological units, especially in TYA.

The application method showed that motivated phraseological units in both languages make up the majority. Of these, applicants for free collocations are more common. A transparent inner form is characteristic of the phraseology of both languages; especially clear, colorful images of the Tatar phraseological units. This, apparently, is explained by the folkloric origin and a small proportion of semantic changes in Tatar phraseology. The more common the components of phraseological units, the higher the level of motivation. Among motivated and applied for a free phrase, the majority are phraseological units with components-genonyms and such nouns as *man, woman, boy (boy), lady (lady), eget (boyfriend), karchyk (old woman, wife)*. Among phraseological units with a darkened internal form, the prevalence of English phraseological units is noted.

It has been established that the gender category in the English and Tatar languages is a lexical category, represented primarily in nouns. The noun has the greatest nominative ability. The greatest semantic load in phraseology usually falls on the substantive component.

An examination of the phraseological systems of two unrelated languages from the point of view of the presence of a substantial component expressing the gender category allows us to identify common and different features in the degree of rethinking the components, their role in creating the image, and allows us to see what is common in the worldview of different peoples and national specifics, since phraseology - This is a layer of language that is already nationally specific.

The presence of common and different components makes it possible, in our opinion, to analyze the general and the different in the field of semantics of phraseological units. The following substantive components of phraseological units expressing the category of the genus were identified:

In AYA: *mother, mamma, godmother, father, daddy, sister, brother, aunt, uncle, son, daughter, grandfather, grandmother, granny, widow, widower, bachelor, bride, husband, wife, man, woman, girl, lad, master, Mr, Mrs, Miss, guy, maid, maiden, lady, lord, gentleman, dame, squire, knight, king, emperor, queen, princess, duke, chevalier, mistress, blonde, nurse, whore, witch, nanny, belle, damsel, actress, baron, chap, dolly, cow, bull,, hog, sow, buck, stag, colt, ram, ox, cock, goose, gander, hen*.

In YOU: *ana (əni), ata (əti), khatyn, ir, code, kody, kodacha, biatay, ul, kyz, apa, aby, abzy, agay, ene, ŋiжgi, kilen, kiyau, əbi, babai, baжça, eget, malay, marжça, cards, karchyk, abystay, aksakal, bikə, үgez, syer, təkə, ətəch, tavyk, alasha, aigyr*.

We did not include nouns denoting professions and titles that originally belonged or belonged to men by virtue of tradition, for example, *patsha, soldier* , etc., as this would expand the already extensive research material.

The distinguished substantive components expressing the category of the genus are subdivided into lexical-semantic groups (LSH) according to the seminal analysis.

All components of the nouns expressing the category of the genus are united by the archaism "living being". The main division on LSG is carried out in accordance with differential semes.

The groups of components of the masculine and feminine are distinguished (S1 is the genus sema).

Each group is divided into two subgroups (S2 - seme 'man', 'animal').

The subgroup "person" in each group is divided into smaller groups (S3 - seme 'sign of kinship', 'social status', 'age', 'marital status', 'title', 'other signs'). The subgroup "animal" is divided into two groups (S4 - semes 'mammal' and 'bird').

There are also potential semes (Sp), reflecting the secondary properties and characteristics of the subject. These properties and characteristics (real or attributable) depend on social stereotype and are realized when consumed. These are semes such as seme grades, seme intensity. Potential semes do not affect subdivision on LHG (Moon, 1994: The New Encyclopedia of Britannica Text, 1994).

4 Summary

The substantive components of phraseological units expressing the category of the genus are divided into the following groups:

IN AYA:

Male gender

1. Men.

1) the sign of the relationship (father, daddy, brother, son, uncle, grandfather);

2) the marital status (husband, widower, bachelor);

3) the age (man, boy);

4) position in the society (Mr, master, lord, gentleman);

5) the title (squire, knight, king, duke, chevalier, baron);

6) other signs (lad, guy, chap);

2. Animal.

1) mammal (bull, ox, stag, buck, hog, boar, colt);

2) the bird (cock, gender);

Female gender

1. Men.

1) the sign of the relationship (mother, mamma, godmother, sister, daughter, aunt, grandmother, granny);

2) the marital status (wife, widow, bride);

3) the age (woman, girl, maid, maiden);

4) position in the society (Mrs, Miss, mistress, nurse, nanny, whore, actress, dame, lady);

5) the title (queen, princess);

6) other signs (blond, damsel, witch, dolly);

2. Animal.

1) a mammal (cow, mare, sow);

2) bird (hen, goose).

IN TYA:

Male gender

1. Men.

1) the sign of the relationship (ata, əti, ul, aby, abzy, agay, ene, babai,);

2) marital status (ir, biatai, baҗa, kiəγ, code, biatai, cards);

3) age (ir, malay, eget);

4) position in society (aksakal);

2. Animal.

1) a mammal (γgez, təkə, ayyr, alasha),

2) bird (ətəч);

Female gender

1. Men.

1) the sign of the relationship (ana, əni, kyz, apa, apai, əbi);

2) marital status (Khatyn, kodagy, kodacha, җiңgi, kilen, karchyk, bikə);

3) age (khatyn, kyz, karchyk);

4) position in society (aksakal);

2. Animal.

1) a mammal (cheese);

2) bird (tawyk).

Comparison of the LSG components of phraseological units in AYA and TYA provides an opportunity to see the difference in the linguistic pictures of the world of two national communities. Distribution by LHG demonstrates the uneven distribution of male and female components among semantic groups. In TYA, the components of the masculine gender predominate in quantitative terms, while in AYA, the components of the female gender dominate. In AYA, there is wider use of the female components of the group 'other signs', 'position in society', many of which are emotionally colored tokens. It is noteworthy in TYA that the most numerous components of the male and female gender groups are 'marital status'.

It should be noted the polysemantic of some Tatar nouns. So, the noun '*ir*' has the meanings 1) man, 2) husband; noun '*khatyn*' - 1) woman, 2) wife; noun '*kyz*' - 1) girl, girl, 2) daughter. This may be explained by the enormous role of family relationships in the life and consciousness of the Tatar people.

Ambiguity is also characteristic of some nouns of AYA. For example, the noun '*man*' denotes both man and man. The meaning of the word must be determined by context.

The most common in both languages are phraseological units with genonymous components. These are phraseological units with the components '*mother*'- "mother" (51), '*father*'- "father" (43) in AJ, '*ana* '- "mother" (49), '*ata*'- "father" (56) in TH. Phraseological units with the component '*kyz*' - "daughter, girl, girl" (42) are also common in TYA. The productive components are '*man*' - "man" (46), '*woman*' - "woman" (27) in AYA, '*ir*' - "man, husband" (27), '*khatyn*'- "woman, wife" (24) in TYA. In AYA, a large number of phraseological units with the components '*king*' - "king" (48), '*queen*' - "queen" (19) are noted. Among

phraseological units with a component-zoononym, Tatar phraseological units with components' *cheese* '- "cow" (38), " *tavyk* ' -" chicken "(58) and English phraseological units with component '*cock*' - "The Rooster" (28).

5 Conclusions

So, the study showed that motivated phraseological units dominate in both languages, applying for a free phrase with a transparent internal form, which proves that the components of the phraseological units we examined are inherently close to words. Tatar phraseological units are characterized by particularly vivid images., Which we explain by the folkloric origin and a small proportion of semantic changes in Tatar phraseology. Most of those motivated and applying for a free phrase contain a component-genonym and such substantive components as *man, woman, boy (boy), lady (lady), eget (boyfriend), karchyk (old woman, wife)*. Among phraseological units with a darkened internal form, the prevalence of English phraseological units is noted.

Acknowledgments

Literature:

1. Vinogradov, V.V.: The main types of lexical meanings of the word / V.V. Vinogradov. Questions of linguistics. No. 5. 1953. p. 21.
2. Zhukov, V.P.: The semantics of phraseological turns. Uch. allowance for students. ped in-com. - M.: Education, 1978. P. 160.
3. Zhukov, V.P.: Russian phraseology M.: Higher School, 1986. P. 310.
4. Ibragimova, I.I.: A comparative study of somatic phraseological units (in the English language and Tat. Lang.): Dis. ... cand. filol. sciences. Kazan, 1993. P.156.
5. Molotkov, A.I.: Fundamentals of the phraseology of the Russian language. L.: Nauka, 1977.p. 283.
6. Rosemarie, G.: The Stylistic Potential of Phraseological Units in the Light of Genre Analysis. Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications, ed. by A.P. Cowie Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. pp. 125 - 144.
7. Moon, R.: The Analysis of Fixed Expressions in Text. Advances in written discourse analysis, ed. by R.M. Coulthard, London: Routledge. 1994. pp. 117-35.
8. Moon, R.: Frequencies and Forms of Phrasal Lexemes in English. Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications, ed. by A.P. Cowie, 79100. Oxford: Clarendon Press, G. Nunberg, I.A. Sag, T. Wasow. Idioms. Language 70. 1994. pp. 491-538.
9. Smith, W.G.: The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs Text. W.G. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970. P. 679.
10. The International Dictionary of English language Text. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. P. 1023.
11. The New Encyclopedia of Britannica Text. L.: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1994. p. 986.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ